HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, July 25, 1974

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

MORGAN-WHYALLA MAIN

The SPEAKER laid on the table an interim report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on Morgan-Whyalla Pipeline (No. 2) (Part Replacement).

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTIONS

PETROL

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier say what action the Government has taken to ensure adequate petrol supplies for South Australia should current industrial disputes involving especially the Transport Workers Union result in a shut-down of operations at Port Stanvac or prevent supplies being released from any of the depots? The people remember only too vividly the difficulties that have been caused by petrol shortages brought about by previous industrial disruption, and current widespread concern that another petrol shortage is imminent could precipitate panic buying, which would quickly diminish present supplies. With this in mind, I ask the Premier whether the Government has taken any action to protect the people against shortages of petrol and possible rationing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government keeps a constant review of South Australia's petrol supplies. I had conversations with my officers during this week in order that a complete survey of the possibilities for South Australia should be taken in the event of any trouble at this stage of the proceedings. That is something I cannot effectively forecast with any accuracy, but I always take the necessary precautions. The officers concerned in this matter have been given instructions and, in consequence, we will be able to meet any difficulties should they arise. However, the present indications are that I do not expect that difficulties will arise, but we will be prepared if they do. As against difficulties of this kind, notice of legislation on such matters will be given in the House next week.

WATER SERVICE

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education, as Acting Minister of Works, have reviewed the decision not to grant or recommend the granting of an indirect water service to a constituent of mine (Mr. K. E. Smith, of Houghton), the granting of such a service having been recommended by the Ombudsman? I refer to the Ombudsman's Report tabled in Parliament this week which, quoting from a letter to the Engineering and Water Supply Department, dated February 28, 1974, states in part:

> I recommend, in terms of section 25(4) of the Ombudsman Act, 1972, that the department should either grant or recommend to the Minister the granting of an indirect water supply to Mr. K. E. Smith.

The Director and Engineer-in-Chief declined to give effect to this recommendation, the reason being that that department is charged with the responsibility of administering the policy that has been approved by the Government. The property concerned is situated in the Mt. Lofty Range watershed and is outside the area defined for the township of Houghton. It does not abut an existing water main, and, in accordance with the measures exercised to control water pollution in the metropolitan watersheds, the department, in the circumstances, would not extend water mains or grant an indirect water service. The Minister of Works felt unable to support the recommendation to the Director and Engineer-in-Chief. The case was reviewed at Cabinet level, and Cabinet confirmed the Minister's policy that, whether or not hardship existed, no extensions of water diversions could be granted, nor could provision be made for services in watershed areas, since to make any exceptions would require the making of many such exceptions, and this would defeat the policy.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This matter arises in the first place from the establishment of a policy in March, 1970, regarding the control of water pollution in the metropolitan watersheds, and that policy, as members appreciate, was established by the previous Government. At that time, a policy statement was set out which made clear that, in our society, Governments do not impose restrictions for their own sake but that it is important to realize that controls within the catchment areas of the metropolitan reservoirs are vital to the economic continuance of Adelaide. These controls are designed to achieve their purpose with the least possible interference to existing activities and with the least possible restriction on people's rights.

The policy statement categorically states that, in areas outside township areas such as Mr. Smith's, the department's policy is not to extend water mains or grant indirect services, which means that only properties abutting existing mains can expect to receive a water supply. In response to Mr. Smith's various inquiries, a statement on water pollution control was sent to him and acknowledged by him in a letter dated May 1, 1972, in which he stated, in part:

> . . . your department was kind enough to send me information describing water pollution problems and the department's policy of control.

Paragraph 7 of the pamphlet on water pollution control in metropolitan watersheds, issued by the department, states:

> Water supply policy: except within those township areas, where the department will raise no objection to subdivision and resubdivision, the department's policy is not to extend water mains or grant indirect services.

The department believes that Mr. Smith was aware of the situation when he was negotiating to buy the block of land in the Houghton district which he subsequently bought and on which he built a house. The substance of the Ombudsman's report is that a discretion can be exercised, and that it is his opinion that it can be exercised in this case without fear of creating a precedent that may cause other problems. The matter was considered at some length by the Minister of Works (Hon. J. D. Corcoran), and subsequently was referred by the Ombudsman to Cabinet to be considered. Cabinet considered the matter and confirmed the decision of the Minister and of the department, and a letter in relation to this matter was written by the Premier to the Ombudsman, as follows:

Dear Mr. Combe,

> Thank you for your letter of March 27. This matter has been considered in Cabinet. Cabinet has confirmed the policy of the Minister that, whether hardship exists or not, no extensions of water diversions could be granted or provisions made for services in watershed areas, since to make any exceptions will require the making of a very large number of them and this would defeat the policy. If in your view it is necessary to report this matter to Parliament then, of course, that is a course you must take. However, in view of the honourable member's question I am willing to ask Cabinet to reconsider the matter.

Mr. Millhouse: Perhaps, too, in view of the motion of which I have given notice!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think the concern of the member for Tea Tree Gully in this matter is considerably more relevant and more genuine (because she has been acting on behalf of her constituent) than the member for Mitcham's attempt to take some political advantage of the situation before the L.C.L. does it. The main matter relates to the problem of creating a precedent. Other similar situations have occurred, and we believe the Ombudsman has expressed his point of view genuinely. I assure all members that the Government's point of view is also genuine, and there happens to be a genuine disagreement between the Government and the Ombudsman about this matter. I shall be pleased to ask Cabinet to reconsider the matter and any related problems, and to consider whether there may be a means of gaining control of the situation other than by a refusal to supply a service. Perhaps controls are necessary on building houses in watershed areas.

TRANSPORT DISPUTE

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Premier say whether, because of the present Transport Workers Union strike, provision is being made to continue emergency services, especially to hospitals and similar institutions Also, is the Premier aware of another problem that has been drawn to my attention today concerning this matter and involving health authorities: that is, the matter of butcher shops and the removal of offal from these premises, a task which is normally performed daily but which, in many cases, has not been performed for about a week? When the offal has not been removed for almost a week, a considerable odour is being generated and hygiene is suffering. Is the Premier also aware that, when private butchers have attempted in the past to dispose of waste products to Master Butchers Limited's boiling down works, they have been prevented by picketing from delivering their products? As the whole situation presents a rather serious health problem, I ask the Government to consider seeing whether this health problem can be solved.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I have been in touch with people affected by this dispute and, as yet, it seems there is no immediate danger. In fact the Adelaide City Council issued a statement about this matter in this morning's press. Further, a conference has been convened for tomorrow and I expect an early settlement. Unfortunately, a similar conference held in Melbourne yesterday did not achieve a settlement. The dispute is a Commonwealth one brought about by an agreement negotiated federally with the Transport Workers Union for an over-award payment of $25.40 a week. State transport workers are asking that that over-award payment shall flow on to drivers covered by State awards. As yet no application has been placed before the State Industrial Commission.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the emergency?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: As far as an emergency is concerned there is no need to fear a problem in that area, because people are not likely to be affected. If the honourable member thinks he is going to panic me into saying that I will take similar action to that taken by his colleague in Queensland and declare a state of emergency (that is what some members opposite would like me to do), he is wrong. The matter is before arbitration; that is the way we believe these matters should be dealt with. Regarding wage demands being made today, it is not a one-sided issue, because with increased profits and prices one can expect wage demands.

Mr. Coumbe: That does not relate to the question I asked.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I am trying to explain that the situation is being dealt with in the proper way before the Arbitration Commission and that there is no information at present to suggest that an emergency exists because of this dispute,

PORT AUGUSTA SHIPPING

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Premier examine the situation applying currently at the Port Augusta wharves with a view to ensuring that Port Augusta remain a shipping port, thereby protecting the employment of waterside workers in that city? In recent years there has been a gradual scaling down of shipping through Port Augusta. I understand that the only cargo to be shipped this year is a build-up of copper concentrate from the Peko-Wallsend mines at Tennant Creek, and that Peko has now built its own smelter at Tennant Creek and will ship copper concentrate directly through Darwin. Barytes is not now being shipped through Port Augusta either, and I believe that Pacminix Limited (the company developing a copper mine at Mount Gunson) intends to bypass Port Augusta completely when shipping out its ore. The wharf strength at Port Augusta in recent years has dropped from 60 to 32. Although it has been suggested that these men may be able to find jobs at either Whyalla or Port Pirie, I am greatly concerned about their employment, as I believe that they should be able to retain work at Port Augusta. For this reason, I ask the Premier to use his influence to ensure that Port Augusta continue as a shipping port.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We will certainly have the matter examined.

MONARTO

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Premier give a broad outline of the projected financial expenditure, by this Government and the Commonwealth Government, on the city of Monarto over the next five years? I emphasize that I am asking only for a broad outline. Obviously, the Premier will not be able to supply exact figures, and he will probably not be able to estimate the extent of the money that the Commonwealth will eventually be able to give the State to assist in developing Monarto. However, as I believe that the Premier will now have in mind some reasonably accurate estimates for the next few years, I ask him to give that information to the House.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A submission has been made to the Department of Urban and Regional Development on the cash requirements of development at Monarto. However, it will be impossible, until we have a decision from the Commonwealth about its attitude on these matters, to say how much will be spent by the State Government and how much by the Commonwealth Government, simply because, in the absence of Commonwealth support, we cannot in isolation undertake the kinds of expenditure disclosed in this cash flow statement. The sum we put towards the project will depend on decisions by the Commonwealth Government. As soon as I have indications in this area, I shall be able to give the honourable member a reply, and I will do that as soon as possible.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Minister of Development and Mines indicate whether plans for the disposal of sewage effluent from Monarto have been completed? In his second reading explanation of the Murray New Town Act in 1972, the Premier clearly indicated that Monarto sewage could be processed by normal means and the effluent used for irrigation purposes. I understand, however, that recent studies have indicated that this effluent cannot be used for irrigation purposes in the Bremer

Valley, because the soil there has a high content of sodium clays, too high to use water with a salt content. Furthermore, other problems exist because the effluent from the sewerage system could have a high potassium and nitrogen content and therefore could not be released into creeks in the area or into the Murray River.

The Hon, D. J. HOPGOOD: All effluent water has a high potassium and nitrate content, and the problem is really no different in principle at Monarto from what it is for the future of Bolivar effluent water. A final decision has not been made in this matter, but the Monarto Development Commission is working closely with the Engineering and Water Supply Department in a study that they believe will ultimately solve the problem well before people are living on site. A study is proceeding at present.

