

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, July 19, 1972

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

PETITION: MONALTA SEWERAGE

Mr. EVANS presented a petition signed by 65 residents of Monalta who stated that the lack of sewerage facilities in that area constituted a health hazard. The petitioners prayed that sewerage facilities be provided for Monalta concurrently with those provided for Sun Valley.

Petition received and read.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: NEWSPAPER REPORT

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. KENEALLY: I claim that this morning's edition of the *Advertiser* contains a serious misrepresentation of my political affiliation. In reporting that I presented a petition to this House yesterday, the *Advertiser* refers to me as Mr. Keneally, L.C.P., Stuart. I claim that this is a reflection upon all the ethical, political and moral values to which I adhere. Over many years, I guess, I have been called many things, and sometimes probably quite legitimately so, but never have I been referred to in such grossly offensive terms as Mr. Keneally, L.C.P., and I trust that the *Advertiser* will see fit to print an apology.

QUESTIONS**TRAVEL COMPANY**

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Attorney-General say whether the activities in this State of Travel House of Australia have been or are being investigated by his department, and whether action has been taken by the Government to help in their plight South Australians who are stranded overseas? The information made available in this morning's newspaper, and supplemented by this afternoon's newspaper, clearly indicates that many people from this State have been inconvenienced, some having lost their life savings as the result of the activities of this organization. The Commonwealth Government has said that it has made available immediately \$10,000 to help in their plight the people stranded overseas. In his reply, can the Attorney-General also say what is the Government's attitude towards making available financial assistance to South Australians who have been stranded overseas?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have, of course, read the reports in the press concerning this matter and have asked officers of my department to investigate the situation to enable me to be acquainted with the facts. I also intend to discuss with the Premier, who is also the Minister responsible for tourist activities, the general question of the consequences to South Australian citizens of this failure, and I shall let the honourable member have further information when I have more detail.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. JENNINGS: I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether you intend, this session, to alter the way in which you call members to ask questions. The member for Mitcham is Deputy Leader of the Opposition and we are told that he is also Deputy Leader of the Liberal Movement (more popularly known as the bowel movement). To allow the honourable member to do justice to his twin roles, do you intend to call him twice to every other honourable member's one call?

The SPEAKER: There will be no alteration in the procedure regarding the calling of questions.

ABORTION LEGISLATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I must say that I am rather disappointed with your reply to the member for Enfield, Mr. Speaker. I would be willing to take advantage of any such offer from the other side. I desire to ask my first question of the day of the Premier. Does the Government intend to allow any Bill to amend the provisions of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act concerning abortion to be debated in Government time? At the end of last session the member for Playford announced that he intended to introduce a private member's Bill on this topic, although he refused to make it public, in answer to my request in this House to do so. I assume from the activities that have continued since (the foundation of the Right to Life Association, the petitions presented to this House yesterday and similar petitions that I understand are still circulating widely throughout the State) that he or some other honourable member still intends to introduce a Bill on this topic. I remember that in the 1968 and 1969 sessions debate on this matter took a long time and took place in time allowed by the then Government, not in private members' time. I understand further that several other matters, Bills and so on, will be introduced by private members during the present session, so the pressure on time on Wednesday afternoon is likely to be heavy.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The pressure on Government time is likely to be not merely heavy but extreme. The Government has its programme, and an amendment to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act of the kind the honourable member has mentioned is not part of that programme. I have previously said that, if an honourable member wishes to introduce a private member's amendment concerning this matter, he is welcome to do so. If an honourable member does that he will be treated in no other way than that in which private members are treated.

Mr. Millhouse: That's even if it comes from the front bench?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Wherever it comes from in this House. If an honourable member wishes to introduce a Bill of this kind, and I presume the honourable member must intend to do so, because he has shown such extraordinary interest—

Mr. Millhouse: No, that's not so.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, if that is not so, what is the honourable member doing? Is he stirring? What is it all about? The honourable member is desperately anxious to know about the use of the time of this House to debate a measure which, apparently, he does not intend to introduce.

Mr. Millhouse: You're over-reacting.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham has asked a question. He is not now going to debate what is given in reply.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member mentioned that during his period in office a Bill was introduced and debated in Government time, and that is true. It was introduced as a Government measure and, even though he voted against some of its provisions subsequently, it was explained by the honourable member. That course will be followed by this Government.

FORESHORE STORM DAMAGE

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation say what the Government has done to assist with urgent repair work to foreshore areas damaged during the storm of June 29 and 30 this year?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: In view of the urgency of repairs to damaged areas of the foreshore, immediate action was taken by the Government to assume responsibility for recent storm damage together with uncompleted work from last year's storms. The previous system of repairs to storm damage was for the work

to be performed through councils which would let the tenders and supervise the work. However, this has resulted in delays in commencement of work. It is clear that there is an urgent need to perform work along our metropolitan coast where weaknesses exist. For this reason, on this occasion it has been decided to use the services of the Engineering and Water Supply Department to immediately perform this work. By taking this step, we have been able to commence work already in the following areas:

(1) Repair of 1971 storm damage on the Brighton Esplanade in the vicinity of Jetty Road. This damage was aggravated by the recent storms and the estimated cost of repairs is approximately \$100,000.

(2) Repair of the recent storm damage at Brighton between Downing Street and Gladstone Avenue estimated to cost \$60,000.

Within days the Engineering and Water Supply Department will begin repairs to storm damage which occurred recently on the sea front at Henley Beach in the vicinity of Chetwynd Street. This is estimated to cost about \$60,000. It is estimated that all these works will be completed by the end of October. The special type of rip-rap shore protection works recently completed at Marino, Brighton and North Glenelg successfully withstood the recent severe storm and suffered no damage whatsoever. This new method of laying rip-rap, designed in such a way as to break down wave action, is vastly different from the old methods applied in the past of simply dumping rocks on the beach at weak points along the coast. The solution has therefore been found and it only remains to institute similar protective works at the three areas of weakness referred to above and the problem of recurrent storm damage repairs will be solved.

The works to be undertaken will be properly engineered and carried out efficiently. As a result, they will be permanent and will be able to withstand the attacks of any future storms. When we have secured the foreshore against damage, all that will remain will be to replace the lost sand and keep it replenished. The various councils concerned are all in favour of the steps that the Government has taken. The recent announcement of the membership of the Coast Protection Board and the appointment soon of an Executive Engineer to the board's staff will mean that qualified expertise will be readily available to the Government to handle problems that arise in relation to our foreshore and coastline in the future.

KANGAROO ISLAND DISPUTE

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Premier say how he can justify the ethics he applied yesterday in introducing into his argument the case of a cook at Government House? The Premier yesterday gave details of a case which was never brought to court but in which a settlement was made by the Government of the day in favour of a former cook at Government House. This case was, of course, not relevant to the debate because it was not relevant to the action which the Premier yesterday tried to justify, but also—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is tending to debate the merits of the matter rather than explain the question.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I just want to point out the irrelevancy, Mr. Speaker; that is not my main point. However, in this respect the Government always considers that it is responsible for the Governor, in the same way as a matter arose on one occasion that I know of when a public servant left a paddock gate open, livestock were lost, and compensation had to be paid. In addition to the irrelevancy of the matter in question, I wish to ask the Premier how he justifies ethically what he said on either ground: first, disclosing his own private client's business in which he was involved, I take it, as a private lawyer; and, secondly, bearing in mind that Standing Order 150 prevents a member from using the name of the Governor for the purpose of influencing the House in its deliberations.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The matter was relevant in that it was a case involving an industrial dispute. It was an industrial matter of under-payment concerning an award.

Mr. Millhouse: But did you take proceedings in the Supreme Court?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I did, because under the provisions of the Industrial Code, as the honourable member will well know, once a breach of award occurs it can be sued for civilly as a civil debt. That is the mode of enforcement.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you agree with that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course, the honourable member is now hawering. He apparently does not know the mode of enforcement of decisions of this kind in the Industrial Court.

Mr. Millhouse: That's not right.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In addition to this, it was a civil action only; the Government was not involved. It was a private contract of the Governor; it was not a contract for

which the Government of the State of South Australia was responsible at all. The honourable member says it is analogous to the State Government's having to pay money for the negligence of one of its servants, but this is not so. It was a private civil debt of the Governor related, however, to an industrial matter in the breach of an award. The reason that the Government advanced for meeting not only the costs but also a substantial part of the claim was that it was not in the public interest to have the matter litigated, with the Governor as one of the parties in a civil dispute. But, in the Government's view, it was not this time in the public interest for the State to go to the kind of confrontation which members opposite asked it to do and to bring this State to a grinding, shuddering halt at enormous expense—

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Will you answer my question?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have. There is complete relevance in this. As to the question of revealing matter in which I was concerned as a lawyer, the honourable member has to face the fact that it has been the subject of a public vote in this House. It was a case listed publicly in the Supreme Court; it was not a question of revealing any private information that was under privilege of any kind.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Do you have your client's authority?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have had my client's authority in that matter for a long time.

Mr. Millhouse: Did you have it specifically on this occasion?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member believes that there has been any breach of propriety on my part as a member of the profession, no doubt he will take it to the Law Society Council, but I cannot conceive of his doing so, because he knows that what he is now saying is rubbish.

METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY

Mr. LANGLEY: Does the Minister of Works expect any difficulty in the metropolitan area in regard to meeting the demand for water next summer?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: We do not expect any difficulty.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am fully aware that there is a Question on Notice which deals, I think, with holdings in the metropolitan reservoirs. At the moment, I

do not intend to refer to the figures involved in that question; they will be kept for the person who put the question on the Notice Paper. Allowing for a minimum total intake into reservoirs (and we have about a 90 per cent chance), about 9,800,000,000 gall. will flow into the reservoirs. This will probably mean that we will have to pump from the Adelaide-Mannum main about 14,200,000,000 gall. and from the new Murray Bridge to Onkaparinga main about 5,800,000,000 gall., a total of about 20,000,000,000 gall. this year, at a total cost of \$1,104,000, compared to 2,112,000,000 gall. which was pumped last year at a cost of about \$125,000. The State will therefore probably be involved in a much heavier expenditure on pumping this year than was the case last year.

FESTIVAL THEATRE

Mrs. STEELE: Can the Premier say whether the Government has considered or will consider amending the State Lotteries Act to permit one or more lotteries a year to support the festival theatre? It is one thing to have a festival theatre which the public accepts as an important asset in benefiting the cultural life of South Australia; it is another thing for it to be able to do the job properly and so establish and maintain the standard which the community would expect of such an undertaking. Some disquiet has already been expressed that support may not be readily forthcoming from individual people and/or professional and commercial undertakings to supplement the financial support already being given by the South Australian Government and the Adelaide City Council. The festival theatre and the projected performing arts centre will be extremely expensive to run. In fact, it is questionable whether the complex can be expected in the first years of its operation to do better than break even, if in fact it does not operate at an actual loss.

The Sydney Opera House is, and has been, built with funds provided by a series of lotteries and probably its running costs in the future will continue to be subsidized by further lotteries. There is doubt whether the South Australian public, who so well support the South Australian lotteries, the revenue of which we give to hospitals, is really concerned about to what purpose the proceeds are put, provided that subscribers continue to have chances to win prizes. Further, it has been announced that officers of the Lotteries Commission are to investigate overseas the operation of football pools and some form of lotto,

and the time may soon be propitious to provide sufficient funds to run the festival theatre and the performing arts centre from either lotteries or these two possible new sources of revenue.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has not considered taking money from the lotteries to provide assistance towards the running costs of the festival theatre and the subsequent performing arts complex. The reason for this is that we do not expect that in the running of lotteries in South Australia extra money would flow to us because the object of the project is the performing arts complex rather than the Hospitals Fund. If we took money out of the Hospitals Fund that we get from the Lotteries Commission, that sum would have to be found from elsewhere in revenue, so it would only be robbing Peter to pay Paul. It is not expected that we could profitably run in South Australia the kind of lotteries that have supported the building of the Sydney Opera House at vast expense and the provision of a complex which, frankly, in many ways is not functional and which requires an enormously more expensive staff than will be required in our festival theatre and performing arts complex here. I have seen an initial budget for the festival theatre, and I expect that we will come fairly close to breaking even on it, provided that we can get a reasonably high proportion usage of the time available. However, we must expect that there will be some losses on its running; in fact, that was always expected at the time that it was intended that the City Council would run it. At that time it was expected that we would have a loss of about \$40,000 a year on the theatre alone. Although there will be some losses, I do not think they can be usefully recouped by altering the lottery situation: that would simply mean another burden on revenue in another direction. I expect that, with the new South Australian Theatre Company being set up, there will be much public involvement in the activities of the now State-supported company, and that there will be from time to time a number of appeals relating to certain projects with regard to the total performing arts complex. For instance, I hope that in due course we shall be able to provide from appeal moneys for several things that need to go into the total complex. For example, we need some significant works of sculpture, which should be formed around the towers on the plaza, and there are several things of this kind to which we hope the public will subscribe. If we all co-operate

in this project, I hope it will be by far the most beautiful and most functional performing arts complex in the southern hemisphere. I do not think I can give any further information.

Mrs. Steele: Will funds be forthcoming from either of the two other innovations to which I referred?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Not really. It is expected that, if any new ventures of this kind are undertaken, the money derived from them for the State will be heavily committed in other directions anyway.

ELIZABETH DOWNS SCHOOL

Mr. CLARK: Will the Minister of Education consider setting up a full-scale inquiry into the safety or otherwise of oil heaters in wooden classrooms? I have nothing but the highest praise for the work of the Education Department following the recent fire disaster at the Elizabeth Downs School, and the people of the area are also most happy with the speed with which the work was done and with the way in which the burned school buildings were put into use so expeditiously. As the Minister knows, a petition was signed in the area by over 500 people who expressed concern about the use of oil heaters in wooden classrooms. These people had no axe to grind themselves, for their wooden classrooms had been replaced by rooms made of material other than timber. However, they believe that a full-scale inquiry is needed to assess the position at other schools which still have many wooden classrooms. I know that, in reply to my considered petition, the Minister told me that he would ask the Public Buildings Department to inquire into the matter but, as my constituents would still like a specific inquiry made into the matter, I ask the Minister to consider this.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: First, I think I should say that it was not only officers of the Education Department who were involved in ensuring that there was no interruption to the work at the Elizabeth Downs Primary School when the 12 classrooms were burned down: if it had not been for the co-operation from and the magnificent effort by the officers of the Public Buildings Department considerable interruption to the work at that school would have been inevitable. I assure the honourable member and his constituents that the inquiry requested of the Public Buildings Department in relation to the safety of oil heaters will be a thorough-going and full inquiry and that it will be conducted by people who are competent to conduct such an inquiry.

I do not think it is possible to give any further assurance than that. I am satisfied that the investigation by the Public Buildings Department will be of a type which is appropriate in these circumstances and which will satisfy the views of parents of students at Elizabeth Downs.

SHOPPING HOURS

Mr. COUNBE: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say why the Government intends to reintroduce legislation to provide for Friday night shopping in the metropolitan area? In view of the recent increase in award rates for shop assistants which will lead to an increase in the cost of goods sold in shops, the apparent lack of enthusiasm for Friday night shopping in the metropolitan area (except in some outer-suburban areas represented by Labor members), and the added costs that are likely to flow to the consumer as a result of extended hours, why does the Government intend to introduce and proceed with this legislation this session?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: It amazes me that an Opposition member should ask such a question. For months and months Opposition members have agitated for us to make such a move, and yet they want to know why we are doing so now. I can only suggest to the honourable member that, if he is patient, a Bill containing the full details will be before him shortly.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. WELLS: Recently the Commonwealth Department of Labour and National Service released statistics in respect of unemployment conditions prevailing in Australia. Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what is the current position, especially in relation to South Australia?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: For South Australia, including the Northern Territory, the number of persons registered for employment at the end of June increased by 1,457 over the May figure to a total of 12,328 (2.3 per cent of the work force). The increase in the number of persons registered was accounted for by increased unemployment of males, with the number of females registered remaining at about the same level. Both adult and junior males seeking employment increased in number, adult males by 1,031 and junior males by 420. The number of persons registered in the Adelaide metropolitan area increased only marginally over the end of May figure. The number registered in non-metropolitan districts increased by 1,351. The largest

increases were as follows: Port Lincoln, 571; Port Pirie (including the mid-North and Yorke Peninsula), 395; and Gawler, 138. By occupational group, the bulk of the increase in unemployed was in unskilled manual workers, where the number of males registered as unemployed increased by 1,393 over the end of May figure.

It now appears, yet again, that the Commonwealth Government has no effective answer to this unemployment. All indicators suggest that the unemployment figure is stuck around the 100,000 mark and will stay there while the present Government stays in power in Canberra. If it had any answer it would surely have tried it, so that it would have had an effect in this election year. To sum up, that Government is bankrupt of ideas and, as a result, the Australian workers must continue to suffer.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Lands, say whether the policy on rural industry employment grants has been altered? I refer specifically to the Naracoorte District Council, which applied for a grant of \$30,000 and was given \$9,000 for three months. The council was employing 30 men at the termination of the last arrangement in June and expected to be able to continue to employ these people when the funds were available. However, on present arrangements, the council can employ only seven men, and 23 men are still looking for employment and an additional six persons have applied since. As the total number out of work is 29, I ask the Minister whether he will discuss this matter with his colleague to find out whether further funds can be released to improve the position in the Naracoorte area.

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

OVERLAND

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport obtain from the Railways Commissioner figures showing the number of passengers carried on the Overland for each of the past four months and for the corresponding periods last year?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes.

SALISBURY OFFICES

Mr. GROTH: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary when a police station and courthouse is likely to be constructed at Salisbury? The Salisbury council has told me

that it has land available within the Salisbury centre that would be suitable for the erection of a police station and courthouse, and the council would be willing to negotiate with the Government on the use of this land for such a purpose. That there is a demand in Salisbury for a police station and courthouse is borne out by the publicity centred around the hearing of unsatisfied judgment summons cases, in that some justices of the peace have criticized the hall in which these cases are heard at present. I consider that the hall is adequate for hearing these cases but, nevertheless, any civil cases that must be heard at Elizabeth courthouse place a great financial burden on people who must travel there at some inconvenience because of irregular bus and train services.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I can answer part of the honourable member's question, as only the part relating to his suggestion about a courthouse at Salisbury pertains to my department. The courthouse at Elizabeth, when first constructed and opened, was intended to cater for the needs of the whole area, including Salisbury, and this was because a policy had been developed that was designed to provide the maximum adequate standard facilities that could be provided with available public funds in this field. To attain that, it would be necessary to concentrate the expenditure of funds on a single building in a central position, designed to serve the needs of the whole area. If funds are dissipated in constructing courthouses in several centres, the result will be that the standard of accommodation in none of them is adequate for the purpose. The policy that has been laid down and is still being followed is that, where possible, the funds should be concentrated on constructing a building of adequate standard in a situation that will serve the needs of a relatively wide area. The policy which was followed before I assumed office and to which I have adhered is that the courthouse at Elizabeth should serve the needs of the surrounding area, including Salisbury. An exception was made in the case of unsatisfied judgment summons matters and certain interlocutory proceedings, because of the inconvenience to people at Salisbury who would have to travel to Elizabeth for those cases. Whereas, generally speaking, a person is involved in a contested court case only once or, at any rate, a few times in a lifetime, unfortunately some people appear before the unsatisfied judgment court several times and their position is such that it is a burden on them to

have to travel even the four miles to the Elizabeth courthouse. For that reason arrangements were made to hear unsatisfied judgment cases in the Masonic Hall at Salisbury. That is far from ideal and the department would prefer that the hearings took place at Elizabeth. The files are kept at Elizabeth; the administration is centred there; and there are many reasons of convenience and efficiency that point to Elizabeth as the place for the hearing of these cases. However, the position of the local people of Salisbury has prevailed and the arrangement for hearing the cases in Salisbury has continued, but my examination of the position has convinced me that there would be no justification in present circumstances for spending funds that would be required to erect a new courthouse in the Salisbury area. That is not to say that the day will never come when the construction of such a courthouse is justified. It depends very much on development in the area as to what is required to serve the people of that area, but I can only say that, having regard to the funds available and likely to be available in future and the demands in relation to those funds, there is no prospect in the foreseeable future of the construction of a courthouse at Salisbury.

I greatly regret having to say that, because I know that there is considerable feeling in Salisbury that a courthouse is desirable. One always would like to meet aspirations of that kind, but one has a duty to ensure that funds are spent in the best possible way for the benefit of the whole community. I will refer the matter of the police station to my colleague, because I do not know whether there are any plans for the erection of that building, and I will give the honourable member a reply later.

CONCRETE SLEEPER INDUSTRY

Mr. HALL: Will the Premier say whether he is concerned about the state of the concrete sleeper industry in South Australia, and whether he expects the successful tenderer in response to the Commonwealth Railways advertisement for the supply of 200,000 sleepers to be announced soon? Is the Premier taking the necessary action to combat at Commonwealth level the alleged Country Party influence that is said to be working on behalf of the Western Australian timber industry? I refer to an article in this morning's *Advertiser*, written by Stewart Cockburn, which has the following statement as a heading:

Federal Country Party pressure on behalf of the Western Australian timber industry is alleged to be threatening multi-million dollar

contracts for rail sleepers sought by the concrete products industry in South Australia.

This matter is of great industrial significance to South Australia, because the manufacture of such concrete sleepers could bring in as much as \$15,000,000 to this State. It is reported in that article that concrete sleepers are far superior in performance to wooden sleepers and that experts from the Commonwealth Railways recommend their use. I have been told privately that the prices submitted by South Australian tenderers are competitive in price with the price tendered in respect of Western Australian wooden sleepers. In addition to the superior technical performance of the local sleepers, the excellence of the South Australian cement industry is well known throughout Australia and, as a result, we could well lead this nation in providing the highest standards of railway track construction. In submitting this question to the Premier, I ask that he take all necessary steps to ensure that political pressures outside this State are not exerted on behalf of industries in other States to injure the South Australian economy.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government, which has been concerned about this matter for some time, has been directly involved in making submissions to the Commonwealth Government about the superiority of concrete sleepers and the development of a concrete sleeper industry in South Australia. I have been aware for some time of the matter to which the honourable member refers and which is raised in Mr. Cockburn's article this morning. Some time ago I conferred personally with the leaders of the concrete sleeper industry in South Australia and submissions are being made by the South Australian Government to the Commonwealth Government on this matter.

KINGSTON BRIDGE

Mr. CURREN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the programme for the construction of the new bridge at Kingston-on-Murray is on schedule and when it is expected that the bridge will be open for traffic? The construction of this bridge is of great economic importance to the residents of my district, not only commercially but also from the point of view of tourism and private travel. The completion of the bridge will benefit residents of my district greatly.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I can appreciate the concern of the honourable member about this project because of its importance to him and to his constituents. His concern explains

why the honourable member has on numerous occasions sought information from me on the progress being made. At the last check it appeared that the bridgework would be completed on schedule in the latter part of December this year. Some months ago I had an opportunity of viewing the project first hand and was present for the laying of the first beam. I had discussions with the bridge contractor, who confirmed my belief about the completion date of work on the bridge. Ancillary roadworks that cannot be carried out until the bridgework is completed will take another six to eight weeks and then the bridge will be put into service early in 1973 and become part of the road network leading to the honourable member's district.

FALL-OUT

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether rainfall in the Adelaide Hills and in other country areas where reticulated water is not supplied will be monitored for radioactive fall-out on a regular weekly basis and whether the results will be made public immediately they are available to the Minister? In areas where there is no reticulated water and where people rely mainly on rainwater, it is of concern to those people that radioactive fall-out figures be disclosed because, if there was a substantial increase in such fall-out, they would then have the opportunity of releasing the water as they would know what was the level of radioactive fall-out in the water they had collected. It is important for the sake of their health and that of their children that they know the results immediately they become available. Such monitoring should be carried out on a regular weekly basis. Although at this time there is no real fear of great contamination, because fall-out is not at a high level, this matter must be watched as a matter of general safety as the time may not be far distant when the contamination will be high enough to be dangerous to people.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It is the responsibility of the Minister of Works to have such monitorings carried out and these readings taken. I have spoken to my colleague on this matter because of my natural interest in it. I believe that for the detail the honourable member seeks the matter should be referred to my colleague. I will take this matter up with him and see that the honourable member is supplied with the information he requires.

FOOTBALL POOLS

Mr. SLATER: Will the Attorney-General, representing the Chief Secretary, say whether an approach has been made by private individuals or organizations for permission to operate football pools in South Australia and, if it has, whether it is likely that the Government will give permission for the introduction of such pools in this State in the near future?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I shall be pleased to refer the matter to my colleague and give the honourable member a reply.

