

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, July 28, 1976

The PRESIDENT (Elon. F. J. Potter) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: SEXUAL OFFENCES

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS presented a petition signed by 78 electors of South Australia alleging that the crime of incest and the crime of unlawful carnal knowledge of young girls were detrimental to society, and praying that the Council would reject or amend any legislation to abolish the crime of incest or lower the age of consent in respect of sexual offences.

Petition received and read.

QUESTIONS**KANGAROO ISLAND SETTLERS**

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I direct a question to the Minister of Lands. Has the Minister received from the Chairman of the Land Settlement Committee any report, either verbal or written, on the inquiry being conducted into the war service land settlement problems on Kangaroo Island? Secondly, is the Minister satisfied that the terms of reference of the committee are wide enough to enable a full and comprehensive inquiry to be made?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The reply to the first part of the question is "No". The only discussions I have had with the honourable member of another place who is Chairman of the committee have involved the difficulty in obtaining stenographers to take the shorthand report of the proceedings. I think that this matter is still being considered. The reply to the second part of the question is "Yes".

PRISON AMENITIES

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I address a question to the Minister of Health. I have seen in the press recently that there has been questioning of the showing of R-rated films to the prisoners at Yatala prison and I wonder whether the Minister could tell us how many such films have been shown at Yatala prison and say whether, in fact, this showing would tend to deprave and corrupt the prisoners.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am not sure how many have been shown at Yatala. I know that, of the last 44 films shown there, two had an R rating, and following the showing of both those films I have heard of no mass rapes taking place there, no break-outs, and no lowering of the morals of the inmates at Yatala as a result of the showing. I do not think it has done any harm, so I do not know why the gentleman in question was complaining about the showing of the films. These 16 millimetre films are selected by the prison amenities section, and I think it is the opinion of prison officials that it is unfortunate that more 16 mm films are not produced.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I seek leave to make a short statement before directing a question to the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: With colleagues from another place, I recently visited Adelaide Gaol and Yatala Labour Prison. We commenced our inspection of Adelaide Gaol at 9.15 a.m., and we went to the Yatala prison for lunch. I want to say at the outset that Mr. Kelsey, the Superintendent of Adelaide Gaol, gave us every opportunity to inspect the gaol, to comment, and even to talk to the prisoners if we wished, which we did. Dealing with the Adelaide Gaol, I say first that we were asked, on leaving, whether we would like to sign the visitors' book and make any further comments. My colleagues made some comments and I was the last to do so. Mr. Kelsey noticed what I had written, namely, that the prison should be a museum. When entering the gaol, one finds a most depressing atmosphere. There are two divisions, A and B, the first one being on the left-hand side. We went up into the tower and looked down. Going through the prison, I noticed that the accommodation on the left-hand side included shower facilities. I do not know how many prisoners use those facilities (there seemed quite a lot) but the showers were exposed with old concrete walls. We went further on to the recreation centre, where there was an eight-ball pool table, and a chap was taking a shot while I was there. I said, "That's a funny sort of cue", and he said, "It's a broomstick; we cannot have a billiard cue, because they could be used to belt people around the head." The old stone walls had holes in them, and he said, "That's where they cue up with that type of broomstick." Those were the only recreation facilities I saw.

Then we went to the right-hand division, where there were new shower recesses or cubicles, certainly with no doors on them. There were four or five of them (I could see about the same number of prisoners), and a larger recreation hall with paintings on the wall and one eight-ball pool table. I was pleased to notice that in the Adelaide Gaol they have done away with the tin pans in the cells used for toilet purposes. Prisoners are locked up from 4.30 p.m. until 8.30 the next morning, and in the summertime it becomes unbearable for them. They now have chemical pans, which have been there for only two or three weeks. They are the type used in caravans and are known as "porta-potties". Some of the prisoners said that the gaol was very old and depressing. There are people in gaol who have been there on remand for up to eight weeks waiting to come to trial.

Another thing I noticed when we were leaving was that the cells which were very narrow, with thick walls, were very cold; there was no heating, and each cell had a little table and a bed. Mr. Kelsey said there were plenty of blankets. The prisoner is locked up at half-past four and stays there until half-past eight the next morning. The air space in the cell would be about 7 m³. It has a dome-shaped roof and, when the steel door is locked, there is a steel piece about 1.2 m high punched with holes to provide ventilation. It is very cold at night and in the summertime it is very hot. There was certainly no heating there. We were shown a kitchen over 100 years old which had recently been done away with, and now there is a new kitchen operating in the Adelaide Gaol. Inmates and others associated with the gaol are very pleased with the new kitchen facilities and also with the new pan system. The cells in Adelaide Gaol that we saw were single accommodation, and just before we left we were told that there was also double-bunk accommodation that were being used by two persons.

Some of the prisoners are lifers, there for having committed all kinds of crime, including sex crimes.

Prisoners are there for any crime that one may care to mention. There could be a young man in the gaol on remand on some minor charge and accommodated with a lifer who could be a homosexual. The Yatala prison has double cells but the accommodation is used by only one man. In relation to the Adelaide Gaol, I submit that the two-man cell accommodation should be used by only one man, as in the case of Yatala prison. Further, in the Yatala situation, the pan system still remains in operation. There are many long-term prisoners there, and that system should be done away with. Prisoners at Adelaide Gaol should have their individual cell, as they have at Yatala. I was not asked to sign a book at Yatala prison but, if I had been, I would have pointed this out. Will the Chief Secretary take the necessary action to have the use of two-man cell accommodation at Adelaide Gaol discontinued, with those cells accommodating one prisoner, as is provided at Yatala prison? Secondly, will he consider improving the gaol's recreation facilities and provide, say, table tennis equipment and at least two pool tables with billiard cues, as are provided at Yatala, as well as other amenities that would give prisoners a useful way to spend their time? Thirdly, I ask that prisoners at Yatala prison be supplied with the chemical disposal toilets known as "porta-potties", such as are supplied at Adelaide Gaol.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Improvements have been made at Adelaide Gaol in relation to the occupancy of the cells. I understand that only on rare occasions is it necessary to put two prisoners in one cell. The provision of billiard tables is a matter for the amenities section to consider. The honourable member has asked me to go and see the cells. I have been there and have spoken to the officers and prisoners, as well as visiting the amenities section. In regard to improvements at Yatala prison, the Government is gradually getting rid of the buckets from the cells and installing what are known as "porta-potties".

WIRABARA BRIDGE

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Transport in another place.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Last October, after severe floods, the main road bridge crossing the Rocky River near Wirrabara was badly damaged, making it unserviceable to road traffic. His Excellency stated in his Opening Speech that \$250 000 was to be spent on replacing this bridge. First, the old bridge must be demolished, and I understand that it is to be blown up. According to my information, the Army Department, having been asked to blow up the bridge, examined it and said that it could not do so. The Mines Department was then asked to blow it up and examined the job. However, according to my most recent information, it has not told the Highways Department whether it is able to demolish the bridge. I have noticed that the railway bridge at Crystal Brook, which was also damaged in the same storm in October, has been demolished. The Government used a firm of private contractors known as Ackra Explosives. As we now know that there is a private firm able to demolish bridges, will the Minister consider reviewing the position with a view to destroying the old Wirrabara bridge, so that work

can proceed on rebuilding the bridge, which is so important to north-bound and south-bound traffic in that area?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and obtain a reply.

WOMMA ROAD INTERSECTION

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question relates to the intersection of Womma and Heaslip Roads, west of Elizabeth. Over a period of time several serious accidents, some of which have been fatal, have occurred at this intersection. This is somewhat hard to understand because of the clear view a motorist gets from both directions and also because on one side of the intersection Womma Road is sealed; whereas on the other side it is not sealed. Nevertheless, some serious accidents have occurred there, including yet another about a month ago. I believe (and I am subject to correction on this) that at that stage the Minister had his attention drawn to the matter, and that a suggestion was made that some alterations could be made to the crossing: at least give-way signs or something of that nature could be placed there to prevent further accidents occurring. As far as I am aware, nothing has yet been done. I therefore ask the Minister to ascertain from his colleague whether something can be done that will, we hope, avoid further fatalities at this intersection.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and obtain a reply.

DROUGHT RELIEF

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Lands a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: My question relates to the drought and specifically to the offer made by the South Australian Meat Corporation, as reported in this morning's press, to pay 40c a head for bare shorn sheep delivered to its works. The problem in many cases is that the cost of freighting the sheep to Samcor would amount to more than that sum. People in the hardest hit areas, such as the Mallee, would be deprived of any real benefit from the offer. Consequently, will the Government consider offering a subsidy on freight for this purpose?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Only this morning I read about Samcor's offer. I assure the honourable member that I will look at this matter very closely to see what I can do to alleviate the situation to which he has referred.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to directing a question to the Minister of Lands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I have been told that several farmers with drought-stricken properties have asked at their local council office for a form on which to apply for drought relief, but they have been told that the forms were not available in those council offices because the forms were distributed only in declared drought areas. Will the Minister consider declaring the whole State a drought area so that any person suffering hardship can apply for a subsidy and have his application dealt with on its merits?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: This is a most unusual request in seeking to have the whole of the State declared as a drought-stricken area. It is just not practicable to do this. Much of South Australia is currently enjoying good seasonal conditions and, in these circumstances, I cannot accede to the honourable member's request.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: It's a small area enjoying good conditions.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: It all depends on how one looks at it. In relation to the total area of the State, this applies to a large area. Those areas that have been—

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: That's not right.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Just a minute, we must get the position correct. A large part of South Australia is enjoying good seasonal conditions. Only this afternoon I had lunch with a pastoralist from the North-East. In that district they have an enormous number of stock on agistment, and the whole of the North-East of South Australia is enjoying tremendous seasonal prospects at this time. Other parts of South Australia also are in a similar position. Unfortunately there are also many areas of the State experiencing drought conditions, and these areas have been specifically spelt out. This matter has been looked at by the Lands Department and the Agriculture Department, as I have indicated, almost on a day-to-day and week-to-week basis and, if there are more areas to be added to the drought-declared areas, they will be added. Unfortunately, under the legislation applying in South Australia, we cannot declare certain areas as drought areas; as has been done for many years, we must declare hundreds as being drought-stricken hundreds. Different circumstances apply in other parts of Australia where similar action is undertaken, but I do not believe that this inhibits the operation of the system in relation to the declaration of hundreds as drought areas, and I cannot accede to the honourable member's request.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Does the Minister of Lands support the proposition that any primary producer in South Australia who considers that he has suffered hardship because of the drought should be entitled to apply for relief and have his application dealt with on its merits?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Yes. There are many ways in which primary producers can apply for assistance, and I will tell the Council the ways in which finance is available. They include farm build-up, debt reconstruction, carry-on finance and, in the agriculture field, tree-pull finance. Anyone is entitled to apply for those types of assistance if he so desires and if he thinks he has an opportunity of getting it.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Will the Minister of Lands, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, say whether the present Federal Government has taken any interest in the prevailing climatic conditions and the sufferings thereby caused to the rural community, and whether it is intended, the Federal Minister having only last week addressed a body of rural interests in this State, that assistance will be forthcoming from the Federal sphere in order to assist the present plight of the farming community in large areas of the State?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Representations are at present being made to the Commonwealth Government. I was surprised to read in this morning's press of a statement made by the Acting Prime Minister (Hon. J. D. Anthony), who at one time was the Minister for Primary Industry and who no doubt has the interests of primary producers at heart, in which he said that the Commonwealth Government would make finance available on a subsidised basis for sheep

going on agistment and also for fodder coming on to farms. On checking briefly with other States this morning, I found that they knew nothing about this matter and had not been told about it. I should like to clear up what Mr. Anthony meant by his statement. Under the drought relief scheme, for example, the Commonwealth Government expects the South Australian Government to pay \$1 500 000 before it will come into the scheme, and the Victorian Government has to pay about \$3 500 000 in this respect. Therefore, I do not know how Mr. Anthony's statement fits into the present overall situation. However, I assure the honourable member that the Commonwealth will be informed of our situation in order to see whether it can help, as I believe it should.