LAND VALUATIONS

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Premier say how frequently land valuations, particularly of rural land, will be made? My attention has been drawn to the fact that some landowners have recently received notice of a new assessment, following previous valuations made in some cases in 1970, and in other cases in 1971. What is alarming is that in many cases the valuations have increased by 250 per cent to 300 per cent. I have two examples of cases of constituents in my district. In one case, a property was valued in 1970 at $21 an acre (.4 ha), while the 1974 valuation was $65 an acre. In the other case, on June 30, 1971, 333 hectares was valued at $21 400, while on June 25, 1974, the valuation was $61 610. I realize that the Act provides that a general valuation shall be made within each area at least once during each successive period of five years. Can the Premier say whether the Government has any policy of having valuations made more frequently than at five-year intervals?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At the time the new Valuation of Land Act was introduced, we made clear that circumstances would arise in which it was of advantage to the people concerned to have revaluations at more frequent intervals than every five years. To have valuations every five years in a situation of rapidly rising land prices—

Dr. Eastick: Or decreasing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —(or decreasing land prices) could produce difficult results for many people. Consequently, in several areas it was considered better to have a flexible policy of valuation within a period. The Valuer-General has been carrying out this policy. For instance, we have had several requests for early revaluations from councils in country areas. With the staff available, as far as we can we have tried to meet these requests. Several requests have been made from areas in the South-East. It is of advantage to define increasing land valuations for people so that they can get increases over a previous year of rather less than what would happen with a five-year valuation. As it is, the revaluation simply cannot, because of the limited number of staff in most cases, be done annually; therefore, a comparison with a previous year's valuation may be completely inaccurate. To say that there has been a 300 per cent increase in one year when the previous valuation was not the year before is a completely inaccurate statement.

Mr. Dean Brown: What about—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows very well the sorts of statement made recently at certain citizens' meetings. The valuations referred to have been related to an annual increase. A comparison with the previous valuation—

Mr. Dean Brown: I was talking about water and sewerage rates.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As the honourable member apparently is not aware of the basis of valuations in South Australia, I suggest that he read the Valuation of Land Act.

SHEARERS

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what steps he has taken to prevent the shearing industry stoppage widely, advertised and organized to occur in South Australia next week?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I understand that negotiations between the parties are in the early stages. If a strike is contemplated for next week, I have yet to hear about it. After hearing the question asked by the honourable member, I am not sure whose side he is on. When I hear more about the matter I shall be able to tell the honourable member more about the situation.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Premier indicate the anticipated sittings of the House this session?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I expect that the House will sit until the Royal Show adjournment and that, after I introduce the Budget Estimates on August 29 it will adjourn for the following week. I also expect that the House will adjourn for the holding of the Constitution Convention meeting in Adelaide during Melbourne Cup week, as it will be impossible to hold a meeting in Melbourne at that time because accommodation will not be available easily and because in the circumstances attention may tend to be elsewhere. Apart from those two adjournments, I expect the House to sit through with night sittings until about the end of November and then to adjourn and to reconvene in February for the completion of the session.

STUDENT TEACHER ALLOWANCES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Education say why the principle of arbitration is rejected when fixing student teacher allowances? Recently the Minister announced rises in student teacher allowances ranging from 7 per cent to 45 per cent, with most students receiving a rise of 7 per cent. The Minister has completely rejected the idea of arbitration and his rejection seems to hinge on the argument whether these people are employees of the Education Department. When Mrs. Steele was Minister of Education, the present Minister (then the member for Glenelg) raised this matter himself. From what I have seen of the reports in the *Teachers Journal* and in the press, the principle of arbitration for fixing student teacher allowances has been rejected completely.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not think that the Education Department, either now or when Mrs. Steele was Minister, has regarded the student teachers as employees. The only authority that regards them as such is the Commonwealth Commissioner of Taxation, and recently the Premier has written to the Prime Minister asking that the Commonwealth Government re-examine that matter, because our view is that student teachers are scholarship holders and that it is wrong that the Commonwealth Commissioner of Taxation should regard them as employees and therefore wish to tax them.

I think that the question of arbitration on something that is basically a scholarship allowance largely answers itself, once we accept that it is a scholarship. There is only one place in Australia where student teachers allowances are subject to arbitration. That is in Victoria, and I

suggest respectfully that Victoria has got into difficulties as a result of that arbitration procedure. I think that we here recognize that the bulk of a student teacher's scholarship should be somewhat greater than would apply if the student teacher were a university student not subject to bond and in receipt of normal scholarship payments from the Australian Government. However, we still regard the allowance as a scholarship, and the ability to finance this scholarship is of consequence to the State Government, particularly as in the current financial year the total cost of student teacher allowances in South Australia is likely to be about $6 500 000. It is a matter of budgetary consequence and in our view it is not a matter that should be submitted to arbitration.

I make clear that the honourable member's suggestion that most students will receive only a 7 per cent increase is false. If the typical family is one in which there are one or two dependants other than the student teacher, the average income of parents which will allow a 30 per cent increase in the student teacher allowance is about $7 000, and everyone receiving less than $7 000, if that was the average situation with one or two dependent children other than the student teacher, would be scoring more than 30 per cent. Everyone above $7 000 would be scoring less than 30 per cent.

I point out to the honourable member that, in assessing parental income, the earnings for the 1973-74 financial year are considered, not the present weekly earnings multiplied by 52 to give an annual figure, and average earnings during that year were between $5 200 and $5 400. In any family where the only person earning was the breadwinner, the average situation would imply an increase of over 30 per cent. I admit that that position is modified by the fact that, in some cases, both mother and father are earning an income, but nevertheless I suggest to the honourable member that, for the 1973-74 financial year, over 50 per cent of the parents of student teachers are likely to have an income below $7 000, and in those circumstances over 50 per cent of the student teachers will get an allowance increase of 30 per cent or more. The position is not as the honourable member has stated.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me forthwith to move a motion without notice.

Mr. Jennings: What's the motion?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Premier knows.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members, I accept the motion for the suspension of Standing Orders. Is the motion seconded?

Mr. Boundy: Yes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The motion that I desire to move and for which I require the suspension of Standing Orders is of the gravest urgency. I may say that I have acquainted both the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition of the terms of the motion. It is as follows:

That this House express its full support for Senator Steele Hall—

Dr. Eastick: Did you say. "Senator Wright"?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: From the Leader's interjection, I do not think he likes this. The motion states:

That this House express its full support for Senator Steele Hall in his opposition to the massive and, at this time, utterly unjustified increases in salary for Commonwealth members of Parliament, Ministers, and others, as proposed in the determination of the remuneration tribunal tabled in the Commonwealth Parliament yesterday, and call on all South Australian members of the Commonwealth Parliament to oppose them.

That is the motion that I desire to be debated and, I hope, carried in this Chamber this afternoon. As I have said, this is a matter of the gravest urgency and that is why I have sought the suspension of Standing Orders, because I understand that our Commonwealth colleagues intend today to suspend their own Standing Orders to put this measure, through. I consider that that is an outrage. Not only are the proposals disgraceful at this time—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —but they—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has sought leave of the House to move for the suspension of Standing Orders and, in accordance with Standing Orders, he has the opportunity to explain to the House, for 10 minutes, the reason for the suspension, but on no account can he debate the subject matter on which he intends to move if the suspension is granted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I accept that and apologize if, in my indignation, I have transgressed. The point I make is that, if we are to express an opinion that is likely to have any influence on our Commonwealth counterparts, we must do it now. I remind members that yesterday during the no-confidence debate, when I stated my own categorical opposition to this increase, I tried unsuccessfully to draw members on both sides of the House to make a statement. Therefore, this is our last opportunity to express an opinion on this matter. I also remind members (and this shows the urgency of the matter) that this morning's newspaper contains the following report:

Federal Opposition M.P.s seem certain today to approve for themselves a $5 500 yearly pay rise.

The SPEAKER: Order! Once against the honourable member is deviating from the explanation of the reason for the suspension of Standing Orders. I repeat that the subject matter of the intended motion cannot be the subject of debate in explanation of the reason for the suspension of Standing Orders.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I quoted that only to emphasize the word "today", which I thought I did emphasize by inflexion. Unless we act this afternoon, it will be too late to do anything. If I may on that same point (and not to debate the merits of the matter) refer to this afternoon's *News,* there appears the following:

Further moves on the M.P.'s salary issue may come from the Opposition's joint Party meeting to continue this afternoon.

So, there is no doubt about the urgency of this matter. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to other members that, if I am refused the right to move my motion for the suspension of Standing Orders, that will be tantamount to an approval by the Government of what its colleagues in Commonwealth Caucus have, by a majority, voted to do. That will be the interpretation by South Australians, however much Government members may laugh at me now.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has wandered too far from his explanation. The honourable member has moved his motion to suspend Standing Orders; it has been seconded; and I will now put the question.

The. Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I oppose the motion.

Mr. Millhouse: Hypocrite!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has disclosed that the purpose of his motion is to attempt to discuss in the House the business of the Commonwealth Parliament.

Mr. Millhouse: It's the business of the people. They're indignant at what's going on, and you know it.

The SPEAKER: We are discussing a suspension motion, not the substantive motion. The honourable member must display the necessary decorum. I give him a first warning for his infringement. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This is not a matter on which a State House can properly take action. What is more, the honourable member has moved his motion for suspension at a time when we have a heavy session of business in view and when this House has just completed the longest no-confidence motion debate in its history, enabling members a full rein to discuss matters, including this matter. Ample opportunity has been given to members. The Government has work for members to do, and I do not intend that the honourable member should pre-empt the business of the House in order to try to bring the politics of his sole federal colleague into this place.

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is the motion moved by the member for Mitcham to suspend Standing Orders. Those for the question say "Aye"; those against, "No". There being a dissentient voice, a division must be held. Ring the bells.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, and Wardle.