FILTRATION

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Works say whether he now believes that the filtration of Adelaide's water supply is now necessary for reasons of safety and, if he does, what danger to the community does he fear in the present water supply? Members will have read for, I think, the third time the announcement during the recess of plans to filter Adelaide's water supply. In that statement the Minister was reported as having said that, although in the past Adelaide's water was not aesthetically attractive, it was nevertheless safe. For the first time the Minister is reported as having said that filtration may have to be considered now for reasons of safety. There is much disquiet and uneasiness in the community about the various dangers that can occur in our water supply, and I believe that the Minister should make a statement to reassure members of the community on this matter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member will be aware that I make statements from time to time, especially when some people try to suggest the existence of a danger that does not really exist. I seem to recall that the honourable member himself has recently tried to do that at least once. For the first time (and I emphasize that it was the first time) I announced just recently on behalf of the Government that, if it was returned at the next election, its policy would be to proceed with filtration of the metropolitan Adelaide water supply. I had indicated on a couple of occasions previously that investigations were proceeding in this matter, but at no time had I indicated that it was the Government's policy to implement such a plan.

Dr. Tonkin: Was it misreported?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It was not misreported. That was exactly what was stated in the press and it was only recently that I said this would be the Government's policy. Indeed, the Liberal Party announced that it

would filter the water supply, and that was put forward, prior to the last election, by the then Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Hall) as his Party's policy.

Mr. Millhouse: And your Leader pooh-poohed it at the time.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham must cease interjecting when Ministers are on their feet replying. The honourable Minister of Works.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: On that basis work is proceeding, involving the necessary design, for filtration to occur. The Adelaide water supply, as well as that in other parts of the State which receive a supply reticulated by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, is perfectly safe now, as it has been in the past and will be in the future. Filtration will make the water more attractive aesthetically; it will be sparkling clear water and, of course, this is desirable anyway. One of the other reasons that persuaded the Government in this matter is that some time in the future the suspended solids in the water will increase to the extent that they will mask the effect of chlorination, and at that stage viruses may not be as easily killed as they are at present. I think this was what the honourable member was aiming at when he asked this question. We would not expect, of course, that if filtration did not take place for the next 20 years we would have any cause for alarm. However, the Government recognized that if filtration had to be implemented at some future time it was better to implement it now than, say, at a stage when it had to be implemented for that specific reason. This was probably the aspect referred to by the honourable member, but I assure him that the supply is perfectly safe and will be safe until filtration takes place.

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister say when it is intended to filter, water pumped into the Morgan-Whyalla main? The Minister said that the major factor in the Adelaide water supply which was building up and might cause some danger later involved suspended solids. We have heard that suspended solids are present to a high degree in the Morgan-Whyalla main, and we have also heard the terms of a petition presented in the House yesterday by the member for Stuart. Will the filtration of water going into the Morgan-Whyalla main be considered as an urgent measure? Is the Government considering this at all and, if it is, will it depend on the Government's being elected at the next election?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is not the Government's intention to filter water supplied through the Morgan-Whyalla main; I hope that is clear. The honourable member said he had been told there was a great number of suspended solids in the Morgan-Whyalla main, but I should like him to check that information, because that is not the case. The Morgan-Whyalla main is cleaned regularly. The temporary units that were installed by the Government to combat the amoebic meningitis late last summer have been completely successful, so much so that permanent stations are being installed. Recently Dr. Anderson, who is the recognized authority on this virus, stated that the measures taken by the Government regarding water supplies at Port Augusta, Port Pirie and Whyalla had been completely effective. The only way the Government can effectively kill the amoebae is by chlorination, as there is no other known method. It is not the intention of the Government to filter water from the Morgan-Whyalla main. I think the honourable member will be aware that there is no necessity to do so and I believe it would be a difficult engineering problem to solve. Although I am not an engineer, I have been told it would be a tremendously complex problem to effectively filter the water to all the areas served by the Morgan-Whyalla main.

Dr., Tonkin: Expensive?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is not only an expensive undertaking but a very difficult one as well. It is something one does not do at the source of supply, because that does not have the desired effect.

NORTH GLENELG BRIDGE

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport investigate the possibility of providing a footbridge south of the King Street bridge at Glenelg North over the Patawalonga Lake during reconstruction of the existing bridge, including work on additions to the Patawalonga Lake regulator gates? Under the south-western suburbs drainage scheme, involving alterations to the Patawalonga Lake at Glenelg North, the King Street bridge will be reconstructed, the ends of it being severed during the widening process, and I believe that the regulator gates are to be extended. As a result of this work, which may commence within three months, about 1,000 people living on the Glenelg North peninsula will only have access via the Anderson Avenue bridge, which is in poor condition, or via the new road between Military Road and Tapley Hill Road. Will the Minister therefore investigate the

possibility of constructing a footbridge across the Patawalonga Lake south of the King Street bridge in order to give schoolchildren, as well as other people who do not drive motor cars, easy access, for instance, to the nearby school?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: A temporary bridge?

Mr. BECKER: Yes. When the King Street bridge is rebuilt, the centre part of the footbridge might be demolished, and the eastern and western parts of it retained as boat moorings.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will examine this question, which has been asked on numerous occasions previously. Although I do not know whether the honourable member has introduced anything new, I understand that answers have previously been given, but I will review the whole matter again and bring down a report for the honourable member.

MARGARINE

Mr. SIMMONS: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to take action to see that members of the public wishing to eat polyunsaturated table margarine will be able to purchase this commodity without restriction? It has recently become difficult to purchase this commodity in my district, the reason given being the existence of quotas on its production. Without wishing to canvass the relative merits of butter and this type of margarine, I point out that a considerable body of experts considers that animal fats may be harmful to health and, rightly or wrongly, many people prefer to use polyunsaturated margarine. As this commodity is produced in Australia and is, as far as I know, not harmful to health, and as it is competitive in price with butter, will the Minister ascertain why persons should not be permitted to have a free choice in the matter?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take up the matter with my colleague and bring down a report for the honourable member.

EYRE HIGHWAY

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say when he will stop deceiving the people of this State and publicly acknowledge that the Government is continuing to implement many aspects of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Plan? Further, will he say whether the Government's acceptance of this document will have any adverse effect on expenditure in respect of important country roads?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know what is the honourable member's disappoint-

ment in relation to this matter. He apparently has the idea that something adverse is happening in regard to country roads, but I do not know of any area in this State that is receiving more financial assistance than is the honourable member's district. Obviously, he has not read the statement of the Premier to the effect that the State Government will find the money to construct the Eyre Highway in the honourable member's district, even though the Commonwealth Government has consistently refused the requests of not only this Government but also the former Government of the honourable member, led by Mr. Hall. The Commonwealth Government has consistently ignored South Australia's rights in this matter, and it was only after the Premier made the announcement concerning the Eyre Highway that we suddenly found the Commonwealth Government considering the provision of about \$600,000,000 in respect of national highways. I think that the honourable member should give credit to the Premier rather than take the snide action he has taken in attacking this problem.

PRODUCE DEPARTMENT

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he intends to table the report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Government Produce Department? On March 29 this year, I asked whether the Minister of Agriculture had received the report and, if he had, whether he intended to table it. On April 5, I received a reply which said that the Minister had received the report of the committee but that he had not had an opportunity to study it. After he had studied the report, he said, he would decide whether it would be tabled. I assume that since April the Minister of Agriculture has had time to study the report and I now ask his colleague what is the decision regarding its tabling.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take the matter up and let the honourable member know what is my colleague's intention.

BALED HAY

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Marine say what is the cost a ton for loading baled lucerne hay from the wharves at Port Adelaide to ships carrying livestock to Kuwait? In the south-eastern part of my district there has evolved an industry growing lucerne by irrigation. Some of this is made into pellets for export to Japan and the rest is baled and sold as baled lucerne hay. The growers receive \$24 a ton on the property and a charge of

\$5 a ton is made to cart the hay from the district to Port Adelaide and stack it in the shed on the wharf. I am told it costs \$20 a ton to load the baled hay from the wharf to the ship, which works out at 60c a bale. The growers consider this cost is excessive because baled lucerne hay can be picked up from the paddock and stacked for 10c a bale.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not aware of what the charges are but I will take the matter up with the Marine and Harbors Department and see whether I can obtain the information the honourable member requires.

BRIGHTON ROAD

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the work on the remaking of the section of Brighton Road between Don Avenue and Strathmore Terrace will be completed before work on the section from Dunrobin Road northward to Anzac Highway? The Minister of Education announced in the local press last week that this section would be resealed after the water main was replaced. As he is as familiar with Brighton Road as I am, I am sure he realizes that the worst section of Brighton Road is between Dunrobin Road and Anzac Highway.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The hold-up with Brighton Road, as the honourable member has been told on many occasions, is the relaying of the water main. I do not know what the situation is at the moment, but I will obtain the information and let the honourable member know.

DR. MOLLER'S CLINIC

Mr. FERGUSON: Can Dr. Tonkin say what were his findings and conclusions following his visit to Dr. Moller's clinic in Kassel, where oxygen is used in the treatment of vascular diseases?

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member for Bragg wish to reply?

Dr. TONKIN: I will do my best in the circumstances. I visited Dr. Moller's clinic in Kassel, Germany, on April 28, 1972. I received every courtesy from Dr. Moller and his staff, and am most grateful for his hospitality. He was most anxious to explain to me the work of his clinic in detail, and did so. I spent much of the day watching him at work, and discussing with him the various patients seen, their treatment, and the indications for and results of therapy.

In summary, Dr. Moller treats three main conditions associated with the circulation;

varicose veins, varicose ulceration, and generalized arteriosclerosis (that is, hardening of the arteries). The methods used are identical to those commonly accepted and used throughout the world, and the results are those to be expected from these procedures. There is no secret drug or ingredient available to Dr. Moller which is not obtainable in Australia. As well as using these methods, Dr. Moller uses a machine to bubble oxygen gas into the femoral artery of the lower limb in the treatment of generalized arteriosclerosis. He also injects small quantities of oxygen under the skin of the calf and ankle.

This use of oxygen, which he has described and advocated over the years in several medical papers, has been tried and evaluated in a number of centres, including Adelaide, but no advantages over existing methods of treatment have been found. Dr. Moller's opinion of the value of oxygen therapy has thus not been generally confirmed by medical authorities, and the treatment is not generally accepted as advantageous by doctors. Patients returning from treatment in Kassel generally fall into one of three categories. First, there are those people, about whom little is heard, who are not improved. These people cannot be helped anywhere. Secondly, there are those people who are improved because of the accepted treatment given, or who would have improved during the period of their visit anyway, and who benefit from the positive attitude at the clinic which encourages co-operation with treatment, exercise, etc. For example, smoking is strongly discouraged, or banned, and this will lead to an improvement in many cases anyway. These patients, who may be shown to be clinically improved, will benefit from similar treatment and encouragement in Australia. Thirdly, there are those people who return feeling much better, in spite of no apparent change in clinical and laboratory findings before and after treatment. I have seen those findings at Dr. Moller's clinic. These people, who are often most vociferous in their demands that oxygen therapy be made available in Australia, have had their symptoms relieved by their visit, and naturally tend to attribute this relief to the one thing not used in Australia, that is the oxygen. But since many other factors, including the trip itself, are involved in their psychological improvement, the provision of oxygen therapy in Australia is unlikely to help these people. It is unfortunate they have so little insight into the reasons for their improvement in symptoms, since it is frequently these people, believing everyone can

be helped as they have been, who promote oxygen therapy and so cause distress to those people who cannot travel to Germany, ultimate disappointment to those patients who can go and who cannot be helped, and unnecessary trouble and expense to those who are improved by treatments already available and in use in Australia.

Dr. Moller also, on Mondays and Fridays only, administers injections of fresh cells, in what is popularly understood as rejuvenation therapy. This form of treatment is also not accepted by the medical profession generally.

BREAD

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether the Government intends to introduce legislation on the hours during which bread baking may take place? I understand that letters have been sent to bakers seeking their views on this matter. I do not need to point out to the Minister that weekend baking enables many country bakers to remain in business despite keen competition from the larger city bakeries.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: True, letters have gone out seeking the views of bakers in various country areas. Up to the present, we have received a few replies. However, until we receive replies from everyone who has been canvassed in relation to baking hours, we shall not be able to make a firm decision in respect of legislation. I can tell the honourable member that the matter is being watched constantly and that negotiations are taking place. In fact, some time next week I will meet the parties for further discussions.

PRINCES HIGHWAY

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say when the Government will commence upgrading the western end of Princes Highway, from Measday Hill to the outskirts of the city, from highway status to freeway status? With many other members, I was delighted with the tour the Minister arranged for members and others before the opening of the new section of the Princes Highway freeway from Stirling to Germantown Hill. It was obvious that, on the return home, the bus had to reduce speed when we came down Measday Hill and were confronted by two somewhat remarkable signs (I hope motorists take notice of the signs) that required us to reduce speed quickly because of the second-grade or third-grade nature of the road that we were approaching. It is obvious to the average motorist, when he comes to the highway at the end of the freeway, that it is not

nearly up to the standard of the freeway over which he has travelled. I believe that it is in the interests of safety, as well as in the interests of providing access to the metropolitan area for country people (especially people who we hope will live in the new city) that this section of the highway be upgraded.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As the honourable member will know, at present we plan to take the South-Eastern Freeway as far as the Murray New Town in a period of five years, and the Highways Department has plans well in hand to conform to that programme. It is not intended to upgrade any of the existing sections of road in cases where these sections will be virtually replaced by the South-Eastern Freeway, unless some sections reach the stage where they are highly dangerous; I do not think this has occurred anywhere at this stage. Some minor alterations are taking place where conditions can be made safer but, generally speaking, we are looking towards replacement rather than renovation in the case of the existing route.

VOTING RIGHTS

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Attorney-General say how much the Government has spent so far in advertising the voting rights of 18-year-olds and urging them to apply to have their names placed on the State electoral roll? I would like the answer to include a breakdown of expenditure for daily metropolitan newspapers, weekly suburban newspapers, provincial newspapers, radio and television. I have noticed in the daily press extensive advertising concerning the rights of young people between 18 and 21 years to now add their names to the State electoral roll. I am completely in accord with this, because I believe they have the right and privilege to enrol, if they wish to do so. However, I am concerned at what I consider to be discrimination levelled against young people in the country, who are not being given the same degree of information as is being placed in the metropolitan newspapers through the two dailies and the weekly suburban newspapers which go into most houses in the metropolitan area. I have not yet seen one single advertisement in country newspapers advising young people of their electoral rights. I suggest that this represents discrimination in two forms. First, the country newspapers are being denied a share in the Government's extensive advertising programme, thereby being denied important revenue at a time when other forms of advertising in these country newspapers have been reduced by the difficult

economic situation in the country. Secondly, and more importantly, we see again blatant disregard by the Government of country people. It would seem the Government wants only to encourage voting by young people in the metropolitan area, where it believes it will win majority support because of the past breakdown of electoral support for the major parties. I challenge the Attorney-General to deny that this form of discrimination is taking place, and I ask him to improve the situation forthwith.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I suppose that the challenge was by way of explaining the question. I have been ignorant enough to think that citizens of this State who reside in the country read the daily newspapers. I should think that the people on whose behalf the Leader claims to be speaking would be rather surprised to learn from him that they do not read the daily newspapers. I should think that people in the country areas of South Australia, including those in the 18 years to 21 years age group, would have much more interest in public affairs than apparently is credited to them by the Leader.

Dr. Eastick: Stick to the point.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Therefore, I think that the whole point of the question is baseless, as it rests on a false foundation, namely, an assumption that country people do not read daily newspapers. However, I will obtain the information about costs that the Leader seeks, although its relevance completely escapes me.

CLARE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: What information can the Minister of Education give about the alteration to the existing sealed road near the Clare High School, and also about the road, known as Elliot Street, which leads on to the highway in front of the new high school? A few weeks ago the Minister was invited to the Clare High School continental where he had an opportunity to see the problem that exists outside the school in relation to traffic on the main bitumen road, and also at the point where the passengers of school buses disembark. As it is some time now since the Minister visited the school, I should think he would have some information about the matter, and I should be pleased if he would give it now, if he has it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member is not very good at checking his facts, and I think that is a pity.

Mr. Clark: He doesn't read the newspapers.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: He does not even read the local newspaper. Regarding the main road, the matter has been fully considered, certain proposals having been put forward. The people in the area have been fully informed about this. The access road was not the main point of the representations made to me in Clare at a function which I attended but which the honourable member did not attend. The main point made concerning the safety of children coming to and going from the school was that the main road at that point was narrow, many bicycles had to turn right into the school across the traffic, and, consequently, there was considerable danger. That was the immediate problem that I had investigated on returning to Adelaide and, as far as I know, that matter has been dealt with properly. Last week I received from the high school council a further letter regarding the access road, and the matter is being investigated at present. Therefore, the reply to the honourable member's specific question is "None".

KANGAROOS

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation tell me what is the position in South Australia concerning kangaroos, and can he assure me that no instances occur in this State such as those portrayed in a television programme last evening? I raise this matter because last evening I saw on the television programme *This Day Tonight* that it was reported that in Queensland brutal killing of kangaroos occurred, depleting their number to such an extent that kangaroo shooters were poaching over the New South Wales border.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I assure the honourable member that the situation that apparently she saw last evening on television is not likely to occur in South Australia, and I think the lack of controls over the shooting of kangaroos in Queensland has tended to be reported in a considerably wider way and has led to many people in the community thinking, because of what goes on in that State, that the kangaroo is threatened with extinction throughout Australia. Certainly, in all States except Queensland the kangaroo is protected by legislation and the honourable member will recall that, when the National Parks and Wild Life Bill was introduced in this House last year, we pointed out that all kangaroos were protected in terms of that legislation, the only instances in which they could be destroyed being those where landowners were provided

with a permit to destroy kangaroos that were deemed to be in pest proportions on their property. Those landowners are required to satisfy officers of the National Parks and Wild Life Department that they have an excessive number of kangaroos on their property, and they are given a permit to destroy what is considered to be the number by which the property is overstocked. This situation works quite satisfactorily and the position is under control, in that we have control over any destruction of kangaroos. One weakness in our present situation is that it is difficult to police firmly the number of kangaroos that may be killed after a permit has been issued, because our inspectors cannot be on every property to count the number exactly, to ensure compliance with the permit that has been issued. I reported to the House earlier that we were contemplating adopting a system similar to that in Western Australia, namely, that where a permit for, say, the destruction of 200 kangaroos that may be overstocked on a property is issued, if a tagging system is introduced whereby each of those kangaroos, after being destroyed, has placed on it a tag containing the licence number, we will be able to ensure absolutely that no problems occur in this direction. This matter is being considered, and I expect a report to be made to me soon. If the report is favourable, such a system can be introduced here.

ENVIRONMENT REPORT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether the Government intends to make public the report of the committee on environment? If it does not so intend, will the Minister say why? His Excellency announced in the Speech yesterday that the committee's report had been received and that the Government intended to introduce an environment protection Bill during this session. Indeed, I think it was known before His Excellency spoke yesterday that the Government had received the report. Of course, the Government of which I was a member appointed that committee, not long before the election in 1970. It would be a very great help to members of this place and, it goes without saying, of great interest to the public of South Australia to know what is contained in the report, and I think I am not exceeding my authority when I say that I think the previous Government intended that the report, when received, should be published. I therefore put the question to the Minister and, if he cares to explain when some of the

many other reports which the Government has had but which it is still hugging to its bosom, such as the report of the water rating committee, can be made public, I should be grateful.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: True, the committee on environment has completed its findings and has provided me with a copy of its report. I point out to the honourable member that it is a very good report, quite lengthy and containing much detail. I am sure that the honourable member properly expresses the views of other members of this Parliament when he says that he would like to see the report, and I am sure that that also applies to members of the public, who have a great interest in the subject. I intend to provide members of Parliament with a copy of this report and also to make the report public. The time when that report will be made available is not clear now but I assure the honourable member that I shall be making it available as soon as possible.

DIABETIC DRINK

Mr. WELLS: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to provide a report on the health hazards that may accompany the drinking of a diabetic soft drink known as Tab? One of my constituents came to me yesterday extremely concerned that her three children, during lunch hour and the recess period at school, were buying, with pocket money that she had given them, a soft drink known as Tab, which is the diabetic type of soft drink produced by the firm concerned. The woman was horrified to find that on the can was printed the warning "Take on medical advice only".

Mr. Mathwin: That applies to whisky, too, doesn't it?

Mr. WELLS: There is a warning on cigarette packets, but no-one reads it. Of course, this woman's children have had no such medical advice. She was extremely concerned, and I also am concerned. I want to know what health hazards confront persons, including children, who drink this beverage, and I want to know whether the Minister will take action to prevent the easy sale of this beverage if he is satisfied that the health hazards are serious enough. Also, I want the Minister to consider restricting the sale of this beverage to certain avenues and not permitting its sale in any delicatessen where a child can get it.

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

FLAMMABLE CLOTHING

Mrs. STEELE: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say where or what is the stumbling block that prevents the introduction of standards governing the use of flammable materials in the manufacture of children's clothing? I am afraid this question is a hoary old chestnut. Questions on this matter have been asked in this House for years, and the replies given never get beyond the point of affirming the concern and attention given the subject by the Ministers concerned at meetings held from time to time in the various State capitals. I last mentioned this matter to the Minister in March this year and he said that the Ministers were still awaiting a firm decision from the Australian Standards Association, which was investigating the matter. Recently, publicity has been given to an extra hazard, that of blankets made of flammable material. It seems appalling that any further delay is acceptable to the Ministers charged with the responsibility of safeguarding the community from such hazards, especially when it is children who are so often the victims. From time to time the Medical Superintendent of the Adelaide Children's Hospital makes outspoken comments on this problem, which should be of great concern to the Government, drawing attention to the increasing admissions of cases of burns caused by the ignition of children's clothing, particularly night attire. Will the South Australian Minister give a lead in this direction to all other State Ministers and insist that a decision, long overdue from the Australian Standards Association, be immediately forthcoming?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I shall be leaving this evening to attend a Minister's conference in Melbourne tomorrow at which this matter will be discussed. It is hoped that all Ministers will be then able to decide whether they will be able to introduce legislation this year.

WATER RATING

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Minister of Works investigate the possibility of implementing a new system of excess water rating? The current system of excess water rating could react adversely against people living in dry areas. People who live in areas of high rainfall and who use excess water could be accused of extravagance but, in areas of low rainfall, excess water usage is necessary. Will the Minister consider introducing a system where the cost of excess water bears a direct

relation to the level of annual rainfall of the area concerned?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member is aware that already the Government bears a great loss on country water supplies, especially water supplied to the area in which the honourable member's district is situated. From memory, I think that the loss sustained by the Government to supply Port Augusta alone is \$163,000 in one financial year and, no matter what method the Government might adopt regarding excess water, it must face up to the fact that it cannot afford to make that water available at any rate lower than the current rate. I do not know what system could be evolved, and I think that the honourable member should be asking, "Will the Government make water available more cheaply?" I am sorry to say that the reply is the same as I have already given to the honourable member in the past: that we cannot see our way clear to do that. The whole system of water rating is subject to a report, to which the member for Mitcham referred earlier today. I refer to the report of the Sangster committee. The evaluation of this report is currently being undertaken by officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and is almost completed. When I have received that evaluation I shall then have to refer to the Treasury to decide whether the method of rating will be changed in any way. This is an extremely complex matter, and I point out that, whatever the outcome of the Government's decision regarding water rating, it will not, in my view, be able to afford to collect less for the water supplied to people throughout South Australia. Although I acknowledge the points the honourable member has made about water usage in dry areas, I cannot at this stage say whether any relief will be provided to people in the area he has mentioned.

UNDERGROUND WATER SURVEY

Mr. CUMBE: Will the Minister of Works provide me with information regarding the matter raised by the Governor in his Speech about an underground water survey being carried out in the South-East? The Minister would recall that this project was started some years ago when funds were made available for this work. Will he give an up-to-date report on the findings regarding the availability of underground water in this area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member would like to say that his Government started this investigation.

