HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 29, 1973

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

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL

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

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

PETITION: CASINO

Mr. EVANS presented a petition signed by 121 citizens who expressed concern at the probable harmful impact of a casino on the community at large and prayed that the House of Assembly would not permit a casino to be established in South Australia.

Petition received and read.

QUESTIONS

FRUIT-GROWING INDUSTRY

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say what response, if any, the Government has had to its representations to the Commonwealth Government for urgent and special consideration to be given to the fruit-growing industry of this State? Last week the problem associated with the citrus industry was indicated in that one firm had $500,000 worth of orange juice on hand, and the industries on the Murray River estimated there would be a potential Joss of $2,000,000 to $3,000,000 a year to the citrus industry if all of the fruit now being processed for juice had to be sold as fresh fruit. From volume II issue 32 of the Newsletter from the South Australian Fruit-growers and Market Gardeners Association one learns that a problem has been created concerning apple juice and apple concentrate as a result of the contents of the Commonwealth Government's Budget, and the point is made that, during 1973, 25 per cent of the total apple crop has been processed. It is apparent that both the citrus industry and the apple and pear industry will suffer a potential loss as a result of the Commonwealth Government's Budget and that urgent and special consideration must be given by the Commonwealth Government to these vital areas of the State's economy.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I passed on to the Commonwealth Government the representations made to me, but I have not yet received a reply.

CONCRETE SLEEPERS

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Premier say what discussions have been held between the South Australian Government and the Commonwealth Government about employment in this State resulting from the proposal to build a railway line from Alice Springs to Tarcoola? An industry was established here producing concrete sleepers when they were needed. I know that negotiations have proceeded between the State Government and the Commonwealth Government about a survey and other matters concerning this line. As in the past we have had to import many timber sleepers from Western Australia, obviously there is a need to re-establish an industry in South Australia, possibly in the North, to produce concrete sleepers. Therefore, I ask whether (and in what way) the Government has promoted to the Commonwealth Government the benefits of using concrete sleepers and what reaction it has received.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Before the election of the Commonwealth Labor Government, the State had made representations to the then Government in Canberra concerning the necessity of our using concrete sleepers. It is quite clear that in the long term the economics of using concrete sleepers are better than the economics of using timber: while there is greater capital outlay, there is a lower maintenance factor, and this is quite clearly established. However, with an eye to electoral interests in a certain district in Western Australia, the previous Commonwealth Government made a political decision in favour of timber sleepers. The representations made by us and by members of the concrete industry of this State were ignored. When the new Government was elected in Canberra, this was one of the first matters that I took up with the Prime Minister and the Minister for Transport. As a result of our representations, the Minister for Transport agreed that tenders for sleepers would be recalled, that concrete sleepers would be allowed in tendering, and that that decision in favour of which kind of sleeper was used would be on the basis of an economic evaluation of the results. We are confident that an economic evaluation will give us the concrete sleeper contract. That is the position as it stands at present.

APPRENTICE TRAINING

Mr. MAX BROWN: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to the question I asked him on August 23 about apprentice training?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: No request has been made to the Apprenticeship Commission, either by employers or by trade unions, for any alteration in the training curricula for apprentices in 1974. However, some weeks ago I asked the Apprenticeship Commission to inform me whether the block-release method of training should be adopted in certain additional trades next year. The report of the survey of training needs made in South Australia last year included a recommendation that the Government take steps to determine ways in which a more flexible trade-training system could be introduced. Over the past few months, I have had several discussions with representatives of the United Trades and Labor Council and various employer associations regarding the action they consider should be taken on recommendations made in the training

survey report, and this matter is still being considered. If any trade unions can suggest ways of improving the training of apprentices, the Apprenticeship Commission will be glad to receive and consider their suggestions.