Noes (21)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Crimes, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Allen, Mathwin, Nankivell, and Venning. Noes—Messrs. Burdon, Corcoran, Duncan, and King.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

QUESTIONS RESUMED

MASSAGE PARLOURS

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister representing the Attorney-General say what evidence exists to suggest that there are massage parlours in South Australia staffed by prostitutes and organizations composed of criminal elements; what proportion of massage parlours is involved in this form of operation; and whether the Government intends to introduce legislation to licence and control massage parlours? Concern has been expressed to me about a press report of yesterday, allegedly made by a senior police officer in Western Australia, in which he said that massage parlour operation was a $5 000 000 a year operation employing 700 prostitutes, some of whom were being offered between $250 and $600 a week. The concern expressed to me has been as a result of the proliferation of advertisements in our newspapers concerning this sort of establishment. Obviously, people are concerned that criminal organizations may be taking over such operations in this State.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have discussed this matter with the Commissioner of Police and it is being kept under constant surveillance: investigations are made by the police of any complaints received. To date the Commissioner has no evidence that criminal elements have taken over these organizations, but I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

LICENSING ACT

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Premier say whether the Government will amend the Licensing Act to enable the court to consider the need for a storekeeper's liquor licence remaining in the area to which it was granted when the court considers an application to remove the licence to a different location? I understand the Premier has received correspondence on this matter from people at Cooltong concerning a situation that has arisen in which an application has been made to remove the storekeeper's liquor licence from that area to the metropolitan area. I understand this sort of thing has happened once before at Tailem Bend. I believe that, when such an application comes before the court, under the present provisions of the Act the court cannot consider the need for the licence to remain where it is: in other words, the court cannot consider the needs of the people in the area for which the licence was originally granted. As I believe that this provision was not corrected when the Act was presented to Parliament, will the Premier consider amending the Act to close this loophole?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will examine the matter.

GREEN TRIANGLE

Mr. RODDA: Will the Premier make a statement about the proposed development of the green triangle in the South-East? On a recent visit to Mount Gambier the Premier met leaders of the community and the chairmen and mayors of councils for considerable discussion on this matter. Also, he met the Leader of the Opposition in Victoria (Hon. A. C. Holding) and discussed this matter on a regional basis. As the proposition has been widely publicized in the South-Eastern and Western Victorian newspapers, I should like to know whether the Government has considered constituting the green triangle on a regional basis rather than as a State complex.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is clear from the preliminary studies of the working party that it is not sensible to divide the economy of towns in the South-East (Naracoorte, Penola, Millicent, and Mount Gambier) from towns in the South-West of Victoria, and it is particularly absurd to say one should look to the only deep sea port in the area as a means of shipping. If we are successfully to develop regionally, we have to consider what are economic regions rather than to think about boundaries drawn up in England in the last century by gentlemen who knew nothing of local conditions. Consequently, I suggested to mayors and chairmen of district councils in the South-East the desirability of a joint planning operation to develop the region with the South-Western districts of Victoria, and of presenting this area to the Commonwealth Government, which has not yet accepted it as a regional development area. I undertook to supply a planning officer to prepare preliminary studies outlined in the working party's report, so that we could make submissions to the Commonwealth Government for its acceptance, as we have already gained acceptance of Monarto and the iron triangle area north of Spencer Gulf. I have given directions for that planning officer to visit the honourable member's district and also to be available to councils in the South-West of Victoria. I have discussed this matter with members of the Portland

council in order to obtain maximum participation by councils and by citizens' organizations in preparing the submission to be made to the Commonwealth Government for its support. I believe this could be a vital matter for the area, and the only sensible way for planning to proceed.

OUTER METROPOLITAN PLAN

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say when a final decision will be made concerning the outer metropolitan plan? I understand that objections were accepted about nine months ago, and people in the Hills area are anxious to know whether any desirable modifications have been made to the plan. I know that much of the area is now under interim control, but people in this area should be able to know what the final plan will be.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Some matters must be considered before a final decision can be made. However, I will inquire about the present situation and ascertain whether I can tell the honourable member next week when the decision is likely to be made.

COUNCIL GRANTS

Mr. GUNN: Is the Minister of Local Government aware of the severe financial difficulties being faced by some councils in this State because of the lack of information received from his department about the grants councils will receive during the present financial year? I have been told by several councils of their difficulties, and one council has stood down all of its private contractors and another has told its employees to take holiday leave pending the receipt of further information from the Highways Department. Because of this serious situation, will the Minister make a definite statement on the matter?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: First, may I correct details of the question in order to place it in its proper perspective?

Mr. Goldsworthy: Make up a question that you can answer!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am replying to a question from the member for Eyre, and the member for Kavel does not help himself or anyone else by butting in. The problems faced by councils at present are not really caused by lack of information on the level of these grants. Unfortunately, too many councils have been relying on grants they have received in the past, and one of the main reasons for appointing the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas was to obtain the restoration of economic viability in councils, as the lack of such viability is one of the main causes of the present problem. However, as the honourable member properly said, many councils rely on these grants or on debit order work to keep themselves operating. At this stage we cannot give an assurance because a final decision has not been made in discussions with the Australian Government regarding the level of assistance that will be forthcoming in current Australian Government legislation under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act. Once that legislation has been passed we shall be able to make the necessary allocations. Until now the Government has told councils, whenever we have had the opportunity, that they need to plan their programmes to sustain them from their own resources. In other words, they should not expect assistance merely because they have received it in previous years. Unfortunately, I cannot give a full reply to the member's question, other than to repeat that local government must stand on its own two feet. However, some money will be made available during the current financial year, but the extent to which it will be provided has not yet been determined.

FIRE FIGHTERS

Mr. EVANS: I direct my question to the Premier because I believe it may involve a decision of Cabinet. Does the South Australian Government intend to co-ordinate all fire-fighting activities by using only professional fire fighters? Mr. Overall of the fire fighters organization has advocated such a move, and at the June State A.L.P. convention successfully moved that such should be the case. By using this method all volunteer fire fighters would be redundant. In fact, Mr. Overall, on June 8, said that such was the case in Western Australia and New South Wales. However, that is not the case in those States, because volunteer units are still used in large numbers.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a statement of policy.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 23. Page 22.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): In addressing myself to this document, I support the statements made by His Excellency the Governor in relation to the respect in which His Royal Highness the Duke of Gloucester was held during the various periods he was in Australia. I am in total accord, on behalf of my colleagues, with all the expressions that have gone forward from this State through His Excellency to Her Majesty the Queen. On an earlier occasion we look the opportunity to refer to the passing of Messrs. Edgar Raymond Dawes and Ernest Clifford Alan Edwards. That apart, I believe it is a disgrace for the Government to have placed the rest of the document in the hands of His Excellency: it is the most puerile document I have seen since I have been in this place.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It looks like a shopping list.

Dr. EASTICK: The inadequacies that are apparent in the statement given to His Excellency to mouth on behalf of the Government show just what a mess we are in and how uncertain are the programmes required for the progress of this State. A moment or two ago we heard the Minister of Local Government say that the Government is uncertain at present what the situation will be regarding funds for local government activities. I will tell the Minister what is the situation: there is no clear indication, nor has there been, to local government from any source whatever of whether any funds will be made available. The Minister has made a general statement that when the Government knows what funds are available it will tell councils what they can do. The present situation is that some projects have been run down because there are insufficient funds in kitty. We also know that people are being stood down and that contractors are being paid off because councils cannot proceed with their works programmes, programmes that have received Ministerial approval.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It's disgraceful.

Dr. EASTICK: It compounds the problem we have in this State of the Government's failure to give direction or leadership. In many cases the Government has failed to receive an indication from the all-powerful group based in Canberra. This afternoon members from the Canberra office are in Adelaide to indicate to those involved just what funds, if any, will be available for roadworks. I hope, although I am not optimistic, that later today or tomorrow we shall be told what funds are available for this sort of work in South Australia.

I hope, too, that in the mass of legislation to come before the House (and it was referred to again this afternoon by the Premier—that it will not be objectionable) seeking retrospective action to cover Government incompetence, such as previous legislation relating to the planning authority, we shall not find ourselves being asked to agree to go back in time and to tell organizations that have followed a proper course, such as the Myer organization at Port Adelaide, that their opportunity to proceed will be denied whether they win a case in court or not. That was a reprehensible piece of legislation. I make no bones about the fact that if similar legislation is introduced this session members of my Party, to a man, will stand against such an attack on the freedom of the individual, a freedom that should . be assisted by the Government and not crushed into the mire. There is no place in legislation for retrospectivity. At the outset, I want to make clear the point I have made, lest we have similar objectionable legislation to that in the past introduced again this session.

In his Speech, His Excellency said that extra funds had been made available by the Commonwealth Government, permitting South Australia to fare better than the other States. I will not dispute that totally, as not all the documents that it would be necessary to study on this matter have been made available to Opposition members. However, some information given to the House (including a reference by the Premier yesterday) does not give an accurate perspective in relation to the funds South Australia can expect to receive in future. Yesterday, we were told that additional finance was made available to South Australia for the purchase of land in the Monarto area. Although I do not deny that that is probably the case, I point out that, on an earlier occasion this year, when we were told that the Government would receive funds for this project and land purchases were undertaken, in reply to a question asked by a member in another place the Premier had to admit in Parliament that the money to be used to purchase the property had not been received from the Commonwealth; By necessity, because of property transactions undertaken, money had been transferred from the State to the purchaser, yet still the Commonwealth had failed to make money available. Therefore, the cost of servicing the money was a direct charge against the State at a time when the Commonwealth should have made the payment so that we would not lose money on the deal.

Another instance during the past 12 months that is worth noting is the case of the Commonwealth's saying that it would make available to this State and other States, as a non-repayable grant, money for sewerage purposes. Suddenly that became a loan, not on normal terms and at the normal interest rate, but a loan repayable over 30 years at 8½ per cent interest. The Minister of Works had said that $2 000 000 would flow into South Australia for this purpose, but the sum was reduced to $1 600 000. Moreover, when the additional costs connected with the interest are considered, we have to repay this grant that became a loan at a total expense of $5 000 000.

The additional money made available in cases of expectation of the purchase of land in the Monarto area was made available because funds that had been stood aside for the growth centre of Albury-Wodonga were not immediately required, as a result of problems in administration and preparation. We should not fool ourselves. Any greater proportion of funds that we have received in 1973-74 has been received from what we would otherwise have received as our proportion in 1974-75. A commitment has already been made to the other States of a certain sum for their projects. The position will simply be that in 1974-75 the sum coming to South Australia will be considerably less than the sum we might otherwise have expected.

His Excellency's Speech states that the Government will adopt a vigorous programme of exploration for gas and hydro-carbons. Over almost the whole of the past two years members of my Party have been telling the Government that South Australia's supply of gas and hydrocarbons would be in difficulty unless some incentives and inspiration were given to the owners of the gas supplies. In view of the price they had available and the uncertainty about any increase or how an increase would be arrived at, it was impossible for those people to proceed with further exploration or proving. The activities of the Commonwealth Minister for Minerals and Energy (Mr. Connor) and his high-handed and irresponsible approach to the future of this major industry in South Australia were the subject in this House last year of a motion that I am pleased to say all members supported.