Mr. Cumbe: I did not say that.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In fact, the investigation into the water resources of the South-East has been speeded up because this Government believes that it is important to know as accurately as possible what these resources are. Also, it initiated an investigation into all aspects of pollution of underground water in that area. As the honourable member would know as a result of his experience, it is extremely important not only to that area of the State but also to the State as a whole that we do not pollute that source, which could be easily done when it is realized that the people of the South-East are living virtually on top of the water supply. First, about 640 bores and 20 measuring stations are required in the South-East as part of the investigation. About 600 bores have already been sunk or registered, although in some cases existing bores have been used, and 14 measuring stations have been installed. Additionally, a comprehensive weather station and other equipment installed near Greenways has been functioning for 12 months. However, it will require probably 10 years of data collection from these sources before we can accurately say what are our total resources in this area, although preliminary indications show there is sufficient water in the South-East to support a total population at this stage of at least 250,000 people.

Mr. Coumbe: Is the Water Resources Council assisting in this matter?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not certain whether it is assisting in this matter, but it is involved in other investigations. As the honourable member would know, we are conducting an investigation over the whole of the State, including the northern part of the State. I shall be happy at any time to obtain further information and to make it available, because many theories have been advanced previously. However, it is considered that huge quantities of water in the area are not available to the extent that some would have us believe. I have only in the last day or so received an interim report from the committee set up to examine pollution aspects. That is not a final report and, although I have not yet had time to read it, I expect that it is an interesting document.

CHILD-MINDING CENTRE

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Attorney-General obtain from the Chief Secretary a report on what progress has been made regarding the proposal to establish a child-minding centre at the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes.

CLARENDON RESERVOIR

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Works say what progress has been made on the planning and construction of the proposed Clarendon reservoir? On March 4 last year, at page 3775 of *Hansard*, the Minister, in reply to a question I asked, said:

During July, 1970, the possible construction programme for the dam was examined in the light of funds likely to be available for this project. Subject to recommendation from the Public Works Committee and approval by the Government, planning following the construction of the exploratory adit between January and July, 1971, allowed for the construction of the diversion tunnel and tower base between February and August, 1972, and work on the main dam contract between June, 1973, and May, 1976. With no further change in the present financial situation, the overall completion date is not likely to be delayed, although some delay in the timing of the diversion tunnel is probable. Meanwhile, land for the project is being obtained as it comes on to the market.

In the Governor's Speech yesterday, there was only one reference to the Clarendon reservoir, namely:

Acquisition of land at Chain of Ponds and other areas for the protection of metropolitan reservoirs, including land for the proposed Clarendon and Little Para reservoirs, is proceeding.

I asked earlier this year whether work on the dam had been postponed at that stage, and the Minister replied on April 4:

Concurrently with the Government's consideration of the Loan Estimates for next financial year, the project to which the honourable member has referred and many other projects are being considered. As soon as a decision is made, either the honourable member will become aware of it when the Loan Estimates are presented or, if it is possible to let him know beforehand, to allay some of the fears he has expressed on behalf of his constituents, I will let him know.

I ask this question again today, because many of my constituents are still unaware of the position: having heard rumours that construction has been delayed for six to eight years, some of them wish to make additions to their dairies, effect improvements generally to their properties, or leave their properties. As we approach the Loan Estimates debate, I believe that the Minister should know by now whether or not it is likely that work will proceed, and I ask the question now in order to get a definite reply if possible.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will not at this stage give the honourable member the information he seeks, bearing in mind that the Loan Estimates are due to be considered in August and are being compiled now. I will

examine the question, so that the people concerned will know definitely what is the score. I think the previous reply given regarding the availability of funds still stands: I think I said that, if the position did not change, the completion date would be some time in 1976. However, I will examine the question and give a considered reply.

ABATTOIRS REPORT

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, any information on the situation regarding the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board and on Mr. Ron Gray's report concerning its operations? In April this year, when I asked the Minister a similar question, he informed me that a report from Mr. Gray was expected within a month or six weeks, in about May. As it is now two months later than that expected date, I expect that the Minister has some information on Mr. Gray's investigations at the abattoirs and that he has a statement to make to the House concerning this matter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

POLICE COMMISSIONER

Mr. HALL: Will the Premier say whether the Government secured the services of Mr. Salisbury as Police Commissioner by offering him a superannuation arrangement that would enable him to retire after not more than 10 years and to receive a much greater entitlement than that of the former Police Commissioner (Mr. McKinna)? Further, will he say what are the financial details of this arrangement?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There was a negotiation concerning a special superannuation provision in order for Mr. Salisbury to come from England and to forgo certain provisions that he had there. There were negotiations with the Home Office, and there were negotiations concerning this superannuation provision whereby a special contract has been executed. I will get the details of that and let the honourable member know.

MOUNT PLEASANT SCHOOL

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Education arrange for the Mount Pleasant Primary School to receive financial assistance for the purchase of, a heavy duty 26in. mower? I have received a letter from the Secretary of the school committee who says that it was necessary for the committee to buy the 26in. mower to cut the school oval grass because the arrangements they had with the Talunga

Park curator were terminated as a result of legal complications. The committee made a request under the subsidy scheme when it was operating and later made an application under the capital works subsidy scheme, which was refused. The committee was told that the item should be covered by the ground maintenance grant, which is \$50 a year. The mower cost \$386.65. There is a large playing area to look after but, as there are only 55 pupils, a considerable burden is placed on the school committee. I am convinced that the purchase of the mower was necessary for the work needed to be done. I wonder whether there is any other suggestion the Minister can make to enable these people to get financial assistance over and above the \$50.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will look into the matter.

McNALLY TRAINING CENTRE

Mr. McANANEY: My question is to the Minister representing the Attorney-General during his absence. Many of the inmates have absconded from the McNally Training Centre over the past years and have done considerable damage whilst at large. Does the Government make any—

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of Sessional Committees.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor:

1. We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the Speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.

2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to the matters placed before us.

3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

Mr. CLARK (Elizabeth): I move that the Address in Reply as read be adopted. During the last 20 years I have listened to about 20 Address in Reply debates, and I do not think I have ever appreciated more the reading of the Governor's Speech than I did yesterday.

I think this may be partly because the Governor read it in an interesting way and partly because he is a man for whom I have a great admiration indeed. I believe we are happy in South Australia to have such a distinguished South Australian willing to give his services to the State of South Australia in a viceregal capacity. My only regret is that Sir Mark Oliphant came to us as Governor because of the lamentable death of Sir James Harrison, whose work was appreciated by us all.

Over the years I have heard some Speeches that I thought were pretty poor but I am not saying that about this one. I believe it was a good Speech. The chief idea of the Speech is to give a brief account of the Government's performance during the previous year. It also provides a blueprint of the forthcoming legislation for the present session and for the future. I believe this was done very forcibly in the Speech, but I will have more to say about that later.

As is customary in these debates, I will mention something which, unfortunately, we prefer not to mention, but I must say a word or two about members who have died since Parliament last sat. I refer, first, to Bill Quirke, who died recently. He was a man I grew to appreciate very much. Very often I did not agree with him, but at least he was a man, a colourful character in this Parliament. I have noticed, particularly over the past few years, that the colourful characters of this House do not seem to be with us any more. We have some characters here, and at times I think some are peculiar characters, but the really colourful characters seem to have gone. It may be that I am growing older, but there seem less of them here now than when I first came to this House.

Mr. Mathwin: Look behind you.

Mr. CLARK: I was not referring to clothing, although it could be said that the clothes of some members are much more colourful now. I am sorry that this note of merriment has intruded into my remarks when I was attempting to speak of past members who have gone from us. Nevertheless, my remarks are sincere. I refer also to the Hon. Bill Robinson, from another place. I came to know him very well as a colleague on the Public Works Standing Committee. Although politically we never seemed to agree, in many other things we did agree and we were firm friends. I mention, too, George Bockelberg, who was in this House for 12

years and who, I believe, had none but friends in this place.

Another member more closely and more intimately known to me was Lin Riches. I appreciated the remarks made yesterday concerning Mr. Riches, particularly those of the Premier. I believe his remarks would have touched the heart of anyone who knew Lin Riches intimately. I was very fond of him. He was a friend. We heard yesterday from the member for Adelaide with his quotations from the works of a great poet. I wish to give a quotation which I believe adequately applies to the late Lin Riches. This time it is a quotation from Browning:

One who never turned his back but marched
breast forward,
Never doubted clouds would break,
Never dreamed, though right were worsted,
Wrong would triumph,
Held we fall to rise, are baffled to fight better,
Sleep to wake.

I think those words apply to the late Lin Riches. He was a good friend, a good citizen, a good Parliamentary representative, and a good man.

Mr. Jennings: A good Speaker.

Mr. CLARK: A very good Speaker, as the member for Ross Smith very properly interjects. He will be missed by his large circle of friends, by his relatives, and by us all. I offer my sincere sympathy to his relatives and to those of the other deceased members I have mentioned.

I have been in this place for over 20 years, and I did not think it was possible for me to get a "first" here at this late time. However, I have managed to do that. This is the first time I have had the opportunity of moving the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. Jennings: It will certainly be the last, anyway.

Mr. CLARK: As my friend says, it will be the last. I doubt very much whether my speech will be better than others I have made on the same subject, but I trust it will not be any worse. This is not generally a debate in which we hear especially good speeches. The scope of the debate itself often militates against this, I think, but it is at least a debate that gives everyone some opportunity to get things off their chests, and this can be very handy at times.

As I said, this is the first opportunity I have had to move this motion. During my time in this place, members of my Party have not had great opportunities to move in this way,

because there have not been very many years when my Party has been the Government.

Mr. Jennings: Not that we did not get the required number of votes.

Mr. CLARK: As I was about to say, this was certainly not the fault of members on this side, but it was due to circumstances possibly, as my friend the Attorney-General says, too painful to mention, but which I must mention in the course of my remarks. If they bring pain to anyone, I trust it will not be serious pain, but pain in the form of a reminder of things that have gone and that should never have taken place at all.

I have been here a long time. During the past few weeks I have spent some time in a pastime I would not recommend. I do not advise people to read the speeches they made many years ago. Possibly they have learned something, but they may find that they said things in those days which they now have not the slightest remembrance of having said. They may find, too, that a number of things said then would be said today in a slightly different way.

Things in Parliament nowadays are much the same as 20 years ago, yet they are completely different. I was elected on April 19, 1952. In that year the House sat on June 25 for one day and adjourned until July 22. The adoption of the Address in Reply in that year was moved by Mr. Howard Shannon, former member for Onkaparinga, now retired, and seconded by Mr. George Whittle, who then represented Prospect and who was defeated in the following year by Mr. Jack Jennings.

Of those who were here then, some have been defeated, some have retired and more than I care to think of have died. Only the Hon. David Brookman (member for Alexandra), and the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin, in another place, now remain. I have some excuse, therefore, for regarding myself as an old stager.

Under the electoral set-up in those days it was virtually impossible for members of my Party to win Government. This had an unfortunate influence on the Parliament, or at least on some of the A.L.P. members in the Parliament at that time. They tended (only a few of them, but it was enough) to regard themselves as members of a permanent Opposition.

It is disheartening at any time that, no matter how effectively you debate, how forcibly you talk, and how much you do everything possible to put forward your point of view, you cannot ever win the division, because the electoral system will not give you the

opportunity to do so; it will not give you the numbers.

Mr. Mathwin: I know exactly how you feel.

Mr. Jennings: But you did not get the numbers; we did.

Mr. CLARK: Another 10 or 20 years is, I suggest, a conservative estimate of the time the honourable member will be here, provided he keeps his seat (which is open to some doubt). He will find that after a while it becomes more and more wearisome, but, of course, there are some advantages about being in Opposition. Although happy to be in Government, as a private member sitting behind the front bench I find there is much more fun in being in Opposition than in Government. For one thing, a member did not have to be very responsible. In this Parliament at present, this is made obvious at times by Opposition members. An Opposition member has more opportunities to speak, even though at times what he says is not really worth saying. I can tell those Opposition members who believe they should be in Government that it is not a pleasant task. When I came in here first, one or two Labor members had somehow or other grown into a rut whereby they thought that they would never be in Government (some of those members were never members of a Government, as they did not live long enough). This attitude of theirs had a depressing effect on other members. This feeling was fairly cordially encouraged by the then Premier of South Australia (Sir Thomas Playford), and who could blame him? The fact that not many Labor members shared this attitude is clearly the case, otherwise we would never have got into Government at all.

In 1952 things were very different from the way they are now. There were only 39 members in the House of Assembly; 12 were Labor members; four were Independents; and 23 were Liberal and Country League members. When I say that in some ways Parliament was the same but that in other ways it was very different, I am certainly telling the truth, even if I am only relying on numbers. At 45 years of age, I was the youngest Labor member in Parliament. Although I am not boasting about this, it is a fact that I was the only Labor member of the House who had a university background. Only two or three Government members at that time had a university background, and they were lawyers. I am not sure whether the House is better or worse now, but the situation is certainly different. Let me say something about the Government and Opposition Leaders at that

time. Tom Playford (he was not Sir Thomas then, but plain Tom) was Premier of South Australia. He was very firmly in the saddle at that time, his Ministerial colleagues being solidly behind him. They had to be, for they could not imagine anyone but him as Premier or any other Government than the L.C.L. Government.

Mr. Crimes: Divine right.

Mr. CLARK: Yes, that is not far short of the truth. At that time it seemed almost like sacrilege to suggest anything else. This attitude was so widespread at that time that it has had repercussions and reverberations that are still echoing through L.C.L. halls. It appeared to the then Opposition that Parliament was completely subservient to the Premier. The Labor leader was Mick O'Halloran, who will be remembered by many. He was a fine speaker and debater and an able and very lovable man. I thought enough of him to name my youngest son after him. He would have made a first class Premier, as those who knew him will agree, but he was denied this right because he was a victim and captive of the electoral system at that time. If Sammy Lawn was still with us, he would say "Hear, hear" to that remark.

Although our numbers in the Labor Opposition were small, I like to think that we had quality, if not quantity. I hope the member for Alexandra, who was here at the time, will tell me I am wrong if he thinks I am too far off the mark; I do not expect him to agree with everything I say. However, we had a number of tireless workers who continually pressed Labor's claim for electoral reform and for other things that we were desperate to obtain. I can refer to Frank Walsh, Fred Walsh, and Cyril Hutchens. I suppose Cyril campaigned in every district in South Australia as he worked to obtain Government for the Labor Party. There were men such as Harold Tapping, Lin Riches, and Sam Lawn. As a good many members here know, to Sam, the electoral system was an evil disease. And there were others. We had several older men who were still doing the best they could for the Party they believed in.

In the following year we had a couple of rather worthwhile additions to the Labor Party, because in that year Jack Jennings and Don Dunstan, who are young enough still to be here for a good while, came into Parliament. Members realize that very minor changes were made to the electoral boundaries, until eventually we were in Government. This took us years to achieve, and I do not intend to go

into that struggle at this stage. I want to return to 1952 and to some extent to compare the Parliament of that time with the Parliament of today. In 1952, Labor members had much work to do. Nowadays, when we sit in Government with a handsome majority, many backbenchers complain that they do not get enough work to do in the House, and I agree with them. It was a fine apprenticeship for a young member to be in the Opposition in those days. Searching questions (at least we thought that was what they were) were asked. Instead of speaking occasionally, we spoke several times each day, and this was necessary because there were only a few of us. I believe this was fine training for a member.

In 1952, 56 Bills were passed by Parliament, and in 1971-72 131 Bills were passed. In 1952, the House sat on 43 days for 208 hours 31 minutes. In 1971-72 the House sat on 74 days for 471 hours 16 minutes. In 1952 the total number of *Hansard* pages was 1,566, whereas in 1971-72 the total number was 4,768. I quote these figures more as a matter of interest and of comparison than anything else. I do not know that they prove much, except that we certainly do sit for longer hours now. When I first entered Parliament in 1952, in the early part of the session, except on a rare occasion, we did not have to sit in the evening after dinner. Occasionally some urgent matter came along and we sat late to pass it, but normally our late sittings were only towards the end of the session and we did not have many such sittings then. Nowadays we have become accustomed to sitting late almost from the start of the session; I should not be surprised if we sat late this evening. As I say, I am not sure that it has proved anything; I am not at all certain that the strain on members of continually sitting late at night is a good thing for Parliament but I am sure that the great volume of work facing us today necessitates that being done.

I believe also that district work has increased enormously during the last few years. I know mine has, despite the fact that my district at the last redistribution was virtually cut into four, which was a very good thing because it brought a number of very fine members into Parliament. I welcome them here if I have not done so already. Society is now much more complex than it was then. The problems of people are much more complex now, particularly in districts like mine where so many people have come from overseas and have problems arising from their being newcomers to a different land. When I first came to

this place, I represented Gawler and parts of country areas around Gawler, including Lyncdoch, Wasleys, Williamstown, Smithfield, and so on. It was a semi-rural, semi-industrial seat. I assure honourable members that the problems then were different from those I have had to face in the last few years.

It may be of some interest to members if I quote a couple of things from the Governor's Speech opening Parliament on June 25, 1952. One thing that was said was:

My Ministers will seek legislative authority for the electrification of the suburban railways. We have been waiting quite a time for that electrification to take place; I rather think it will not happen now. I am sorry that my friend the Minister of Education is not here when I mention education—and I promise not to take longer than eight minutes to talk about it! I should have liked him to hear this reference. It was stated in the Governor's Speech of 1952 that expenditure on school buildings for 1951 had been £1,039,203. Honourable members need pause for only a second to realize (and the Minister of Education in particular would know this, as would the member for Torrens, who for a time occupied that important Ministry) that today for a little over \$2,000,000 we would not get very much work done on a school. I know from my association with the Public Works Standing Committee just how much the cost of school buildings is today and I am sure that, if the Minister of Education was to read this, he would sigh in some ways for the good old days; but let me remind him that they were in many ways fairly bad old days as well. The House itself, I believe, was much more decorous then than it is today.

Mr. Burdon: In what way?

Mr. CLARK: I believe members were better behaved. I do not say this unkindly. I think the chief reason for this (and I say this without reflecting on Speakers since that time) was that the Hon. Sir Robert Nicholls, whose portrait hangs behind me on my left, was certainly the best Speaker I ever sat under.

Mr. Coumbe: The doyen.

Mr. CLARK: Yes. As far as I could gather, he was completely impartial. I recall one occasion only a few months after I had entered Parliament when I was, like most members when they first come into this place, very innocent indeed as regards procedure. I was speaking on a certain matter and the Speaker rose to his feet and said, "Order!" I sat down because someone next to me gave me a shove and told me to sit down. The Speaker said, "The honourable member is out

of order. If he had been following his argument along such and such a line, he would have been in order." I thanked him for that explanation. Outside the Chamber he said, "I did not want to sit you down, Jack, because I was interested in what you were saying." However, I do not want to go into that part of the matter of decorum in the Chamber today, but it would not be possible to have a finer Speaker than the Hon. Sir Robert Nicholls was. He knew everything it was necessary to know about what should and should not be done, and his firm hold on the situation often assisted him in preventing unnecessary remarks being made. He was a fine Speaker and a fine man but politically he was on the opposite side to me, so I am, after all, saying something.

The biggest trouble for my Party was that the numbers were not here. We could talk ourselves out and not get very much advantage from it. It was like a peculiar football match: it was the sort of football match where we always lost the toss at election time. We always kicked against the wind and we did so for the whole four quarters. All the free kicks went to the other side and even then, at the end of the election on a Saturday, we inevitably finished thousands of votes in front but always lost the game. Knowing that that sort of thing is going on has a depressing effect on members who have worked to get something going. I do not believe that the struggle for electoral justice is over yet in this State. The enormous shadow of another place still hangs over us. I have a feeling that this may be resolved in the next few years, but I consider we could do just as well without the other place. I remember years ago when I studied political science (as they used to call it in those days; nowadays they call it politics) we were told that if the other place always agreed with the House of Assembly it was not necessary to have it and if it disagreed it was an infernal nuisance—and I agree. I doubt very much whether I shall live to see electoral justice—and I hope to live to a ripe old age.

Let me take the liberty of comparing the Parties as they were then. This is my idea of how they were. Other honourable members are at liberty to disagree violently with me; I do not mind at all—it is their privilege. I will not say much about the Australian Labor Party. It is obvious that it is stronger now than it was then. Even if we are stronger only numerically, it is very handy in Parliament. I consider that the inhibitions caused by electoral disadvantages gradually have been got out of our system and we are cured of them.

Regarding the Liberal and Country League, or the Liberal and Country Party, or whatever it is called, I consider that that Party was much stronger and much more undivided then. I rather think that members opposite may agree with me on that. Perhaps, as many people used to say, it was a one-man band but, after all, it was an extremely powerful band, with a conductor in complete control of his own band, and the band respected him, too.

Mr. Jennings: He used to blow his own trumpet.

Mr. CLARK: I suppose he was in the position that it was easy to blow his own trumpet, although he found it was easy to get many others to blow it for him. Although we sometimes complain bitterly about the news media, let me assure honourable members that the media is marvellous now so far as the Labor Party is concerned compared to what it was then. When this powerful Leader left the Liberal Party, for a long time the Party was like a ship without a rudder, and recent developments have not improved the situation. I consider that at present the Party is in an unfortunate position, because I believe in having a strong Opposition and a strong Government.

Mr. Jennings: Now it is a ship with a captain at each end.

Mr. CLARK: I wish the honourable member would not anticipate what I am about to say. At times his mind seems to run along similar lines to mine, and this is understandable, because we have been feeding interjections to one another for many years. For some time after Sir Thomas Playford left, the Party was like a ship without a rudder. Now it is like a divided ship, a ship on the rocks and breaking at the seams. As the member for Ross Smith rudely got in before me and said, it has a captain at each end. I do not think this is good.

Like many other people in this State, I cannot understand this so-called Liberal Movement. Perhaps it is beyond my powers of reason to follow it, but one thing saddens me. That is that some honourable members have announced that they are members of this group and, with my knowledge of them (and they are men I respect), I cannot work out what they are doing. I may be wrong but, as far as I can see, the Liberal Movement seems to have been set up to further inflate the already inflated ego of one man. I do not know what the other members are doing this for. There are still other members in the group who are

babes in the wood and I would expect them to be in such a group, but I wonder what some members are doing in this organization.

I think the L.C.P. is the official title of the Party now, although the Country Party does not like it. We have the L.C.P., the L.M. and, besides that, a small group performing a difficult tactical and acrobatic feat of sitting on a slippery fence with both ears to the ground. I was going to say that the members of that group were waiting to see which way the cat jumped, but that would mix the metaphor too much. I will say they are waiting to see who comes out on top. I will not mention the names of the members of this group, but I think honourable members know without my telling them. The public has its eyes focused on this group and some people are saddened about what is happening to an organization in this State that once was so strong. As I have said, I consider this to be bad, because the strength of a Parliament depends not only on a strong Government but also on a strong Opposition.

Before I conclude my speech, I should like to speak about the Public Works Committee. I have been a member of this committee since 1960 and Chairman of it since 1968, so I can speak with some authority. Some members, particularly new members, do not know much about the work that the committee does, yet this is the most important committee in South Australia. It is a permanent Parliamentary committee that has existed since 1927. It comprises seven members of Parliament, one of whom is appointed Chairman, and I hold that position at present.

Two members of the committee are members of the Legislative Council and five are members of the House of Assembly, and any member of Parliament who is neither a responsible Minister of the Crown nor a holder of any office of profit under the Crown is eligible for election to the committee. His Excellency the Governor makes all appointments, namely, of the Chairman, the members, the Secretary to the committee, and such other officers as he deems necessary. We are appointed, of course, under the Public Works Standing Committee Act, 1927-1970.

Before a Bill can be introduced in either House of Parliament authorizing the construction of any public work or the appropriation of money for expenditure on any public work estimated to cost, when completed, more than \$300,000, a legal prerequisite is that the committee investigate and report upon such work. The normal procedure by which a project is

brought before the committee is by a reference from the Governor directing such investigation.

It is interesting to note that, in the course of its inquiries, the committee goes to much trouble. It may be assisted by expert witnesses from Government departments associated with the project or it may call on private individuals, as the committee does. These witnesses may make prepared submissions or may be called before the committee for examination by members, after which the findings are reported to the Governor, and the reports, together with minutes of evidence, are laid before both Houses of Parliament.

In considering the references under the Act, the committee considers the purpose of and necessity for the work, whether it is revenue producing, and its present and prospective public value. It is not generally known that, whilst normal procedure is for a reference to be forwarded to the committee by the Governor, existing legislation permits any Minister or any other member of either House of Parliament to make a reference, upon a motion to that effect being passed. In addition, the committee may, of its own prerogative, call attention to any matter connected with the public works or proposed public works of the State on which, in its opinion, Parliament should be informed. This has been done in the past.