BUSH FIRES

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: During the latter part of last year, huge bush fires ravaged a large area of the North-West of the State and also part of Eyre Peninsula. At that time the Government quite correctly made available Highways Department equipment to assist in containing these fires. Some private contractors' equipment was also involved, and negotiations were undertaken with the Government to have the cost to the private contractors met by the Government, since in some cases the Government itself had sanctioned the use of the private contractors' equipment. A request was made that payment for the use of machinery be made by the Government. At that time, what was considered a satisfactory reply was obtained from the Minister of Agriculture. The same situation applied in connection with the Elliston council, which used heavy earthmoving equipment to try to stem the holocaust in its area. This council, too, was under the impression that payment would be made, and it submitted a detailed request, totalling \$1 700, to the Minister. The contractor in the North-West required \$480. Because a satisfactory reply was received from the Minister during the negotiations, when will these requests be met? No payment has been made up to the present, and the people concerned would like an answer.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will draw the honourable member's question to the attention of my colleague and ask that he treat the matter as urgent. I will bring down a reply as soon as possible.

NATIONAL ROUTE No. 1

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: When I was a member of the House of Assembly I asked the Minister of Transport a question, which I will read to the Council.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Did you get a reply?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Not a very satisfactory one. On September 14, 1972, I asked the following question:

Will the Minister of Roads and Transport take up with the appropriate Commonwealth authority the matter of re-numbering Lincoln Highway between Lincoln Gap and Port Lincoln and Flinders Highway between Port Lincoln

and Ceduna so that these highways comprise part of National Route No. 1? National Route No. 1 is a major highway from Cairns in Queensland to Broome in Western Australia and it follows the coastline as far as practicable, so it is a scenic highway. However, in South Australia it leaves the coast at Lincoln Gap and cuts across Eyre Peninsula to rejoin the coast at Ceduna. This is a departure from the usual practice for this highway, which misses some of the most beautiful coastal scenery in Australia as well as the most beautiful seaside city in Australia.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Did you ask your question when you were representing Port Lincoln?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Yes, but I still hold the same view. My question continued:

It would be natural for a traveller, perhaps with a caravan, not knowing the area to follow National Highway No. 1 and so miss seeing this important part of South Australia with its beautiful scenery.

The Minister said that he would get a reply for me, and on October 3, 1972, he made the following reply:

The actual routes of the national route system of Australia are determined by the National Association of Australian State Road Authorities (N.A.A.S.R.A.). This ensures uniformity, particularly where more than one State is involved. Accordingly, I will have this question of relocating National Route No. 1 via Port Lincoln raised by the Commissioner of Highways at the next meeting of N.A.A.S.R.A., scheduled for October, 1972.

I have heard no more of the matter since then. I am not blaming the Minister, because I was not in Parliament for two or three years. However, I should like to know whether the Commissioner raised this matter at the meeting of N.A.A.S.R.A. and, if he did, what was the decision of that meeting. If the meeting decided against the suggestion, will the Minister ask the Commissioner of Highways to raise the matter again? If this request, which I consider to be reasonable, is not acceded to, will the Commissioner request that this section of highway be shown as an alternative route to National Route No. 1?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and obtain a reply.

RAILWAY STAFFING

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Can the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Transport, inform the House of the proposed strength of the Rail Division of the State Transport Authority? Further, can he state the number of administrative and managerial officers in that division? Will he also say whether the problem of superannuation for those employees who are transferred to the Commonwealth has been solved to the satisfaction of the railway employees?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the question to my colleague and obtain a reply.

QUESTION PROCEDURE

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: If I may, with your indulgence, Mr. President, I raise a matter of some concern to me. It dates back to the sittings on June 10 this year, when I was denied the right to leave, granted by this Council, because, under a Standing Order, my very learned friend on my right, the Hon. Mr. Burdett, called "Question". If my memory serves me correctly, although there was no dissenting voice when I sought leave, your worthy self, as occupant of the Chair, then ruled that the calling of "Question" denied me of and nullified the leave that had

been granted by this Chamber. Yesterday I did a similar thing to what the Hon. Mr. Burdett had done. I want to make abundantly clear that this type of action should not be taken by anyone in this Council, unless the honourable member taking it clearly and properly recognises that the right to deny leave to an honourable member who has been granted it does not reside in members on only one side of the Chamber. That is something for which members on the Opposition side must accept full responsibility. If there is retaliation, it is retaliation in a strict sense, and it is a right that members in this Council, on whatever side, should have. Yesterday, Mr. President, I called "Question", and you saw fit to rule against me, on the basis, if my memory serves me correctly, that you had not heard me dissenting when leave had been sought. Your observation was correct. I had not dissented, but that does not deny me the right to call "Question" and nullify the leave that has been granted. I say that, although I am not a great stickler for rules in this place, because all rules are made to be broken, for the sake of humanity and principle.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I say that, whether the Hon. Mr. Hill has been in the Army, the Navy, or in real estate.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: He was in the Navy.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Yes. I want to be serious in this matter, if I may. I repeat that all the rights are not with members on the Opposition side. The second thing is that you ruled against me yesterday, and it was a direct contradiction, I say with all respect, of the way you ruled on June 10. I would thank you for an explanation.

The PRESIDENT: There is, in my view, a material difference between what happened on June 10 and what happened yesterday. Yesterday, I think on two occasions, an honourable member had sought leave to make an explanation prior to asking a question. No dissenting voice was heard and leave was granted. I think that on each occasion the Hon. Mr. Foster then called "Question".

The Hon. N. K. Foster: That is right.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member did that when the member who had been granted leave had not even uttered one word in explanation. In those circumstances, I thought it was completely contrary to the leave that had been granted only a second or two before. It is possible for honourable members to call "Question" at any time after the honourable member who has been granted leave has embarked on his explanation, and the purpose of that (and I am referring to the reason for the procedure) is to prevent an honourable member from going into a long and prolix explanation that is getting nowhere. The purpose of calling "Question" is to terminate the honourable member's leave by bringing him right up to the point of saying, "Come on, you have had enough; now is the time to ask the question." That is how the arrangement should be used. Yesterday the honourable member called "Question", when not one word of explanation had been uttered.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: That is what happened to me, when Burdett pulled that stunt on me.

The PRESIDENT: On the contrary—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Read *Hansard*.

The PRESIDENT: Order! On June 10 the honourable member had embarked on his explanation. He may not have got far but, when the Hon. Mr. Burdett called "Question", the honourable member had already made

some remarks pursuant to the leave granted. I hope that we do not get to the situation where we try to use the procedures available in this Council for tactical purposes and nothing else.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: That still leaves it in the air. That is not what happened on June 10.

SHACKS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Lands a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: My question concerns the matter of Government control over shacks and shack owners in this State. There is a strong rumour on Yorke Peninsula that Lands Department officers are taking photographs of all shacks along the coastline so that evidence will be held by the department if such owners extend their buildings without consent. Will the Minister say whether this is so, and whether this policy applies over the whole State? If it does, how much could this exercise cost, and would not a simple system of statutory declarations by owners at the appropriate time suffice?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I assure the honourable member that ground level and aerial photographs of shacks have been taken for many years, so this is nothing new. If we are to control shack sites throughout the State, it is most important that all this information be available. I assure the honourable member that the representatives of the Shack Owners' Association and the district councils to whom I have spoken throughout the State are completely in accord with what the Lands Department has done in the past and what it is doing now, and that they are grateful that something along these lines is being done.

HOUSE PHOTOGRAPHS

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: My question arises from the question just asked by the Hon. Mr. Hill. Does the Minister of Lands agree that, if the taking of shack photographs is to be deplored, the same principle should be applied to unscrupulous land agents who take photographs of more presentable homes in the street than those that are for sale, and then advertise them in a block in order to induce people to buy certain properties?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I agree with the honourable member. Indeed, I think he has hit the nail on the head. I apologise for the first part of his question. Nevertheless, what he has said is correct.

HOSPITALS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Will the Minister of Health provide the Council with details of the comparative expenditure, on a per capita basis, on hospitals in South Australia compared to the expenditure on hospitals in other States?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: As I do not have the figures with me, I shall try to get them for the honourable member.

WILLS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Chief Secretary a question.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Speak up! I cannot hear you, mate!

Leave granted.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. DeGaris.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Following the questions that have been asked regarding photographs, I raise the matter of an advertisement (I think inserted by the Community Welfare Department) which appeared recently in a newspaper circulated in the northern parts of the metropolitan area and which stated that people who wanted to make wills could make them free. As a result, a person went to make his will free of charge, and this is done, provided that the Public Trustee is made the executor of the estate. However, if a person wants someone else to be the executor, payment must be made for making the will. Will the Chief Secretary have this matter investigated, as this practice appears to be unfair advertising by the department to get business for the Public Trustee?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will have the honourable member's question examined.

TOW-TRUCK INDUSTRY

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The Chief Secretary is no doubt aware of the controversy that surrounded the tow-truck industry in South Australia recently, as a result of which it was alleged that ugly threats were being made in the industry. The Minister may also recall that the Leader of the Opposition in another place (not to be confused with the Leader of the Opposition without shadow portfolio in this place) had much to say about the matter and suggested that the industry should be nationalised or socialised. Will the Minister say whether the industry is becoming more stabilised than one could have expected from the previous press reports to which I have referred?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Regarding the possibility of the industry's becoming more stable, I am not sure. The controversy seems to have subsided at present. I will make inquiries for the honourable member.