I wish to refer briefly to the oft-quoted statement of members opposite (particularly Ministers) that South Australians enjoy open government. Opportunity is not given to people everywhere to receive all the information necessary and to have access to reports that should be dealt with by this Parliament. In many instances, they should have been seen in Parliament before they were distributed elsewhere. In this regard, I highlight the case last weekend of the release of the first report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas. Copies of the report were mailed to councils on Friday of last week to reach them by Monday of this week, about 12 hours or more after the report had been made available to the newspapers. The appropriate column in the *Advertiser* on Friday indicated that the report was handed to His Excellency last Thursday. It should have been tabled in this House before it was released outside and, more particularly, before it was made available to the press.

Mr. Coumbe: When did we get it?

Dr. EASTICK: Late on Tuesday, and then it was not provided very graciously. It is not good enough for the Government to release to the press important material contained in reports before those reports are presented to Parliament. It is certainly not an indication of responsible open government or of a responsible attitude to the Parliament.

The Beerworth report on juvenile court matters is not yet available to members of the Opposition or to the media. In legislation subsequent to the period in question, it was necessary to ensure that the Government's failure to release such a report could not be repeated. It was written into the legislation that reports in an unabridged form would be tabled in this House. The Callaghan report has been gathering dust since before Christmas. Members have only heard and read about this report, because it has not yet been made available to them. On his return from overseas about two weeks ago, the Minister of Agriculture is reported as having said on the Australian Broadcasting Commission programme *Country Hour* that the Callaghan report had been available for a long time but that he could not release it until the powers that be did something with it. Who are the powers that be who are holding up that important document and preventing it from being made available to members of Parliament? Who are the powers that be who have released certain information from that document but who have failed to make the information available to members?

We were told that the Sangster report, about which there has been much discussion recently, was available to members of this House if they cared to go to the office of the Minister of Works and read it. They could not take it away, they could not take a stenographer along to note relevant parts of it, and they could not make a photostat. This report, which relates to the major aspects of water supply in South Australia, should be available for scrutiny. Before the 1973 State election I was informed, as Leader of the Opposition, that if I liked to go to the Premier's office I could read the documents relating to the Redcliff project but that, having read those documents, I would not be allowed to speak about any relative aspect of the project; otherwise I would supposedly be committing a breach of confidence. I would not be able to pass on to my colleagues or members of the community any information contained in the report. I was to be muzzled on an issue as important as the Redcliff project, a report on which was in the hands of the Premier. The Bennett report has not yet been seen and we do not know the contents of that important document, which also relates to the water situation in South Australia.

I have already referred to the Royal Commission report on local government boundaries which became available to members of this House only after it had been distributed to the press and to the councils. This report is an extremely important one to every member of this House, because it affects people in their local communities. It seeks to destroy, in many instances a relationship which has existed for many years among members of the community, although it is not as destructive as I understood the Minister would have liked it to be. Statements, were attributed to him that he would prefer to see 30 or 40 local government bodies in South Australia, and this would have destroyed local government more than would the recommendations in this report, which reduces the number of councils from 137 to 72.

Certainly if the number of telegrams constantly being received by members on this side from areas such as Minlaton, Pinnaroo and Lameroo is any guide, there will be a complete destruction of community interest, and consequently the Bill will have to be scrutinized carefully. We do not know when subsequent reports will be available. The restructuring of local government, if it is to proceed according to the plan laid down, will revolve closely around the arrangements made regarding staffs for their future, including decisions as to which member of a council staff will have seniority over another and whether the council whose name may be retained will have any prior advantage as regards the appointment of a district or town clerk.

What will be the situation, for example, of a person who received his qualifications years before another person who may show a greater ability or drive in respect of instituting the reorganization? Before he introduces his first Bill, I respectfully suggest that the Minister ensure that every member of this House has received all the necessary reports: otherwise I can see that we will be in for many arguments.

The Ombudsman Bill was introduced in 1972 after considerable previous debate initiated by members on this side, including the member for Fisher. The Government having subsequently changed its mind on this matter, deciding to support it, the Attorney-General said on September 28, 1972, when introducing the Ombudsman Bill:

> The chief characteristics of the ombudsman system are that it provides a citizen aggrieved by an administrative decision with cheap, speedy and simple machinery for the ventilation of his grievance. The Ombudsman is neither fettered by the doctrine of Crown privilege nor by the more formal nature of a full judicial inquiry: he is simply the formulator of administrative equity by the power of persuasion . . The institution in fact should provide both the member and his constituents with a new and effective means of redressing grievances against the administration . . . Thus to some extent the veil of secrecy in government is lifted.

On October 17, 1972, during the Committee debate on the measure, members on this side sought to include in the Bill a provision to limit the period of time for which a person appointed could occupy that office. The Attorney-General is reported, at page 2136 of *Hansard* as follows:

> Inevitably, if he does his work well, he will tread on corns. He must act fearlessly, being willing not only to criticize public servants but also, if the occasion arises, to criticize Ministers and the Government . . . The primary consideration is that the Ombudsman should not only be independent but clearly be seen to be independent of the Government of the day and of the majority Party in Parliament at any time.

We fully concur in the last statement by the Attorney-General to which I have referred, but recently the Government has sought to destroy, in the public mind, the independence of the person who occupies that vital office. We have seen the hand-washing Minister of Education take the ridiculous action of committing this person not into the role of Ombudsman but as the Royal Commissioner to examine a matter relating to a school and to school discipline. This person's integrity is not in question by any member on this side, I suggest, and I doubt that it is in question by any member opposite, having regard to what was said when Mr. Combe was appointed.

However, this person's position requires independence and an opportunity to seek information from all persons without the problems of the Judiciary and without an investigation that causes controversy, at least in the first instance. This position has been destroyed by placing him in the public arena regarding a matter of discipline that the Minister of Education has told us earlier should be the responsibility of the Headmaster of the school. All members will await with interest the ultimate outcome of that inquiry, the first sitting of which took place last Monday. I repeat that the fact that the Minister of Education drew this person and this office into the public arena is a disgrace to the Government of which the Minister is a member.

Other members have been concerned about documents that were placed before this House earlier this week, but those documents, particularly those relating to Mr. Kennedy, were based on information that had been available for a long time. Mr. Kennedy was able to indicate earlier that the Minister of Works, when approached about the water licence regarding Mr. Kennedy's property, had said bluntly, "I have had several approaches. I have acceded to only one and that was because the person making the claim threatened to shoot me." I do not condone threats to shoot, but what an admission that was for a Minister of the Crown to make!

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Where did you get that cock-and-bull story?

Dr. EASTICK: It is not a cock-and-bull story. I suggest that the Minister ask his colleague when he returns. I am not criticizing the Minister of Works for not being here. If he is doing work that will be beneficial to this State, I am fully in accord with that, so I ask the Minister of Labour and Industry not to get that matter out of context. I make the point that much earlier information

had been given to Mr. Kennedy that in no circumstances would the Minister of Works accede to his request.

The documents available are interesting. They show that the Ombudsman, in considering this matter, has relied on what reasonably could be expected of a person placed in a position such as that in which Mr. Kennedy was placed. I have no doubt, from statements made by the member for Tea Tree Gully this afternoon, that what was said and the information that has come forward from her constituent, Mr. Smith, are equally telling against the Minister's attitude and the bureaucracy in the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I consider that, when they voted on the Ombudsman Bill, members of this House specifically intended that the matters that this officer unveiled would be acted on by the Government and corrected.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Why appoint him if they're not going to take notice of him?

Dr. EASTICK: Exactly. Again, if this person's activities suddenly start to become a little close to the quick, the Government suddenly finds other means to trim his wings. I refer to a report in the *Sunday Mail* of July 7. Normally I do not read this particular column but on this occasion I considered that it highlighted a matter that needed highlighting and that it should be aired here in this debate. The author of the report is Max Harris, and the report states:

Isn't it marvellous that South Australia has an Ombudsman? It will be an especially useful office for dealing with that most burning subject of the moment—prices! It means that the little guy, whether he is a business man in trouble or a consumer who feels he's been taken for a ride, can go to a fair and impartial investigator.

I have referred earlier to impartiality, and I suggest that the impartiality of that position has been undermined by the Minister of Education. The report also states:

But ho, ho, ho, what's this? Very silently and stealthily the *Government Gazette* of June 20, page 2450, contains a proclamation which excludes the South Australian Prices Branch from the activities of the Ombudsman. That is, if you have a complaint about a price fixed item, the Ombudsman will just have to tell you to go away and drop dead. This silent act of exclusion raises the question—what the devil can the Ombudsman do for the citizenry? What investigatory powers has he got? How many other Government departments are to be immune from investigation? Is there any real point in having an Ombudsman at all? Or is it just a piece of political grandstanding?

I make the point that there was no political grandstanding regarding my support for this position when it was voted on in the House. I do not deny that on an earlier occasion I said clearly that I thought the Ombudsman would become a public inquisitor, and I voted against the motion in the first instance. When it was later introduced by way of legislation (and when I could understand the intention of the House and of the legislation), I gave it my support, not for political grandstanding but for the benefit it would be to the man in the street. The report continues:

The defensive wall of silence built around the Prices Branch is evil enough in an open democracy. Nothing has been done or said to alleviate a growing public suspicion that the department is a political tool of the Government rather than a just and objective body.

I emphasize "a political tool of the Government rather than a just and objective body". I will not accept that description of the position and, if the Government intends to move in that direction or act in a way that would allow such an intention to be effected, I assure the Government that the Opposition will be looking for relief and a way of clearly demonstrating that that is not the intention, nor will we accept that as a method of future approach to this important office. The report continues:

The fact that the Ombudsman, the troubleshooter for public complaints, is specifically excluded from looking at any Prices Branch decisions is ominous. Why can't the public be permitted to know if service station operators are getting a fair go or not? Why can't we see if prices for milk, bread, and beer are justifiably increased or not at any given time? Why can't we know the facts? It's us ordinary consumers who pay the prices.

It is that kind of information and comment that give strength to the motion of which I have already given notice: that in South Australia we require a prices justification tribunal, as distinct from a Prices Act with the machinery that now exists. Later in the session, we will certainly be looking to that measure. I make the further point that the real reason why we should consider a prices justification tribunal is the political manoeuvring that has been undertaken by the Ministers and the Government in respect of the determinations of the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs. We have a situation whereby decisions regarding the prices of beer, bread and petrol, taken a considerable time before the announcement on May 23 this year, were held back for a political purpose: to get away from the odium that would flow from the then forthcoming Commonwealth elections.