As well as reporting on individual projects referred to it, the committee is required to make a general report to the Governor each year on its proceedings under the Act. It may interest honourable members to know that, in the 10 months ended June 30 this year, the committee reported on 28 projects, costing more than \$68,000,000. The Public Works Committee has considered hospital projects costing \$35,000,000, education projects costing \$9,500,000, water supply projects costing \$21,500,000, and other Government building projects costing \$2,000,000. The expenditure recommended by the committee in the 10 months to the end of June totalled \$68,000,000. So, I have some reason for saying that the committee is very important. I have been a member of the committee since 1960, and I have found my membership very satisfying. I publicly offer my thanks to all committee members, who have worked so well together. When I became Chairman of the committee in 1968, our first job was the very difficult one of considering the Modbury Hospital project. I am happy to say that the committee agreed to the project, and in his

Speech yesterday His Excellency said that the building of the hospital was nearly completed.

Mr. Coumbe: You followed a very good Chairman.

Mr. CLARK: Yes; he was a very fine chairman and a pretty good bloke. Members of the Public Works Committee strive to keep their deliberations nonpolitical; that approach has been successful at 98 per cent of our meetings. One of the advantages of being a member of the committee is that one gets to know departmental officers very well. Consequently, when a member needs information in order to serve his constituents he can discuss the matter more satisfactorily with the departmental officer if he has been associated with that officer during meetings of and inspections by the committee. To be a member of the Public Works Committee is very satisfying but very time consuming. Since I have been Chairman of the committee I have spoken less frequently in this House, simply because I have not had the time to do so, and that is a loss to the Parliament! I am sure that other members of the committee cannot spare the time to do all their necessary work; nevertheless, I would not like to see the system altered, although I have often thought that the Government might be wise to appoint an independent Chairman. I have not made this suggestion before, because I would have been reluctant to give up the job, but the matter should be considered by the Government.

Mr. Coumbe: Do you mean that the independent Chairman could be a retired member of Parliament—for example, the Hon. D. N. Brookman?

Mr. CLARK: I had not thought of that but, if I had done so, I might have suggested the names of the members for Alexandra, Goyder and possibly Elizabeth.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What about the member for Davenport?

Mr. CLARK: I apologize to that member. Her decision to retire was so recent that I omitted to mention her. She knows well enough that I am the last member of this Parliament who would be rude to anyone—intentionally, anyway. I believe that the programme in His Excellency's Speech is well balanced; it does not need any boosting from me, and I will leave it to members on both sides to praise it. This is the last time I will speak during an Address in Reply debate. I shall miss my associations with Parliament, especially my associations with the Public Works Committee. To be honest, I will miss

the friendships I have made with members on both sides. To some extent the Parliament of this State is like the Army: one gets to know one's colleagues pretty well when one lives with them as constantly as one does here, particularly in view of the extreme provocation we sometimes experience. In these circumstances one learns to know the value of fellow members on both sides. I am reminded of the following words of Charles Lamb:

All, all are gone, the old familiar faces—except the face of the member for Alexandra, of course. Some old familiar faces have been replaced by new faces, but I miss the old faces. When a member finds himself constantly looking back over the past and tending to think that the past was not so bad after all while he should possibly be looking forward to the future, perhaps the best thing that member can do is to leave Parliament so that his place can be filled by a younger man; that is what I intend to do.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I have much pleasure in seconding the motion so capably moved by the member for Elizabeth. I listened to His Excellency's Speech yesterday with a great deal of pride, because we were hearing for the first time an address given to this Parliament by a Governor who was born in South Australia. He is, as honourable members have already mentioned, a very distinguished South Australian. He is a man of the people, despite his great academic and scientific qualifications. As he has taken a great interest in many of the problems that face the country today, he will no doubt play a major part in finding answers to them. His Excellency the Governor is a splendid and wonderful man and a great choice for the position, and I express the view of every member in saying that.

I take this opportunity of paying tribute to another great South Australian. I refer to the member for Elizabeth. I doubt whether any member of Parliament either here or in another place is as well respected or more greatly loved than is the member for Elizabeth. I know from my term on this side of the House of the high regard in which he is held. I for one greatly appreciate the advice and assistance he gave to me as a new member. He is always very helpful and his advice is always very sound. It is sad that, because of age I suppose (and I say that in a kindly sense), he has found it necessary to retire at the end of this Parliament. As I probably will not have an opportunity at that time to express my views, I do so now. I do not think it would be

fair of me to say farewell to the member for Elizabeth without also paying tribute to those members of the Opposition who will not be with us voluntarily after the end of this Parliament. I do not intend to say goodbye to those members of the Opposition whose electors will not return them.

Mr. Jennings: Why not?

Mr. KENEALLY: It could possibly be an embarrassment to them and to me because I might select the wrong ones. The member for Goyder, who has been a member of this House since 1963, has already announced his retirement. I suppose that he, in common with me, has not worried *Hansard* to any great extent. He probably does not speak as fast as I do, but in terms of volume he has not worried *Hansard*. Nevertheless, I believe he has been a splendid representative of his people and he, too, is well respected and liked. I do not think the member for Goyder has ever expressed a nasty thought in this House, and we all appreciate that, but the same cannot be said for all of us.

The member for Davenport, who became a member of this House in 1959, will always hold a unique position in the history of South Australia because I believe she was the first woman to be elected to the South Australian Parliament, certainly the first woman to be elected to the Ministry.

Mr. Coumbe: To the House of Assembly, but not to the Parliament.

Mr. KENEALLY: I accept the interjection. Nevertheless, it does not deprive her of her unique place in the State's history. She has played a notable part in Parliament during her time in office. We on this side of the House also have a prominent woman member in the member for Tea Tree Gully, who is the first woman to be appointed Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee. I, together with many other members, am sure that ultimately the member for Tea Tree Gully will also be appointed to the Ministry.

The third member of the Opposition who will retire at the end of this Parliament is the member for Alexandra and, although I never agree with his politics, I express my admiration for his capacity for work. I doubt whether any member approaches his duties with the dedication he shows. Although I doubt whether any Government member would agree with the policy he espouses, I think the Attorney-General was perhaps exaggerating when he once said that the member for Alexandra possessed one of the best minds

to come out of the 17th century. A conservative point of view exists in the community and I believe that the member for Alexandra expresses very well that viewpoint, which has the right to be expressed. It is sad that a man as fit and young as the member for Alexandra should find it necessary to retire. However, we wish him well.

Having paid tribute to members who will retire at the end of this Parliament, I should also like to pay tribute to an ex-member and good friend of mine who died recently and who has already had tribute paid to him in this House. I refer to Lin. Riches, who will always be remembered at Port Augusta. Although I have said it on a previous occasion, Lin. Riches was synonymous with Port Augusta and Port Augusta is synonymous with Lin. Riches. No man loved his town more and no man was able to do more for his town than Lin. Riches did. I believe that one of the greatest attributes he possessed was his remarkable wife. All those members who have had the pleasure of meeting or knowing Mrs. Riches will understand what I am saying. Mrs. Riches was of great assistance to her husband during the whole of his public career, and I, together with other members, express my deepest sympathy to her.

Earlier, I spoke about the members who are to retire from Parliament at the end of this session. It has now occurred to me that these members have lived and served the State over periods of great change; they have lived and served during times of war, depression, boom, hydrogen bombs and computers—in fact, the best and worst technological changes that we have experienced. I suppose their relief in retiring from Parliament is tempered by the regret that they are leaving us at a time when the greatest challenges ever to face the Parliamentary system are now facing us. Because we live in a technological age we are required to cope with the complexities inherent in such an age. Problems such as pollution, overpopulation, starvation, discrimination, alienation of the people from the governing process, multi-national corporations, executive and bureaucratic control will have to be faced and overcome, and Governments of all types and degrees of complexity, no matter how constituted, must play their part. Of course, we as the Government of South Australia will be involved.

I believe that no matter how good a Government we have, how relevant the Government's policies are to solve the issues, no matter how competent the Ministry, or how

effective the Government and Opposition are, what we are able to do as a Government is clearly inhibited by the relationship we have, under our federal system, with the Commonwealth Government. I will say a little more about that later. I do not want to be like my colleague, whose speech was almost completed before he could refer to the Governor's Speech; I will refer to it now.

Looking through His Excellency's Speech, one is struck by the fact that one sees the completion of the promises made to the people of South Australia by this Government prior to its election. This Government has been able to introduce industrial reform, and it will complete its introduction of such reforms this session in the Bill amending the Industrial Code. These are issues that bear directly on the welfare of the people of South Australia. Very little legislation has greater relevance to the problems that the ordinary person meets than the type of legislation incorporated in amendments to the Industrial Code, which I welcome. I do not intend to speak at length on any of these points, because they will be canvassed during this session.

A Bill to establish an environmental protection authority, which it is expected will be introduced this session, illustrates the lead this Government is giving to Australia as a whole in its attention to environmental matters. We are thankful that we have as our Minister of Environment and Conservation a man who is so interested in and concerned with his portfolio that he has won for himself (and deservedly so) a wonderful reputation throughout Australia. We are indeed proud of him. I was going to mention the next matter later, but I will do so now. The *Australian* has run a series of articles on the South Australian Government entitled, I think, "The Dunstan Experiment", in which the feature writer said that, besides the Premier, the South Australian Government was fortunate to have on its front bench five members who would not only be direct assets to any other Government in Australia but would also probably find themselves the Leaders of such Governments. I mention this aspect because we are fortunate to have such a competent front bench.

Community welfare was dealt with in His Excellency's Speech, and I am looking forward to the implementation of the policies of the Community Welfare Department. At Port Augusta we will see great advances made in the welfare of the people of the area, particularly of the needy minority of my constituents, an aspect to which I will refer later. In his

Speech, His Excellency also referred to the standard gauge railway line to link Adelaide with the existing Australia-wide standard gauge network. The present situation has existed for many years and is a legacy of the most ridiculous transport system that was ever evolved. This is also a part of the Commonwealth system, about which I will speak shortly.

I noticed, also, that there will be an increase in the sum of money to be spent on education and that our enthusiastic Minister of Education has once more been able to overspend his allocation. We on the Government benches do not complain about this, although perhaps the increased expenditure on education means that less money will be available for other departments. However, we all appreciate the importance of education and we are pleased that the Minister is able each year to increase the sums of money allocated to this field. I am also delighted to see that the rural scholarship scheme is to be expanded and that secondary rural scholarships can be now considered a right for all students in isolated areas. I notice that this system will now be available to children in later years of their primary education. This, in itself, is an advance, particularly these days when people on the land are in such dire straits. I should like now to contradict some of the statements that have already been made in this Parliament.

Mr. Venning: What about making a few statements instead of contradicting others?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KENEALLY: I will contradict the statement that this Government is not concerned about the man on the land, the primary producer. I point out to the honourable member that if at times we show some intolerance (I do not think we do) it would probably be as a result of some of the representation in this House. If there is any indication of that, the honourable member could easily be responsible for it. One thing that has concerned me more than any other matter since I have been a member of Parliament is the working of our Commonwealth Parliamentary system which, I believe, does not work at all. I do not intend to approach this subject as one who has any great knowledge of constitutional law, because I do not have such a knowledge. However, I should like to express some of my misgivings about how this system is working as an ordinary layman would see it.

Every year we have the example of the Premiers going to Canberra to attend Premiers' Conferences, and submitting their claims for

finance to enable them to run their States and to provide the essential services for which they are responsible. Every year we see press reports of not just our Premier (who, I believe, is treated most disgracefully at times by the Prime Minister) but also other Premiers, such as the two merry knights, Sir Henry Bolte and Sir Robert Askin, complaining bitterly about the allocations made to them by the Commonwealth Government. We see this each year, and I believe it is not good enough.

The Commonwealth Government, which has access to the funds, bears no responsibility for spending those funds for the benefit of ordinary citizens. It says, "We do not have any responsibility in areas of education, health, social welfare, and so on. They are the responsibility of the States, and we are providing adequate money to enable them easily to provide those services." In turn, the States say that the Commonwealth Government does not provide them with sufficient funds and that they are unable to supply all the necessary services. We have, therefore, the Commonwealth Government blaming the State Governments for the situation and, in turn, the State Governments blaming the Commonwealth Government. It would be easy for me to say that the current situation that applies to South Australia is purely one of political expediency and that the Commonwealth Government is not willing to supply to South Australia all the funds it needs, simply because the Commonwealth Government is of a different political complexion. However, that is not the whole answer, as the same situation also applies in the States in which a Liberal Government is in office, the Governments of which also complain about their allocations.

Our Premier certainly gets treated in a most disgraceful manner, and all the members of this Parliament and the people of South Australia should object because, after all, he is our Premier and he does represent us in Canberra. We expect the Premier to be treated in the same way as other Premiers are treated.

Mr. Evans: Did the—

Mr. KENEALLY: If the honourable member who interjects were ever Premier of this State (of course, he never would be Premier), I should expect him to be treated in the same way as our Premier should be treated, irrespective of whether or not we agree with the honourable member's politics.

Mr. Venning: Tell us about the rural situation!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KENEALLY: It is interesting that the honourable member should make that interjection.

Mr. Venning: You mentioned it just now.

Mr. Goldsworthy: We're listening.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KENEALLY: I do not profess to be an expert on the rural situation, but—

Mr. Venning: Then keep quiet!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Stuart is making the speech and does not need any assistance from the member for Rocky River or the member for Kavel.

Mr. KENEALLY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was going to say that I do not profess to have any expertise in all matters concerning our rural industry, unlike certain members of the rural industry who believe that they have expertise in industrial matters and matters generally. However, it is pleasing to see that certain people engaged in primary industry took note of the advice I gave them when I first came into this place (although they may be growing different crops from those I suggested) regarding diversification and rationalization, and I believe the industry is on the up and up. Despite the criticism of members such as the members for Rocky River, Frome and Kavel and the unlikelihood of their taking my advice generally, I appreciate that they have heeded what I said in this respect.

I wish to deal now with Commonwealth-State relations in connection with the education system. As the Minister of Education pointed out recently, not many years ago the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science requested State Ministers of Education to conduct a survey on educational needs. The respective Ministers duly did so and indicated that the sum of \$1,400,000,000 represented the difference between what the State could provide and what was actually required to bring the States' level of education at least up to that enjoyed by people living in the Australian Capital Territory. What has the Commonwealth Government done about this survey? It has shelved the information obtained and done nothing about it whatsoever. We have seen that the State Governments are unable to provide an education system anywhere near the level required. Indeed, I believe that our education system is structured wrongly, in that priorities are given to tertiary institutions: money is provided direct by the Commonwealth Government for tertiary education, whereas no money is provided for pre-school and primary education.

Although I am not an educationist, it seems to me that the greatest area of need is in pre-school and primary education: a child may have a behavioural problem, difficulty in learning, or a defect in hearing or eyesight, and these problems can be detected early in a child's life, preferably before he or she goes to primary school. However, if the State Government were to accept this proposition, what hope would it have of changing the priorities so that money provided by the Commonwealth Government could be provided for pre-school and primary education, where the greatest need lies? We have no hope on our own of changing these priorities: it is a matter in which the Commonwealth Government should assist. I shall be speaking at a later stage about the amount of finance that should be provided for Aboriginal education.

The Aboriginal field is where, again, we have a duplication of responsibility but where the Commonwealth Government has abdicated its responsibility. In 1967, as a result of a referendum, the Commonwealth Government was given direct power to legislate in respect of Aborigines, but it has done nothing in this regard. The situation still prevails in South Australia whereby direct assistance provided by the Commonwealth Government for Aborigines is practically negligible, despite the fine-sounding words we hear occasionally from the Prime Minister and also from the Minister now in charge of Aboriginal Affairs (Mr. Howson). The only Commonwealth Minister who has indicated any sympathy in this regard is Mr. Wentworth who, when he showed some sympathy for an appreciation of the Aboriginal problem, so embarrassed the Prime Minister that his portfolio was taken away from him.

Mr. Hopgood: He has done a bit of embarrassing since, too.

Mr. KENEALLY: The whole concept of Aboriginal welfare is wrong, for there should be no discrimination in this respect. We have in South Australia a community welfare programme covering all areas in the community that need assistance, and I believe that this system should be adopted by the Commonwealth Government and that there should be no discrimination involving Aborigines by having a separate department cater for them. Aborigines should be regarded as a part of the community generally. The Commonwealth Government should accept its responsibility here and provide adequate housing, education, health facilities and consideration in respect of land to which the Aborigines are entitled, so that they may play the part in society that they

are entitled to play. I think it is about time the Commonwealth Government realized that the States are unable to carry the full load and do all that is needed to be done for Aborigines. Our capacity to act in this regard is limited by the amount of finance provided.

In addition, the Commonwealth Government is not prepared to give to the pensioner, or the person who requires the social welfare benefits, the status to which he is entitled. Elderly people have helped to make this country what it is. We say that we have a great and rich country of which we should be proud, and these people have played their part in this respect, yet the Commonwealth Government refuses to give them credit and to grant them a pension that enables them to enjoy the living standard they deserve. Another area in which the Commonwealth-State relations fall down is that of employment. Although Commonwealth Government decisions affect employment in this State, I noted that the reply to a question today, given by the Minister of Labour and Industry, was met with derision by members opposite. However, employment in the State is affected by decisions made by the Commonwealth Government. The State is expected to provide finance in order to overcome the immediate problems experienced by the unemployed, even though it is Commonwealth decisions that cause unemployment.

Having said earlier that I would speak briefly about our transport systems, I repeat that we have a most ludicrous situation in respect of our railway system. For many years we have had in Australia seven separate railway systems and three different gauges. Adelaide is not connected to the standard gauge system, although we heard in the Governor's Speech that at last that is on its way. Whyalla has just been connected to the system. The amount of assistance given by the Commonwealth Government for the railway system is inadequate. The Railways Department has the answer to many of the problems facing the urban person today, problems such as pollution, road safety, cheap cargo conveyance over long distances, and so on. The railways will be able to convey greater loads at lower prices over greater distances, yet it is the poor relation in our transport system. Our priorities must be changed. The railways system needs greater assistance, and I favour the Commonwealth Government's taking over the railways completely.

Mr. Venning: You are a centralist.

Mr. KENEALLY: The honourable member accuses me of being a centralist. In the views I have expressed up to now one could justly say I am a centralist. If the honourable member can explain to me how the Commonwealth system works to the benefit of everyone in South Australia, I am prepared to listen, but as long as the Commonwealth system is not working I am a centralist to that extent.

The Commonwealth Government should take over the railways, or at least subsidize that part of railway expenditure that goes into providing services for commuter traffic. Every train to the country runs at a huge loss. But this is an essential service that the State is required to provide while the Commonwealth Government, which has the capacity to assist, does nothing about it.

Another area that has great relevance to contemporary problems is family planning. We hear much about over-population. Great emphasis should be placed on family planning centres, and this has been accepted, although not to the extent I should like to see. However, it has been accepted in principle. I should like to see contraceptives provided at the centres, if not free of charge then certainly at minimal cost. Another contemporary problem is abortion. Prevention is much better than cure and, if we had family planning centres able to provide the service required, then we would have less requirement for abortion, which must never be used as a contraceptive.

While the State Governments are attempting to overcome a problem the world will face in no small measure, we have a Commonwealth Government that not only forces people to pay full price for contraceptives but believes that on top of that there should be a tax of 27½ per cent. Whether that is a luxury tax or an entertainment tax I do not know.

I object to the principle of placing a tax on contraceptives. The Commonwealth Government should investigate this field more closely, and I understand that that may be done. Things are not going too well in the Commonwealth sphere, so the Commonwealth Government can suddenly become magnanimous and provide greater sums of money to alleviate some of the problems, but we must wait until the Commonwealth Government has to provide additional finance. Additional funds should be provided because they are needed, not because it is politically expedient to do so. I may be criticized for taking the bat

to the Commonwealth Government, but I will refer to that later.

A matter that concerns me and at least one member of the Opposition, the member for Fisher, is that our Commonwealth system has resulted in a proliferation of politicians. In Australia we have 728 politicians representing 12,750,000 people. For every 17,484 electors we have one member of Parliament. This probably means that we are the most over-governed country in the world. We have so many politicians that each elector has 14 members representing him.

Mr. Evans: Sixteen.

Mr. KENEALLY: It has been said that this includes Legislative Councillors and Senators. Because we have so many members representing each constituency, there is confusion about the responsibility of one member of Parliament as compared with that of another. Every member in this House would have had brought to him problems that were the responsibility of a member of the House of Representatives, and vice versa. If the division were purely between State and Commonwealth members, there would not be so much confusion. Can any member of the Opposition tell me, through you, Sir, whether their constituents know the duties or areas of responsibility of each Senator, Legislative Councillor, and other member? They do not know.

Mr. Venning: But—

Mr. KENEALLY: There are people in my district who have not heard of the member for Rocky River, which does not surprise me, but they cannot tell me who are the Legislative Councillors who represent the area. Probably only three electors out of 10 know who are the Legislative Councillors, but I suspect that only one in 10 could tell me who are the Senators. As a result of our federal system we also have a duplication in departments. We have seven Education Departments and seven Ministers of Education, and so on. If all the Ministers were as competent as our own, this could be a good thing. If the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science were as competent as ours, however, we would not need the other Ministers. The same would apply to the Minister of Environment and Conservation and to other Ministers who have been spoken of in the highest of terms by impartial correspondents. I take no heed of interjections from members opposite, because to some extent they may be biased.

The Commonwealth system that we have to suffer inhibits our Ministers and their capacity to plan adequately for what they want to do within their own departments in providing services within the State. How can they adequately provide all the things they need when they must compete in Cabinet with each other for priorities so that they can get as much of the cake as possible?

Labor Party policy is to provide adequately for such things as health, education, and social welfare, so they should be taken completely out of the political field. It is a shocking situation when Party politics is played at the expense of education, health, social welfare, Aborigines, and so on. The only way to overcome this is to provide completely for the needs of these departments so that there is no conflict between the political philosophy of members of the Opposition and that of Government members. If we were able to take these matters out of the political field altogether, we could then concentrate on the problems facing us as a Government. Education and health are extremely important matters, but if our whole political effort is concentrated on these issues, we may not be able to get to those other great and pressing problems, such as pollution, over-population, and multi-national corporations and the concentration of power under them. I know that members opposite talk about legislative power, but little is said about these multi-national corporations. It was said not long ago by none other than the Duke of Edinburgh that if the current trend continued it would be only a few years before world industry as a whole was controlled by fewer than 200 companies.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the trade unions?

Mr. KENEALLY: That appals me. Members opposite profess to support private enterprise: they think it is the ultimate. However, when there is no control over private enterprise the situation of which the Duke warns is reached, and world industry is controlled by fewer than 200 companies. Members opposite and the people whom they profess to represent in this House must surely be concerned about this. Of course, Governments must be concerned with the power that falls into the hands of these big companies.

I have tried to express one or two reservations that I have about the Governmental system applying in Australia. In November this year, we have the last chance available to us to see whether or not this system works. I believe that our only hope to have the federal system

work as it was intended to work is to elect a Labor Government in Canberra. Should that not solve the problem and should we still have every year the problem of State Premiers being unable to get sufficient finance to provide the services required in the States, I say that the system will not work. I am prepared to say that it does not work at present, because the Commonwealth Government, with its piecemeal policy, does not want it to work, for it can make political capital out of the problems that befall the States. If a Labor Government is elected in November, we will see whether the system can be made to work. If it cannot be made to work, someone with a much better brain than I have will have to concentrate on this matter closely, someone such as the Premier, who has spoken articulately on the subject at great length.

Members interjecting:

Mr. KENEALLY: That is more than I can say for some of the members who are interjecting. I hope members on both sides are concerned, as I am, with the situation which prevails today and which has been prevalent for some time with regard to the Aborigines, who are a depressed section of the community. I hope we can find a solution to this problem. As I have said many times, it is not good enough to have a piecemeal attitude towards solving the problem that Aborigines have in certain areas. It is not good enough to provide the finance so that the Aborigines can be educated, and do this in isolation. It is no good turning out into a community an educated Aboriginal, who can then find no place for himself in that community. We must provide him with work and housing in the community. If we educate Aborigines, we must also provide them with a job and a house that compare favourably with the standard that they will expect as fully educated people. This is a problem that we at Port Augusta must face in the future. At the Port Augusta High School the total enrolment of 1,050 includes 75 Aborigines. In the primary area the following Aboriginal enrolments have taken place and are shown in comparison with total enrolments, as follows:

	Aborigines	Total
Port Augusta West . .	18	259
Augusta Park.....	13	237
Wilsden.....	39	557
Wilsden Infants . . .	32	215
Carlton.....	77	557
Central Primary . . .	49	270

At Port Augusta we have 300 Aboriginal students in a total enrolment of 3,000. That

is 10 per cent of the total school enrolment, but that is only the beginning of the problem. The estimated total Aboriginal population of Australia is about 140,000, but it is expected that this figure will double in 25 years and at the end of the century there will be 300,000 Aborigines in Australia. The Aboriginal population is expanding at a greater rate than the non-Aboriginal population in Australia. Over 53 per cent of the Aboriginal population in Australia is in the age group of 0 to 15 years compared with 30 per cent of the non-Aboriginal population, and at schools 36.6 per cent of Aboriginal children are in classes 1 and 2. These figures depict the current situation, but this ratio will increase and the percentage of Aboriginal children to total enrolments will increase dramatically in future years. We can no longer be content in believing that this is not an issue to which we must find an answer because, of course, this is what we must do.