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Works consider having Parliamentary Papers made available for use in members' district offices? The district offices are working extremely well but, because Parliamentary Papers are not provided in them, one is precluded from carrying out research into various matters in one's office. Will the Minister consider this suggestion?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am delighted to hear from the honourable member that, in his view, members' district offices are working well; indeed, I also believe that to be the case. When the honourable member refers to Parliamentary Papers, I take it that he is referring not only to Bills but also to reports tabled in Parliament and to Notice Papers. However, I believe that the question of providing these papers in members' district offices is one that should be directed to you, Mr. Speaker. I support what the honourable member has said, and I should be grateful if you, Mr. Speaker, would see that Parliamentary Papers are made available where requested. That is probably the most reasonable way to approach this matter. Not all members may see the need for this, but country members especially could find such action of assistance. I shall be happy to take this matter up with you, Mr. Speaker, and let the honourable member know what decision has been reached. Indeed, if any member believes at any time that an additional facility is needed in his office and if he lets me know (he need only write to me or ring me), I shall be happy to look at the request, because I see no reason why offices should not be properly equipped and functional.

NARRUNG POLICE

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question concerning the possible retention of the police officer at Narrung?

The Hon. L. J. KING: In 1970 a major survey was conducted by the Management Services Section of the Police Department to ascertain the police work-loads in the Narrung and adjoining police districts. It revealed that the retention of the Narrung police station was not warranted. The decision to close this station was not made on the work-load alone, but on a balanced consideration of the degree of isolation and the availability of alternative policing provisions. More recent studies of the area have shown the situation has not altered. The nearest police station to Narrung is Meningie, 26 miles (42 km), away, and is connected by a partly sealed and all-weather road. The normal travelling time between these towns is estimated at 35 minutes. An examination of police activity at Meningie has shown there has been a continuing increase for several years, and there is now a necessity to upgrade the police station in the near future. Resulting from this, the police officer stationed at Narrung has been performing duty at Meningie on two days each week and at other times as required. The intention is to build an additional house at Meningie to accommodate the officer in charge while the present station residence is demolished and another erected. Upon completion of the latter, the station will be staffed by two men. When this occurs it is intended to close the police station at Narrung and the policing of the area will be done from Meningie. However, this is not expected to happen before 1976. Problems are not expected as a result of the closure of the Narrung police station, as attendance can be obtained within 35 minutes from Meningie. It will also ensure a police officer is available at most times to attend in emergency matters, and will be as efficient a service to the Narrung residents as is provided at the present time. Currently the officer there has two days off a week and assists at Meningie on at least two other days. As previously mentioned, the Narrung police station is not expected to close until approximately 1976, but, when it is closed, adequate protection will be provided for the residents of the area and the premises will not be disposed of until there is satisfaction that it has become redundant for police purposes.

PAYNEHAM SCHOOL

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister of Education say whether the Education Department is considering the relocation of Payneham Infants School and the incorporation of the infants school within Payneham Demonstration School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will inquire for the honourable member.

COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Education say what plans his department has, in co-operation with the Commonwealth Government, to extend the plans for community schools to country areas? Last week the Minister made a joint announcement with the Commonwealth Government that two metropolitan schools would be developed on a community basis. Because of the urgent need to develop such facilities in other parts of South Australia, I ask the Minister what are his plans.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Regarding community centre high schools, we have been granted the funds necessary for the initial design work on the Angle Park and Thebarton projects. The Commonwealth Minister made clear that the case for development in these two areas was based on the fact that both areas were disadvantaged. The further development of this concept is a little uncertain at this stage, because we do not really know how successful the idea will be, the Commonwealth Government regarding the two projects that have been approved as pilot projects for the whole of Australia. We have a huge volume of work to do not only in preparing the design of these community centre high schools but also in working out an appropriate administrative structure and staffing of them, so that the community can make effective use of the facilities available in the schools. I imagine that with regard to future areas the whole State would have to be considered, a priority being given to areas that were in some sense disadvantaged. Country areas could be included in this consideration. However, my first reaction is to say that the fringe area of Whyalla, and the position that might apply in Port Augusta or Port Pirie, in parts of Elizabeth or Salisbury, and in one or two other areas—