Clearly, there has been political manoeuvring. Clearly, the Ombudsman, in his investigations on behalf of individuals, has got so close to the quick that it has been found necessary by a back-door method (albeit a responsible method within the terms of the legislation) to make a pronouncement in the *Government Gazette* of June 20. Last evening, I was able to indicate to the House, when debating another issue, that some of the problems before us had been clearly spelt out for a long time. The programme was not the brain child of the present Premier in 1965, as it had been thought to be. He was only voicing and taking up points that had been made on a much earlier occasion by the Prime Minister. I quote from an address to the Melbourne University on July 19, 1957, under the heading "Constitution *versus* Labor (Mr. E. G. Whitlam)".

Mr. Millhouse: You went through all that yesterday.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, and if I see fit I shall go over it again today. I will not ask the member for Mitcham whether I may open my mouth.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Crimes): Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Dr. EASTICK: Indications were given that the solution was the remedy to the inadequacy of the States. Under that heading, we learnt the following:

What steps should be taken to enlarge the powers of the national Parliament and to redistribute the powers of the States? First, we should always support a referendum to grant to the Commonwealth Parliament economic or social powers which it does not have, especially economic or social powers such as marketing, credit and investment, housing, health and education. Much can be achieved by Labor members of the State Parliaments in effecting Labor's aims of more effective powers for the national Parliament and for local government. Their role is to bring about their own dissolution. When the Labor Party holds office in the Commonwealth Parliament, the States which have Labor Governments could readily make agreements under section 51 (xxxiii) and (xxxiv) for the acquisition and construction and extension of railways in the States by the Commonwealth and under section 51 (xxxvii) for the reference to the Commonwealth of many of their present functions, such as those in respect of health and hospitals, ports and fisheries.

Some Federal Steps—The greatest role, however, in achieving Labor's objective must always be with a Federal Labor Government. Since Labor has already initiated and

implemented so much of its welfare policies, it should, when next in office, devote itself to organizing and developing Australia on a national basis. A Labor Government should make positive offers to the States to accept a reference of their powers over railways, hospitals, universities and housing.

The address continued under various other headings. This, against the background of the activities of the Commonwealth Labor Government since it came into office in December, 1972, the barn-storming kind of activity we saw (with the two at the head for a period of weeks immediately after they took office), was bad enough. However, it was acceptable to many people in the community; in fact, to a sufficient number in the community, leading up to May 18, whilst the author of the address was at the helm. I suggest that it is becoming much less acceptable to many people in South Australia and elsewhere now that the power has been taken from that political leader.

I refer now to an editorial in today's *Financial Review,* which, under the heading "Power slips away from the better Whitlam", states:

"Vote for Whitlam, he is so much better!" the electorate was urged in the recent election. And there is no doubt in anybody's mind that it was the Prime Minister who dragged his Party over the finishing line ahead of the markedly less than popular Liberal Leader, B. M. Snedden,

Today, the people of Australia would not accept that proposition, and that has become much more evident. The article continues:

But, as our political correspondent Robert Haupt pointed out, as the final result was counted Mr. Whitlam's stature within the Party was reduced by the narrowness of the win. Two events in the past few days have demonstrated that the electorate did not, in fact, vote Whitlam or Whitlamism into power. The so-called mini Budget was clearly a lesser package than Mr. Whitlam and his Treasurer, Mr. Crean, intended. The language of the Treasurer's speech to the Parliament on Tuesday was in such utter contradiction to the actual content of the moves announced that it was clear that he had chosen to emphasize the short-fall between performance and intent on his part.

What is that short-fall and what has been the effect on people in the community? Let us consider the effect it is having on the South Australian community which members opposite claim they seek to represent but which Opposition members really represent. It was suggested that people (and young people in particular) were to have housing moneys available at low interest rates. Where is it? We were to have a situation in which young people could offset the cost of borrowing money against their income tax. Where is it? We were told that people would not pay a higher rate of income tax or of indirect taxation. Where is the proof of that? We were told that the community would have the benefit of pre-school education. Where has that gone? Aged people were told that there would be no means test from September or October of this year after the age of 70 years. Where has that gone?

One could continue a recital of what was going to happen and what chances would be given to the people of this State, but all this has been taken from them. There has been a constant erosion of promises that were made and a major short-fall in those favourable changes that were to be given to the people of the Commonwealth. Clearly, the matter is out of hand, a situation that was ably described from this side by so many speakers yesterday. If people in South Australia are to have the chance to advance, then we must have much better leadership than that displayed by the Australian Labor Party at both Commonwealth and State levels. We believe there is a need for industrial development in South Australia and for a future chance for young people in this State, but we find it difficult to understand how that situation will be achieved as a result of present activities.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: It is being achieved.

Dr. EASTICK: It is not. People at Port Pirie were certain that they were to have a new harbor, but where is it and where is the industrial potential for that city? Why is the Minister leaving the House? Obviously, it is because he has not been able to sustain the promises made with gay abandon to the people of Port Pirie. A statement in yesterday's *Financial Review* suggests that the future of General Motors-Holden's is obscure. If the future of G.M.H. is obscure, what is the future for South Australia? We also have problems in the consumer durable, textile, and leather industries, and in industries that help G.M.H. put together a motor vehicle. Where is the future for South Australians if that situation is allowed to continue?

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You're just a knocker.

Dr. EASTICK: If I were a knocker I could go to Port Pirie and tell the people there what had happened to the promises made to them.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You wouldn't win any popularity contest there.

Dr. EASTICK: I would from Mr. Connolly and his supporters. It is all very well for the Minister to claim that we on this side are knockers, but it is also extremely important that people, if they are to be responsible, should show that they are realists. Apparently, we have to accept that it is desirable that we place South Australia in the forefront by introducing trendy innovations, but it is important to know that, after introducing these measures, we can sustain them. However, it seems that by introducing these innovations we are pricing ourselves out of our industrial security and future. The last thing I should like to see would be for the State to lose any industry that we now have, but if we cannot place our products on the Eastern States market at a markedly advantageous figure we shall not be able to place them there at all. That is a situation that must be considered by the Government.

Another point relates to the industrial problems apparent to every member of the community. We have received little joy from the replies of the Minister of Labour and Industry to Opposition questions about the concern and health of people in areas that are denied the removal of refuse, meat scraps, and other debris. We have had no indication that the rolling, irrational, and irresponsible strikes being perpetrated on the people of South Australia by the Transport Workers Union will stop, or that the Government will show the leadership necessary to prevent the people of this State from being denied basic commodities.

Mr. Jennings: You don't know—

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order, but they are doubly out of order when an honourable member is not in his proper place.

Dr. EASTICK: It would be interesting to hear a speech from the other side that shows that the honourable member really understands that he should be standing up for the rights of his constituents rather than trying to make cheap political points out of debate. We have a situation in South Australia (I do not deny that it exists in other parts of Australia, too) where there is a need for leadership from the governmental level that has not been forthcoming. We on this side have been denied opportunities, and suggestions we have made over some time have been disregarded.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Tell the House what sort of leadership you want.

Dr. EASTICK: If that is the way the responsible Minister is carrying on at present (and I say "responsible" as regards his responsibility to the job), we shall not get that leadership.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: We are giving it: people are returning to work.

Dr. EASTICK: But that is a problem confronting every sector of the community, and the Minister did not reply to that question this afternoon any more than he is replying to my statement now.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: I have told the honourable member for Torrens that a state of emergency does not exist.

Dr. EASTICK: The proper thing for the Minister to do now would be to cease interjecting. Obviously, we are close to the bone, otherwise the Minister would not be as vocal as he is; after all, he is usually not vocal at all. When I commenced—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister must not persist in interjecting.

Dr. EASTICK: When I commenced my speech I indicated that other than for the formal parts, for which we on this side have due regard, there were many deficiencies in the Speech placed in the hands of His Excellency to present to this Parliament. Many arguments will be raised, based on reality, from members on this side during the time ahead of us. I believe that the member for Goyder, a new member to this House, will speak in this debate later this afternoon. I wish the honourable member well in the time he is in this House and hope that he gives due regard to his responsibility to his constituents.

The Utopia that the honourable Minister opposite would have us believe exists in South Australia and in Australia at present does not exist; the Utopia that he seems to believe is available to us—

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You're just a knocker.

Mr. Coumbe: The honeymoon is over!

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, and the honourable Minister will find that out soon enough. I never believed that Utopia was spelt "h-e-1-1", but that is the inference one must draw from the type of leadership we are getting in the Commonwealth sphere and in this State at present.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I congratulate His Excellency on the way he has carried out his duties since his appointment. He is a remarkable South Australian, and the way he presents his ideas to a wide range of people in differing situations is a credit to him. Also, I congratulate the newly elected member for Goyder who, I understand, is to follow me in this debate. I wish him every success in his Parliamentary career.

Having said those nice things, I turn now to one section of the Leader of the Opposition's remarks, because the member for Whyalla will deal with the body of the Leader's remarks. I found one aspect of his speech utterly intolerable and unjust, and on that he must be brought to book. The Leader said that the Minister of Labour and Industry in this State had not done all in his power to help settle industrial disputes. Actually that is a modification of statements we heard yesterday afternoon and last evening that the Government was engendering industrial disputes. I will not repeat what I said last night, but if the Leader cared to do any research at all he would discover that the present Minister, as well as the former Minister, whenever there was an industrial dispute in this State under Commonwealth or State jurisdiction, became involved at the request of both parties. Alternatively, if the disputes were prolonged and the parties did not request intervention, the Minister intervened of his own accord. I know for certain that the present Minister's intervention in many industrial disputes led to settlements.

It was nonsensical for the Leader to speak as he did. At least he did not commit the stupid error that some of his colleagues did last evening when they said that the Government was engendering industrial disputes. One of the main features of His Excellency's Speech dealing with forthcoming legislation concerns law reform. I believe that reform in that area is necessary and that one area where it is necessary is in the structure of the law courts. The time has come to make drastic reforms in procedure. It is absurd to see judges and lawyers wearing robes, gowns, cravats and wigs similar to those worn by eighteenth century gentlemen. It is rather peculiar, although colourful, to see in the courtyard of the Supreme Court and the Local and District Criminal Courts a parade of gaily clad gentlemen in all the hues of the rainbow from red to lilac. If some of the members opposite who spoke last evening used their normal processes of reasoning, they would look at a Supreme Court judge involved in a criminal trial, when wearing his red robe, and say, "Here comes a Communist", or they would look at a District Court judge in his lilac gown and say, "There goes someone from the L.M." Lord knows what members opposite would say if a judge went past in a black gown. I imagine country members would say it was indicative of Senator Wriedt.