BOLIVAR EFFLUENT

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Minister of Works was reported to have told another place yesterday, when tabling a report on the possibility of using effluent from the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works to irrigate the Northern Adelaide Plains market garden areas, that the scheme would cost \$19 800 000 and that it was most unattractive economically. He added that he did not think it was within the financial capabilities of the State to finance the scheme, and he was not optimistic of obtaining any Commonwealth money. Will the Minister consider making a submission to the Commonwealth Government in relation to financing the scheme, particularly in view of the desirability of recycling effluent and making maximum use of the water for the benefit of farmers in that area?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

CROYDON PRIMARY SCHOOL

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Croydon Primary School upgrading.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 27. Page 169.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In supporting the motion, I join with other honourable members in congratulating His Excellency the Governor on the manner in which he opened Parliament on June 8. Like other honourable members, I feel rather sad that he will not perform that duty again, because of his impending retirement. His Excellency has caused people in this State to think more deeply on many issues, particularly fundamental issues, and to question matters that were previously accepted by many people without question.

His interest in conservation and the environment must be acclaimed. As a result of his active term of office, there has been more discussion, more debate, more involvement in public issues and, therefore, more participation in the democratic process by people throughout the State. He has also carried out his formal duties with correctness and dignity. What more could be expected of a Governor than that in this modern age?

I, too, support the expressions of sympathy following the deaths of three former members of Parliament, Messrs. Ferguson, Hogben, and MacGillivray. I did not know Mr. Hogben or Mr. MacGillivray, but I served with Mr. Ferguson, and I particularly extend my sympathy to his widow. I held Jim Ferguson in the highest esteem. I was pleased to see that the Governor's Speech gave first priority to the effects of the drought on rural people. I hope that the Government will be realistic in its announcements of aid to people affected by this unfortunate seasonal condition. I hope, too, that the Government, in reaching decisions on this aid, will take notice of recommendations from producer organisations.

I wish to make a few suggestions as to how I believe the life of South Australians can be further improved, particularly in the fields of housing and the arts. I wish to refer to one of the fundamental tenets with which all Parties agree—that our ultimate aim in metropolitan Adelaide is to try to contain the population for all time at not more than 1 200 000 or 1 300 000. This question is in the forefront of the minds of people who are interested in population and in metropolitan housing. The Government's long-term plans to attain this goal of keeping Adelaide relatively small by world standards include the concept of Monarto.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Adelaide is quite a large city by world standards.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is arguable. There has been a considerable amount of local resistance to Monarto from people who have said that they do not wish to live there. The Government has now encountered financial difficulties in connection with its plans.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Whose fault is that?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The financial difficulties were encountered before Mr. Fraser became Prime Minister. There is evidence that a considerable number of people want to live in country towns and country centres that are not far from Adelaide. Considerable planning and research are required to see whether a plan can be put in train

whereby many more houses can be built in existing townships and rural centres.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Name them.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If the honourable member could control himself, the business of the Council would be run much more satisfactorily. I want to explore the possibility of greater emphasis being placed on the building of houses by the South Australian Housing Trust in these country towns. I am not taking up the cudgels for one specific town or area, but I find when I speak to people from the country and when I have discussed this subject with members of Parliament representing rural districts in which these towns are situated that there is a strong demand for housing in these areas, and that demand is not being satisfied.

I believe that if this trend could be encouraged (reversing the accepted concept and the historical movement of population from the country to the metropolis) the target of containing Adelaide as a city of reasonable size might well be achieved realistically.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Where would these people find employment?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Employment is only one aspect. Some towns are not too far from Adelaide. I point out to the honourable member the way in which young people, especially, are seeking dwellings in country towns, obviously preferring that life-style. Either they find work in such country towns or return to their original point of work and bear the burden of commuting over a considerable distance. The honourable member can shake his head from side to side, but what I have said is a fact. The situation to which I have referred is accentuated by the cost of housing in metropolitan Adelaide. In many instances the price of country houses is less than the price of houses in metropolitan Adelaide. This could be an important factor.

Many young people and others find that the natural features of the country, the historical association of areas and the quietness, open space and rural atmosphere are far more attractive as a future living environment than what is offered in metropolitan Adelaide. I believe that a survey should be undertaken by the Government into this matter. This could lead to a situation in which our existing country towns could expand and people, through their own choice, could live in those towns rather than having to continue to live in metropolitan Adelaide.

Indeed, I believe (and I am not criticising the trust's plans, methods or decisions) that the matter should be dealt with by a separate board that could be known as the country housing board. The board could work in close liaison with councils in these towns and centres. Applicants for housing could initially make inquiries at local government offices. People wishing to build a new house, to buy or rent a house, or to make any inquiries whatever about housing in those towns could approach that office. The local government office in turn could liaise with the board, which would have as its sole duty the overall management and planning for increased country housing throughout South Australia.

Under this scheme the trust would be the constructing authority. If a council saw a need for, say, 20 houses in a town, it would apply to the board for such housing. The board would liaise with the council regarding the number of houses to be built, the standard required, the design, the specification and other relevant matters, and the board would then inform the trust that it required the houses to be built. If any dispute arose between the trust and the board, such a dispute could be adjudicated by the Minister.

Under this scheme the trust would not build any houses outside metropolitan Adelaide without the consent of the board. The board could comprise, say, an independent chairman, a representative of local government, a Housing Trust nominee, and perhaps a nominee from the Director of Planning. Not only would the acceptance of this scheme develop a trend to house more people from metropolitan Adelaide who might like to leave Adelaide and live in these country areas but it would also play an important part in encouraging local expansion, especially of industry within those particular towns. This point might come closer to answering the matter raised a moment ago by the Hon. Mr. Cornwall.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Will the honourable member give way?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I have always had respect for the Hon. Mr. Hill, but his position today seems to be rather extraordinary. It behoves the honourable member to explain several points. For example, he has stated that by encouraging people to go to these unspecified country towns industry would be created. Will the honourable member explain that? Also, can he explain whether he is advocating a great suburban sprawl from Gawler to Victor Harbor, because I cannot see any other result from the scheme advanced? Perhaps I am dense, but that is how I see the situation. In reply to my earlier interjection the honourable member stated that people who lived in these country towns could commute to the city, but then he went on to say that this scheme would result in increased country housing throughout South Australia. I should like the honourable member to clarify these points.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will try to explain further my scheme and I hope the comments I will make will encompass the points raised by the honourable member. Incidentally, I am not raising the matter with a view to hotly debating many details; I am simply promoting a concept that I believe to be in the best interests of metropolitan Adelaide, of the State, and of the people who, choosing freely, would prefer to live outside metropolitan Adelaide.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Can you be a little more precise?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: One can be when one goes further into the matter. Getting back to the matter of employment (and this matter was raised by the Hon. Mr. Cornwall on two occasions), I believe that a small excess of available housing in country towns would have the effect of assisting to expand commerce, industry and employment in those towns, whereas the present situation occurs when there is a scarcity of housing. I refer to a small industry in a town employing, say, 10 or 15 people. If an employer wants to expand his industry, and if there are no houses to spare in a town, he will have a much more difficult task in encouraging workmen to come to his town, especially if his situation is compared with a situation in which housing is readily available.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: What town?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Many towns in this State fall into this category.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Name one.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Nuriootpa is one. I do not know how many towns the honourable member wants me to name. I have made my suggestion, also, as a means of retaining people in country towns and of encouraging this trend, which exists and which I would like investigated

and researched. Many people in metropolitan Adelaide are showing an interest in living in country towns.

If a board of this kind were established and if its policies replaced the present policies whereby priorities are fixed and decisions are based on building trust houses in certain towns, there would be a greater expansion of our existing towns and centres. I am sure that would be in the best interests of the State. I ask the Government whether it will look into this matter and carry out some kind of investigation to see whether or not this may be a positive proposition whereby these country towns can be further expanded and the population growth of metropolitan Adelaide arrested somewhat.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Are you opposed to Monarto?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes, I am.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: If this scheme of yours does not work, what else have you in mind?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am still to be convinced that this scheme could not be developed into a major plan. It could be expanded much further to a point where the proposed board could concentrate on the major cities of this State, and this would be a further incentive for industry and commerce to establish or expand in these areas. I think the general plan of providing adequate housing for these major centres is a sensible and realistic alternative to Monarto.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Do you know the views of the Environmental Protection Council on Monarto?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not want to get into an argument on Monarto now. In my own time, I will bring down my views on Monarto.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Will the honourable member give way?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I wonder whether the honourable member who has just spoken briefly on development is prepared to deal with where development, in his terms, should be. Will he tell the Council which age group in the next 10 years, and continuing for the following 10 to 15 years after that, will make the heaviest demands on the areas of which he is speaking?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: First, newly married couples.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: No, before that; they could be newly married at 13 or 25.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I want to address myself to my own argument for one moment and not the sort of interjection that comes from members opposite. When an honourable member of this Council gets up and tries constructively, without any controversy or criticism of the Government, to put forward an argument, honourable members opposite, some of whom—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You used the term “dole bludger”.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: —have not been here very long, seem to think that their sole responsibility is to interject when nearly every sentence is uttered. I do not mind interjections, because they are all part of our life and we have to be realistic about it, but I see little benefit accruing to the procedures carried out in this Council if honourable members keep interjecting when non-controversial matters are being submitted for the consideration of the Council and the Government.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: On a point of order, Mr. President. If the Hon. Mr. Hill will look at *Hansard*, he will see that there are very few interjections from me; I take exception to what he has said. The only reason I was interjecting—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Under which Standing Order are you taking a point of order?

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Frankly, I am not trained in law, as the Hon. Mr. DeGaris is.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Will the honourable member withdraw that statement?

The PRESIDENT: We will deal with one thing at a time. The Hon. Mr. Cornwall has raised what he said was a point of order, but I fail to see that it was a point of order in the way he put it.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will not proceed any further with Monarto or anything else like that. I make my point from my own observation and suggest that it could be looked at by any Government that genuinely hopes to contain the growth of the city to the population limit most of us want.

The other matter, which I mentioned earlier, is the arts in this State. First, I refer to the New Opera of South Australia Incorporated. I asked a question yesterday (there has not been time for a reply) about the possible acquisition of Her Majesty's Theatre in Grote Street for this company, because I believe the company is making satisfactory progress. Its future could be very bright as a future State opera company in South Australia, but one of the ingredients of its future success must be that it be established in a permanent home.

It seems to me, from discussions I have had with people who are more expert in this area of opera and opera administration than I am, that Her Majesty's Theatre would be an ideal permanent home for a future State opera company. I hope the Government will, if the property is available for sale or if it is able to acquire it on a long-term lease, take action to achieve this goal. I am not saying, when I commend the New Opera, that all of its performances have been good. In fact, I hasten to say that some of them have not been to my taste, and I have heard criticism by others of its performances.

However, all companies of that kind have growing pains. I believe the new manager of the company, who has been appointed recently, is a most competent officer, and the members of the New Opera are particularly keen on their task. With Government assistance in securing Her Majesty's Theatre for New Opera and by other initiatives that the Government may take to assist the company, this area of the arts can be consolidated here in South Australia, and ultimately, although it may take a few years, we could have a State opera company of which we could all be proud.