A seminar with the theme of "Post-Primary Education of Aboriginal Children" was held recently and those taking part in the seminar were members of the Education Department who have direct contact with Aborigines. One recommendation of the seminar is as follows:

Positive discrimination in favour of the employment of Aborigines in Government departments should be accepted. This is an urgent matter.

This is an important point. State and Commonwealth Government departments can play an important part in providing employment. At Port Augusta High School we have many remarkable children of Aboriginal descent, and I invite any honourable member to visit that school and see for himself. Such young men and women should be allowed to take their proper place in the community. A survey at the high school has shown that 62 per cent of the children believe that education equals employment: that is, if they are fully educated they believe they will be able to find employment in Port Augusta although, as I have said, the facts do not bear this out. Few Aborigines in Port Augusta are employed in what I regard as worthwhile work. Although the Commonwealth Railways is the largest employer of Aborigines in Australia, the type of employment offered in the railways is not of a high standard. There are, of course, reasons for this. I should like to see at Port Augusta positive discrimination in favour of the employment of Aborigines. The Hospitals Department could employ two, three or even a greater number of young women

who now attend the Port Augusta High School. This is an important aspect which should be taken up by the department, because the employment of an Aboriginal boy or girl singly in what he or she believes to be a hostile environment will be unsuccessful. Therefore, Aborigines cannot be employed singly, but in groups of two or three.

We must accept that not all of these people will be able to cope. There will be many failures. It is useless to tell an Aboriginal student that if he or she studies successfully and obtains qualifications equivalent to those obtained by other children he will get a satisfactory position when there is absolutely no indication that that will be the case. It is futile to expect the private sector to accept the responsibility of providing all the working positions that these people require. Therefore, the Government must accept this responsibility and set the standards. I ask all Government Ministers whose departments have offices or responsibilities at Port Augusta to look into this matter and provide positive discrimination for Aborigines through employment. It may be argued that this is the old hand-out system, but this type of work can be provided for a limited number of years to show that jobs are available and Aborigines would do that much more to attain them.

Within the education system insufficient emphasis is placed on what the Aboriginal needs to learn. There is insufficient motivation. Indeed, I ask why the Aboriginal should be compelled to study history which concentrates on ancient Greece or the glories that were Rome and which completely ignores the history of Australia, which did not commence the day the first English convict set foot on this soil. The history of Australia goes back many thousands of years and is tied up integrally with Aboriginal culture. I would like to see the Education Department accept in its curriculum the history of the Aborigines and Aboriginal culture. That is something worthwhile and something which students in South Australia should learn to their advantage.

Once the Aboriginal finds that we are interested in his background and culture much ground will be made up. Tribal elders could be brought in to provide instruction for the children. It would motivate the Aboriginal and give him confidence and some advantage over the rest of the students, whereas at the moment he is completely disadvantaged. I would highly recommend the report of this conference to those members of the House

who have the time and the interest and who want to study it. Any member who says he has not the time or the interest to read this report is not really looking to what could happen because, if we are to continue the present system of educating the Aborigines and frustrate them by not allowing them to play their part in the community and by not giving them adequate jobs and housing, we shall force them to take matters into their own hands.

Because I represent an area containing many Aborigines, I know very well that this can and will happen. I have had responsible people within the Aboriginal community come to me and point out that there is a trend towards violence. They have brought this to my notice because they are not happy with this trend and believe that I, as their Parliamentary representative, should exert some influence within the Parliament to stop this occurring. Certainly, I shall do everything I can.

My comments in this debate have ranged far and wide but I believe that what I have said is relevant to the Governor's Speech. The federal system under which we operate is particularly relevant to much of what the Governor had to say in his Speech about the moneys made available to us. I deplore the situation where Party politics can inhibit the ability of the State Governments to provide the services not only that they wish to provide but also that they have the responsibility for providing. I am not at all happy that the Commonwealth Government is not accepting its responsibility in the field of Aboriginal welfare, because its negligence in this field will create great problems for the State.

After all is said and done, and as has been mentioned by the member for Torrens, whereas local government is the government that is closest to the people, the State Government is much closer to the people than is the Commonwealth Government. I believe the system whereby the Commonwealth Government has access to most of the funds yet refuses to accept responsibility for spending that money in the best interests of the electorate at large, places a burden on the States that currently they are unable to bear. I conclude by saying once again that I hope that those people within the community who are able to look at the federal system from a constitutional point of view should do so soon, because unless that happens I fear for the future of our political system.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion. I should like to refer briefly to the Speech delivered yesterday by

His Excellency. I recall an occasion early in December last year when, in all simplicity, he used the words "I have returned home." Yesterday he said this in his Speech with reference to his good lady and himself:

We will do all in our power to promote the advancement of the interests of this State and its people.

I can say on behalf of most people in this State that this attitude of quiet simplicity exhibited by, as some speakers have already said, a son of this State and one of its most distinguished scientists is much appreciated by the community. I noted what His Excellency said about the loss of his predecessor since the last time we met. On an earlier occasion, the opportunity was taken to express on behalf of the Opposition, and indeed of the people of South Australia, to Lady Harrison our regret at the loss that she and her family had suffered. Our thoughts are still with them and, although we appreciate the simplicity of the attitude of our present Governor, we recall, with regret, the brief stay of his predecessor in this State, as His Excellency did yesterday.

Reference has been made in this Chamber, and it was my responsibility to refer briefly to the late Mr. L. G. Riches and to the late Mr. P. H. Quirke. In the last session of Parliament reference was made and recognition given to the late Mr. G. B. Bockelberg. Other members, both today and yesterday, have indicated their feelings in that respect. Briefly, I now touch on the loss of the other person mentioned in His Excellency's Speech—the late Hon. William Walsh Robinson. Although he did not sit in this House, he was greatly respected throughout the State, and certainly in Northern District, which he represented for 18 years. He, too, was a person of quiet simplicity but also of deep thinking and understanding. My first encounter with him was when, as a member of the Public Works Committee, he came to Gawler on an investigation of a proposal for a sewerage system.

Mr. Coumbe: A successful investigation.

Dr. EASTICK: It was a very successful investigation and the work is now 50 per cent completed. On that occasion the questions Mr. Robinson asked and the discussions we had led me to appreciate that his was a realistic attitude to his responsibility on that committee. Subsequently, I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Robinson when he came to Gawler with a very great friend, the late Hon. Bob Wilson, who was also a member of another place. The difference between those two men in physical stature was considerable: one was lean and tall the other short and, one

might say, dumpy, but their respect for one another, their attitude to each other when they were together, their hospitality, their interest, and their genuine friendship had to be seen to be believed. I respected the late Mr. Robinson for the complementary part he played in this unique combination.

I had the opportunity earlier this week of passing on my personal regrets to the wife of the late Mr. Robinson's son. I know that every member of this House is most disturbed by the end that was his. It happened to be one of violence, one that unfortunately is playing an increasing part in the road toll statistics of this State—the collision of a motor vehicle with a pedestrian.

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

Dr. EASTICK: I noticed in the speech by the member for Elizabeth that he was saying it was not a good thing for the legislation or for Government that so much time should be spent so late at night. I rather suspected at one stage that he was going to say he favoured the suggestion I made last week for a four-day week.

Mr. Clark: I wish you had mentioned it to me beforehand.

Dr. EASTICK: Unfortunately, by his answer when he returned to the State, the Premier seems to have misconstrued the suggestion. I was suggesting a four-day week, sitting two weeks out of three, which would have had a rather different effect from the attitude expressed by the Premier, who considered that the Ministers would not have had the opportunity of contact with their staff. I do not go further with that suggestion now, because I hope to discuss it at a later stage. I can only agree with the member for Elizabeth that too often too much legislation is being considered in the late hours of the night and the early hours of the morning, and this is certainly not to the advantage of the resultant legislation.

I was surprised that His Excellency's Speech left until the last few paragraphs any reference to the State's financial situation. In these last few paragraphs the position at June 30, 1972, was pointed out, in that, instead of having an expected deficit of \$7,346,000, the State had finished the year with a deficit of \$1,066,000. Although His Excellency was able to indicate that the Loan funds had been overspent by \$4,429,000, in the long term this is not relevant to the normal Financial Statement or normal revenue income to which the balance is related.

The fact that it was possible to undertake additional work because of the nature of the weather conditions was advantageous to the

State in the long term. Not only is the work being carried out now and not only can we gain the benefit of it immediately, but, with the escalation of costs we are seeing in all manner of undertaking, the State must, in the long term, be at some advantage by having taken the course of overspending those Loan accounts. I do not suggest for one moment that the Government's action in this regard was anything other than reasonable: I am heartily in agreement with it.

However, I draw the attention of the House to the statements made by the member for Stuart, who was rather provocative when he was referring to the Commonwealth Government's attitude to the States in respect of finance. The present Government has used this ploy on many occasions when it has rubbished the Commonwealth Government for a failure to make funds available to this State, claiming that the amount made available has been quite unreasonable. Obviously, the member for Stuart has not read the complete Speech, because it contains this statement:

Fortunately, as a result mainly of increased financial assistance from the Commonwealth (arising directly from a greater increase in the "average wage" factor in the statutory formula)...

Here we have an admission by the Government, which advised the Governor in the preparation of his Speech, that South Australia in fact received a greater sum than it had in the past. Certainly the announcements made after the Premiers' Conference indicate clearly that each State benefited as a result of the additional funds made available during that conference.

I draw the attention of members, particularly the member for Stuart, to the publication *Commonwealth Payments to and for the States for 1970-71* issued by the Treasury. At page 90 of that publication there is a breakdown of the total payments to the States from 1958-59 to the estimated figures for 1971-72. I do not suggest that the estimates for 1971-72 are necessarily the final figures that were determined at the Premiers' Conference, and for the basis of this discussion I shall refer back to 1970-71. On examining the figures we find that in every period South Australia, on a per capita basis, has been at an advantage when compared with New South Wales, Victoria and some of the other States. I wish to refer to the per capita amounts made available from Commonwealth sources; in 1958-59 New South Wales received \$52.58, Victoria \$50.81, and South Australia \$69.88—a very significant difference. In 1962-63 the figure for New

South Wales had increased to \$68.86, Victoria \$67.79, and South Australia \$96.23—again a very significant difference, the figure being nearly 50 per cent greater than the per capita allocation to the two Eastern States.

Mr. Hopgood: You sound like Sir Robert Askin.

Dr. EASTICK: The important thing is what is documented, which gives the lie to the argument advanced by members opposite, particularly the member for Stuart, that the Commonwealth Government has not been looking after the interests of South Australia. It is quite impossible for everyone to be satisfied at all the time.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Why?

Dr. EASTICK: I shall come back to the obvious for the benefit of the Minister later. Throughout the period I have referred to there has been an advantage to South Australia. As a further example, in 1970-71 the figure for New South Wales was \$142.23, for Victoria \$139.28, and for South Australia \$187.22.

Mr. Burdon: You are bringing politics into it now.

Dr. EASTICK: No; I am simply stating plain facts. Moving further to the 1971-72 estimates (I am unable to say that these are the final figures), for that period the estimates for New South Wales were \$140.31 and for Victoria \$137.44, notwithstanding that both of those States had shown a decrease, whereas for South Australia the estimate was \$191.92 (and increase); so the South Australian situation had improved once again to the disadvantage of the Eastern States.

Mr. Keneally: That covers all the States.

Dr. EASTICK: I am referring to the split up for all of the States, which is the important thing, and it is important that we get the facts straight. The argument the honourable member put forward this afternoon was just too bad, but these are the facts. I refer to a document which was prepared by the Treasury officers of all States, which is up to date to the period 1968-69, and which shows that on the basis of an index of change relative to the Commonwealth grants for the States between the period 1949-50 to 1968-69 the increase had been on the index basis of 100 to 622; in other words, there had been a 622 per cent increase during that period of the distribution of the funds by the Commonwealth to the States. I shall not go into further statistical detail, all of which is available to every member. I decry the attitude that South Australia is at a disadvantage compared to the other States, when

obviously from the figures I have quoted, if the member for Stuart wants to study them rather than call out for them, he will find that this State benefits at the expense of the two major Eastern States. That is the important point. Members had to wait until the last paragraph of His Excellency's Speech presented yesterday for acknowledgement by the Government that its financial position at June 30, 1972, was at an advantage over expectation as a result of the increased funds made available by the Commonwealth.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It was because of good management.

Dr. EASTICK: We could talk about management for a long time, but I can explain to the Minister that, as a result of the detail which has been provided, obviously there has not been good management. In the debate yesterday it was shown there was poor management on the Government's behalf in that it admitted that it had distributed taxpayers' funds in an unconstitutional manner. I shall not refer much more to the State's finances for the simple reason that we are not being given the opportunity to study the balances as at June 30, 1972. We had that blanket statement by His Excellency in his Opening Speech, but the end-of-year results, which are the breakdown of income and expenditure from the Treasury officers, have still not been distributed to members. Although it is the normal expectation that the end-of-month detail will be made available to members, and is made available to them during the early part of the month (as early on a number of occasions as the eighth or ninth day of the month), here, on the 19th day of the month, we are still waiting for the detailed breakdown of this State's receipts and income to June 30, 1972. What is there to hide? The following extract also appears in the document to which I am referring:

It is a fairly consistent series of modest increases in the flow of State revenues.

What constitutes a fairly consistent series of modest increases? The documentation available to May 31 suggests that increases well above the budgeted figure on many items have resulted in this State's having a much lower deficit. More particularly, it has made a mockery of the Budget which was put before honourable members but which now reflects an over-taxing of the people of this State. As far as one could determine from the available information, the people of this State were going to provide the Government with an additional \$25,000,000. I have on many

occasions been able to use these figures, which have been gleaned from the detailed research that has been carried out. However, I found I was incorrect in making the statement I made, my authority on this occasion being none other than the Premier himself.

About two weeks ago, the Premier told the Premiers' Conference that the measures introduced by his Government had resulted in raising an extra \$30,000,000. These are not my figures, or figures that I have conjured up: they are figures that were pronounced by the Premier himself. Whether the figure of \$30,000,000 is the actual figure, or whether it was merely the Premier's belief when he introduced the various pieces of legislation to which I have referred, or whether we will find that the final figure is above \$30,000,000, are indeed matters for conjecture. It is important that, if we are to help the people we represent, the figures that are normally available to the House by this time each year be now made available without any further delay.

Yesterday, honourable members had the opportunity of discussing a measure which, in the minds of some people, was an industrial measure but which, in the eyes of others, was a civil measure. However, the Supreme Court recognized it as a civil measure. The situation that has evolved on Kangaroo Island is only a small part of the total industrial upset which is besetting not only South Australia but which is starting to move across the whole of Australia. I should like briefly to highlight some of the effects that the introduction of a 35-hour week would have on the people of South Australia and, indeed, on those of Australia generally. This aspect is indeed relevant to industrial issues, and it will be interesting to see how the Government introduces amendments to the Industrial Code and similar types of legislation. One finds in the pronouncements coming from Canberra, as a result of research, some rather startling figures. On June 8 last the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport said:

As one of the world's top 12 trading nations, Australia would suffer an "explosive cost problem" if a 35-hour week became the national norm.

As a result of a discussion the Minister had had with the relevant department and of information received from the Minister for Labour and National Service, he went on to say:

I am forced into the conclusion that the campaign has motives solely based on political considerations or the encouragement of the

costly philosophy of "maximum money for minimum work". The facts are that a national 35-hour week without compensating increased productivity could cost Australia \$3,000,000,000 annually in increased costs. In more human terms, there are estimates that a housewife's purchasing power could be reduced by approximately 15 per cent, while farmers, who are unable to pass on rising costs, could find their returns reduced by approximately 30 per cent. The ramifications on trade are obvious: the luxury of a 35-hour week would price Australia out of many of its overseas trade operations, and that would bring increased strains to bear on the domestic scene. In the Australian transport scene, operations which are now efficient would be put in jeopardy and freight rates would have to rise. I believe employers should stand up to be counted on this issue and should resist pressures for the 35-hour week. It is in the national interest so to do.

The \$3,000,000,000 referred to in that statement is the maximum possible at this stage. Other figures emanating from the department of the Minister for Labour and National Service, as a result of investigations carried out by his staff, suggest that, if the decreased productivity through the weekly loss of five hours in respect of each working person is to be met by the employment of additional persons, the national cost will be between \$1,200,000,000 and \$1,500,000,000 a year. But if the decrease in productivity were to be made up by way of overtime rates (that is, using the same staff as at present but working overtime to retain productivity) the national cost would be between \$2,300,000,000 and the \$3,000,000,000 already referred to. The Minister for Labour and National Service, in a press release dated June 26 last, when referring to the introduction of a 35-hour week, said:

Their objective is not more leisure but more of the working week to be paid at higher overtime rates. The result could only be increased unit costs of production in whatever industries were to be affected. In other words, the introduction of a 35-hour week must intensify inflationary pressures at a time when the strongest of efforts must continue to be made to contain them.

The release also states:

The Minister said he was sure the community understood this. He recalled that a recent Gallup poll had indicated that only 13 per cent of Australians favour the immediate introduction of a 35-hour week. In the same poll, 60 per cent of respondents said they wished to retain the 40-hour week.

Mr. Wright: Didn't you watch Michael Willesee the other night? The employer proved conclusively that he could raise production on a 36-hour week.

Dr. EASTICK: Was that one isolated case, or was it across the board?

Mr. Wright: We'll look after you.

Dr. EASTICK: I would be interested to hear about that. The Prime Minister has also entered into this debate and I refer to his statement of May 7, as follows:

The time lost in strikes—

Not only in relation to the 35-hour week but the industrial situation generally, which is especially important in connection with the overall statements that I have made—

increased very strongly over the previous year. This was in 1970-71. He continued:

The total increase in the time lost was 28 per cent and the total of wages lost was \$45,000,000.

These figures are significant in this area of industrial unrest and industrial pressure which, as I pointed out, has become more and more noticeable.

His Excellency's opening speech is obviously different from other Speeches of this nature. The early paragraphs dealt with the Government's concern at what was happening with agriculture and the agricultural industry and, for the first time to my knowledge, we saw a Labor Government which was wooing the agricultural scene. The Government was in it because there is an election year coming up and because, at long last, the arguments put forward from this side have sunk in and because the Government thought there was some advantage in it. We have said for a long time that it is important to maintain a viable agricultural industry. We have said that, if the agricultural industry is not maintained, the effect will flow on and cause distress, decrease the need for productivity and adversely affect the mode of living of the people as a whole. We have witnessed decreased productivity in the agricultural area and at the same time a lowering of prices on the world market. We have seen the reduced purchasing rate of the farming community in recent times and we have had near-drought conditions in this State in the earlier part of this year. For the first time we have seen the Labor Government showing an interest in the rural community and, for this, we can be happy.

Mr. Wells: If this was the first time, what were you doing while in Government?

Dr. EASTICK: I am talking about the effect of having a Labor Government. The Labor Government between 1965 and 1968 did nothing for primary industry, nor has this Government between 1970 and June, 1972.

We find that in an election year the Government is suddenly wanting to do something. True, there is great need for an improvement in the agricultural situation and the attitude of the Government in this matter. We see at long last that the Government is showing an interest in abattoirs, an interest in rural reconstruction, an interest in egg marketing: all these areas are included in the document before us. An inquiry into the abattoirs has been under way and interim reports have been made verbally to the Minister (as we have been informed by his own statements), but the effect of those interim reports or any activity regarded as desirable and necessary at the abattoirs is just not obvious. We have a situation which is highlighted in the document before us that there has been a rapid increase in the beef population of the State. Towards the end of last session, in answer to the member for Alexandra, the Minister of Agriculture in another place was able to show that, in relation to beef cattle alone in South Australia, between 1968 and 1971 there had been a 107 per cent increase, and from figures that came from the statistics department about two weeks ago as regards the current estimate (probably very close to being correct) emerged the fact that between March, 1971, and March, 1972, there had been a further increase of 32 per cent, a tremendous increase in beef cattle numbers during the period from 1968 to March, 1972—107 per cent for the first three years and an additional 32 per cent for the following year.

But what has been the increased availability of killing capacity at the abattoirs? It is non-existent; there has been virtually no increase, and we saw in the earlier months of this year, when near-drought conditions prevailed, a rapid reduction in the value of beef, because it was impossible for the abattoirs available to the State to take up the slack and provide the increased killing capacity necessary to handle these increased stock numbers. I fully appreciate that we cannot install killing capacity of this kind overnight, but certainly with the increase that has been building up the need for an extension of facilities and for assistance for the abattoirs has been obvious long before the present moment. It was necessary from the time when this Government came into office, but it has been denied the abattoirs. Unless some positive action is taken soon, if we have a similar climatic pattern next year to the one we have experienced this year or if the rainfall should cease now so that the eventual feed capacity of this

State is markedly reduced by the end of this year, we shall have an overstocking of cattle.

Not only will this State be at a disadvantage (and this has been drawn to the Government's attention for a long time in relation to the increased American meat market available) but also there could be a marked loss of stock. If there is a general Australia-wide drought condition or a reduction in feed capacity or availability across the Commonwealth, as may well happen, with the increased build-up of stock in the beef cattle area many agriculturists will go to the wall. An injection of funds at this moment is imperative; it has been imperative for the last 18 months. On behalf of the people that we represent in this State, I hope it is not delayed any longer.

One is a little puzzled at the reference in His Excellency's Speech to the fact that there has been an increase in the advisory and experimental fields of the Agriculture Department. This is a time when considerable concern appears to be shown by people associated with the Agriculture Department that they do not know where they are going. As there seems to be lack of direction under whose authority they will come, as to what part of the Agriculture Department will be hived off to some other department soon, it is difficult to understand the reference to an improvement in the overall scientific and investigatory pattern that the department is taking on.

It is also interesting to note in a recent document from the Commonwealth the amount of funds made available by the Commonwealth to the States. It allows the State of South Australia more than \$4,000,000 for an improvement in agricultural experimentation and investigation. When will the Government indicate to the people involved in these programmes exactly what it intends or exactly what it will do in the future development, control or direction of the Agriculture Department? Certainly there is a fear at present that, with the type of activity that is going on, there will be a dissemination of the work of the department into a series of other departments. Is this correct, or will the department be permitted to proceed and fulfil a role similar to the extremely useful purpose that it has served in the past? It has a vital purpose for the future of agricultural areas of the State. We would like to know much more than has been made available to us in reply to questions asked in this House over many months. We want to know, for instance,

whether the Minister of Education will suddenly find that he has the Rural Youth group and the Bureau of Agriculture group under his control.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I haven't got the Rural Youth group.

Dr. EASTICK: Is the Minister going to take it?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I don't think so, unless you are going to tell me to take it.

Dr. EASTICK: I would not tell the Minister to do anything, but it is interesting to know for the first time whether there will be a hiving off into the Education Department. It will be interesting to know that the rumour is not correct, and it will be interesting to see whether there is an alteration in future. It is also difficult to understand that at this time. When there has been this increase in the beef industry one organization associated with the Minister of Agriculture, namely, the Artificial Breeding Board, has financial and management difficulties, and that certainly is not to the advantage of improved beef cattle types or of beef cattle breeding in this State. I hope we will get from the Minister of Agriculture, or from another responsible Minister, an enlightened attitude and that an improved image will be given to the Artificial Breeding Board.

We also see a comment about Murray New Town, and I do not want to take this subject from the member for Murray, because obviously the matter is vital and significant to him in the area that he represents so capably. However, I had the opportunity during the recess since the House last sat to attend a seminar which was addressed by a task force group with membership from several universities in Australia and which was arranged by the Australian Institute of Urban Studies. A document circulated on that occasion is of considerable interest. It is entitled "Skeleton of the First Report of the Task Force on New Cities for Australia".