Mr. Gunn: That's not true.

Mr. McRAE: Seriously though, I believe that the time has come for these odd and peculiar garments to be put aside. They serve no purpose: they are a relic of our far distant past.

I now turn to other matters more important than dress, although dress indicates attitude. First, I should like to see the dock removed from the Criminal Court because, except in the case of a violent or potentially violent offender, there is no need for it. An accused person should be able to sit immediately behind his counsel and give instructions, without the ridiculous necessity of counsel or the solicitor instructing counsel having to peer over the galvanized iron spikes around the edge of the dock. In the case of the Whyalla court, a lawyer must scream at his client, who is behind bars in a small room half way up the back wall. This is a ludicrous state of affairs.

Mr. Payne: At this stage he's an alleged offender.

Mr. McRAE: Yes, under our law the accused is presumed innocent until found guilty, and rightly so. Witnesses called to give evidence in our courts can find the experience distressing. The atmosphere of a law court is rather forbidding, much the same as I suppose the atmosphere of a House of Parliament, particularly a large House of Parliament, can be forbidding.

I do not suggest for a moment that the staff of the Supreme Court and the District Criminal Court are not helpful. They are helpful, but they have their limitations. What happens is that a witness, who may be required to give evidence in an unpleasant case, is placed in a witness room and, suddenly, perhaps after waiting for some hours, a whole day, or even longer, the orderly comes in and tells him he is required to give evidence. When he steps into the Supreme Court or the District Criminal Court he is faced by a confusing picture. In the Supreme Court, there is the red-robed judge with a black sash, and a court packed with jurors, bewigged

counsel, prison officers, spectators, and so on. This is a great ordeal for an ordinary witness. What I suggest in this connection will not cost anything, which is a pleasant change for any suggestion from a back-bencher. I suggest that one of the officers of the court merely conduct a witness around the premises so that he can familiarize himself with the surroundings. It is not proper that he be taken into the court in which he will give his evidence, as he should give evidence free from any preconception. However, there is nothing wrong (and it is a sound idea) with taking him into another courtroom and letting him familiarize himself with the atmosphere, so that when he gets into the witness box it is not a forbidding experience. If that were done I believe that more people would step forward and help in cases, whereas now many are reluctant to give evidence.

Having made some critical statements about dress and other appurtenances of the court, I accept the fact that there is a just claim for some *indicium* of the barrister's rank, and I think the solution is a black gown, such as that worn by lawyers in the superior courts of the United States.

Mr. Coumbe: Perry Mason!

Mr. McRAE: He is in the district courts and, as he never loses a case, he does not go on appeal. Although I have not had the opportunity of seeing any Bill, I gather from His Excellency's Speech that a small claims court is to be established to deal with claims involving sums of up to $500. This is very important. The current situation is that lawyers are forced to advise their clients that, if the client is going against anyone other than a large corporation (and in that case he must be a sure winner), there is no point in issuing legal proceedings for sums of $200, $300, or $400, because legal costs will eat into the result. A good system operates in California in respect of a small claims court. I would not like the court here restricted just to debts, as I anticipate that this court may deal with matters such as peace complaints, disputes over fences, disputes between neighbours, and minor charges of slander, assault, and so on.

In California, the situation is handled well. The presiding officer is a lawyer, but the legal profession may not appear inside the court. The claimant gives his evidence on oath but in his own words. The presiding officer tries to help him present his case, while not hindering him in any disputation. He tries to clarify the situation as best he can. Then the defendant puts his story, also on oath, and a result is given. From that result, there is no appeal, and that is alleged to be one of the deficiencies. However, I do not agree with that, because I have found often in the past that people who feel a genuine grievance, if they are told that there is no point in going on with the case because they can only lose in the end, are very disappointed at the state of the law. I believe such people would far rather ventilate their claim in a court of law in the way I have suggested. Win, lose or draw, they would come away happier and with a better notion of what the legal system stands for.

Mr. Jennings: Without costs.

Mr. McRAE: Yes. Having dealt with some matters of procedure, I wish to turn to some matters of substance that are of grievous importance. Over the last few years, we have had the advantage of the Law Reform Committee. Undoubtedly all South Australians owe a debt of gratitude to the people comprising that committee. Mr. Justice Zelling has been on the committee since its inception. The Solicitor-General (Mr. Cox) has also, I believe, been on the committee since the beginning. Many other distinguished lawyers have played a role in making suggestions which, in many cases, have been translated into law.

I will now deal with some of the more important recommendations that I believe should be translated into law as soon as possible. First, I refer to the community problem of the battered baby. This is known widely in the medical and legal professions as the battered baby syndrome. One difficulty at present in trying to solve this widespread community problem is that doctors fear that they may be charged with unprofessional conduct or with divulging information received from a patient and that they may be sued for defamation or forced to give evidence in a tribunal in circumstances against their professional belief.

Because of those things, doctors are not reporting to the authorities the many cases of battered children that now occur, arid it is extremely important that members of the medical and dental professions be protected so that, when they have what they consider is a battered baby syndrome case, they can, without fear of a charge of unprofessional conduct and without fear of court action, go to the police and have the person concerned charged.

Of course, it is necessary to provide for the midway case where the doctor may have legitimate doubt. What I will say now is pitiful in the case of a child and outrageous in the case of the offender, but the offender may say that the child fell from a cot. In those circumstances, the doctor may have difficulty deciding whether that was so. If he has doubt, for the sake of the child the doctor still ought to have protection so that he can go to the Children's Hospital, where there are experts in this matter.

I shall deal now with criminal records in connection with the maintenance by police and other authorities of records of people who have been before the court. About 75 per cent of all people who appear in the Police Court appear there only once. I accept that, if an offence, has been committed, the punishment must be taken and, if there is a possibility of a repetition of the offence, the record should not be erased, because it becomes critical in the mind of the judge, if the offender appears again, to know the offender's past history. I shall cite examples of people having been dealt with badly because, although they have committed minor or trivial offences, the police records did not show the position that way. In giving these examples, I have deliberately obscured the facts so that there is no possibility of identifying the people to whom I refer. Nothing would be gained by identifying them.

I recall one case of a man in his 50's who applied for a senior position and it so happened that, in a small country court about 30 years earlier, he had been dealt with for committing an offence which most of us would refer to as urinating in a public place but which appeared in the police record as indecent exposure. This man was completely puzzled about why he did not get the job, when on comparison with other applicants for the job, he seemed to be doing well and had been told by one person that he had the job. There is a strong case for making provision for a person who has committed an offence, had a conviction recorded, and taken his punishment, when a reasonable period of, say, five years or 10 years has passed.

Mr. Goldsworthy: How would they find out about that? Would a simple request to the police get that information?

Mr. McRAE: I am coming to that matter. It is necessary to amend the law to make it an offence for a police officer to divulge to anyone except stated authorities who have a right to know (such as the Crown Law authorities,

the Police Force, and the Attorney-General) that an offence has been committed. To divulge the information to persons outside that group would be wrong.

There could be exceptions to that, too, because it is a hard matter of conscience for police officers who may know that a person has a disposition to commit offences in a given locality. It is difficult to give examples that do riot identify people, but the police know that certain people are more open to temptation in some places than in others. Therefore, a way must be devised whereby, if the police belief is serious enough, the police officer can say something to a proper and reputable employer. I have explained that 75 per cent of offenders are first offenders and are never heard of in court again. However, even in applying for insurance they must disclose any previous convictions, and that is why a system of erasure must be considered.

Mr. Coumbe: The Builders Licensing Act requires disclosure of offences.

Mr. McRAE: Yes. I hope that the Bill, which requires an all-Party approach, will be referred to a Select Committee for examination.

Mr. Goldsworthy: We wouldn't need erasure, but just something about non-disclosure.

Mr. McRAE: I think the difficulty there would be to ensure that people such as private investigators and other people (in this computer age, so much personal history is held by so many people) would not have access to the information. My next point deals with matrimonial property. Only recently I was amazed to find that a certain position existed. I am far from being an expert on divorce law and many things that emanate from it, but I was amazed to find that there was strong legal authority for the proposition that, if a housewife took in boarders and saved money from the work she did in supplying food and lodging or saved money from her housekeeping, at law that would not be her money: it would be her husband's money.

A case is on record in which a lady properly had saved money from her housekeeping funds and, I think, from keeping lodgers. She banked the money, only to find that her husband, relying on an ancient provision of the law regarding married women's property, was able to say, "That is my money and I will have it." This is one of the legal oddities in respect of which the Law Reform Committee (to which I have referred) helps us so much in being able to deal with these matters.

I turn now to the subject of the commercial arbitration clauses. There is a proliferation of arbitration clauses throughout our law and, in particular, they hit the small man. Of course, everything hits the small or middle-class man. Every insurance policy that I know of provides arbitration clauses. Because of litigation in the House of Lords in about 1874 in the case *Scott v. Avery,* the clauses are referred to as Scott and Avery clauses. Their effect is that jurisdiction of the court is not removed but, in order to get to. the court, a person must first go before an arbitrator. The penalty is that the party who claims he is aggrieved must bear his own legal expenses plus one-half of the cost of the arbitration. Even then, the decision of the arbitrator is not binding. If a large insurer or any other body wishes to take the matter further it is possible to do so, and this imposes more costs on the citizen. I take it that His Excellency, in referring to commercial arbitration, was referring to this kind of situation. I hope that that blot on our law will be removed soon.

I turn now to a general problem, having dealt with some of the general aspects of procedure in the law courts and matters of substance. This is not so specifically a matter of law but one that is most important: third party vehicle insurance. Many people in the community are deluded into believing that, having secured third party insurance, they are covered in the event of an accident which does not involve another vehicle. For instance, they believe that, if they are driving their vehicle home, a tyre blows out, and they drive into a telephone pole and are physically injured, they will be covered by their policy; but they are not so covered.