When I mention initiative by the Government, I refer to one matter, and that is the liaison necessary between the South Australian Symphony Orchestra and the opera company, which requires first-class musicians and a first-class orchestra. It seems to me that the services of the symphony orchestra should be used for this company in the future, and this arrangement may need some leadership from the Government, or at least some discussion initiated by the Government, so that this arrangement between the New Opera company and the symphony orchestra can be achieved.

I realise, of course, that the question of finance, especially at this time, is serious when speaking of acquiring properties of this kind. Nevertheless, I believe there may be ways and means by which money for a purpose such as this could be found. I think the Government would be well advised to dispose of the site in Victoria Square which it is holding and which it has from time to time said is

being held for a hotel of international standard. The disposal of a site like that might be considered and the money funded into the acquisition of another property such as Her Majesty's Theatre, because I have grave doubts that anything will come of the proposal to build on that site in Victoria Square. Indeed, it is of interest to know that the site was originally purchased with a view to building offices there for State Public Service departments.

However, now buildings either have been erected or are being planned for erection behind the State Administration Centre building, and so there is no reason for providing for Public Service departments on the other site. There may be other means of financing the acquisition of this theatre, but the Government has to make up its own mind about that. I ask the Government to give New Opera of South Australia Incorporated every possible encouragement so that it can expand its activities. I am sure that, if that encouragement is given, we will be very proud of that organisation.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I thought you would have said a word for poets.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Is the Australian Opera Company receiving help from your Commonwealth colleagues?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: From what I have read (and I do not know a lot about it), it is in difficulty at present in funding its every-day expenditure. That is not the matter with which I was dealing, which was getting over the first barrier of establishing a home for New Opera. Her Majesty's would not only provide the theatre in which the company would perform but it also would provide adequate administrative offices, and at present the administrative offices of the company, which happen to be on Burbridge Road, opposite Theatre 62, are most inadequate and poor. From that aspect as well, action by the Government is needed.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Do you think the Federal Government should help the Australian Opera Company?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes, I think it should, as funds become available.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I suppose you can apply that to the South Australian Government, too.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes. I am not asking this Government to splash money around in matters of this kind. I ask it to be careful about its expenditure, but in the past it has been somewhat generous to the arts, and I commend it for that policy. I suggest the furtherance of that, not necessarily into the areas associated with the Festival Centre, but in regard to New Opera.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I will send over to Malcolm a copy of what you have just said.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I want the Minister, who is listening intently to me, to raise the matter in Cabinet, with his colleagues: I do not want him to get in touch with the Prime Minister. I now refer to the Art Gallery of South Australia, and I commend it for its high standard of exhibits and display. I commend the appointment of the new Director (Mr. Thomas), who, I believe, is an officer of very high qualifications and competence. I have the same opinion of the Assistant Director and the staff. I wish to bring one feature concerning the Art Gallery to the Government's notice. Unfortunately, the number of people who visit the Art Gallery is not large, yet there is an opportunity, with encouragement from the Government, for the gallery to bring many of its displays out into areas such as along the lawns of North Terrace, on the lawns in the plaza area behind the Bonython fountain in North Terrace, and even along the Rundle Street Mall.

Indeed, it may be possible to obtain the co-operation of some Rundle Street stores so that there can be permanent displays of paintings and exhibits of that kind in the windows facing Rundle Street, in the mall, or between Rundle Street and North Terrace. This would involve the construction of some display units on the lawns to which I have referred and in the mall, because many of these items cannot be open-air exhibits. However, such units could be designed so that their roofs would give ample protection from the sun. With sufficient window space provided, people would be able to see art forms arranged, supervised and managed by the Art Gallery not only in the gallery but also in other parts of the city close to it and where there is much pedestrian traffic flow.

I ask the Government to consider a proposal of this kind, because it is necessary to give opportunity for the Art Gallery to reach out from its present building. I say that because people at large seem reluctant to visit the Art Gallery. They seem reluctant to enter the building. That may be because of the traditional design and classical facade of the building. It does not seem to the ordinary man to be a welcoming edifice. Nevertheless, whatever may be the reason why people do not visit the gallery, I do not think it can be changed easily. If displays were arranged outside the gallery, I consider that a big improvement in interest in the gallery and its exhibits would be encouraged.

The displays along North Terrace during the Festival of Arts were interesting. They were contemporary items, of course, and they were admired by some people and criticised by others. This is all part of the history of art. This kind of display, together with the more contemporary items that the Art Gallery has and must now retain within its own walls, could be brought out to the people more so than is done now. This would be in the best interests of art generally and the Art Gallery. I do not think that the gallery could move in that direction without some initiative by the Government, particularly in relation to the area behind the Bonython fountain, which area, I presume, is controlled to some extent by the Museum Board. It would please me to see Art Gallery displays behind the window which now displays the whale bones in that area.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Have you written to the authorities about it?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No, but it always seems quaint to me to see whale bones on such a beautiful boulevard as North Terrace. Other people would not agree with me but, irrespective of that, other units could be built on that area of lawn, and many people who now seldom go to the Art Gallery building would look at such displays. This trend ought to be encouraged.

The next authority to which I refer briefly is the South Australian Film Corporation, I congratulate the corporation on its production *The Fourth Wish*. We in the Liberal Party support the corporation.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You would never have thought of it yourselves, though.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is an interesting point, because the corporation was not established until after a fairly lengthy investigation into its possibilities, and in our area of Government times were not as affluent as they have been in the past six or seven years. It is only when times change and this affluence is enjoyed by the people that these areas of art should be established and expanded.

I was about to make the point, before the Hon. Mr. Sumner interjected, that we support the future of this corporation, and trust that even better things will come

from it in the future than it has been able to achieve until now. Indeed, I hope that the corporation becomes the foremost film maker in Australia.

I commend the Government on the appointment of the new board, particularly on the choice of its Chairman. Also, I was pleased that Mr. Morris was recently appointed the corporation's new Director, when that office became vacant. It seems to me (and this is somewhat of an aside) that the corporation is not getting its fair share of publicity through the media which it deserves.

I hope that in future the media publicises more of the activities of the corporation than it has done in the past, because the public ought to know more of its activities. It is difficult to see ways and means of achieving such publicity without more co-operation from the media. I hope that it can continue and expand its role and work.

The corporation should be congratulated not only on its most successful recent full-length feature film, to which I have referred, but also on its documentary films, which are of the highest possible standard. On the night that *The Fourth Wish* was shown for the first time, a documentary produced by the corporation dealing with the Adelaide Festival of Arts was also shown. I am sure that all who viewed that documentary would agree that it was an exceptionally fine film. Also, the corporation has established an efficient and a comprehensive film library. This is yet another accomplishment on which it should be complimented.

The last matter to which I refer in this area of the arts deals with the site known as Carclew on Montefiore Hill. I understand that this property is owned jointly by the State Government and the Adelaide City Council. A report in the press a few weeks ago, coming from either an Adelaide city councillor or a meeting of that council, concerned a proposal to use this site for residential purposes. I want to express my strong opposition to such a proposal.

I hope that the Government will not be a party to any arrangement to build residential accommodation on that site. It is a magnificent site and, in the history of this city, I hope ultimately that some development can take place there that will be of assistance to or part of our cultural life or progress.

To use a magnificent site such as that for residential accommodation would be a great shame, and I ask the Government, if the Adelaide City Council is seriously considering such a move, to oppose the proposition, and to retain the present building on the site, which is being used for work associated with the arts. Ultimately, when there is a need, a building that would be to the best advantage of the whole Adelaide community could be erected there.

Montefiore Hill is the Acropolis of Adelaide, and those who will have the opportunity to plan development associated with, I hope, the arts will have a magnificent opportunity to do so on that site. However, to give it up at this stage or in the future for residential accommodation, when there are so many other sites that could be used for that purpose, would be a grave error indeed.

In supporting the motion, I have touched on some matters in which I have been interested recently. I believe there is a need from time to time for honourable members in this Council to raise matters of a general nature and to try to be constructive and make suggestions that they genuinely believe to be in the best interests of the State. In return, I hope that the Government will take some notice or credence of those suggestions. I support the motion.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: In rising to support the motion, I join with His Excellency the Governor and with other honourable members of the Council in expressing regret at the death of former members of the South Australian Parliament. I knew Bill MacGillivray from my earliest memory. He was a friend of my father, and I attended school with his children. He was a man of strong and independent views, and this was obvious from his being an Independent member of Parliament for 18 years. He always fought for what he believed to be right and, with his strong Scottish accent, which he never lost, he was a force to be reckoned with. He was indeed a good member for Chaffey.

Mr. Jim Ferguson was a colleague of mine in another place, and I got to know him well. He was a man of sincere Christian beliefs and principles, which he brought forward in his work. I did not know Mr. Hogben, but his record speaks for itself: he was a member of Parliament for five years, and for 26 years was Deputy Chairman of the Housing Trust. His service to the State was more than that given by many men. To the families of those three gentlemen, I offer my sympathy.

In the early part of his Speech, His Excellency the Governor referred to the exceptionally dry autumn and winter, and noted that good soaking rains were needed urgently. We now know that these soaking rains have not come, and that South Australia is in the grip of one of the worst droughts in its history.

This has come on top of one of the most severe financial periods ever faced by rural producers, particularly beef producers. This drought will in many cases be the last straw. It has always seemed ironic to me that, because some farmers have large estates, many people assume that they have large incomes. In the past, I have often spoken about how primary producers receive a poor percentage return on their capital outlay. I have quoted the case, which is typical of many, of a man with assets, land and equipment worth \$150 000 but with an income in two successive years of less than \$2 000. Of course, the position is much worse nowadays, because rural land has increased in value as a result of inflation. In fact, many rural people, far from having an income of \$2 000, have no income at all.

This does not mean that rural people do not have any outgoings; they still have to fertilise their land and sow crops, although this year many of those crops may not be harvested. In most cases there is also interest to be paid on loans. Above all, there are the unfair and unrealistic capital taxes charged by the State Government. I will not repeat details of increases in land tax and water rates, which have been referred to often. The Government will not accept that these taxes are sending a large section of private enterprise bankrupt. This side of Parliament has for years been seeking to relieve these people of the burden of these capital taxes and to remove many anomalies; when we are in Government, we will do so.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Give us some examples.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: This burden is a further imposition on top of many other burdens that farmers are bearing at present. The declaration of a large area of the State as a drought area and the assistance offered are moves for which we should be grateful. However, I question whether freight assistance for agistment is worthwhile. What is the point of having assistance to agist breeding stock when there is nowhere in the State where stock can be agisted? I urge the Government to keep

a daily watch to see whether more assistance is required and whether further areas should be declared drought areas.