During that seminar, to which a member of the Government had been invited, there was opportunity for discussion with representatives from the South Australian Housing Trust, the Railways Department, the State Planning Office, persons involved in land brokerage, and persons in the building industry and all those industries associated with new development and housing projects. The important thing that came from the discussions was the very matter that was raised during the last session of this Parliament about the first Bill relating to Murray New Town. It was that unless there was a

sound economic base upon which to work any town would fail. There is no value at all in setting aside an area of land and developing a town if the residents are not provided with work nearby. There is no value in establishing a dormitory town with between 100,000 and 200,000 people 40 or 45 miles from their place of employment.

The Government has not given any indication of the industrial and economic base for the development of the town. We know that during this session legislation will be introduced that will provide for a further step in the development of Murray New Town. We will take great interest in the series of measures that will be necessary in connection with the development of the town and, for that matter, of other new towns. However, if we are to be able to give proper attention to the legislation, we will need an early announcement from the Government on how it will provide the area with a solid economic base. If we are to have a dormitory town with people commuting 50 miles to work or if we are to have people staying away from home from Monday to Friday, we will see the development of a considerable social problem in the dormitory area. Consequently, it is essential that the Government state the economic base for the area very soon. These comments were forthcoming as a result of careful consideration of the matter during the seminar arranged by the Australian Institute of Urban Studies.

The Bill introduced last session froze land prices at their level on the day of the introduction of the Bill. That worthwhile step was commended and supported, but in this State we are seeing a series of events that is of no advantage to people wanting to build houses. We are seeing provisions that result in the escalation of the cost of properties. The very nature of the demands that can be made in connection with underground drainage, kerbing, water tables, underground electrical services, and other servicing requirements expected of the subdivider results in the escalation of the cost of land to the point where people are being denied the opportunity to purchase properties for a reasonable price.

Whilst in many instances private enterprise is not permitted to undertake by private construction essential services such as electricity, water and sewerage, we are putting the young people of this State at a disadvantage. There is nothing in the information given to the House so far to suggest that there will be any attempt to bring

prices into reality. In fact, it is quite to the contrary, because we find that, according to statements made to the House, we will see the licensing of land agents; presumably there will be a changed situation from what has prevailed in the past. It may well be said that the Real Estate Institute of South Australia has an axe to grind—why should it not have? But the institute has provided valuable information which indicates that, if the State is to move in the direction that other States have taken and discontinues the practice of land brokering, there will be a considerable increase in the cost of the transfer and management of property.

Mr. Ryan: That's not necessarily so. How can it be done?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: No-one is doing away with land brokering.

Dr. EASTICK: It is interesting that the House is where we must come to obtain these answers; we cannot get them elsewhere.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You might get them if you ask the institute nicely.

Dr. EASTICK: It would be good to know that there will be no increase in costs of land transfers and that the Government will not enter this field, because it is important to bring before the people of the State the very nature of the increases that might result (and this will make the Minister happy) if the Government intends moving in the direction in which it is rumoured or believed that the Government is moving.

Mr. Harrison: Ask the Deputy Leader.

Dr. EASTICK: We have already seen the effect of increased stamp duties on all these types of transaction: it is scandalous and, but for members in another place, the Government would have extracted an additional \$400,000 from the people of South Australia, mainly from land transfers. I notice that the Minister has suddenly gone quiet. The situation I wish to bring to the attention of the people of the State is that, if South Australia should move in the direction taken by New South Wales and Victoria on earlier occasions, the document charge, which does not include the stamp duty, for the sale of an average \$10,000 house, together with the mortgage required by the purchaser of, say, \$7,000 would in Victoria be \$285 and in New South Wales \$413.70, whereas in South Australia it is now only \$50. I cannot hear any denial by the Minister that these figures are correct. However, after he has had the opportunity to examine them, he will no doubt let me know if they are wrong.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What will the Government do next year?

Dr. EASTICK: Exactly. On the figures that apply to the three States now, the community of South Australia is at an advantage because of the present method. The figures I have given have a considerable relationship to the attitude the House and the Government must take in any further consideration of this matter.

I should like now to refer to the statement regarding the improvement of facilities at Outer Harbour, a project that is of tremendous importance to South Australia. It is estimated that the cost will be more than the original estimate. Indeed, I think it exceeds \$2,000,000, and it is expected that work will be completed by the end of this financial year. His Excellency also said that work was to continue on the widening of the dredged channel in the Port River to a minimum width of 500ft., at a total estimated cost of \$10,000,000. That is a considerable outlay, which is warranted if the port facilities in this State are to continue to function correctly. However, the question that is exercising the minds of many people is one that I know has been before the Public Works Committee recently: whether we can expect to maintain a satisfactory overseas shipping arrangement in competition with what appears at present to be a more satisfactory container arrangement through the port of Melbourne.

I do not want to see the loss of revenue to this State any more than any honourable member opposite does. It is extremely important that we are able to undertake the maximum amount of local shipping possible. However, when one relates figures of this nature (and I refer to \$10,000,000 for dredging) and the cost of facilities that would be required for proper containerization and handling, one must consider urgently whether we should not come to a better working arrangement regarding facilities available in Victoria. I do not want to see any loss of advantage to South Australia, but at the same time I think we must have a more realistic look at this situation before we outlay the funds of the magnitude which are envisaged in this document and which will be an escalating charge to the people of this State.

Mr. Ryan: We would probably lose what we already have, wouldn't we.

Dr. EASTICK: True, we have that problem, but we have seen such a reduction in shipping that has left this State, and we have experienced difficulty in getting shipping into South

Australia to export agricultural produce particularly, so I believe we must examine the whole problem and not just sectional aspects of it. I support the motion.

Mr. WELLS (Florey): I, too, support the motion, and add my congratulations to those already proffered to His Excellency the Governor for his magnificent Speech. I join with other honourable members who have expressed the regret felt by the whole of this State at the sad loss of Sir James Harrison. He was a man in every sense of the word, and I have particular memories of him that will live with me for a long while. I first met him when I was a trade union secretary and a member of the executive of the Trades and Labor Council. I was thrilled and honoured to be among the members of the executive of the council who were summoned to meet Sir James at Government House. We went along and were received very cordially, and Sir James said to us as a body, "I have met the Parliamentarians of this State; I have met the civic fathers of this State; I have met the leaders of commerce of this State; and now I feel that I want to meet the people who really matter in this State—the leaders of the trade union movement."

Mr. Brown: That included the wharfies.

Mr. WELLS: Yes. I thought this was a wonderful statement for a man in his position to make, and it was sincere. I met Sir James only about 10 days later when, by this time, Parliament had been called together and, in company with other members, I went across to be introduced to him. Sir James had a peculiar look on his face when I shook hands with him and said, "Well, things happen quickly in South Australia." One week I was at Government House as a trade union secretary and the next week I was privileged to be there as a member of Parliament. Of course, Sir Mark Oliphant is a man cast in a similar mould, a man who has every attribute required to be a good Governor of any State and, irrespective of our political affiliations, he does us all proud.

I wish to add my name to the list of members who have expressed regret at the passing of former members of this House. Although I knew only one of those members to any degree, namely, Lin Riches, who was a very fine man, I believe that each of those members was worthy of the highest praise and, with other members, I regret their passing.

The Governor's Speech highlights the fact that the people of South Australia showed great sagacity in installing a Labor Govern-

ment on the Treasury benches of this State, and many factors go to prove the wisdom of their choice. These factors are highlighted in the Governor's Speech and, of course, there will be many more achievements before the end of this Parliament. As usual, the Government indicates every desire to continue to assist the man on the land and people generally within the rural community. This Government has been castigated by previous speakers for doing nothing for the man on the land.

Mr. Rodda: Of course it has.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections by a member out of his seat are entirely out of order. I must ask the member for Victoria to resume his seat. The honourable member for Florey.

Mr. WELLS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Government is tremendously concerned about the financial viability of every man on the land (every rural worker and every rural producer). We have demonstrated this fact time and time again, and we see a further indication of it in the Governor's Speech, where His Excellency said:

My Government has already initiated action to provide subsidies on the movement of stock and fodder in areas adversely affected by the seasonal conditions and further help under the provisions of the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act will be afforded as, and if, this is found to be necessary.

That, of course, was a further indication of this Government's intention to assist the farmer, and it is no new departure; it has always been the desire and intention of this Government.

Mr. Harrison: And always will be.

Mr. WELLS: Yes. If we go back over the years when a Labor Government has been on the Treasury benches, we will find that rural communities have received subsidies and benefits that have never been duplicated by any other Government.

Mr. McAnaney: Bunkum.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Florey must not be intimidated by interjections.

Mr. WELLS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your protection. Environment protection was a term which, prior to this Government's coming into office, was not known. Previous Liberal Governments never mentioned the phrase: they paid no attention whatever to the standard of our environment. We are also most fortunate in having a dynamic Minister responsible now for the care of the environment of this State. Under his guidance

we have made startling progress in the protection of the environment: so much so that his activities are being emulated by other States. He has shown the way and the other States have followed. Yet the Liberal Party when in power did not even know the meaning of this term. An Environment Protection Authority has now been created and we can expect much progress to be made under its leadership and under the guidance of the appropriate Minister whose efforts on behalf of the people of this State have been demonstrated day after day.

I refer to what the Leader said about Murray New Town, but his remarks meant nothing. Indeed, I do not know whence the Leader obtained his information, because he referred to many things of which I, as a member of Government, am not aware. The Leader referred to the impossibility of establishing a new town unless it is supported by secondary industry that can provide employment. Does the Leader believe that the people responsible under this Government for planning the town would take such a step without first ensuring that industries were available to establish in that area? If members opposite do believe this, it merely shows the inane attitude they are prepared to adopt towards any acceptable suggestion put forward by any political party or body other than the Liberal and Country League or the Liberal Movement.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What industries will go there?

Mr. WELLS: I have said that I do not know of the specific industries, but it can be readily assumed that the industries will be available when the town's construction is commenced. This would be an initial step in determining what services are required to support such a town. I congratulate the Government on the vision and foresight exemplified by its intention to create a new town. Members opposite can be sure that this project will figure again as a monument to the farsighted wisdom and the great capability of a Labor Government.

I want now to speak briefly about the activities of the Attorney-General, a man whom I admire greatly, a man we are fortunate to have. The whole State is indeed fortunate in that the Attorney-General decided to channel his brilliant legal talents into the field of legislation, because he has in a short space of time revolutionized the courts and much of the legislation concerning the judicial system of the State. He is a man who has been attacked often in this Chamber, but I am always delighted to be present when he

is attacked because his ability makes it simple for him to answer any questions put to him or to rebut any arguments made against propositions he is putting forward. One reform in particular is the newly constituted Department of Community Welfare which, under his jurisdiction, will fill a long awaited need in our community and serve as a model for other States. We particularly note the activities of the Juvenile Court, which again other States envy and certainly would like to emulate.

The present Minister of Roads and Transport should be honoured. He will go down in the history of this State as the man who saved South Australia from the monstrosity of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan.

Mr. Evans: But it is still going on.

Mr. WELLS: He is a man of vision and foresight. He saw and demonstrated that we were being led into a transport quagmire by the Liberal Government, but he took over the reins of office and has shown the authority that a Minister should show; he has made marvellous strides. He is determined to use every avenue available to improve the standard of our public utilities, and this is a lesson that the Government preceding the Labor Government could well have learnt; at least, it could have led the way there. The Minister inherited a legacy of derelict railway services, too.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: From the previous Liberal Government.

Mr. WELLS: Yes, that is right. The railways produce a deficit, which is something that it is hard for any Government to avoid if it is to provide such a public service. He has struggled to improve the position in the State in this respect.

Mr. Gunn: What about the unions?

Mr. WELLS: Did the honourable member mention unions? I want to deal with that. The previous Liberal Government in power did what it could with public transport and with the railways, but apparently it was not very much. It neglected one vital force within the department—labour. It neglected the South Australian Railways workers shamefully. At one time I was privileged to travel between Adelaide and Mount Gambier.

Mr. Mathwin: I'll bet it took you a long time. The train goes at 30 m.p.h.

Mr. WELLS: It took me three weeks to get there, because I went with an organizer from a South Australian Railways union and visited every small siding where there were cottages

owned by the South Australian Railways and occupied by railway workers.

Mr. Crimes: And you were amazed.

Mr. WELLS: I was shocked. I saw living conditions that I had not thought existed in this State. I saw houses that were tumbling down, with roofs leaking, concrete floors, windows broken or doors so jammed that they could not be opened, and floors that had sunk away from the walls. There were no washing facilities except an old copper heated by wood, and there were no bath heaters. If electric power was required to operate a piece of equipment such as a toaster or an electric jug, the occupants were required to make application for the installation of power and, when power was supplied, an amount of from 15c to 25c a week was added to the rent.

I understand that the South Australian Railways is either the largest or second largest landlord in this State. It has many houses under its control and these houses have been allowed to fall into such a state of decay and neglect that it is an absolute shame. I give full credit to the present Minister, because he has done all in his power to see that the living conditions and accommodation available to the workers under his jurisdiction have been improved.

Mr. Becker: Why did it take the unions so long to get this fixed up?

Mr. Crimes: They went to the Chief Engineer, but nothing was done.

Mr. WELLS: They were not able to do much, because at that time the railways were under the jurisdiction of the Railways Commissioner. The South Australian Railways have since been taken from his control and placed under the jurisdiction of the Minister, who now exercises his authority to see that these things are done. The following letter was written to Mr. Fanning (Secretary of the Australasian Transport Officers Federation):

You will recall that recently when discussing the condition of S.A.R. cottages the question of upgrading was raised. I have sought from the Commissioner details of improvements effected during the last financial year and these are as follows:—

The first matter mentioned is water supply. A concrete ring 4ft. high and 3ft. in diameter was provided, and water was pumped from a dirty water tank once a week. That is what the householder used for drinking, washing, and so on. The following improvements were listed as having been effected:

Water supply, sewerage and drainage	27 cottages
Sleepouts or additional rooms.....	37 cottages

Garages.....	64 cottages
Hot water services	39 cottages
Improved cooking and/or heating facilities	125 cottages

God knows what they ate in the period of Liberal Government. I think they must have eaten witchetty grubs. They had only cast iron stoves. The inside lining, the doors and the heaters had broken up. When Liberal Governments were in power, employees tried to do something about it and they reported these matters through the proper channels, but every time the reply was that something might be done if and when labour and materials were available. They might see another stove in 18 months time. The list of improvements continues:

Clothes hoists, handbasins, sinks, porches, rainwater tanks and other sundries	158 cottages
Additional power points, lights, etc.....	728 items in 225 cottages

The aggregate cost of the above improvements was \$111,000.

This is a clear indication that the present Minister is a man who has his priorities right and who realizes that the labour force is the most important part of any organization. These matters reflect the greatest credit on the finest Minister of Roads and Transport that this State has ever had.

Mr. Millhouse: Didn't the blokes write a letter of complaint to the Deputy Premier when the Premier was overseas? Last year the Deputy Premier received a letter of complaint about the Minister.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! We must have only one speaker at a time.

Mr. WELLS: The honourable member's interjection about a letter of complaint is not correct.

Mr. Millhouse: Yes, it is.

Mr. WELLS: It is not so.

Mr. Millhouse: Then, what was the letter about? The honourable member should read in *Hansard* the question that I asked last year.

Mr. WELLS: If I knew of the letter I would say so.

Mr. Millhouse: The blokes complained about the Minister.

Mr. WELLS: We will see later. The Minister of Roads and Transport is distressed about the mounting road toll in this State, and I am certain that we all share his concern. It is undeniable that no-one could have done more than the Minister has done to reduce the road toll and encourage people to exercise more care on the roads. Let us hope that the road toll for next year is more satisfactory

from everyone's point of view. In the Minister of Roads and Transport we certainly have a person of whom we can be proud. I was pleased to see the appointment of a Select Committee on Occupational Safety and Welfare in Industry.

Mr. Mathwin: And a very good one, too.

Mr. WELLS: It was a very important Select Committee, on which the member for Glenelg was a member. People, generally speaking, do not realize the tremendous waste of man-hours and money occasioned by accidents and mishaps in industry. Many firms are taking wonderful steps to curtail the accident rate, but others are not doing what they should be doing. However, I hope this situation will soon be improved. The Select Committee's report will be of great interest and I am sure that every member will be interested in the committee's findings, from which I am certain that valuable legislation will flow. Industry consists of two parties who at times become careless and neglectful. One party is the employer who sometimes forgets that he has a grave responsibility to provide for the safety of his employees. The other party is the employee who, unfortunately, sometimes neglects to use the safety precautions and provisions provided for his benefit. Unfortunately, some employers provide little or no money in this respect.

An Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Bill will be introduced to replace the industrial provisions of the Industrial Code; this will streamline the old Code and should result in satisfactory provisions. I do not think the old Code in its entirety was satisfactory from anyone's point of view, whereas the new legislation will most certainly be of great value not only to the trade union movement but to the State as a whole.

One item in the Governor's Speech that interests me very much is that the Government will legislate to provide for three months long service leave after 10 years service with one employer. This provision is a step forward, and a very welcome one, because people generally are dissatisfied with the existing provisions. I know that I will probably not be successful in seeking what I want in its entirety, but grave anomalies exist in the Long Service Leave Act. For instance, one anomaly is that the Act calls for 10 years continuous service with the one employer. If this provision is related to the building trade, we find that over 90 per cent of building trade employees never have, and never will be, qualified to enjoy long service leave

because, in the main, they are engaged from job to job. A man may work for Mr. A on a big building for two or three years, and on the completion of that job be dismissed; so he goes to Mr. B and works on his project. A man may therefore have 10 years service in the industry but not qualify for long service leave, which is a grave anomaly. Provision should be made for long service leave entitlement after one has been engaged in an industry for 10 years.

I have sought advice on the percentages to which I am referring, and I am informed that over 90 per cent of the persons engaged in the building industry have not obtained, and indeed cannot obtain, long service leave qualifications. In addition to these people, another sector of the work force is not catered for, either: those people who move from job to job and who work on a casual basis. There are many such people in the building trade who cannot qualify for long service leave but for whom I should like to see provision made.

Mr. Evans: Can you suggest what provision? Does the first employer or the last employer pay for it?

Mr. WELLS: No, I believe a fund could be created.

Mr. Evans: By whom?

Mr. WELLS: Perhaps by the Master Builders Association or some other reputable body. An employer could perhaps be obliged to pay so much into the fund each week for his employees, and those contributions could cease when that man left his employment. I am not saying that this should happen if a person was dismissed for, say, misconduct. If a man worked on a large city building for 2½ years, his employer should pay a certain sum into the fund on his behalf to cover his long service leave entitlement for that period. If that employee then commenced work for another employer on perhaps another long job where he might work for, say, 18 months, his long service leave entitlement could accumulate until he had worked for 10 years.

Mr. Evans: But that would work only if the interest rate was greater than the inflationary trend over that period, otherwise the fund would be inadequate.

Mr. WELLS: Of course, there would be problems, which I am not qualified to solve. However, there are certain people, about whom members opposite would know, who would ensure that the fund was solvent. I should like now to refer to the Housing Trust. In his

Speech His Excellency said that the Housing Trust programme has now settled at between 2,100 and 2,200 houses and flats a year. Although this is a good achievement, I do not think it is a startling figure or that it is enough. Indeed, I should like to see it trebled. However, the present Government is, just as the former Government was, restricted by lack of finance. A serious problem confronts us when one realizes that in one year alone 10,000 applications were submitted for low-rental houses. The people who occupy this type of accommodation should be on low incomes and should really need low-rental accommodation. What the solution is, I do not profess to know.

Mr. Evans: A means test every five years.

Mr. WELLS: That is something.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What about people who go to a town such as Millicent (say, technical people) who do not know whether they will stay?

Mr. Evans: They pay a higher rental.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It doesn't work out; they've tried it in Western Australia.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Florey.

Mr. WELLS: It would be really good if we could devise some method of providing houses for these people, who need them so badly. Every member in this Chamber (or every member who should be in this Chamber) has received many requests from his constituents for assistance in getting a trust house. The usual procedure adopted is that a letter is written on behalf of the constituent to the General Manager of the Housing Trust (Mr. Ramsay), but he cannot pull a house out of the hat, as it were, and almost invariably a reply is received to this effect: "We are aware of the situation, but there are so many applications. Your constituent will have his (or her) application considered in due course." The trust cannot do anything about that, so that is it; but it is a real shame that somehow or other we cannot provide more houses for people who so badly need them.

Perhaps there is some merit in suggestions I have heard in respect of the present tenants of Housing Trust houses but, anyway, I think the trust is doing a good job. I have had much to do with its officers, probably because I pester them so often, seeking houses for my constituents. I am not often successful, but I appreciate the courtesy afforded me by the Housing Trust staff, from Mr. Ramsay down to the lowliest desk clerk. I find that they are courteous people who are only too willing

to help, but unfortunately they cannot work miracles.

I wish to conclude my contribution to this debate by referring to the situation that arose on Kangaroo Island, and I do this by virtue of the fact that it involves a rural community, and the Governor's Speech indicates assistance for rural people.

Mrs. Byrne: And the Leader of the Opposition referred to it.

Mr. WELLS: Yes. Although this whole situation was unfortunate from everyone's point of view, I congratulate the Premier and Cabinet for the action they took which I know ultimately remedied the situation. I was privileged to attend every conference held in respect of this problem. I was present at the first meeting held before Mr. Commissioner Lean, together with several of the people from the island in company with their solicitors, Mr. Maidment and Mr. Williams, as well as officers of United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated, the Stockowners' Association of South Australia and the Trades and Labor Council. We discussed the situation as fully as we could, sitting from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m., and arrived at what we thought to be an acceptable proposition to all concerned. It contained 10 points. It was my understanding that the people from the island would go back to the island and discuss these points with the members of the United Farmers and Graziers and the Stockowners' Association and inform us of the decision at which they finally arrived. I was apparently mistaken, because the matter was discussed at an open meeting at Kingscote. Of course, that action was the prerogative of the people on the island. If they wished to talk to all the townspeople, they were certainly at liberty to do so. The net result was that the proposition which we put forward and which had been agreed to by all present at the conference with Commissioner Lean, including representatives of the Stockowners' Association and the United Farmers and Graziers, were upset. A subsequent court action flowed from this on which I do not wish to enlarge except to say that the court found that the trade union officer was at fault and awarded costs against him. The Executive of the Trades and Labor Council then discussed the situation and determined to extend a ban on goods to Kangaroo Island, which it did.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you remember what they said?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Were you there, and do you know what they said?

Mr. WELLS: I know what was said, because of the anti-union feeling of the island people.

Mr. Millhouse: That's right.

Mr. WELLS: I do not deny it, because that was the situation. The ban was really on and no farming implements, superphosphate or anything else other than foodstuffs went to the island. I wish now to make a statement which I know you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will know personally to be true. Within the 10 points it was stated that foodstuffs, perishables and chemist requisites and the like would be carried and, without fear of contradiction, I point out that never in the history of the Waterside Workers Federation has a ban been placed on transport which included Kangaroo Island. On every occasion when a transport ban was implemented, the people of Kangaroo Island were looked after and the m.v. *Kapoola* and m.v. *Karatta* sailed fully stocked with foodstuffs and necessities for the island.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: We did not hear about this from the Opposition last night.

Mr. WELLS: True, but the reason I raise this point is that a newspaper published the decision made by the Trades and Labor Council and transmitted it to the island but most studiously avoided any mention of that paragraph: that never had a ban on Kangaroo Island been implemented in relation to foodstuffs and necessities. Indeed, the m.v. *Kapoola* and m.v. *Karatta* sailed fully stocked, as the member for Alexandra would know. They were exempt from the ban.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: I know, but is that relevant?

Mr. WELLS: It may not be relevant to this point, except that the inference was that the people would starve; there would be no medical supplies, no Lactogen or milk or any fresh vegetables, but that was never so. That stuff was exempt, and always has been. That is why I make that point.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: They were suggesting that nothing went through.

Mr. WELLS: Exactly. We knew that the State and the people on Kangaroo Island were in dire trouble, so we wanted to get back to the conference table. We asked whether they would confer again, but they refused. At that stage the political boys came into it—the Leader of the Opposition and other politicians. From those I exclude the member for Alexandra, because it is his electoral district and he had every right to be there. Those politicians went to the island uninvited and poked their noses into something that did not concern

them. Why?—to stir up political trouble on the island and cause animosity between the people on the island and this Government. One politician was invited to the island—the Premier. He went over and solved the problem.

Mr. Millhouse: Come off it! You do not even believe that yourself.

Mr. WELLS: I believe it because I know it is fact.

Mr. Millhouse: But no-one else does.

Mr. WELLS: That makes no difference. It is in *Hansard* as my statement, and I stand by it. That is what happened.