Furthermore, so many people I know, having taken out a third party vehicle insurance policy, believe that they will receive automatic compensation; but this is not so. I hope that this Government will soon be able to introduce a no-fault scheme. If I understand the scheme correctly, third party vehicle insurance is now restricted to the State Government Insurance Office and to Edward Lumley & Sons (S.A.) Proprietary Limited. It would seem to me that, if property and other insurance knock-for-knock agreements have been reached between the companies, something similar could be done regarding vehicle insurance. I have not checked the figures, but let us assume that to cover the principle of no fault the premium would have to be increased, I believe that the community would accept such an increase. Such a practice would have tremendous benefits. First, it would ensure that our State Government hospitals were not in debt. I understand that millions of dollars is owing to public hospitals because of the delays in settlement of third party vehicle claims. It is necessary that these moneys be paid, and a no-fault scheme would enable that to be done. I do not believe there would be many cases where undeserving people in fact received assistance. I suppose it would be much the same as workmen's compensation, because probably 3 per cent of malingerers may be found wherever one goes. I hope that, in this Parliament's lifetime, a system of no-fault third party insurance will be introduced.

I turn now to a matter that affects most of the community. The situation has now been reached whereby, if a person has no income, through the excellent legal assistance scheme in the State (the best such scheme in the Commonwealth) he will be backed financially as far as the Privy Council. This has already happened, and South Australian lawyers are proud of the work they have done in connection with the legal assistance scheme. South Australians can be proud of the way the Commonwealth and State Governments have backed the scheme in recent years (perhaps belatedly in the view of some lawyers, but at least the backing was forthcoming). The people who are really hurt by the current legal assistance scheme are the great mass of people. Between 5 per cent and 10 per cent of people who are virtually indigent would be looked after by the Law Society. The 3 per cent or 4 per cent who are millionaires can look after themselves more than adequately. But what about the remainder who have a modest equity in their home, a modest bank account, and a modest income? What will happen to them? True, they qualify for legal assistance. However, they have to pay it back, and it may well be that the case in issue is an important test case. So my suggestion for consideration of the Government and of thinking South Australians and men of justice is that, if a person is not otherwise eligible for legal assistance but has a case that is in the public interest to have prosecuted and decided, the costs of the case should be met by the State.

I go even further and say that if this situation arises in an appeal it is even more important: the costs of appeal can be so prohibitive that many people who believe they have a good case for appeal cannot proceed for fear of the costs that might be awarded against them.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Who will decide which cases the State should take up?

Mr McRAE: I believe it should be done by fiat or by approval from the Attorney-General.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I couldn't buy that one.

Mr. McRAE: I am not particularly concerned with the mechanism. There could be a Parliamentary committee for all I care, but there must be a solution to the problem that concerns so many South Australians who cannot enforce their legal rights because they do not qualify for Law Society assistance and do not have the money or assets to risk. However it is done, whether decided by the Attorney-General or some committee (possibly a non-Party committee), it. ought to be done quickly.

I refer now to the first part of the Mitchell report which, I believe, will introduce a new era of criminal law. Many of the report's provisions could be classed as controversial; nonetheless, one can only admire the way the members of the committee and its officers went about the task and the fair way they have set out in the report the pros and cons of the various suggestions the committee makes.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It's not hard to read.

Mr. McRAE: No, it is straightforward and clear. I hope that, as foreshadowed by His Excellency, the recommendations in the report will be brought into legislative form soon. I believe that this session of Parliament will be an important and interesting one, as foreshadowed in His Excellency's Speech, and I support the motion.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the next member to speak in this debate (the honourable member for Goyder), I point out to members that, as this will be the honourable member's maiden speech, I expect members to conduct themselves as they normally would when a member makes a maiden speech to the House. The honourable member for Goyder.

Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOUNDY (Goyder): In rising to speak for the first time in this place, I should like to record my appreciation of the welcome and kindness I have received from all members, and in particular the welcome extended to me by the member for Gilles when moving the adoption of the Address in Reply, and also to those who have spoken in support of its adoption. I also express my thanks to the member for Salisbury who referred to his assistance to my supporters during the recent election campaign.

I am pleased to take my place alongside the member for Mitcham, the Leader of the Liberal Movement in this place. The member for Eyre yesterday referred to us as one of the minority Parties in this House, but figures in the recent Goyder by-election are illuminating because over 46 per cent of the primary votes and 66 per cent after preferences were distributed were received by me. That is a most convincing minority! We are not a minority Party: we are the growth Party in this State.

I also pay a tribute to my predecessor, Senator Hall, for the sterling service that he has rendered to the Districts of Gouger and Goyder and, more importantly, to the whole State. I congratulate him on his election to the Senate, and I am delighted to observe that he is demonstrating there (as he did here) that effective politics are promoted on merit and not by tradition.

His Excellency, in opening Parliament, referred to the rural situation and reminded us that we have the prospect of a bountiful season together with some problems, including rust. As mine is essentially a rural district, I am concerned with the viability of agriculture and with the effects of rampant inflation on industries that cannot pass on their costs. The recent savage increases in fertilizer costs affect the future of every farm in this State, and threaten the very existence of those areas with mineral deficiencies, such as the calcareous sands west of Warooka and in many other areas of the State. Manganese and copper are necessary additions to superphosphate in these areas, but no subsidy has ever been applied to these mineral additives.

I have details of cost surveys in these areas that show a gross margin of only $12 to $17 for each hectare from barley growing before June 30 this year. These figures indicate that before June 30 the cost of superphosphate landed at Warooka was $72.50 a tonne. Add to this the cost of the July 1 increase (about $18 a tonne) and the January 1, 1975, loss of the superphosphate bounty, and one can present a watertight case for industries assistance. The situation is bad enough so far, but it will get worse. The diminished use of phosphate and trace elements that will result will have a deleterious effect on pastures, thus lessening carrying capacity and animal fertility to the detriment of the State for both producer and consumer alike.

To continue my concern about agriculture, I refer to sitona weevil research. As I have said, the less superphosphate used, the less pasture will be grown, and it is necessary to do all in our power to maintain and enhance our natural soil fertility. All members know the soil-building properties of medic pasture, but the sitona weevil, which eats medic, has made great inroads into pastures throughout the cereal belt of this State since its arrival in 1968. Much research has been done towards establishing biological control of this pest, and I pay a tribute to the work of the Agriculture Department and, in particular, to the dedication that Mrs. Jane Moulden applies to her work. Research has now come to the point where the predator can be evaluated under laboratory conditions, but I understand that the necessary insectory at Northfield is not to be provided because of the pending move of the department to Monarto. This action could delay research from five years to 10 years, and perhaps waste research that has already been undertaken.

On Tuesday I was interested to hear the reply given by the Minister of Local Government to a question asked by the member for Flinders about continuing projects in the light of proposed changes in local government. The Minister said that, if it were considered desirable and necessary, these projects should proceed forthwith. I hope that the Minister of Agriculture will apply the same reasoning to sitona weevil research.

My concern about the underground water situation in the Virginia Basin was heightened by a recent press statement that the basin was being depleted at a rate 12 times greater than its replenishment. If this statement is correct, the need to upgrade research facilities in the use of effluent waters is urgent, because vast quantities of effluent flow into the sea from Bolivar each day. I know of village schemes in India whereby effluent water is recycled by using methane gas, and the resulting water is used for domestic vegetable production. I understand that not even the smell is wasted! We are being warned continually that the Murray River will be a sewer by the turn of the century, and effective and speedy means must be found to use the assets we have that, we now waste.

Another rural problem that is affecting producers and consumers involves the South Australian Meat Corporation. The board, acting under instructions from the Government, has done everything it has been asked to do: it has almost achieved economic viability but, in doing so, it has priced itself out of the market, to the detriment of producers and consumers. It is inconceivable and unforgivable that it is economically possible to freight livestock out of this State, slaughter and process it, and land it back in city supermarkets cheaper than it can be treated in our own Government abattoir.

The charges levied by Samcor are excessive when compared to the charges made by private enterprise. Samcor charges from June 27, 1974, for killing and dressing a body of beef of from 158.7 kg but not exceeding 203 kg were $21.05. Add to that the return from by-products, over $10 a head, and the total was more than $30 for each body of beef. That sum does not take into account other hidden costs of delivery from the yards to slaughter and from slaughter to the market. Private meatworks consider that $6 a body is adequate. The Samcor price to dress sheep or lambs is $2.65 a head, and by-products bring in $1 a head—a total of $3.65. Private enterprise, however, can do it for less than $1 a head.

Samcor charges, therefore, are made to the detriment of industry and the housewife. A recent article in the *Chronicle,* headed "Meat industry review needed", states in part:

> There is concern that Samcor, in pursuing its specific charter, may ultimately do telling harm to the State's meat industry, by eroding industry confidence, loading industry costs, sapping consumer incentive, blunting private enterprise initiatives. The ultimate responsibility for this, however, would have to lie at the Government's door. It was the Government which set up Samcor, and which drew up its charter.

Our. export lamb industry has no outlet this season for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is the severe handling charge presently applying. Last year the suggested lamb price was 30c to 35c for 0.454 kg and more, but this year it may be as low as 18c to 20c. Skin values last year were $5 each, but this year it is expected they will be about $1.50 each—a difference in sale value of $15.50 on a 15.8 kg lamb, which is down to $7.80 this year.

The producer must bear this loss, but the city housewife cannot benefit from his misfortune because of the enormous escalation in Samcor charges since last season. The article in the *Chronicle* continues:

> Encouragement of the private sector to establish regional abattoirs would have several advantageous effects on both the community and the State's overall economy. Competition between private companies invariably results in better returns and greater industry efficiency. Regional development, in turn, means decentralization, more job opportunities and a broader social environment choice for the individual. In short, there is much to be said for full Government support and assistance for large-scale private sector projects.

I was heartened today to read in the *Balaklava Producer* of a land sale at Mallala, where about 80.94 hectares of land was bought by R. J. Gilbertson Proprietary Limited, established meat exporters, for a private export meat venture. I hope this means that the Government is in sympathy with the problems of the industry and with the need to give the housewife of this city the cheapest meat she can have consistent with the costs involved.

Finally, the first report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas states that some amalgamation and rationalization of local government areas on economic grounds is desirable and should be accepted, particularly in metropolitan and near country areas. However, there are many instances in the report where proposed new rural areas are too large to retain the desirable close contact with ratepayers. The desirability of maintaining the viability of present district centres, particularly social viability, has been disregarded. . On Tuesday afternoon I received a sheaf of telegrams strongly protesting against the recommendations of this report as it affected my area.