Mr. Gunn: Coober Pedy?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The areas I have referred to show up clearly as being areas of economic disadvantage with regard to the people who live there. If the recreation facilities are inadequate, certainly that establishes the required condition for setting up such a community centre school. The position at Coober Pedy is difficult because of the problem in respect of recreation facilities there. With the opening of the school library for community use, we are beginning an experiment in Coober Pedy. It will be interesting to see how that develops and to determine also what special security problems may exist as a consequence of community use of the Coober Pedy school. Certainly, I hope that the Angle Park and

Thebarton projects turn out to be a great success; as a consequence, we would get a rapid extension of this notion throughout the State.

In several instances, without assistance from the Commonwealth Government, the department is entering into joint arrangements with local government in relation to developing community facilities in country schools. For example, at Loxton High School a joint project for a community hall to be constructed in the schoolgrounds has been negotiated by the high school council, the district council, and the Education Department, and that project should get under way shortly. Several similar projects can proceed independently of the Angle Park or Thebarton projects. Both of those projects are large, involving the provision of community facilities for a significantly sized community. A project on that kind of scale would not be fully appropriate in the smaller country centres, although it could well be appropriate in some of the larger ones.

STOREMEN AND PACKERS DISPUTE

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what action the Government will take to resolve the present dispute between South Australian storemen and packers and certain companies, and what action will be taken to ensure that large quantities of perishable foodstuffs do not rot? A dispute has arisen over wage claims because, I believe, the unions have requested a $10 a week rise and the companies have offered $8 a week, and South Australian storemen and packers have consequently imposed a ban on the handling of the companies' products. This ban is likely to affect—

Mr. Jennings: Question, Mr. Speaker!

The SPEAKER: The leave of the House has been discontinued.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The award under which storemen and packers are employed is a Commonwealth award and it is not within the jurisdiction of this State to deal with Commonwealth awards. I have taken an interest in the situation that has developed and I have had negotiations with the Commonwealth Government about it. A meeting has been proposed for 10.30 a.m. next Tuesday, but it is conditional on the ban being lifted, and the union is now considering that recommendation.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY

Mr. DUNCAN: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what progress has been made with the drafting of the regulations under the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, 1972, and can he also say when such regulations will be proclaimed?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The Safety, Health and Welfare Board has been established by my department and the first industry to be approached is the building industry. The committee comprises representatives of employers and trade unions involved. The committee has made certain recommendations to the board which, I understand, is considering the recommendations. I am waiting now for the submission of the board regarding the type of regulation required. When this is received, it will be submitted to the Government for legislation to be drafted. The operation of the board will be governed by regulations.

FRUIT JUICE

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Minister of Education discuss with other Ministers, at their meeting to be held at the end of September, the need to provide fruit juice in lieu of milk for Aboriginal children in the Far North of this State? This question is supplementary to the following reply received in the House yesterday:

The proposal of the Commonwealth Government is for the provision of milk, or substitutes, to schoolchildren on a needs basis. A meeting of Ministers has been proposed for the end of September to discuss details.

Earlier this month I received from the .Minister of Health a reply to a letter I wrote to him making submissions on behalf of a school in the Far North of the State and asking for fruit juice to be substituted for milk. It was claimed that sores, head lice and malnutrition were evident at the school and that a lack of vitamins was also evident. It was suggested that the provision of fresh fruit could be of benefit. The Minister of Health claimed that this was not possible under the present Commonwealth Act. As this matter will be considered at the meeting of Ministers, will the Minister of Education press this point on behalf of schools in the Far North?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is not intended that I should attend this meeting of Ministers but rather that the Minister of Health should attend it. If the purpose of the meeting is to determine who should get milk or who should get substitutes for milk, the problem is reduced to very much a health problem rather than a general administrative problem for the Education Department in ensuring that milk is distributed to all schools. For that reason, it is appropriate that the Minister of Health should attend the conference. I will certainly refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and ask him to take it up at the meeting of Ministers at the end of September. I must say (and I am sure that my colleague will agree with me on this point) that, so far as I am concerned, special arrangements must be made for Aboriginal students, particularly in some remote areas of the State where there are serious nutritional deficiencies. I cannot say whether the supply of orange juice would solve those problems, but certainly this Ministerial conference should consider the overall problem seriously.