Mr. Millhouse: But you do not deny what I said, though.

Mr. WELLS: I am saying what happened. The Premier, realizing there would be no conference, not wanting any further confrontation but wanting, in fact, a solution to the problem, agreed to use his influence to have the ban lifted. The ban was lifted forthwith. Ultimately Cabinet made a decision in respect of costs, because there had to be a settlement on costs before there was any conference. Ultimately we went to Kangaroo Island, where, in the initial stages of our conference, we were met with what I would describe as distrust or doubt.

Mr. Venning: Any reason?

Mr. WELLS: No reason at all; but we talked our problems out and gradually the bitterness disappeared. A situation of understanding arose. The Trades and Labor Council officers got to understand more readily the problems of the people on the island.

Mr. Venning: They should have done that in the first place.

Mr. WELLS: The people on the island who originally had been bitter suddenly realized that the officers from the Trades and Labor Council had not got three heads, seemed fairly normal blokes, and perhaps were all right. I believe we gained mutual respect for each other. We talked over our problems. We did not reach final agreement. Again, the talks broke down on one point, but discussions went on and ultimately a decision was arrived at that was satisfactory to all parties. The position now is that I do not retreat one iota from my opinion that any man who works anywhere and takes the benefits gained by a trade union should be a member of that trade union. However, the position on the island now is that a body will be set up, comprising the employers (the farmers and, graziers and the stockowners'

organizations). They will have their committee, with a pipeline to the Trades and Labor Council. If in future there is any indication of industrial trouble on the island, from wherever it derives, they will contact the council. We will discuss the matter, and, in all probability, go to Kangaroo Island, and we will talk the matter over.

Mr. Evans: Will you sit on Mr. Dunford?

Mr. WELLS: Mr. Dunford is a respected trade union officer.

Mr. Crimes: And he's elected, too.

Mr. WELLS: He is elected by his members. If members opposite expect me to say anything derogatory about Mr. Dunford or any trade union, they are wasting their time.

Mr. Millhouse: No, we don't expect that.

Mr. WELLS: My time is running out and I ask honourable members to let me continue. Now we have a position of harmony in respect of Kangaroo Island. I have made friends of people on the island, and I now call them my friends.

Mr. Evans: What did you call them before?

Mr. WELLS: Previously, they did not trust us and we did not trust them. There is no open animosity now, and we can talk. We can have a chat over a lemonade and solve our problems. The situation at the moment is as it should be. There will be no move away by the Trades and Labor Council from a decision once it is made. That is the policy, and the people on the island agree wholeheartedly with it. I conclude by saying that I am extremely proud of the part our Government has played in this matter. We must not forget that goods worth more than \$6,000,000 flow from Kangaroo Island each year and that the people on the island are part of our State and that they are, in the main, battlers.

Mr. Evans: And they're strong willed.

Mr. WELLS: They are strong willed, all right.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: But they're not pigheaded like you. That's the difference.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WELLS: I think we must recognize that, because of the efforts of the Premier and his Cabinet, we were placed in a position where we could talk, and we did talk and talk again until we resolved the situation. Would the Opposition prefer that we were still confronting these people and would it prefer that we were in a position where nothing was going to or coming from the island? On the other hand, does the Opposition want a position of peace? People from the Liberal

and Country League and the Liberal Movement have been accused on the island of trying to foment trouble to provoke further confrontation for political purposes.

Dr. Eastick: Who accused whom? You name them.

Mr. WELLS: If the Leader wants a name, he, for one, was accused of going to the island and fomenting trouble.

Dr. Eastick: Not at all.

Mr. WELLS: That is what these people told me. The Leader wanted a direct confrontation because he thought he could embarrass the Government.

Dr. Eastick: That is totally incorrect.

Mr. WELLS: That is the situation. I met many warm-hearted and friendly people over there; they previously did not understand our problems and we did not understand their problems, but we can now sit down and talk matters over, and I am convinced that there will be no more trouble. Anyone who thinks that Dave Brookman could not easily retain the seat of Alexandra is mistaken, because I gained the impression that many people on the island thought Mr. Brookman was a good bloke.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the adoption of the Address in Reply, but I regret that the Speech to which we are replying was such an undistinguished one. I would have hoped that the Attorney-General, or the Government through the Attorney-General, would give His Excellency, on the first occasion on which he has opened Parliament, a Speech of rather more significance than the one he delivered. As far as I can see, there was no mention of such matters as Commonwealth Constitutional reform, and we hope there will be a convention on that matter in the next few months. Further, there was no mention of what is the topic uppermost in people's minds in South Australia at present, apart from the Kangaroo Island matter, which was canvassed by the member for Florey; the topic I am referring to is the ghastly and tragic Duncan case. Even the question of 18-year-old voting rights, in connection with which the Labor Party has been most vocal in its efforts to have Miss King enrolled on the Commonwealth electoral roll, was not mentioned. Further, there was hardly a mention of that continuing thorn in the Government's side, late-night shopping. These things, apart from late-night shopping, were not mentioned at all.

I can find only three matters in the Speech on which I desire to comment. The first

occurs in paragraph 8, concerning the conversion to metric measure. I hope that, at least for a few years, when metric measurements are to be used either in Acts of Parliament or generally throughout the community the old Imperial equivalents will also be quoted, because I confess quite freely that I have the very greatest difficulty in converting one to the other. Those people who have reached middle age (and that includes everyone in this Chamber, and it flatters some of us) and are set in their ways will have this same difficulty. We ought to be given a chance to get used to the system. Last session we had a Bill in which the term "Celsius" was used as a measure of temperature, and no indication was inserted in the Bill by the Parliamentary Counsel as to what "Celsius" meant. At that time I did not know what it meant, and I confess that I was too ashamed to ask what it meant. I now know that it means "Centigrade", and I am all right. Not one member asked what it meant at the time, but I will bet that I was not the only one who did not know. I hope, for the sake of the general public and for the benefit of members, that the old Imperial equivalents of metric measurements of length, etc., will always be quoted.

The next matter I mention, contained in paragraph 15, concerns the happily anticipated opening of the Modbury Hospital. I have always had doubts about the wisdom of having a hospital in this area. The project was started during the time of the Walsh Government between 1965 and 1968, and I well remember the Premier's announcement after he had been in office for a few months of the beginning of the work on the hospital. Being somewhat of a doubter, I went out there to have a look at the site and found that the beginning of the work was represented by one Highways Department bulldozer that had done a bit of scraping on the site and had stopped. When I went out there, nothing was happening on the site.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: That was only about 24 hours after the Public Works Committee had recommended the project.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Something like that. In fact, it was a sham. I notice (and this is why I mention the matter) that in paragraph 15 of the Speech the Government says, through His Excellency, that it is expected that facilities will be opened gradually as staff is recruited. I know, even though it is not admitted in the Speech, that the department is having enormous trouble in recruiting staff. The capacity of the hospital is 220

beds, and I think I am right in saying that it will open with only 20 beds. This is a very bad state of affairs. Of course, it is comparatively easy to build a building, but what is just as important (indeed, more important) is the standard of care given in that building. It is useless our building facilities if we cannot get the staff for them. I should like to know from the Government how long it is expected to be before that hospital is in full use. The third matter I mention is referred to in paragraph 13 of the Speech in which His Excellency says:

A Bill for an Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act to replace the industrial relations provisions of the Industrial Code will also be introduced.

I presume that the Bill will contain an attempt to cut out the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in such actions as *Woolley v. Dunford*. I am not necessarily against that, if all the Bill does is transfer the jurisdiction to the Industrial Court. However, I cannot see much point in it, but, if it will make the unions or anyone else happy, that is all right by me. The Attorney-General has already done it in the field of workmen's compensation: the jurisdiction has been taken away from the Local Court and invested in the Industrial Court.

The Hon. L. J. King: The Minister of Labour and Industry did it. You do me too much honour.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not mean to do the Attorney any honour at all, because the only result that I or members of the profession who are engaged in that jurisdiction can see is that the procedure is now far more complex and, therefore, far more expensive, but the remedies people get are certainly no better. I make no complaint about those engaged in the Industrial Court jurisdiction, such as Judge O'Loughlin and his colleagues, but the remedies are no more expeditious or satisfactory than they were when handled by the Local Court. I would be opposed to the abolition of the action for inducement or procuring a breach of contract; that was the cause of action in *Woolley v. Dunford*. I warn the Government again that such a provision as is contained in section 72 of the Queensland Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, or even in the English Trades Disputes Act, will not be sufficient to take away the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in such actions. I remind the Government of the English decision of *Rookes v. Barnard* and the tort of intimidation, and I warn the Government that it is not easy to transfer a jurisdiction founded

in the common law from the ordinary courts to the other courts.

Unless the Government intends to deny costs to parties in the Industrial Court under any circumstances, transfer of the jurisdiction will not avoid the situation that we have had in South Australia in recent weeks and months. Indeed, I hope the Government will think twice before it tries to do this. Despite what has been said by the member for Florey and by other members, the Government is in real trouble over the Kangaroo Island dispute, and it knows it is. That trouble will get worse if, at the behest of the unions, the Government monkeys with the rights of individual citizens and their enforcement by the courts. The case of *Woolley v. Dunford* was an excellent example of a court upholding the rights of an individual citizen. Let there be no mistake about it: Mr. Woolley has won, and he and all the people on the island have been vindicated by what has happened.

One cannot think of a more vindictive action than that taken by the Trades and Labor Council in putting a black ban on the whole island because of its anti-union attitude. That is what it did and that is what the member for Florey admitted it did. Well, that ban has now been lifted, and I hope that no-one will be kidded by the member for Florey or by anyone else into believing that there has been a settlement. Indeed, Mr. Woolley and the people on the island have had a complete victory, and the formation of a committee to act as a channel of communication in the case of future disputes (without any commitment, let it be remembered) means nothing and is no more than a face-saver for the Australian Workers Union, a face-saver which was made possible by the payment by the Government of \$9,985 for Mr. Woolley's agreed costs, a payment which, so far as I know and from all the information which we in this House have received, is without precedent. The Premier said in the press, immediately after news of what had happened had leaked out, that there were many precedents for this. The *News* of July 11 contains a report in which the following appears:

Mr. Dunstan said there had been plenty of other cases in South Australia when the Government had paid costs in order to get effective settlement.

If there are plenty of other cases, none has been quoted in this Chamber or outside of this Chamber; nor did the Premier at the time care to elaborate on his statement. The only conclusion one can draw from his silence and that of the Attorney-General and the other

Ministers is that there is no other case and, indeed, I certainly can find none. The whole of this incident is just the latest in a series of incidents in which the present Government has chosen to override the law or has shown its complete domination by the trade union movement or, as here, both. Despite the thin veneer of its self-styled liberals on the front bench, the A.L.P. was, and is, and always will remain, nothing more than the political arm of the trade union movement.

Mr. Hopgood: Mr. McLeay doesn't agree with you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not concerned with him, although I have been interested and amused to see members opposite studying his pamphlet tonight. I assure them that their study of the pamphlet will richly repay them. One has only to look, as I have to look day after day when the House is in session, at members opposite to see the truth of what I have said: that is, that the Labor Party is merely the political arm of the trade union movement. On the front bench we have the Minister of Roads and Transport, the Minister of Environment and Conservation, and, *par excellence*, the Minister of Labour and Industry as three trade union representatives on the front bench. If one looks behind them, as I look now, at the other two benches, nearly every member I can see is a former trade union officer.

Mr. Brown: We're not ashamed of it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not suggest for a moment that the member for Whyalla should be ashamed of it, but it goes to prove the point I have made twice—

Mr. Wright: What is it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —but I will make it again for the member for Adelaide: the Labor Party is merely the political arm of the trade union movement. I have said it three times now, and I include you, too, Mr. Speaker, because you have been a trade union officer. I do not know how I could make it clearer.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Do you represent the Law Society in here?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I leave that to the Attorney-General.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I was asking you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, the Minister is trying to turn the matter around.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I'm trying to help you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I tried unsuccessfully yesterday to get the Attorney-General on to his feet to rebut some of the things I had said,

but he remained strangely and significantly silent in the circumstances. Perhaps the Minister of Environment and Conservation will care to answer the point I have made, or some of the former trade union secretaries sitting behind him may care to answer it.

Mr. Wright: What is the point?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have said it three times; I will move on to the next one.

The SPEAKER: Repetition is out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and it is unnecessary, Sir. They know, just as well as you do, the point I have made. Let me give another example of what I have said about the disregard of the Labor Party for the law of this land. It is on the national scene and it concerns the candidature for the seat of Hotham of Mr. Barry Jones who is, I believe (and this will be subject to correction if I am wrong), the endorsed A.L.P. candidate, a man—

Mr. Hopgood: It is Johnston.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is right; Jones is the quiz kid. One of the things that amazes me, if by any chance I do make a mistake, is the pleasure which members opposite take in putting me right. Barry Johnston is the man's name, and he is the endorsed A.L.P. candidate for Hotham. He is a man wanted by the Commonwealth police for dodging the draft.

Mr. Wright: And do you believe they couldn't pick him up if they wanted to?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Adelaide is almost making my speech for me. If he will just contain himself for a moment, I will deal with that point, because it is the point I am coming to.

Mr. Wright: Answer my question!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, if the honourable member would stop shaking his finger at me and give me about a minute, I will answer the question. Surely he can contain himself for as long as that. I understand that Mr. Barry Johnston delivered his policy speech on a tape recorder only last evening.

Mr. Wright: You must listen to A.M. too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I did not, but I heard it on the news, anyway. At least, I believe not all Labor men are happy about the situation of Mr. Johnston as the A.L.P. candidate. I believe the Commonwealth Leader of the Party (Mr. Whitlam) has expressed some misgivings about the matter, and those members opposite who try to say that there is a split on this side of the House should remember the wrangling that went on at the recent meeting of the Federal Executive

of their own Party. We read about it in the paper.

Mr. Wright: Do you believe it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I do believe it, and I invite the member for Adelaide to deny that there was wrangling at this meeting and that the delegates from Victoria were on one side in the matter and their Commonwealth Leader (Mr. Whitlam) was on the other side. Surely one of the most pathetic things we have ever seen in politics was the letter of complaint sent by a member of the executive to either the Commonwealth Attorney-General or the Prime Minister saying "You are only doing that as a plot. You will wait until the writs have been issued before you pick him up so that we will not have a candidate for Hotham." I have never heard anything so utterly ridiculous.

If that is the depth to which the Labor Party has sunk in this matter, then Heaven help it and the people of Australia. If the Labor Party really believes that the Commonwealth Government through the Commonwealth Police is deliberately avoiding picking up Barry Johnston in order to score a political point, why does not the Party produce that gentleman publicly so that he does go to court and answer the charges against him? Why does the Party not do that if he is so easy to find? If the Party genuinely believes that the Commonwealth Government is trying to keep him away until a more convenient time, why does the Party not drag the rug from under the Commonwealth Government's feet and produce him? He is the Party's candidate. Why does he not come along to court? The Party must know where he is; it must be in touch with him, especially if he can tape record his policy speech. Indeed, who with any sense at all would believe that the Labor Party could not produce him and would not produce him if it thought such action would be to its advantage. To me that was the most pathetic effort by the Party ever.

Another example at the Commonwealth level of the Labor Party being prepared completely to disregard the law and to encourage others to do so as well relates to something that occurred in South Australia. Indeed, I am glad that the Attorney-General is in charge of the House at this time as this is a matter in which he himself was involved. Some weeks ago he was involved in allowing a man who was in prison for an offence under the National Service Act to leave Yatala Gaol and address a meeting outside its walls.

Mr. Wright: And weren't you sorry it went quietly!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was not concerned with the results but with the action of the Government. Like most other members, I received letters about this matter from constituents complaining about what had transpired and I shall quote from a letter from a constituent so that members opposite will not think that the words are mine.

Mr. Hopgood: Will you table the document?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I had not thought to but, if the honourable member wants it tabled, I might do so. The letter is as follows:

As a nation we tend too frequently to expect man's inherent decency to overcome the incipient undermining of law and order. This attitude may be permissible as long as the nation's leaders are steadfast in demanding and achieving adherence to the laws of the country. Unfortunately we have as the Premier of this State, a man whose offbeat ideas lend support for actions which offend man's natural decency and dignity. The decision by the Premier and the Attorney-General in permitting a man imprisoned by Commonwealth action to address a meeting outside Yatala Labour Prison must be condemned by all decent Australians, irrespective of their political allegiance.

The writer asked me to take the matter up with the Commonwealth Attorney-General, which I did, and I have here a reply from Senator Greenwood which states, in part:

You would appreciate that, as a matter of power under the relevant Statute and Regulations, the actions of the Comptroller-General of Prisons and the Ministers involved are not legally open to question. I have, however, deplored and regretted the action taken as I regard what has been done as a "bending" of the law for blatant political purposes. The circumstances in which the matter was brought to light—by statements by your Premier—this is, of course, a letter to me and I had to own the Premier on this occasion—indicate that the real objective was to achieve publicity for the cause of opposing the National Service Act. The action taken, apart from the problems it points to in Commonwealth-State relations in this area, tends to weaken the public's acceptance of the impartiality of the rule of law and administration of justice. However, the weight of newspaper comment and editorial opinion is a salutary reminder of the general opposition to the political misuse of lawful processes.

That is just what this was. The letter continues:

Thank you for writing. I have written, expressing my concern, to the Attorney-General for South Australia.

That was a very good letter.

The Hon. L. J. King: He got a very good reply, too, and I will show it to you tomorrow.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I invite the Attorney-General to produce the letter from Senator Greenwood and a copy of his reply.

The Hon. L. J. King: I shall be delighted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am sure that the Attorney-General, who has now intervened in the debate in this way, will agree with me that the law is the cement that keeps our community together. The law is that body of rules without which any community would fall into chaos and everyone (not only those like the Premier, the Attorney-General and the member for Playford, who have been trained in the law, I think, and also the Commonwealth Leader of the Labor Party) should respect the law and observe it.

Mr. Wright: Provided that they are not involved in it.

Mr. Keneally: What if the law is not a good law?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have said what I have said and I stick to it. I hope the Attorney-General, when he speaks in this debate or at some other time when he produces the letter, will either agree or give his reasons for disagreeing with what I have said about the nature of the law in our community. It is to me of the utmost importance that we observe the law; otherwise, this State will fall into a condition of anarchy.

Turning now to the future on this point, one wonders what stand the present Government in this State will take if some of the unions carry out the threat they have made to work only a 35-hour week from next September. I refer now to a press report of June 24, which is as follows:

Members of South Australia's biggest trade union will refuse to work longer than a 35-hour week from September. This is the effect of a decision of the first State conference of the new Amalgamated Metal Workers Union, which ended in Adelaide yesterday.

What view (I invite the Attorney-General to answer this, too, tomorrow) will the Government take if that union does work only a 35-hour week from next September? Shall we get the same view taken as was taken of the Kangaroo Island dispute, that we must give in to the union when it has decided what it will do, just as the Government gave in to Mr. Dunford because, as has been said in this House, he said he would go to gaol and would not pay the costs? Are we to be browbeaten by every union that digs its toes in? I should like an answer to these questions and the people of South Australia would like an answer, too, because we will face this situation in a couple of months, according to that newspaper report.

We know, of course, where the unions themselves stand on this matter. I have here the *Constitution and General Rules* of the Australian Workers Union. Let me read one part of it. Let us look at the objectives of the union. I am referring to paragraph 3(k). There is no 35-hour week for the A.W.U. It wants a 30-hour week. It is that union's objective to advocate and fight for a six-hour day and for five days of six hours each to constitute a week's work. We know where the member for Adelaide will stand on this matter. He, as a former official of the A.W.U., will be urging the Government not to give in to a 35-hour week but to go further. What else do we see? We see this statement:

Alone we can agitate—organized we can compel.

That is exactly what the union has as an objective, and that is precisely the pressure under which this Government will always give in. Let us hear from the Government's representative in the Chamber, the Attorney-General, who is so studiously reading and pretending not to hear what I am saying, what the Government's attitude will be to this union's working only 35 hours a week from September. It will be interesting to hear him on this and to see whether the Government stands up to its obligation to uphold the law.

Mr. McRae: Why didn't you get Sir Robert George to pay his own wages?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Playford is baiting me about the case of the cook at Government House. There has been reference to that case in this House before and it is referred to in the newspaper this morning. In my view, there is absolutely no relevance whatever in that case. In the case of *Woolley v. Dunford*, judgment had been given and it was only when the defendant had said he would not pay in any circumstances but would go to gaol and when the members of his own union had said they would not imprison him, thus setting the stage for a most ugly confrontation, that the Government stepped in and said, "It is all right, boys, we will pay the costs", although Mr. Dunford did not want them paid, as he said. That is the case of *Woolley v. Dunford*.

Let us now come to the case of the cook at Government House. This is not the first time that the Premier has not scrupled about revealing information in this place when he thinks at the time that it will be to his own political advantage, irrespective of the wishes

of other people. We had it with Mr. Currie on one occasion.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the interjections are getting a little too prevalent, and I must ask the honourable member for Mitcham to address the Chair rather than honourable members on the back bench. This will assist in maintaining law and order in the Chamber.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should have thought it would be more helpful if you asked members not to interject, but if you do not catch me one way you seem to catch me another way. I was mentioning Mr. Currie and saying that this is not the first time the Premier has revealed information in this House that has embarrassed other people. He did it over Mr. Currie, who repudiated publicly what the Premier, when Leader of the Opposition, had done. Let us now come to the case of the cook at Government House. That was an action that was pending. It had not come to trial. There was no hearing, no judgment, and no order for costs. It was a matter that was settled. There was no obligation at that stage on anyone to make any payment whatever, and I defy the member for Playford to refute that.

Mr. McRae: You didn't want to settle private debts.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is the difference between the two cases. As the member for Alexandra said in the excellent, concise explanation of his question this afternoon, the Governor has always been regarded as being in a different position from that of other people, but there was no question whatever in that case of an obligation which had already been imposed by the court being assumed by the Government, and I defy the member for Playford to say otherwise. When the honourable member speaks perhaps he will deal with the pleasure or displeasure of Mr. Dunford concerning what has been done on his behalf. I shall be delighted to hear the honourable member on that point and on the question whether gift duty is payable on the amount made available to pay his costs.

Mr. McRae: I will deal with the cooks' award.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member will not get too close to the case of *Woolley v. Dunford*, I warrant. What about the other examples that the Premier said in his press statement we would be told about? Why did

the Premier have to go back 10 years to a case that was entirely different in an effort to support his arguments? The answer is that there are no similar cases at all. I have referred to those matters to show how the present Government and the Commonwealth Labor Party, which supports it, are willing to ignore the law or override it when they want to do so. I regret very much the demonstration we have had of the strength of the influence of the trade union movement over the Government.

Last year, when speaking during the Address in Reply debate, I said that I was in favour of a Bill of Rights, and I am still in favour of it. Early this session I hope to sponsor a Bill to introduce into the law of this State a Bill of Rights. I realize that it will be jockeying with quite a few other matters on private members' day. We now know from the Premier's reply this afternoon that the Bill of the member for Playford, if bom at all, will be debated in private members' time. One finds it difficult to see how a Bill that will undoubtedly attract much debate, as this matter did when it was last before the House, can possibly be dealt with on Wednesday afternoons, especially since there will be a number of other matters for debate, of which I have already mentioned one.

Mr. McRae: Will you be supporting my Bill?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I remind the honourable member that on the last day of the previous session I asked him to make his Bill public so that the general public and all members could see it in just the same way as I made the previous Bill public in 1968. I left debate on that Bill until the new session so that everyone would have the opportunity of forming an opinion and expressing it, but the member for Playford refused to make his Bill public, no doubt hoping to get some political advantage by keeping the Bill a secret until he introduced it. As I do not know what the Bill will contain, I do not know whether I will be able to support it. If the member for Playford had taken what I regard as the decent and straightforward course in publishing his Bill, I could perhaps have given him an answer tonight; as it is, we will have to wait for some time yet, apparently, before we know precisely what he proposes.

I hope that I shall be able to develop, as the session goes on, some of the matters to which I have referred, and I expect that many of those will come up between now and November.

In supporting the Address in Reply, I join with other members in expressing condolences and congratulations where they are due.

Mr. HOPGOOD (Mawson): It is always a great joy and delight to follow the member for Mitcham in this or in any other debate. It seems to happen to me frequently, but I assure him that it is not by design. Probably of any two members in the House the member for Mitcham and I should understand each other's political philosophies perhaps more than anyone else, because from time to time we seem to represent our political Parties at this or the other seminar at tertiary, secondary, adult education institutions, etc.