Most came from organizations within the Minlaton council area and were from various community organizations. They strongly protest against the recommendations because they believe the council will disappear as a separate entity. They claim (and I agree) that Minlaton is a proven centre of a variety of community interests. The report at page 56, in referring to the amalgamation of the Minlaton council, states:

> The District Council of Minlaton presents a somewhat different picture. The principal town of Minlaton is comparable with the principal town in the District Council of Yorketown. We have taken into account that the hospital at Minlaton is owned and operated by the district council, the schooling position in each town and the rate revenue from each of the areas.

The rate revenue for each of the areas is the same. The report continues:

> There is some conflicting opinion about areas on either side of the boundary between the two councils.

The report recognizes that Minlaton has a claim, but then ignores that claim. The organizations to which I have referred earlier have enjoyed financial assistance and guarantees for some of their projects, but more particularly they have enjoyed much physical help with machinery and time spent by council employees working in shack areas and in school and sporting grounds. Ratepayers accept that this kind of council involvement is a proper activity, but they fear that much larger areas and more remote management will result in a loss of these services.

I believe that where disputes arise in local government areas the Bill should embody the right of appeal against the proposed changes and the right to conduct a local referendum in the council areas concerned. We live in a democracy; the present boundaries are an embodiment of that democracy in local government, but surely, before changes are made, people in local government areas should have the right to express their views through discussion and finally through referendum so that their voices may be fully heard and their rights resolved. I support the motion.

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I wish to convey my personal sympathy to the next-of-kin of the former members (Messrs. Dawes and Edwards) in their sad loss. I, like some other members, did not know either of those gentlemen, but I am sure that they played their part constructively in the interests of the people they represented. Although my next remarks were not included in the Governor's Speech, they should have been.

Mr. Chapman: Go on: this is new information for us.

Mr. MAX BROWN: First, I want to deal with some of the matters raised by the honourable member who has just resumed his seat. I congratulate the honourable member on his election to this place but point out quickly that the Australian Labor Party did not run a candidate in that by-election, as he is well aware. I sometimes wonder whether he may think, as I think, what the hard core Labor Party voter may have done in that by-election.

Dr. Tonkin: They were instructed what to do.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I do not think so. They would have used common sense, as all Labor Party supporters do. I had an opportunity of looking at the breakdown of the voting figures at that by-election.

Mr. Millhouse: It was very instructive.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Yes, it was. Although I have not a copy of that before me, if we look at the figures closely, we will see that the Liberal Party won in only about two booths.

Mr. Millhouse: You mean the Liberal and Country League!

Mr. MAX BROWN: The Liberal Party; it has changed its name.

Mr. Millhouse: There's been no change at all.

Mr. MAX BROWN: In my opinion, the L.C.L., on that breakdown of the figures, won in only two booths. The other part of the breakdown that was interesting was that, where the Country Party voted, by far the majority of the preferences went to the Liberal Movement.

Mr. Millhouse: That is right.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I wonder what the L.C.L. now thinks of the results of that by-election. For example, I wonder what the member for Rocky River, who happens to be overseas, is thinking about the next election.

Mr. Millhouse: We have a fairly good idea.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I have heard from a reliable source that the member for Rocky River has bought a caravan so that he can go more freely among his electors, and I am sure the member for Mallee, with his goatee beard, will have much more afforestation on his face before he gets away from his problems!

Mr. Becker: How is your district going?

Mr. MAX BROWN: I am glad the member for Hanson has interjected, because the act he put on after that by-election would have to be seen to be believed. What the member for Hanson does is suddenly to come along with the brilliant idea of moving a vote of no confidence in the Leader. Never in the realms of politics has so much political know-how been exercised by so few people at such an appropriate time.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MAX BROWN: I turn now to a problem that has been raised in my own electoral district, and possibly it has something to do with the whole State. It causes me grave concern. To the city of Whyalla two wise guys, door-knocking experts, have come and have sold or are selling shares in pine forest concerns in other States. I will not mention the two companies in question, but one is established in Perth and the other in Sydney. When people buy shares in those two companies and check with the Registrar of Companies in South Australia, they find that neither of them has a prospectus, and therefore they are illegal. What happens and what could adversely affect the people who invest money there is that the people who accept the money have no legal responsibility for what happens to the project. In other words, if the project goes down the drain, the shareholders cannot, because of the illegal standing of the companies in South Australia, approach the companies to get any refunds that normally they would be entitled to. I deplore this type of activity and bring it to the attention of the House. If any other members happen to come into contact with this sort of thing, it should be raised by them. For the present, I can only say that the Crown Law Department has the case in hand. I hope that something positive will be done.

I turn now to a matter that is very close to my heart—the conciliation and arbitration system under which we live in this country. Previously in this House I have said that the system we now live under has failed. I repeat that: I believe it has failed. Many people in the State made a great blast of the dispute that happened in Whyalla last Christmas, and I want to deal with that dispute and suggest where the conciliation and arbitration legislation, as we know it, falls down.

The dispute began between the Painters and Dockers Union and the Whyalla shipyard management. Just about the first thing that happened was that the shipyard management began to stand down other workers employed in the yard. I say that that sort of action by any employer immediately prolongs the dispute and even creates a bigger dispute, because any trade union whose members are stood down from employment will immediately demand that all other members of that union not work overtime in that establishment. It is only common sense that as a responsible trade union it cannot in any circumstances justify the situation where members in that one establishment are, on the one hand, working hours of overtime while, on the other hand, members of the same union are outside the gate, having been stood down, and are earning nothing. As soon as that is done, under the Act there is a dispute and, therefore, a worker is not entitled to any unemployment benefit.

Mr. Harrison: That happens at General Motors-Holden's.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Yes. So in fact there are two problems. In the first place, instead of solving the problem, we aggravate and escalate it, which is wrong in any circumstances. It is obvious that, before one can attempt to solve a dispute, the parties should get together. No-one in his right senses would not advocate that—certainly I would not. The only real way to get together and solve a problem is by conciliation but, under this system, before, conciliation the parties must agree to go before a conciliator. Therefore, if one party to a dispute refuses to go to conciliation, that is it. That is ridiculous. The second part of the problem is that, even if the parties decide to go before a conciliator, both parties must agree to accept his recommendations, which on many occasions will not be agreed to by either party. In fact, in this dispute at Christmas time that lasted about six weeks the parties went before a conciliator on no fewer than three occasions. That is a ridiculous situation. I have a suggestion to make, and it is only a suggestion, as I am an ordinary guy.

Mr. Chapman: You're not fair dinkum about it!

Mr. MAX BROWN: I know that the honourable member would not like to see disputes settled, whereas I like them settled; that is the difference between us. Regarding the arbitration and conciliation system in this country, I think that, especially with regard to national wage cases, decisions may have been far too conservative, and that is one of the problems we face today.

Mr. Chapman: Responsibility is used in dealing with irresponsible claims.

Mr. MAX BROWN: According to the member for Alexandra, every worker in the country is irresponsible, but he knows nothing about workers. A glaring example of the conservatism to which I have referred is the decision in this year's national wage case, the recommendation being for an increase of 2 per cent plus $2.50. That is peanuts! The unions having decided that that was no good, across-the-board negotiations between employers and unions followed, and in the metal workers case alone the sum involved is $15. Events such as this make the arbitration system look stupid.

The suggestion that the escalation of wages causes inflation is pure bunkum. I am proud of the fact that I have dealt with workers all my life, and I have never run into a millionaire worker yet. Recently, when barmen received a wage increase, someone tried to tell me that the increase was not justified. AllI know is that in my town one hotel is owned by a millionaire who owns a chain of hotels. I bet London to a brick that the barman in the hotel will not be a millionaire in a year or two. I believe that price rises create and feed inflation. The Prices Justification Tribunal is laughable. Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited (very good friends of mine), the oil companies, the sugar refineries, the Ansett companies, and other companies must be laughing all the way to and from the tribunal. Let us consider my favourite company, B.H.P. Company. After receiving one increase in the price of steel, it brought out a six-monthly balance sheet showing a profit of a cool $51 000 000. Inside two weeks, it was back at the Prices Justification Tribunal for another increase, and it got it.

Mr. Becker: What about the oil in Bass Strait?

Mr. MAX BROWN: It got oil and steel price increases. For these reasons, if for no others, I believe that the arbitration and conciliation system operating in this country has a long way to go. A recently returned Senator (Senator Jessop) was reputed not long ago in my local newspaper as saying that one of the causes of inflation was that secret ballots were not held in trade union elections.

Mr. Chapman: I support that.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I appreciate that, as the honourable member knows nothing about trade unions.

Mr. Chapman: I know more about trade unions than you know about—

Mr. MAX BROWN: The honourable member knows more about profits than I know about them. Senator Jessop's statement is absolutely ridiculous. He makes many statements, but I wish he would do his homework. I was a secretary of a trade union before I came here and, in an election for office, I went for a secret ballot. Probably most trade union leaders, if they are pressed for office, go for a secret ballot. However, I cannot see what this has to do with inflation.

Mr. Chapman: Should there be a secret ballot when union members are directed by their leaders?

Mr. MAX BROWN: In the almost 20 years that I was a trade union leader, on only a few occasions when I arrived at the scene of a dispute were the workers not already outside the gates. Although he thinks he knows something about this, the honourable member knows nothing about it. I was pleased to hear the member for Stuart ask the Minister of Development and Mines about the proposed indenture for the Redcliff project. That was a valid question. In effect, he wanted an assurance that the indenture legislation to be introduced this year relating to this project would not include provisions similar to those in the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's Steel Works Indenture Act. The Minister rightly gave assurances that this would not happen, and I am pleased about that. At page 46, paragraph (5) d, the report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas states:

With regard to the land mentioned in the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's Steel Works Indenture Act, 1958, and on that account not within local government boundaries, we do not accept that this should be the position; that is, we do not accept that part of the submission of the city of Whyalla which agrees to the continuation of the exclusion. We believe that all of the land within the Whyalla planning area should be within local government. We recognize, however, that a political decision must be made as to whether the exemption granted to the company should be continued.

That is the unfortunate situation. Last year the Whyalla council had a budget of about $1 000 000, and it received an *ex gratia* payment of $8 000 from B.H.P. Company; that is peanuts. This year the council's budget will be about $1 500 000, and I am wondering whether the council will receive $12 000 from B.H.P. Company. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

BRIGHTON TO CHRISTIE DOWNS RAILWAY DUPLICATION AND EXTENSION BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.22 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 30, at 2 p.m.