Paragraph 6 of His Excellency's Speech refers to one of the most far-reaching and radical measures ever proposed by any Government. I therefore ask Parliament to examine its implications very carefully. It is proposed that the Government will legislate to provide that civil action for damages should not be taken in industrial disputes; such legislation will place one section of the community, trade unions and trade union officials, above the law. When any section of the community, whether it be the Chamber of Commerce and Industry or a trade union, is put in this position, we are fast approaching anarchy. This is something of which the Hon. Mr. Dunford would be well aware, and he had much to say about it yesterday. He also had much to say about the large salaries of Legislative Councillors. Perhaps he could use some of his large salary to repay the damages that the Government paid on his behalf a few years ago.

Later in paragraph 6 of His Excellency's Speech, we see how the Government and the Premier are coming under the control of left-wing trade unions: the Government intends to legislate for compulsory trade unionism. I realise that the actual wording is as follows:

The removal of the present limitation on the power of the Industrial Commission to provide in its awards for absolute preference to members of trade unions.

However, members opposite know perfectly well that preference to unionists is synonymous with compulsory unionism. This was borne out in the House of Assembly a few years ago when, following a series of questions, urgency motions and no-confidence motions, there came to light a letter from the Minister of Transport (Hon. G. T. Virgo) to the Highways Department, instructing that employees be encouraged to join the appropriate union by ultimatum, if necessary. What sort of ultimatum? It is obvious there can be only one sort of ultimatum: if you do not join a union, you do not have a job. The Government was too clever to sack people openly for this reason, but at that time there were industrial disputes in Government departments if there was a non-unionist there. The disputes continued until the person left or joined a union. This has happened in many Government departments.

My own belief is that, if a worker receives benefits as a result of the lawful work of any association or union, he should belong to that association or union. However, if he chooses not to so belong, he should have that right: there should be no compulsion. A recent poll by Roy Morgan for the Australian National University shows that 79 per cent of all unionists believe that there should be no ties with any political Party; 82 per cent of union members believe that union officials should be elected by secret ballot; 84 per cent of the people questioned believe that there are too many strikes.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Will the honourable member give way?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Yes.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Will the honourable member agree that the Federal Country Party-Liberal Party Coalition Government enacted amendments which provided for the true concept of compulsory unionism in the maritime industry, one of the very few areas where compulsory unionism is provided anywhere in Australia?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: That does not alter my view at all. I am still opposed to compulsory unionism, and I

always will be. I do not care whether a Liberal Government or a Labor Government is involved. The poll shows that 68 per cent of the people questioned believe that membership of trade unions should be voluntary; only 22 per cent believe that it should be compulsory; and 10 per cent were in the middle and did not know or did not care. In these circumstances, where is the pressure for compulsory unionism coming from? Obviously, it is coming from the extreme left wing of the Labor Party. I hope that, when the legislation comes before this Council, it will be remembered that most unionists do not want it.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: The measure will not be for compulsory unionism.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: The honourable member knows perfectly well that the Government's terminology in this connection is a complete euphemism: preference for trade unionists is synonymous with compulsory unionism. If two men apply for a job and one of them is a non-unionist, time after time he cannot get a job because a unionist applies at the same time. Surely he will be forced to join a union. This is compulsion by blackmail.

I was particularly interested in a reference in His Excellency's Speech to plans in connection with secondary education. The last five years has seen Governments in Australia of all political complexions spending unparalleled amounts of public money on education. Vast sums have been spent on all aspects of schools from bright new buildings, extensive research and innovations to the greatest cost of all, a large and highly paid army of teachers.

In South Australia the education expenditure has increased from \$137 200 000 in 1971-72 to \$307 900 000 in 1975-76. This is an increase in expenditure of almost 225 per cent. I believe that everyone should have the right to equal opportunity in education and, as such, I have no argument about such large sums being allocated to education, provided we are getting value for those funds.

However, there is increasing evidence that we are not getting value for our education dollar. Many leaders in education throughout Australia are seriously concerned at the present standard of education. Certainly, when there is a need to provide remedial classes in English at tertiary level there is a need for concern. The illiteracy problem in Australia is so serious that many English teachers are entering classrooms, unable to spell correctly or to express themselves adequately. How can they teach the subject?

I am not saying that this applies to the majority of teachers, because most teachers are dedicated people who love their work and who love children and show initiative and understanding of the need for change, but there is a growing number of teachers who are not so dedicated. They are lazy and have no concern for children. Indeed, they run like rabbits when the afternoon bell rings, and they take no interest whatever in extra-curricula school activities. A leading Melbourne psychologist maintains that this growing problem of illiteracy results from the ineptitude and incompetence of at least one teacher in every three.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Will the honourable member give way?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Yes.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Has the Hon. Mr. Carnie seen a report, published last Sunday in the *National Times*, containing an extensive report on a survey which explodes the myth of increasing illiteracy? It shows clearly that 14-year-olds today are substantially more literate than are members of the older generation.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: No, I did not see that article in last week's *National Times*. However, I did get much of my information from articles published last year in the *National Times*. These articles presented the opposite view.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I am merely bringing you up to date.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I certainly have an open mind on this matter. However, there are many articles on this matter, and many educationists believe strongly in the view I have advanced, but I will take up the honourable member's suggestion and read that article. The Melbourne psychologist to whom I have referred relates the illiteracy problem to the fact that many school leavers take up teaching only as their third or fourth choice. Either they are matriculants whose results are not good enough for them to undertake the glamour vocations of medicine, law, veterinary science or the applied sciences, or else they are attracted to the teaching profession by the fact that they are paid while they learn. True, such people comprise a minority but they are nevertheless there. These teachers have no interest in children, as they seek only a meal ticket and a job with short hours and long holidays. In his Speech the Governor stated:

My Government's aim of extending the scope of secondary education is being realised. As part of its policy two special music schools were successfully established at Brighton and Marryatville High Schools in 1976 and additional special interest centres are planned for 1977, including one school for languages. Over the past few years my Government has given increasing attention to the place of the performing arts in its education policy. A world authority in theatre-in-education was brought to Adelaide by the Education Department to work with 20 of our local drama teachers. At the present time, many children see at least three professional performances a year in school and at theatres and also take part in workshop activities. I see no reference there to any increased efforts to teach children to read, write, or add up, and this is where the education system is failing. It is not failing in regard to drama and music. Recently Sir Lewis Matheson, former Vice-Chancellor of Monash University, said that students failing in tertiary education did so because of the growing inadequacy of their high school training.

Only a small percentage of secondary students proceed to undertake tertiary studies, yet all students have to enter a highly competitive world to earn a living. Honourable members will probably have seen a report in the *Bulletin* of May 15, 1976, by Peter Samuel entitled "Australia's Education Scandal: We're turning out millions of dunces". In his article Mr. Samuel refers to two studies into the problem of illiteracy in schools and, what is worse, the frightening inadequacies in simple arithmetic. Mr. Samuel referred to one study specifically, as follows:

The study titled *Literacy and Numeracy in Australian Schools* being published in two volumes by the Australian Council for Educational Research is the more elaborate. It has tested a large sample of almost 13 000 Australian schoolchildren in normal schools and normal classes, deliberately omitting the many "special" and "remedial" schools and classes where the recognised handicapped and defective children are located. It was a survey of ordinary, normal schoolchildren in ordinary average classes. Half were 10-year-olds, near the end of primary schooling, the other half 14-year-olds near the end of compulsory education.

I recommend this article to all honourable members, especially as the Hon. Mr. Cornwall did not see this report, which contains much interesting material, although I do not intend to refer to all the examples given. However, concerning 10-year-old children, 8 per cent of those tested were unable to fill in the missing letters in an alphabet exercise, 27 per cent could not divide 56 by 7,

13 per cent could not subtract 9 from 17, and 9 per cent could not add 9 and 6. Of the 14-year-olds, 5 per cent could not multiply 5 by 6, 10 per cent could not use a ruler to measure length, 20 per cent could not say how much three-quarters of a cubic metre of concrete would cost given the information that it cost \$24 a cubic metre. These tests involved 14-year-old children who can legally within the next 12 months go out into the work force.

These children have to go out into the world and we are the ones who are failing them: the adults, the teachers and the Governments of this country. Education has involved much experimentation, and in many ways this is a good thing. Certainly, no-one wants to go back to the age of belting knowledge into children through the use of the cane, but it appears that there is a trend towards excessive experimentation.

Educationists seem to embrace new ideas as solutions to problems. We have seen open schools and the "look and say" approach to teaching reading. The direct result of that teaching method is a disaster, as no-one can spell any more. I refer also to the new maths, which is another disaster and to the practice of allowing children to please themselves as to what classes they attend and what they learn. All these ideas and other ideas have been embraced by educationists with all the intelligence and forethought of a flock of sheep.

Earlier in my speech I was critical of the place given to music and drama in schools. I am not against these subjects in normal circumstances, but there is a basic minimum of knowledge that must be taught. I refer to literacy, numeracy and the awareness of historical time and geographical place. Without these basic understandings no-one can fully take his or her place in the community.

Normally, I am opposed to learning by rote, but I believe it to be essential for the basics, especially for learning mathematical tables and spelling lists. All honourable members would recall their primary school days and would remember the time they spent reciting mathematical tables and doing spelling tests, and most of us know our tables and spelling lists, which is more than can be said of most students today. Today, too many teachers say that it does not matter how students write and spell so long as the students are able to convey their ideas.

Teachers no longer correct spelling and grammatical errors, saying that teaching grammar rules tends to destroy creativity and bore children. However, when teachers say this, who is bored, the teachers or the children? A few years ago, I heard the head of a primary school at a prize-giving I was attending congratulating all children who had won prizes, and he hoped "that they all did as good next year"! What hope have children of learning when this is the example they are set?

To learn any subject, and particularly English or mathematics, certain basic knowledge is necessary. I feel that today children are being taught without those basics. It is only when they have learnt the basics of spelling, grammar, etc., in English and tables and formulae in mathematics that the children can be free to explore these subjects more fully, because they have the basic knowledge. Without it, they can never explore a subject, always remaining ignorant of that subject.

I do not know about other honourable members of this Chamber but, when I was at school, we did not have time for art, drama, and music: we were too busy learning those things that we would need to earn a living in later life.

That does not mean that we did not do these things but we did them extra-curricularly and did not enjoy them any the less for that.

I was interested to read of a school in Victoria where a particular class was studying Ned Kelly in Australian history. They made a suit of armour in the sheet metal shop, visited Glenrowan and did group activities, including film-making and creative writing. I am sure they all knew a lot about Ned Kelly, but he is only a part of Australian history. The logical development is that, when children study Burke and Wills, they will visit the Gulf of Carpentaria, or take a trip down the Murray River when they are studying Sturt.