BOWKER STREET LAND

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Education regard as urgent the provision of toilets on the Bowker Street land owned by the Education Department and will he act immediately in the matter? As the Minister is well aware, the development of this area is a joint one between the department and the local council. The council has submitted a draft plan of the area in a proposal to provide toilets, change-rooms, tennis courts, and an area for car parking. It sent this to the department, asking for the department's approval (merely in principle) on June 28. However, no reply has yet been received and many children from organizations and schools are using this oval, although there are no toilets there at all.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Were these plans sent to me, or to the department?

Mr. MATHWIN: To the department.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Not to me?

Mr. MATHWIN: No, to the Minister's department. Many children are using this area now for such things as organized sport and there is a big problem because there are no toilets nearby. A nuisance is being caused to a nearby hall that is used by Girl Guides and for other purposes, and the position is really desperate. I ask the Minister for his help in this matter.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Occasionally the member for Glenelg surprises me, and he has done this particularly in relation to the joint development of the Bowker Street land, because I am sure the honourable member appreciates that this joint development took place in the first instance consequent on my having initiated the development. I am also surprised that these detailed

plans were not submitted direct to me. The honourable member, as an alderman of the Brighton council, may also care to take up that matter.

Mr. Mathwin: Why send them to you?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I should have thought that, when expenditure of Government funds was involved, as well as a contribution by the local council (and I presume that the honourable member, on that council, has supported the provision of council funds for this joint project), the appropriate person to receive the submission, particularly when the person who initiated the proposal was the Minister, would be the Minister. I should have thought that would be obvious, but I realize that the honourable member may be getting on the band waggon on this whole issue.

Mr. MATHWIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I object to the Minister's saying that I am trying to get political advantage out of this. I am member for the area and that is the sole reason why I have brought the matter up before this Parliament. I am not trying to get political advantage at all.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order.

Mr. Mathwin: I was approached by the Girl Guides.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I ask the honourable member sincerely to suggest to the council that it should take the simple action of informing me directly on any matters affecting this development, because it happens to be a development that I promoted and have supported continually. The main problem in relation to further development of that site occurs partly because of the requirements of Paringa Park Primary School for additional playing area, if the school is to be redeveloped fully on its present site, and the requirements of the nearby high school. In addition, the Glenelg Football Club has requested access to this area and it is necessary to decide where the priorities lie. Certainly, my attitude is that the first priority for use of the area that I must ensure is satisfied is its use by Paringa Park Primary School.

Mr. Mathwin: It's already been fixed.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Glenelg. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The matter of determining use by Paringa Park Primary School is not one for the honourable member or the Brighton council. The department must consider and determine that matter. In addition, those concerned with Brighton High School, which has a limited playing area compared to what we normally try to provide for new high schools, have expressed an interest in the land and attention must certainly be given to those needs. I hope that I have explained some of the problems that must be solved before a final decision is made. Further, we must assess the total cost of the project and see how we can slot it into our overall building programme. I am sorry that the member for Glenelg appears not to be interested but, because I want the record to be clear and straight on this matter and, further, I do not want the honourable member to misquote me locally, I say for the record that I will ensure that investigations into this whole matter are concluded speedily so that the project can be developed in a way that will benefit not only the local residents but also the schools in the area.