Mr. Millhouse: I'm still trying to understand yours.

Mr. HOPGOOD: I have some difficulty from time to time with the honourable member's, too. Generally speaking, a common theme runs through the honourable member's remarks. Members may think that after four or five of these we would be able to swap speeches and be able to give the argument word by word, but I think the member for Mitcham and I would probably follow the dictates of Jelly Roll Morton, who once when asked to replay a certain piece said, "I never play the same piece of music in the same way twice." A common theme runs through the remarks of the member for Mitcham, namely, that the Liberal Party is all about freedom because "liberal" comes from the latin word *liber*, which is a masculine noun—and that fact must upset Germaine Greer. Nonetheless, I believe "*liber*" is a masculine noun meaning freedom. The member for Mitcham has given us some occasion to make a judgment on his commitment to his ideals of freedom this evening in making his position clear regarding the National Service Act.

If there is any piece of Australian law on which people, so far as their commitment to freedom is concerned, can be lined up and counted and found either wanting or otherwise, it is in relation to this piece of legislation. It is clear to me, as a result of the comments of the member for Mitcham tonight, that he has been weighed in the scales and found very wanting indeed. For a lawyer, the member for Mitcham appears to have a singularly mechanistic view of the law. He has an idea that because something has been on the Statute Book somewhere on this continent it is necessary that this law must be upheld at all times. This is an extremely mechanistic view of the law, which is an organic thing, not a machine.

Often the law is changed as a result of changing public opinions and the fact that, after a while, a law becomes a dead letter.

I recall once years ago reading in the *Sunday Mail* that at times a person could still be fined five shillings for whistling on a Sunday. If we took a completely mechanistic view of the law we would probably have to say that that was a piece of law that should have been upheld at that time, but clearly it was winked at. Similarly, it would be true to say that for many years the various regulations promulgated by seaside councils in relation to bathing dress were whistled at. This mechanistic view, which the honourable member seems to take, simply cannot be sustained when one examines the way in which the law is administered.

The honourable member asked us to consider the Duncan case and said he thought there should have been some reference to it in His Excellency's Speech. One wonders what on earth could have been said in relation to this extremely sad matter. One thing that obviously comes out of the confusing mass of material that has been given to us in the press as a result of that case is that, whatever one can say about the activities of the Vice Squad, it is certainly not administering the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, so far as homosexuality is concerned, in a mechanistic sort of way that would be envisaged if we followed the dictates of the honourable member.

This has ramifications so far as the Government's action is concerned in allowing a man who had been imprisoned under the National Service Act to address a group of people outside the Yatala Gaol. I was there on that occasion and was extremely impressed by the remarks of that young man. I was also impressed by the remarks of another young man who claimed that he was then liable to be arrested at any time under this Act. Indeed, he challenged the Commonwealth Police to arrest him and made public where he could be arrested. Of course, this has not happened. Indeed, when one examines the operations of the Commonwealth Police in relation to this matter one seems to be forced to one of two conclusions: that either the Commonwealth Police have an extraordinary way of enforcing the Act that they are called upon to enforce, or they are not enthusiastic about doing it. I will leave it to honourable members to draw their own conclusions on that matter.

I will not enter into the whole business of the Kangaroo Island dispute. One wonders whether the member for Mitcham was in the Chamber yesterday afternoon when the Premier

thoroughly canvassed this matter. I am constrained to say that any resemblance to what happened in this Chamber yesterday afternoon and what was reported on the media, both in the press and on television, is completely coincidental. There was virtually no mention of the points the Premier made, except the one about the cook, and I suppose the unusual and slightly different nature of this point that the Premier raised was one that caught the eye of the *Advertiser*. However, a person simply reading the daily newspapers would get an entirely false impression of what happened in this Chamber yesterday regarding this matter.

Mr. Ryan: Don't they call that the freedom of the press?

Mr. HOPGOOD: Of course, the press is free to report selectively. However, the member for Price lives in some ignorance of the statement that was made recently by a Commonwealth Minister, Dr. Forbes (the Commonwealth member for Barker), who spoke to a public meeting in my district. He was accompanied by the Leader of the Opposition in another place and also by the endorsed Liberal candidate for the Commonwealth seat of Kingston. This meeting was extensively canvassed throughout my district, both in the local press and by means of a handbill that was put in people's letterboxes. I am getting to the point of the extremely understandable ignorance of the member for Price: 20 people turned up to hear the Commonwealth Minister.

Mr. Ryan: The whole Party!

Mr. HOPGOOD: Two people at the meeting claimed to be members of the Liberal Party; I know that three were fully paid-up members of Morphett Vale sub-branch of the A.L.P.; and we do not know who the others were. However, a whole 20 people turned up to hear the Commonwealth Minister.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Was Mrs. Forbes there?

Mr. HOPGOOD: I do not know. She may have been one of the remaining members. I am still concerned that I am not making myself clear to the member for Price. What Dr. Forbes announced to his audience at that time was, "The Labor Party now has complete control of the media." What I would ask Dr. Forbes is, "What went wrong yesterday?" I want to turn now to some of the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition here and to some anticipatory remarks he made in the press prior to the calling together of the third session of this Parliament. The Leader has had some things to say about taxation.

I think it really shows that, in fact, the official wing of the L.C.L. is to the left of the Liberal Movement so far as budgetary policy is concerned.

Mr. Ryan: You mean not the L.C.L. but the L.C.P.?

Mr. HOPGOOD: A Spanish onion by any other name has the same odour. I believe the attitudes of the respective Leaders of the two factions opposite show that the L.C.P. is, in fact, to the left of the Liberal Movement so far as budgetary policy is concerned, because the former Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Hall) castigated us last year for what was regarded as our carefree attitude towards the Budget and the piling up of deficits. I cannot quote his exact words, because I do not have the relevant *Hansard*, but it was along the lines, "I warn the Government that the day of truth is approaching and that it cannot keep on doing that sort of thing." On the other hand, the present Leader of the L.C.P. told the people of this State, and, I guess, of the Commonwealth in general, that because there had been increased budgetary returns (because we were to finish up with a deficit somewhat below \$2,000,000 instead of the anticipated \$7,000,000, which was announced by the Treasurer when the Budget was first brought down) we were, in fact, over-taxing people.

I simply make the point that, if we had not increased taxes to the extent that we did (and most of the increases were very modest indeed), the deficit would have been greater than was indicated. If that is what the official wing of the Opposition wants, that is all right. I am just making the point that generally speaking the commitment to balance Budgets is seen as a fairly conservative sort of commitment and, therefore, I assume that if the present Leader has abandoned this commitment he is adopting rather more progressive policies, whatever we think of the arithmetic of the situation, than is the Liberal Movement.

But I want to turn to the reason why I interjected (out of order, Mr. Speaker) on the Leader and referred to Sir Robert (bowl-'em-over) Askin, the Premier of New South Wales, because, of course, we know that Sir Robert has chastised our Premier for going to his State and saying certain things. Sir Robert has told us that the New South Wales taxpayer is, in fact, subsidizing the standard of living of people in the claimant States under the Grants Commission (that is, South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania) and, therefore, the South Australian Premier is being very cheeky indeed in coming over

and advertising the benefits of Labor Government. In a sense, of course, this is true. The whole point of the Commonwealth Grants Commission is that it enables the smaller States, which lack the industrial wealth of the greater States, to be given grants that will enable them to provide services at the level that can be provided in those other States because, obviously, if we lack the industrial wealth of these States we also lack their taxing capacity.

That, of course, is true, but it is very much balanced out by all sorts of other things; for example, the fact that New South Wales and Victoria have been far more heavily industrialized for many years than have Adelaide, Perth or Hobart has meant that the operations of the Commonwealth tariff have been very much in favour of those two States. In fact, when we purchase any goods that are subject to the operation of the Commonwealth tariff, we as taxpayers of South Australia (or, in this case, consumers) are, in fact, subsidizing industry in these other States, because it is largely through the operation of this tariff that this situation has arisen. Of course, the primary producers are more vociferous than is any other segment of the population in condemning this situation.

The second point I make in regard to this is that for many years Commonwealth capital expenditure in this State has been well below that which we should expect if it were to be granted on a per capita basis. It is not so long ago that South Australia, with 11 per cent of the Australian population, received only about 4 per cent of the Commonwealth capital expenditure. Although I am not sure what the situation now is, I know that that situation persisted for many years. In looking at some of the other situations we realize that Premier Askin has given its only one small facet of the total situation. I wrote this morning to the press, and you probably saw the letter, Mr. Speaker. The last paragraph of my letter was cut out, and perhaps that is just as well, because it was probably a little unworthy. In it I said that Sir Robert Askin believed that he could fool some of the people some of the time by making this type of statement, and I added, "Unfortunately, he is right."

This seems to get at the issue that arose between the member for Stuart and the Leader, but the point that the member for Stuart was making was that we on this side would rather not talk of the State's rights, because we see this as something that is old hat and out the window. Yet, if Premier Askin wants to go on with this, we are prepared to take our

coats off and mix it with him, and I have indicated two of the grounds on which we could effectively do this. We in the Labor Party are less concerned with the actual situation relating to this State and that State and far more concerned with the situation relating to Tom Smith, Bill Bloggs or Fred Nerk, whoever he is or wherever he exists on the Australian continent. That is the quarrel we have with the present imbalance in the Constitution: that the various things which directly affect the welfare of Bill Bloggs and Fred Nerk and their families are largely those areas which remain the responsibility of the States, yet the major taxing capacity has been transferred to the Commonwealth Government.

I am not suggesting for one moment that we should return the taxing power to the States, because I can see some obvious advantages, especially in regulating the total economic situation, by this type of centralization of economic power, but I am saying that we have to get the creaky Commonwealth machinery going and we have to use section 96 of the Constitution as vigorously as we can to channel funds into these most needy areas so far as the average Australian is concerned.

I am not denying that the Eastern States should have more money for those things. Indeed, from what I hear about the Queensland education situation, for example, it is badly in need of money to upgrade its system to bring it somewhere near the standard that exists in the other five States. Earlier in this debate I had to leave this Chamber for a moment when one of the messengers came in and said that somebody on the telephone wished to speak to a Labor member. I was most glad that I went, because the gentleman who rang had just received in his letterbox a small missive from the Commonwealth member for Boothby, Mr. John McLeay, of the Liberal and Country Party. He telephoned to complain about the nature of the pamphlet.

Mr. Jennings: Was it authorized by Ian Smith?

Mr. HOPGOOD: It may well have been. If one looks at the contents of this pamphlet, so far as scurrility is concerned, I doubt whether I have ever seen anything to equal this. Yes, I have seen one thing worse, and that is a recent pamphlet put out by the Nazi Party in Australia. But to say that this is not as bad as that Nazi Party pamphlet is not really saying very much.

I turn the attention of the House now to some of the comments in this pamphlet, because it runs the whole gamut of the unfair

advertising syndrome. Let me take, for example, a picture of Dr. Cairns, next to which appears the quotation "Authority has had its day!" That is just dropped into the pamphlet; there is no indication of the meaning that Dr. Cairns was giving to "authority". It is just there as "Authority has had its day!" Let me now look at a few other statements here. There is this one, for example—"A.C.T.U. misrepresentation" where the following appears:

The A.C.T.U. arranged to defer the recent hearing of the National Wage Case from November to March because Mr. Hawke had not prepared the case. He was overseas! Cost to those he purports to represent . . . over \$400,000,000 in lost wages.

I wonder whether Mr. Hawke has an action for libel as a result of that statement, which goes on to say this:

These are our 200,000 people at or near the minimum wage fixed by Mr. Justice Moore. The record of Mr. Hawke and the A.C.T.U. is scandalous. On performance, the only hope of a decent living for these Australians rests with an L.C.P. Government.

Here is a Government that has got 100,000 people out of work in Australia at present, and yet it blames the A.C.T.U. for the low living standard of the workers.

Mr. Venning: That would be right.

Mr. HOPGOOD: But let me continue, because it gets sillier as we go on. We see the following:

Why do so many unionists vote Liberal? It is estimated that 55 per cent of trades unionists in Australia vote Liberal.

Mr. Burdon: Then all the cockies must vote Labor!

Mr. HOPGOOD: The question that I put to the member for Rocky River is this: just who in the world does vote for the A.L.P.? After all, we got more votes than did the L.C.P. in the 1969 Commonwealth elections. We regularly get far more votes than does the Liberal Party in this State. A little later I shall make some reference to the recent figures in Queensland. From where do we get our support? The member for Rocky River would want me to believe that at least a marginal majority of primary producers vote for the L.C.P. That is one point he is always making. If we do not get a fair amount of the union vote, who are these people who vote for us? Are they phantoms or ghosts who line up? Do we have the bulk of the white-collar vote behind us? Perhaps it is the business men, the employers in industry, who are supporting the A.L.P. Some people are casting the millions of votes that we get at the

Commonwealth elections, but Mr. John McLeay tells us that about 55 per cent of trade unionists in Australia vote Liberal. If we talk about trade unionists in the traditional sense of the blue-collar workers, we are using the words in an out-of-date sort of way: in fact, there is now a vast number of very powerful employee organizations in Australia which make up a tremendous number of the work force, and some of these organizations I am talking about probably include people who marginally support the gentlemen opposite rather than the A.L.P. However, it is important to look at this because, when people talk about militancy in unions, they tend to talk about the traditional blue-collar unionists. Yet, it is perfectly clear that the most militant employee organization in Australia over the past few years (and the pilots have been so successful as a result of their militancy) is the organization of airline pilots. After all, if we are talking about a group that associates to improve its general standards of living and conditions, why should we confine ourselves to talking about employee organizations? For example, what is the average annual income of a medical practitioner? Should not the Australian Medical Association be included, therefore, under this general heading?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: And the Law Society.

Mr. HOPGOOD: Yes. I recommend to honourable members a series of three articles in the *Australian* recently about the legal profession, and I think many of the things said there would be underwritten by some members of the profession, certainly those members of it who sit on this side. I am making the general point that, if Mr. McLeay's Party gets 55 per cent of what he broadly means by trade union votes, well and good, but he should not make all sorts of statements about trade unions on the basis that they are only the unions in the A.C.T.U. This figure of 55 per cent is complete arrant nonsense. Mr. McLeay is in the process of posting these pamphlets, I imagine, to every household in the Boothby District, and there must be between 25,000 and 30,000 such households. This man, who can afford to print these pamphlets and post them to all his constituents, says this, in the same pamphlet, about the L.C.P.:

We are a voluntary organization working on a shoestring budget. We need helpers and, above all, we need votes.

Mr. Venning: It doesn't get help from trade unions.

Mr. HOPGOOD: I remind the member for Rocky River that this member of the Commonwealth Parliament says that the Party gets 55 per cent of the trade union votes. I suggest that the honourable member and the member for Boothby get together and compose their differences on this point. After saying that the L.C.P. needs votes, Mr. McLeay goes on to say:

In spite of the immense wealth of the so-called Labor Party, we believe they cannot buy your vote.

We may well laugh at some of the more ludicrous statements in the pamphlet, but the general tenor of the whole thing is quite scurrilous and it is quite unbecoming a member of any major political Party. I consider that those behind this pamphlet should re-examine the ethics of this pamphleteering and electioneering. One recalls the "downward thrust" pamphlets a few years ago and the use of photographs, whether the people concerned liked it or not, on Liberal Party propaganda. However, nothing comes near to approaching the present McLeay effort.

There are two other matters with which I wish to deal before I sit down, and one refers to retraining people who are rendered redundant by technological change. About 18 months ago the Commonwealth Government in a great splash announced that it would introduce a scheme for retraining people who had been so affected. This would have obviously brought some kudos to the Commonwealth Government and, I believe, rightly so.

Professor Douglas recently talked to us about the cybernetics revolution, and we realize the problems that this could bring in connection with redundancy. So, it seemed to be a great step forward. The Commonwealth member in my area, Dr. Richie Gun, was very interested in this matter and decided to follow up information in relation to it. He telephoned the department, which said it could not give the information without a clearance from the Commonwealth Minister. He then contacted that Minister, who gave a clearance. He telephoned the department again, and the department said that the material would be available in a few days, as it was being processed. Eventually Dr. Gun was able to pin down the officer to the question of how many people were receiving assistance under the scheme, and the officer was able to tell him that two people were receiving assistance.

The result was a small headline in the *Age* on March 9, and small headlines in the *Sun* and the *Sydney Morning Herald* on the same day. Also, there was a small headline in the

News of February 17. In fact, this whole business, which had been the work of a South Australian member of the Commonwealth Parliament, got very little mileage at all in the local press; it got far more mileage in the other States. The *News* gave it only a few column inches. The article in the *Age*, under the heading "Redundancy a 'giant fraud' ", states:

A Federal Government scheme to retrain redundant workers was "the biggest fraud ever inflicted on the working men and women of Australia", a Labor M.P. claimed yesterday.

Dr. Gun (Labor, South Australia) also described the scheme as "a giant-sized confidence trick" which revealed the "completely contemptible" cynicism of the Government.

There were some interesting comments in relation to this matter. The Commonwealth Minister said that Dr. Gun had placed a totally misleading interpretation on the effectiveness of the Commonwealth scheme, but how one could really mislead people in a situation like this, when only two people were being retrained, beats me completely. There may be reasons why there are only two people being retrained under the scheme. All I am asking is this: why was there such a song and dance about it and great splash if, in fact, this was to be the net result? All Governments will have to turn their attention to this very serious matter very soon.

I want to refer now to the extraordinary result in the recent Queensland election. I turned up a monthly journal which is widely disseminated in South Australia nowadays—the *Herald*. An article written by a Mr. Hopgood describes the situation in Queensland as a "Bjeldkemand". This was a pinch from Dr. Neal Blewett, who with Mr. Dean Jaensch in a recent book described the earlier electoral system in South Australia as a "Playmander" for two reasons: first, it was not the traditional gerrymander of Governor Gerry of Massachusetts in the nineteenth century; and, secondly, it was so obviously associated with Sir Thomas Playford. It seemed that if Dr. Blewett could refer to a "Playmander" there was no reason why I could not refer to a "Bjeldkemand".

It is interesting to look at a breakdown of the election results published in a Queensland paper on the Monday after the election. Some votes had still to come in, and they would have marginally helped the Government because late results tend to be anti-Labor; nonetheless, they would not have altered the situation very much. They show that in this election the Country Party received 19.4 per

cent of the valid votes, the Liberal Party 22 per cent, the A.L.P. 48.3 per cent, the D.L.P. 7.1 per cent, an exotic group calling itself North Queensland Labor (Mr. Tom Aiken's group) 6 per cent, and various Independents 2.6 per cent. Yet despite this, at that stage of the count the Country Party had won 22 seats, the Liberal Party 20, the A.L.P. 30, North Queensland Labor one and Independents one. A little arithmetic shows that it took, on average, 7,295 votes to elect a Country Party member, 9,099 to elect a Liberal, and 13,275 to elect a Labor member.

An electoral system is a little like a sausage machine: you feed the meat in one end, in the case of the electoral system votes, and out of the other end come cylindrical packets, some being more cylindrical than others. The point about the packages coming out of the other end is that each one can be only one political complexion. There must be one colour of skin, despite the mixture that has gone into the meat.

The Hon. L. J. King: There are a few ambiguous ones among the Opposition.

Mr. HOPGOOD: Ambiguity in members opposite seems to be rife. When the press looks at election results, it tends to look at them in terms of seats won and lost. We regularly read about a landslide to this Party or another Party because 15 or 10 seats have changed hands. In fact, however, the change-over in votes that causes the landslide may be only slight; indeed, 5 per cent or even less. The really important thing seems to be the nature of the machine that produces the seats at the other end of the system, and this could distort entirely the nature of the meat fed in at the other end.

The member for Elizabeth in his excellent speech this afternoon referred to the many years when the Labor Party was denied office because of the "Playmander" that existed in this State. I was just cutting my political teeth as a lay teenager in those days. I always remember being both amused and incensed by the editorials that would appear in the press on the Monday following a State election in which the Labor Party would get thousands more votes but, as a result of the working of the electoral machine, would get fewer seats. Out would come the press with much gratuitous advice to the Labor Party about what it must do to achieve power in this State: it must clean itself up and do this, that or the other thing, or it would never achieve power.

Suppose I were to play a game of tennis with the member for Hanson and say to him, "We

will play tennis, but you must put your left leg in a splint." Let us suppose that, as a result of this handicap, I won 6-3, what would the honourable member think if I went up to him afterwards, patted him on the back and said, "You played pretty well, but you must improve your backhand before you have any chance of beating me." He would rightly say, "If you let me remove the splint from my leg, I might have an opportunity of beating you." That was exactly the situation of the South Australian Branch of the A.L.P. in those days. It still is the situation of the Party to a lesser extent because there is still a bias against it in the system. That is exactly the situation that exists in Queensland where, as a result of Labor's being defeated not on the votes but on the seats in that House, much gratuitous advice has been given by the press to the Queensland branch of the A.L.P.

There has been increasing pressure on the Commonwealth Government by the Country Party to weight the country vote. The last time the Act was amended in this way we thought we could regard it as the thin edge of the wedge. Further weighting was allowed for, and we did not know how far this might go. The situation is also unsatisfactory in New South Wales. It is not only a rural gerrymander in that sense of the word; it is also sometimes a gerrymander simply in terms of the shapes of the districts and the way in which the boundaries can be pushed around to under-represent the votes of a certain Party. This seems to be the reason why the Labor Party, although clearly ahead in the Brisbane metropolitan area at the State election, did not nevertheless obtain a majority of seats in that metropolitan area. This is a national question, which can be solved only at the national level.

The United States had this situation which was in some ways as bad as, if not worse than, that which used to exist in South Australia, the State of Louisiana, for example, having always been a supreme model of democracy, I don't think! But they have got around the situation by using the mechanism of the Federal Constitution. I have been informed that this is not possible in Australia because of the differences that exist between our Constitution and that of the United States. This is a great pity. The Commonwealth Constitution should be amended so that it would be possible for this to happen and so that the High Court would be able to say to a State Parliament, "Reallocate your boundaries on a population basis or we will start declar-

ing invalid legislation that has been carried by the Parliament elected on the undemocratic boundaries." That is the situation which is occurring in the United States and which has obtained since the judgment of *Baker v. Carr* in 1962. I am not saying that any Party is without blame in the situation. We should, therefore, turn to the Judiciary for a solution. Unfortunately, I cannot see the situation getting any better.

I close by referring to four things for which I am grateful in relation to my district and on which I congratulate the Government for the stand it has taken. I refer, first, to the commitment to the Noarlunga district centre. I think I have said sufficient previously in this House about the disabilities that people living in fringe metropolitan areas suffer. I refer to insufficient halls, recreation facilities and that sort of thing. Their disabilities are compounded by their being so far from the centre of the city where all these facilities exist. Therefore, the commitment to the development of the Noarlunga district centre is a great step forward and one on which the Government is to be congratulated.

Secondly, since I represent possibly the worst area of air pollution in the metropolitan area, I congratulate the Minister of Environment and Conservation on the Clean Air Regulations which he has recently brought down. I recommend that members examine these regulations carefully. The Government has gone to considerable pains to get the regulations in a form that will be plausible and effective. There is no doubt that the prevailing meteorological conditions in Adelaide, particularly during the summer months, makes this area particularly vulnerable to the evils of air pollution.

Thirdly, although it probably benefits the constituents of the member for Alexandra more directly than it benefits my constituents, I refer to the bridge over the Onkaparinga River at Noarlunga, which, I understand, is the next bridge to be built after the one in the district of the member for Stuart. I look forward to being at the opening of the Port Augusta bridge. I also look forward to seeing all members in the Mawson District for the official opening of the Onkaparinga bridge, which I understand will be some time in August.

Finally, I compliment the Minister of Works on the commitment to a sewerage scheme for Braeview. Braeview (of course, postally known as O'Halloran Hill) was subdivided way back in 1961 before the introduction of the

Planning and Development Act. The member for Fisher could tell us much about this; no doubt he has said much about it in the past, because he represented that area in this House for some time. In those early days there were no sealed roads; in fact, there was no water supply, and for some time the pioneers in that area had to cart water to their houses. The layout of the streets is hopeless; it is one that would never be allowed by the present Director of Planning.

Most of these things have now been overcome, but the continuing problem was that of sewerage. It will still be some months before

this facility is provided but, because of the good offices of the Minister and his department (and I should not forget the Public Works Committee), the commitment has now been made, and the local people are extremely pleased that the end is in sight and that their area can now begin to look like a part of affluent Australia rather than effluent Australia.

Mr. McANANEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.47 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, July 20, at 2 p.m.