All these things are a fascinating part of our history but unfortunately we do not have time to spend on this sort of detail. I was reading in yesterday's paper that it had been suggested by a visiting educationist that, to improve reading, schools should use the sporting pages and the backs of breakfast cereal packets. What is wrong with Hans Christian Andersen or Dickens or Somerset Maugham, depending on what level of reading we are dealing with? I read of one school recently which was allowed freedom of choice in the English curriculum, and it replaced Shakespeare with David Niven's autobiography *The Moon's a Balloon*. It was a delightful easy to read book and I enjoyed it very much, but it certainly cannot give the insight into the English language that Shakespeare and other great writers can.

What frightens me most is that now we have many teachers in our schools who themselves have been taught in this way. It is not their fault; it is part of the system. But these young teachers will be with us for the next 40 years, and countless generations of schoolchildren will have the same faults taught to them. I contend that we have tried to move too fast in education; I believe that the experimentalists are feeding their own egos, forgetting that in their experiments they are dealing with the minds and the future of children. Let us get back to the basics of education—in the hackneyed phrase, "the 3 R's". Children now are no different from those of one, two, or 10 generations ago. They need and respect discipline, and I believe they will respond to it. Art, drama, and music are fine and, if a student intends to make any of these things his career, they must obviously become very important; but for most of us they must always remain secondary, things to give us enjoyment in our leisure.

There were many things in the Governor's Speech upon which I could comment, but it would take far too long now. It is best to deal with most of them when the appropriate Bill is brought before us. I close my remarks by mentioning one of the greatest white elephants ever conceived in South Australia—Monarto. In his address, the Governor said:

My Government is still firm in its view that the development of the new city of Monarto should go forward.

I am at a loss to understand the reason for this stubborn insistence on continuing with a concept that is doomed to failure. There has already been one change of name, from Murray New Town to Monarto; I suggest a further change from Monarto to Dunstan's Folly. In a democracy, we cannot say to industry, "We will build a city and you must go there." If industry finds suitable places to set up business, a city will grow as a result of that; but it is not possible or sensible to try to do it the other way. The Hon. Mr. Cornwall, when the Hon. Mr. Hill was speaking and was asked to give way, criticised what the Hon. Mr. Hill was saying about industry growing as a result of town

growth. That is what I am saying—that industry will grow when there is something to feed on. We cannot build a city and expect industry to go to it. A city must evolve from a need, and I believe that is what the Hon. Mr. Hill was trying to say.

The Government has repeatedly said that there are industries that have expressed an interest in Monarto. I challenge the Government to name those industries. I am always prepared to admit when I am wrong. If the Government can name some industries, I shall be happy to admit that I am wrong, but I do not think I am wrong on this occasion. So the Government cannot force industries to go to Monarto, but there is one section of the community that it can force—its own employees. This is how Monarto will be populated, by saying to people in Government departments, “Go to Monarto or you will not have a job.” Talk about compulsion! This is as bad as compulsory unionism.

The Public Service has already expressed its feelings on this, apparently without success. The Government believes in worker participation (the Premier has often said so), so he should allow employees to participate in the decision on whether or not they should be made to go to Monarto. I know the Government will not do this, because it knows the answer it will get.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: The boot is on the other foot.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Yes, very much so.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: You're talking like a true blue. How do you change from the Liberal Movement to the Liberal Party so quickly?

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. R. A. Geddes): Order! The honourable gentleman is doing very well.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: If any honourable member has heard me support Monarto, I should like him to tell me when. I was opposed to Monarto when I was in another place.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: But you opposed the Liberals last year.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I am opposed to Monarto and always have been. I am not talking about Parties.

The Hon. I. E. Dunford: You were elected as a member of another Party. How do people feel about your changing your colours? You are speaking so strongly with a Liberal mind.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I am saying I have never supported Monarto. If the Hon. Mr. Dunford cannot get that through his head, I feel sorry for him.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: I feel sorry for you, because you have changed your colours.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I do not know how much Monarto has cost so far, but it is costing \$1 000 000 a year to keep it going. In today's paper, we read of Mr. Ray Taylor, the former Chairman of the Monarto commission, who resigned because, in his own words, he had too little to do on that commission, being given the golden handshake of \$100 000—a man who is honest enough to say there is not enough work on the Monarto commission to employ him there. I challenge the Government and plead with it to admit it is wrong in its concept and timing, to cut its losses and get out of Monarto, this monument to one man's ego, which is all it has turned out to be. I support the motion.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I welcome the opportunity to speak in the Address in Reply debate, because it is perhaps the one really useful day of the year for a Government back-bencher in this Chamber. Government members

can freely express their views without fear that, when they are in mid-stream, they may have to repudiate something or retract something because the members on the other side are doing their work amending or emasculating our Bills and, of course, sometimes we finish up with half a loaf being better than none at all.

This is certainly an opportune time to review the first year in the life of this Parliament. It has been both a momentous and tragic time in the history of this country. It has touched the lives of all citizens in a deep and irreversible way. I did not intend to canvass the propriety or impropriety of the Governor-General's action on November 11, but, since the Hon. Mr. DeGaris yesterday presented himself as the official apologist for this man, I have decided to mention the matter briefly. I could do no better than refer, from memory, to a statement by Prof. Don Aitken, professor of political science at the Macquarie University, as reported in the *National Times* on July 12. In the statement, Prof. Aitken said that the propriety or otherwise of Sir John Kerr's action on November 11 will ultimately be decided by the historians, lawyers and political scientists, those who write the history books. He goes on to say that, on present indications, Sir John will almost certainly get a very bad press.

A few weeks ago, when the Hon. Mr. Cameron was speaking in this Chamber on matters that had been raised by the Hon. Mr. Foster, he suggested that events in Canberra had nothing to do with the South Australian Parliament. Such a statement was surely stupid, naive or mischievous. There is nothing to suggest that the Hon. Mr. Cameron is naive (although I believe that many years ago he was), and certainly he is not stupid. Therefore, I can only suggest that he is mischievous. Probably, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris would agree with the Concise Oxford Dictionary definition of mischievous: “Given to acts of playful malice or annoyance.” On past performances by the Hon. Mr. Cameron, that is not a bad description. I refer now to events since December 13, 1975.

One of the immediate results of the electoral polarisation of December in South Australia was that the men of unbounded principle in the Liberal Movement had to find a new set of unbounded principles. The chill winds of electoral disaster very rapidly caused a premature winter of discontent for the trendy conservatives. With the instinct of great survivors and steeped in the conservative traditions of “realpolitik”, they moved with indecent haste to return to the safety of the Liberal Party. All the bitter recriminations of recent times were set aside as the deal was arranged, without pride, without shame, and without honour. It is obvious from the Hon. Mr. Carnie's performance this afternoon that he has taken a quick refresher course in union bashing.

Let me turn, Sir, to events on the national political scene. The Labor Party in Government between 1972 and 1975 was accused of being a Socialist Government with a big “S”. This was a thinly veiled attempt to equate it in some way to communism. By any reasonable tests, however, it was never really a socialist Government, either big or small “S”, in the normally accepted definition of the term. Certainly, it attempted to redistribute incomes, and here I must pay tribute to Clyde Cameron for his great efforts on behalf of the working-class people of Australia. There was no real attempt, however, to redistribute wealth or property. It attempted to control ownership of our natural resources, but I would suggest this was prompted more by a spirit of nationalism rather than socialism.

It was a Government of reform. It was a populist Government, but, given the constraints of performing in a

mixed economy, with a hostile Senate and with a horse and buggy Constitution, it is nonsense to suggest that it was anything more than that. Personally, I look forward to the day when democratic socialism will be understood and practised in this country. Given our history of gross materialism and conservatism, however, it is still unfortunately a long time away.

Ultimately, the Hayden Budget of August, 1975, while initiating widespread reform of personal income tax structures, had many of the marks of a conservative Treasury on it. It initiated a large transfer of resources from the public to the private sector. It took account of the twin shibboleths of wage restraint and greater profits on capital investment. It was an orthodox document, in a time of economic recession.

There were signs as early as October last year that, because of Government initiatives, our fragile and sick economy was on the mend, and so it should have been. The economies of all our major trading partners have been on the mend for quite some time, particularly Japan and the United States. Even allowing for a time lag in the normal cycle, we should by now be in a recovery phase. Unfortunately (indeed, tragically) this just is not happening under Fraser, Lynch, Anthony and Street. Industry is still working at two-thirds of its capacity or less. All the Fraser Government's strategies (if they could really be called that) are pitched towards winning an election in 1978; 1976 apparently does not matter, and people do not matter. Everyone must suffer, industrialists and workers alike, while these megalomaniacs handle Government with all the finesse of an elephant on ice. A large unemployment pool, the traditional economic tool of conservative Governments in Australia, is encouraged and expanded.

It is often said that there is little difference in practice, as opposed to ideology, between Labor and the L.C.P. in Government. To disprove this assertion, I would like to contrast the areas of greatest difference between Conservative and Labor Governments. If we accept that Labor Governments operating within the framework of a capitalist economy and the constraints of an outmoded and inappropriate Constitution and in office, but not in power, can ultimately only be Governments of a mildly reforming character, what are the features which distinguish them from L.C.P. Governments? In other words, is there any point in changing Governments from time to time? Is there any real difference between Conservative Governments and Labor Governments in the Australian situation?

To follow my argument through, I would like to put the following points for consideration by this Council and for the benefit of members opposite I point out that, with the exception of defence and foreign policy, which for obvious reasons are the responsibility of the national Government, my remarks apply equally to the State scene. It is in fields such as electoral justice, equality of educational opportunity, welfare, foreign policy, health, justice and accessibility to justice for all of the people and income redistribution that Labor Governments, both State and national, can lay real claim, even with the constraints previously mentioned, and even given that they operate in these limited areas with limited powers, that they can do much better than Conservative Governments.

It is also in these fields that we encounter most obstruction. Many of the Bills aimed at reform in these areas were rejected by the present Federal Government when in Opposition. Those programmes that they could not reject are now being actively dismantled, programmes and initiatives that should have stood forever as the proud achievements of the Whitlam Government. These acts of

destruction are the real tragedies of 1976. The relentless return to the *status quo ante*, without regard to the human cost, without regard to the destruction of hopes and aspirations, is the real evil of the present Federal Government.

The Whitlam Government came to power at the end of 1972 with great enthusiasm but with no experience, of course, because Labor had been in Opposition for 23 years. It was inevitable that it would make mistakes. These were compounded by a major economic recession throughout the Western world. No-one denies the mistakes, but they were far outweighed by the reforms. It is ironic to consider that, in a better economic climate and without a hostile Senate, the Whitlam Government could have been the most popular national Government since Federation, just as I believe the Dunstan Government is on the State scene. Let us examine just what this Government attempted or achieved. I refer, first, to electoral justices, which is a subject dear to the heart of the Hon. Mr. DeGaris.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: And understood by him.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: That is debatable. Unlike their South Australian counterparts, some of whom used to display some propriety some of the time, the Liberal and Country Party senators resisted all attempts to obtain electoral reform and justice. What was the fate of the various Bills in this area? There was redistribution with a tolerance reduced to 10 per cent, which was defeated.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What has that got to do with electoral justice?