DUNCAN REPORT

Mr. BECKER: Can the Attorney-General say whether an edited version of the Duncan report will be made available to the University of Adelaide, and why such a report was requested?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The reply is "No" to the first part of the question and, as to the second part, the honourable member would have to apply to the people who made the request. I cannot say what reasons motivated those who made the request, and he will have to apply to them.

WEST LAKES SCHOOLS

Mr. DUNCAN: Can the Minister of Education say what plans he has to build new primary schools in the West Lakes area, and can he say in what areas such schools will be situated? A constituent who purchased a building allotment in that area is most concerned that, after having seen a plan of the area and being told by a representative of West Lakes Sales Proprietary Limited that his block of land would be within 100 yards (91 m) of a primary school, he has now ascertained that the primary school he was shown on the map will not be built, and this will greatly affect the value of his allotment.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The matter of the location of schools within the West Lakes area has only recently been subject to review and decisions made. I will try to obtain the latest information so that the honourable member can tell his constituent what is the present position. However, at any one time plans of the Education Department can be regarded only as partly tentative, and no absolute guarantee can be given by the department that plans as stated will be realized in all particulars. Any council, the West Lakes organization or the Education Department in giving details of prospective sites for schools can only give that information according to the knowledge that is then available. Having said that, I will try to obtain as much information as I can for the honourable member.

BUTTER SPREAD

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture when he intends to introduce legislation to permit the sale of the new butter spread? The dairying industry has been through bad times, and it might be necessary to obtain legislation quickly from the Government because this butter spread could be more competitive than has been margarine.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will ask when this is likely to happen, although I know that every effort is being made to introduce the necessary legislation as soon as possible and that the Minister is anxious to promote the new product in whatever way he can. Having sampled it, I believe it is a very good product and one that will help generally the interests of the dairying industry. I will tell the honourable member what is the result of my inquiry.

SEX DISCRIMINATION BILL

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to prohibit discrimination against persons by reason only of their sex, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Dr. TONKIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Before beginning my second reading explanation, I should like to say that I appreciate the consideration and sympathy that has been accorded to me by my colleagues on both sides this afternoon.

Women have, for many years, been striving to overcome the disabilities they have suffered in being regarded as second-class citizens. The struggle has been long and protracted, and it is only now, in our present day, that women are approaching equality with men in most spheres of influence. This Bill is intended to overcome certain specific areas of discrimination against women that still exist in our community. The basis for the belief that the female was an inferior has its origin well back in Stone Age times, when her restricted sphere of activity and her dependence governed her position in early tribal society. These restrictions were due both to the female's biological function and to her physical structure, since she was less agile, smaller, and had a weaker body. In other words, her role in society was forced upon her by circumstances and was governed by child bearing, the need for breast feeding, and the need for general family care which followed. Thus, although she shared the labour of primitive societies, the woman was restricted to local activities, while man went further afield hunting and seeking food.

With the development of primitive societies into more highly organized communities, a woman's inactivity became a measure of her husband's degree of success. High social status indeed, kept women from the world of labour, but there was no satisfactory alternative available to them but inactivity, and certainly no sphere of education in which they could occupy their time and employ their talents. Indeed, by their very lack of education, women continued to be ill informed, and were obviously so. During the Middle Ages, theology was considered the highest profession available to man and, in spite of the Christian belief that women had souls equal in the sight of God to those of men, the profession of theology was denied to them. Some women, by leaving the world of normal life and entering a nunnery, were able to explore the world of letters, but they were few, and their influence was confined by the very nature of their vocation.

Generally, however, the attitude of society (including women themselves) towards women followed that of Aristotle, who said that women should obey, being less complete, less courageous, weaker, and more impulsive than men. It was only during the Classical Revival, when the learning of the cloister came to the royal courts, and then spread to the daughters of a rising middle class, that education became available to women more generally. The advocates of education for girls could not win general acceptance for their theories, because there was nothing for an educated girl to do, mainly because universities refused to admit women, again largely because of the religious nature of most universities at that time.