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: If the Hon. Mr. DeGaris does not understand after all his years of experience in this place, I am afraid that I am not here to instruct him. What was the fate of proposed legislation for simultaneous elections for both Houses so that they might clearly represent the prevailing will of the people? It was defeated. There was also legislation to impose realistic ceilings on spending by candidates and to require disclosure of donations to political Parties which was also defeated, thrown out.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What has that to do with electoral justice?

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I will not respond to the Leader's continual interjections, because I consider them to be completely unintelligible. I refer next to public funding of election campaigns on the basis of the percentage vote obtained by the Party at the previous election, which was also defeated. Anything and everything that would have strengthened Parliamentary democracy in Australia was thrown out. Anything and everything that would perpetuate electoral injustice, financial advantage and gerrymandered electorates was clung to with all the desperation of a drowning man.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Anyone who tried to kill Parliamentary democracy more than Gough Whitlam did would be hard to find.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Honourable members opposite may well shrug their shoulders and look smug. Their colleagues in Canberra played a ruthless numbers game, and they won. But they should not fool themselves.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Everyone seemed to think that they did all right.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: The gross impropriety of the Governor-General's actions was not vindicated by the results of the poll conducted on December 13. They are two entirely separate issues.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: They're completely immoral, the lot of them.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I turn now to education. The establishment of the Schools Commission was the most significant thing to happen to education in this country for 100 years. For the first time the twin spectres of State aid and States' rights were laid to rest.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is too much audible conversation. Some of the remarks are completely out of order.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: No-one can deny that more was achieved in the schools of the nation in those three years than at any other time in our history. The iniquitous system of per capita grants is now behind us. The goal of equality of educational opportunity can be achieved. We can only hope that even Malcolm Fraser will realise the political repercussions of any attempt to resurrect it. In the meantime, we await the Federal Budget with trepidation. Honourable members opposite may well ask what is the point of going over the same old ground and say that they have heard it all before: "We won, you lost."

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: That's right.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: But it is not as simple as that. The people of Australia have a right to know what the Fraser Administration is doing to them, and we on this side of the House have a duty to bring these matters to the notice of the people in every public forum that is available to us, and we will continue to do so. Certainly, the electorate is not being informed by the metropolitan press. If the country was being put back on its feet by the assault on the pay packets of wage and salary earners, it is possible that we might accept it, although I doubt it.

However, the plain fact (and I would like the Hon. Mr. Dawkins to ponder this) is that there is no section of the community, with the possible exception of a handful of wealthy graziers, that is not worse off now, both in terms of Government service and in real money terms than it was nine months ago.

Let us examine the field of social security. The Whitlam Government promised to index pensions to average weekly earnings. It promised, and achieved, a level of single pensions equal to 25 per cent of average weekly earnings. Already, the basis for pension indexation has been changed to the more niggardly cost price index and meagre pension increases deferred in the name of economic responsibility. It is no wonder that there will be more "oncours" in this Government than there have been since the time of Bruce.

For the first time, under Labor single and supporting mothers were acknowledged to exist. The aged, the infirm, disadvantaged migrant groups, the deprived and the underprivileged were all given some sort of chance in the so-called affluent society. Unemployment benefits were nudged upwards, not over the poverty line but at least towards it. The Australian Assistance Plan was developed so that there was a real sense of community involvement, and in most cases far greater value for each welfare dollar than the bureaucrats could ever deliver. What curious and perverse logic it is to withdraw funds from something that has already overcome its initial problems and is now functioning so well. But apparently life was not meant to be easy! There was great propaganda to be had from the small percentage of welfare recipients who were dishonest. A new and terrible expression "dole bludgers" was used with devastating effect on the recipients and the community at large. Unemployment benefits became a

social stigma. Widespread destitution is now apparently more desirable than isolated dishonesty.

Our new directions in foreign policy earned us respect for the first time since the halcyon days 30 years ago, when Bert Evatt distinguished himself on the world scene. The sycophantic approach that prevailed from Menzies to McMahon was put behind us. A realistic assessment was made of the world situation and the small but significant role that we could play. Diplomatic relations were established with one-quarter of the world's population in China. Relations with our South-East Asian neighbours were better than they had been at any time in our history. We sought, and were given, a significant role in assisting countries of the Third World.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Fraser used to reckon you were a communist if you went to China.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: That's true.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But he couldn't get there quickly enough himself.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: The White Australia policy, a source of shame and embarrassment, was buried forever. To the extent that our shameful record in Vietnam could ever be erased, we disengaged our troops with due haste and promised that such heinous expeditions would never be repeated under a Labor Administration. But within a few short months of their election the Conservative Parties have destroyed the new initiatives. The Russians are coming again!

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They have been coming since goodness knows when. Fort Largs is still there, and its cannons have never been fired.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Indonesia and Malaysia are quite rightly incensed by the remarks of Fraser on his China trip. The Chinese are at best bemused by it all: this remarkable foreigner who tries to influence Russian-Chinese relations for domestic political advantage! Despite the fact that Mr. Anthony, in his venture into foreign affairs, assures us that the Russians are quite on side, informed sources suggest that, to say the least, they, like Queen Victoria, are not amused. The skeletons of the Red Peril, the threat from the North, are with us again. We are on a not-too-nostalgic trip back to John Foster Dulles, McCarthy and the cold war. Can the electorate be deceived by such a performance? It is not only clearly inept but disgraceful. One may well ask: will the real Minister for Foreign Affairs please stand up?

Let me turn now to health. In the field of health insurance, Medibank must stand as the greatest single achievement of the Whitlam Administration. It was conceived during the sixties and carefully nurtured through its gestation to become a reality in 1974. Nothing approaches it as a greater monument to social justice in our time. Nothing was debated with greater passion, nothing was canvassed more widely with the electorate, and nothing received greater public endorsement than Medibank. It cannot and must not be dismantled.

No-one has ever pretended that Medibank was a free system of health insurance. It cannot be. What it is and must remain is a universal health insurance scheme financed by the taxpayers of Australia according to their ability to pay. There were clearly some areas, particularly with regard to pathology services, which needed amending. But, overall, nothing could be more efficient, just or equitable. And yet it has been distorted and misrepresented more than any other matter in contemporary Australian life. It is time that this matter was resolved forever and, if the Fraser Government continues to ignore

the warnings of the labour movement and most Australians, as it apparently intends to do, it has scant regard not only for its broken election promises but also for the well-being of Australia.

The Hon. Anne Levy: They have made a real Medi-muddle.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I am unable to follow the new scheme fully. I tried to take out some figures from the front page of yesterday's *News* to show the great injustice of the Medi-muddle! It is referred to in this way in an editorial in the *News*. Under the new schemes, as near as I can gather with my pocket calculator, for a minimum cover for my wife, myself and family, we will pay 1.3 per cent of our taxable income, and, for a full private cover, on our combined income, 1.8 per cent. Let us consider the average worker with a taxable income of \$120 a week. Of course, average incomes are a bit like average rainfall. I recall the time when I was in West Queensland and I said to an old grazier, "What is the average rainfall?" He replied, "It is 10in., but we never bloody well get it." On \$120 a week of taxable income, the figure is 2.5 per cent of the person's taxable income for a minimum Medibank cover—the compulsory levy. It would be 4.7 per cent for intermediate cover, and God knows what it would be for full private cover. What man or woman could consider it?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Make the same kind of comparison in connection with bus fares.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: That is completely inappropriate. In connection with any concept of social justice (and one does not have to be a social democrat: one only has to have a few brains and a little compassion) one has to rely on progressive income tax.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What percentage of your income do you pay for meat?

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I am talking about social justice. No-one who sits in this Chamber and who has any humanitarian instincts at all (and I have doubts about members opposite), regardless of whether he be a Christian, a humanist, or anything else, could fail to go along with a system of progressive taxation, and that is what this Medibank debate is all about. It is about people paying for health insurance according to their income, according to their capacity to pay. If one does not accept that philosophy, one is rejecting the most basic concept of social justice.

One of the unfortunate casualties of the great Medibank debate has undoubtedly been community health care. Governments have been so preoccupied with the health insurance debate that they have had little time to examine the many unfulfilled needs or even to ponder what their role should be. Because of the stresses of modern society, there is undoubtedly an increasing incidence of psychosocial disfunction in the community. Some efforts have been made to grasp this nettle.

The Whitlam Government appointed a Royal Commission on Human Relations, and a start has been made in establishing community health centres. Further, in South Australia some excellent work has been done by the Community Welfare Department. Also, the Foundation for Multi-Disciplinary Education in Community Health, under the chairmanship of Professor Murrell, has been set up. However, this is still largely a talking area, rather than a doing area.

In the field of community mental health care, our success in preventive medicine and health education could be described as very limited indeed. The role of public health authorities is still largely traditional, institutionalised and

conservative. Public health still largely devolves about provision of general and mental hospital facilities and some supervision and control of private medical practice. In the latter field, I suspect that, with its oligarchical and hierarchical structure, the medical profession, for better or worse, remains very much its own master. If it wishes to control its own destiny, it must surely evolve a far more democratic and efficient system of monitoring the competence and ethics of its members. I stress that ethics is not simply a matter of using correct referral techniques and not criticising colleagues. These criticisms have been made to me by younger members of the profession. The view has been expressed frequently to me that older graduates, say, from the 1940's and 1950's (people of my own vintage) are perhaps not keeping up as well as they should be with the knowledge explosion in medicine and other disciplines. Certainly, these professions will have to look at this matter closely because, if the members of a profession do not ensure the competence of their fellows, perhaps someone else will have to do it for them.

At this stage I should like to acknowledge the competence of, and pay a tribute to, the Public Health Department for its contributions to date. The successful school dental health scheme is a great credit to the department and provides a model for other States. However, community health is a co-ordinated multi-disciplinary effort and it remains largely an academic and abstract concept throughout Australia. Indeed, it is a vast and challenging field, and I should like to illustrate the point by quoting from an article by Drs. White and Mitchell published in the *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 1976, Vol. 11, No. 2, as follows:

To halt the drift towards the "healer" role, two major changes are required in the administration of mental health facilities. Firstly, emphasis and commitment need to be given to the goal of promoting normal psychosocial development and preventive intervention. To date matches the commitment and resource allocation given to remedy. Secondly, promotion and administrative responsibility for planning and resource allocation need to be assigned more widely to those concerned with psychosocial development and preventive intervention. To date administrative responsibility for community mental health facilities has resided almost exclusively within the hands of the medically trained. While community mental health centres will continue to require access to hospital beds, and the prescription of medication, there is absolutely no reason why administrative responsibility for centres should not be open and awarded to appropriately qualified psychologists, health education officers, social workers or even the odd lawyer whose focus is on prevention rather than remedy.