It was only when universities and colleges broadened their scope and became more fully identified with secular life that women were admitted to them. There were, of course, some dire predictions of the dangers of admitting women to universities. Women, it was said, were too weak to . stand the strain of serious mental labour, and besides, education for women would result in race suicide, since such women would not marry, or if they did, would not have children. Teaching was the first profession to admit women in European societies in the early 1800's. Medicine and law were much more difficult professions to enter, and early graduates found themselves facing not only hostile medical societies and bar associations but also a hostile public. In those days, the conditioning of which many women complain (and rightly so) nowadays, was intense.

Great progress has been made since that time, but generally it has been only in recent times that education has been accessible to women on a basis more nearly approaching equality with men. In the world of industry, two world wars really showed what women in the work force were capable of, and women are now a significant proportion of our industrial effort. However, it has been only in recent times that the concept of equal pay for equal work has been accepted, and anomalies still exist.

The legal position of women significantly changed after the passing of the Married Women's Property Act of 1882, at Westminster, and successive legislation has followed in many countries, empowering a married woman to control all her property, real or personal, as an individual in her own right. Women's suffrage, taking a somewhat prolonged but parallel course, completed the process of female emancipation. But, once again, anomalies remain. No-one can deny that discrimination against women still exists in this country and in other countries in spite of the tremendous changes that have occurred. The biological restrictions on women's activities have been largely overcome with the development of family-planning techniques. One might say the pill has proved to be the final leveller. The differences derived from the ancient inequality of the sexes are now almost negligible in our society.

Justice George Sutherland, in the Supreme Court of the United States in 1922, said:

> While the physical differences must be recognized in appropriate cases, and as legislation fixing hours or conditions of work may properly take them into account, we cannot accept the doctrine that women of mature age require or may be subjected to restrictions upon their liberty of contract which could not lawfully be imposed in the case of men under similar circumstances. To do so would be to ignore all the implications to be drawn from the present-day trend of legislation, as well as that of common thought and usage, by which woman is accorded emancipation from the old doctrine that she must be given special protection or be subjected to special restraint in her contractual and civil relationships.

This, I believe, is an attitude very valid for our times. The degree of discrimination against women varies according to the general attitude within a community, the attitude of women themselves within the community, and the attitudes of various organized groups of women. Suggested ways of overcoming discrimination tend to vary, therefore, depending on the attitudes of the people putting forward the ideas. There are, of course, minorities at either end of the community spectrum, and there are undoubtedly numbers of "male chauvinist pigs" who believe still that women should be kept in their place, wherever that might be, and would not particularly mind if women did not have a vote. Old traditions die hard in some quarters.

The more vocal minority is composed of the militant Women's Liberation groups, which press for equal rights for women and which want no concessions at all. Unfortunately, some of their members tend to be hypersensitive and will possibly take the introduction of this Bill as evidence of a condescending attitude on the part of a male. I can assure them this Bill is not being introduced in that spirit, although I must say, too, that I do not agree that the total unconditional equality being sought in the proposed equal rights amendment before the United States Senate is necessarily the correct solution, and I think the large majority of women will agree with this attitude.

There are certainly matters which need attention, and it is these which are covered in this Bill. But there are also some traditional privileges and courtesies which should not lightly be thrown away. Far from displaying, as some militant groups would suggest, an attitude suggesting inequality or female inferiority, I believe these courtesies exchanged between men and women are a necessary part of expressing mutual love, respect, trust, and responsibility;

and, indeed, are an essential part of preserving marriage as an equal partnership, and help to provide the support of a family group for growing-up children. For those still attracted to total unconditional equality, I commend the speech of Senator James Buckley, made in the United States Senate on March 22, 1972. He said:

I am opposed to the proposed amendment because, in its attempt to eliminate discrimination against women, it will at the same time inevitably strike down those distinctions and those deferences which our society now extends to women. It seems to me that the discriminations which all of us want to see ended can be more effectively ended in other ways.