Surely this approach has special application to the adolescents in our community. Despite the best efforts presently made there is still an increase in juvenile crime, and an ever increasing use of narcotic and psychotropic drugs. Drug abuse is a problem that is little understood and no-one at present can readily define what percentage of our resources should be devoted to its investigation or prevention. There are many questions but few answers. Yet it is undoubtedly one of the great challenges of the last quarter of the twentieth century. I pose the following questions. What are the basic reasons underlying the increasing use of both soft and hard drugs by the 15 to 25-year-old age group in our community?

Have we anywhere near enough competent psychotherapists to handle the increasing problems created by the psychosocial pressures of modern life? Does the medical profession comprehend the problems? Is it equipped to handle them, and is there sufficient liaison or consensus between, for example, the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment)

Board and private practitioners? I think probably not. Is society's attitude of self-righteousness justified in view of the ever increasing consumption of alcohol and tobacco and the distressing consumption of valium, mogadon, mandrax and "Bex", to name just a few? Also, in view of the widespread use of cannabis and the relative ease with which it can be grown, is it reasonable to prosecute people for possession except in quantities obviously designed for dealing? Further, should its use be decriminalised or perhaps even legalised? I do not know.

Is there a chain of what Dr. Millner calls "multiple drug use" and, if there is, does the use of "pot" expose its users to the hazards of hard drugs despite the fact that it is not physically addictive? How effective would balanced and sensible education on these matters be in our schools? Perhaps we start in this field far too late. And without wanting to suggest an Orwellian concept, should we not be able to screen the unstable, disturbed or depressed children at a much earlier stage? Stress should be placed on prevention. When we talk about school health services, no-one has any objection to vaccination programmes for children, for sight or hearing tests or for dental health care.

I wonder whether it will not be practical in the future to devote much of our effort to the early detection of mental health problems in our schools. There are many unstable, disturbed or depressed children in our community, and perhaps we should be screening them at a much earlier age with the aim of seeking prevention rather than finding a cure.

Should we devote a much greater proportion of our resources to creating bigger and more effective drug squads? Can narcotic trafficking be eliminated? These are but a few of the questions to which we have to find the answers and we must find them in the near future. Certainly, two things are required immediately. The first is to depoliticise the debate, and I am sure the Hon. Mr. Hill would agree with this point. The second is to take these questions out to the public, out into the open, and involve everyone in wide-ranging discussions, free from bigotry, closed minds or preconceived ideas, which are based on emotion rather than reason. I appeal to members on both sides not to play politics with this extremely important and serious matter.

Politicians, the media, public health authorities, the medical and para-medical professions, social workers, educators, parents, and the community at large all have an important role to play. And now is the time to play it.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

WATER RESOURCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to give some real power to the Water Resources Appeal Tribunal set up by division III of Part II of the principal Act in dealing with appeals under section 64 of the Act. Under the principal Act a licence is granted or refused by the Minister on the advice of the appropriate advisory committee. A right of appeal to the tribunal against the refusal to grant a licence, *inter alia*, is given by section 64. The power of the tribunal in the principal Act is to uphold or quash the decision appealed against. There is not the power, given

to most appellate bodies, to substitute its own decision for that appealed against. This means that even after a successful appeal the Minister could maintain his refusal or at any rate could certainly first grant the licence and then revoke it.

Thus there can arise the ridiculous situation that an applicant can go to the trouble and expense of an appeal, win the appeal and then lose because the Minister can again refuse or at any rate can certainly grant the licence and immediately revoke it.

This, in practice, makes the tribunal almost useless. If an appellate tribunal is set up, it should not be mere window-dressing but should have some power. One would have thought that the administration would in fact act on the decision of an appeals tribunal, but the case of *G. H. Michell & Sons (Australia) Proprietary Limited v Minister of Works* (judgment of the Full Court on an interlocutory application given on March 28, 1974) is an example of a case where the applicant successfully appealed to the tribunal and still had his application not granted. He won but he still lost.

That case was brought under the now repealed Underground Waters Preservation Act, 1969-1975, but the appeal provisions are similar. It should be noted that the old Underground Waters Preservation Act, 1959-1966, did give the appeals tribunal the power to substitute its directions for the decision appealed against. I am conscious of the need to prevent an appeals tribunal from becoming in effect the policy-making body. Therefore, the method I propose in this Bill is to empower the tribunal to quash the decision appealed against with such directions as to the tribunal seem necessary or desirable, and to provide that the Minister shall comply with any such directions.

While I think it is generally undesirable to allow an appeal from merely administrative decisions of a Minister, the principal Act gives the Minister some discretions which go beyond mere administration and which are properly the subject of appeal. In any event, it has long been accepted in legislation on this subject that there should be an appeals tribunal. In such a case, the decision of the tribunal should have some real effect.

I mention that the governing council of South Australian Fruitgrowers and Market Gardeners Incorporated, which is very interested in water resources, has stated by letter that it approves of the principle of this Bill and considers that the Minister should comply with any direction given by the tribunal.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 is the operative clause. It repeals section 64 of the principal Act and substitutes a section 64 which enables the appeals tribunal to give directions upon quashing a decision and directs the Minister to give effect to such directions.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Electoral Act, 1929-1973. Read a first time.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It requires the Electoral Commissioner within three months of the return of the writ in any election to publish in the *Gazette* the votes for the last two unexcluded candidates, so that in each electorate where more than two candidates stood for election the allocation of preferences will be

undertaken, whether any candidate has 50 per cent plus one of the votes or not, at any stage of the count. It has become the practice of many political writers and political scientists to assess after each election what is termed a two-Party preferred vote, so that the public may be informed of the overall State support for the Government or the Opposition.

For example, in the last election, the two-Party preferred vote in South Australia is given by most writers as being 49.2 per cent for the Government and 50.8 per cent for the Opposition. But to produce this figure, a determination has to be made, in many cases, by estimating the probable flow of preferences. Requiring the count to continue will substantially reduce speculation and will produce a reasonably accurate figure for the State-wide support on a two-Party preferred basis. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 125 of the principal Act, adding to that section new subsections (14) and (15), requiring the Electoral Commissioner to publish in the *Gazette* the votes attributed to the final two candidates in each electorate.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER secured the adjournment of the debate.

FRUIT AND PLANT PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Fruit and Plant Protection Act, 1968. Read a first time.

GOLD BUYERS ACT REPEAL BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from July 27. Page 169.)

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I find very little to talk about on this Bill. It seems that the present Act was introduced in 1916.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: A colleague of yours should have prefaced his speech with the same remark.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will cease interrupting.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Thank you, Mr. President. I did not know what he was saying anyway. The Act was amended in 1967, the only amendment at that time being that a Chinaman could apply for a gold buyer's licence. Until that time the Chinese were excluded from having a gold buyer's licence. That seems to be the only amendment made to the Act in its long history, and I should like to know why the Act is being repealed. From the information I can gather, there seems to be a need for the State gold buying laws to be amended as a consequence of a decision made by the International Monetary Fund Commission in Jamaica last year. As a result of that organisation's declaring that gold no longer was a necessary means of currency, the gold sellers of Australia were then entitled to place their gold on the world market. However, the other States seem to have amended, not repealed, their legislation. The Perth Mint, in Western Australia, handles 90 per cent of Australia's gold, and in that State legislation similar to that already drafted in Victoria is being introduced.

I should like the Minister, when he replies, to say why the State law has been repealed instead of being amended to meet the necessary requirements. True, South Australia produces little gold. In fact, I think we have only one

field operating effectively at present. That is just out of Yunta, where a little gold is found, and the Peterborough battery is the only one that crushes. Some prospecting is being done at Glenloth and Tarcoola. I have an old friend who is at present looking for Lassiter's reef, so we could have some new development in gold mining in the State. The Peterborough crushings at present are refined through the Perth Mint, in Western Australia.

The Victorian legislation provides for two types of licence. One is an A-class licence, which allows the Gold Buyers Association to issue that licence for the most refined type of gold. The ingot must be stamped with the necessary weight, the exact amount of gold, and the ingot must have no impurities in it. A B-class licence allows for an ingot to reach the market, once again labelled but showing what impurities are in it, as allowed for in regard to that licence. I should be interested to know why the same approach has not been taken to the requirement to alter our Gold Buyers Act, instead of completely repealing the South Australian legislation. I support the second reading.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I thank the Hon. Mr. Whyte for the interest he has shown in this Bill. The provisions of the Bill deal with the control of wrought gold, wrought silver, and precious stones. I understand that the only other provision under the Act being repealed is in regard to control over certain persons in the business. This control can now be exercised under the Second-hand Dealers Act, to which the Government will be introducing an amendment soon.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Repeal."

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The Minister said in his reply to the Hon. Mr. Whyte that the Second-hand Dealers Act will be amended soon. What will happen in the interim, if this Act is repealed, so far as the gold buyers are concerned?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I understand it has to be proclaimed.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: In other words, it will not be proclaimed until you introduce the amendment to the Second-hand Dealers Act?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I believe so.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from July 27. Page 169.)

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I support the second reading. Clause 2 provides that, where a person is convicted of an offence against section 33 of the principal Act, the court may order that any indecent matter to which the proceedings relate be forfeited to the Crown. Section 33 of the principal Act provides that any person who prints, publishes, sells, offers for sale, or has in his possession any indecent matter for sale, shall be guilty of an offence, and it provides various other offences of a similar kind.

I applaud the Government for showing interest in this field and for tidying up this aspect of the law. It is

really only a tidying up, because at present, if a person is convicted of the offence of having in his possession any indecent matter and if, after having been convicted, he takes it back, he is committing the offence again, and presumably the person concerned would agree to the matter being destroyed. I hope that the officers of the Crown to whom this indecent matter is forfeited do not spend much time perusing it.

Could the Minister tell me how many prosecutions there have been in, say, the past 12 months or in any other representative period under section 33 of the principal Act? It should not be difficult to get this information, because the section provides that there cannot be prosecutions under it without certificates being granted. I suggest that this is a reasonable request when we are being asked to amend part of the law that creates an offence.

The PRESIDENT: It may be better to put that as a Question on Notice.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I give the undertaking to reply to this matter as soon as possible.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Clause 3 deals with an entirely different matter and this also is a tidying up. It

provides that "nearest police station" as defined in the principal Act means the police station nearest the place of apprehension at which facilities are continuously available for the care and custody of the person. This clause deals with the problem that the "nearest police station" may be in a place where there are no facilities to hold the prisoner for a continuous period.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I may not be able to obtain by tomorrow the answers to the Hon. Mr. Burdett's queries. However, I give him the undertaking that, if I have not got them by then, I will certainly let him have the replies in writing as soon as possible.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.21 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, July 29, at 2.15 p.m.