I agree with the Senator, and I believe the majority of women in our community will agree, too. If the deferences and courtesies which we accord to women as part of our accepted social behaviour do not discriminate against or in any way penalize women, why should we give them up? Why should we want to see them banned? The are passed from generation to generation initially as part of the love and affection shown by a father for a daughter and a mother for a son, and we should wish to preserve, not destroy, them. Militant groups often seem to have a chip-on-the-shoulder attitude about this matter and are hypersensitive, to the degree that they consider social courtesies and customs extended to women as discriminatory in themselves, but I do not believe this to be so.

The Bill deals with several main areas in which discrimination occurs now, and provides for the investigation and remedy, if necessary, of alleged discrimination in the fields of employment and training for employment, the provision of services, and the granting of loans, when made (and this is the key to the whole Bill) by reason only of the sex of the person involved. In this regard, the provisions of the Bill apply equally to both men and women, although there are necessary exemptions for certain situations. The Bill provides for the establishment of a board (the Sex Discrimination Board) with powers to investigate complaints of discrimination and, if it feels that the matter justifies such an action, to take civil action for damages on behalf of a complainant. The board may also investigate the relative positions of male and female employees in industry, and will report regularly to the Minister. The board will also have the power to negotiate between parties in an attempt to reach an amicable settlement in cases where discrimination has occurred only on the grounds of the sex of the person involved.

It may be seen that the establishment of the board is a most important part of the Bill's intent. It is recognized that it may be very difficult to prove that discrimination in employment, or any other field covered by this Bill, has been made only by reason of the sex of a person. The principles have been set down in the Bill, however, and the board's activities could well achieve the desired result in the majority of cases, without recourse to legal action. It could also, by its activities, lead to a reconsideration of attitudes towards such other matters as equal superannuation schemes for men and women, an equal retiring age, certain protective legislation which inhibits women's job possibilities, and the variations in financial arrangements involving, for example, insurance benefits and debts as they apply to men and women.

I now turn to the clauses of the Bill. Clause 1 is formal, while clause 2 fixes the commencement of the Bill on a day to be proclaimed. Clause 3 relates to the arrangement of the Act and clause 4 covers certain definitions. Clause 5 binds the Crown, while clause 6 prohibits discrimination against any person seeking employment, or already employed, by reason only of the sex of that person. Provision is made for the exemption of any enactment already prohibiting or restricting the employment of persons on work of any description and exempts also employment in a private household or employment for which sex is a genuine occupational qualification.

Clause 7 prohibits discrimination by unions and professional bodies against anyone who is not a member of the organization and who is applying for membership, or against anyone who is a member of the organization, by deliberately omitting to accord to that person similar benefits to those enjoyed by other members of the organization, solely by reason of the sex of that person. This provision applies also to the granting of qualifications or authorizations necessary for carrying on any trade, business, profession or occupation. Clause 8 prohibits discrimination on the grounds of sex in the matter of education or training for employment, but does not apply to any school which is provided or maintained wholly or mainly for pupils of one sex, or any college or institution established in the same way, unless that college or institution examines for or confers professional qualifications.

Clause 9 provides that, where people demand goods or services as usually provided, they must not be refused such goods or services solely by reason of their sex. Clause 10 extends the same prohibition to banks, insurance companies and other organizations lending money for various purposes. It has been a source of some concern to many people in the community that women have been unable to obtain similar loans, by way of overdraft or mortgage, to those normally accorded to men in similar circumstances. I have received, as I am sure many other members have received, protestations from women with secure jobs and assured incomes who have been asked for a male guarantor before a housing loan will be granted if, in fact, it is granted at all. This discrimination which appears to be based on traditional, rather than rational, grounds will be prohibited under this provision. Clause 11 deals with advertisements for employment opportunities which specify a particular sex, where there is no real reason for this discrimination, and provides for a penalty not exceeding $200 for such an action.

Clause 12 covers the responsibilities of employers and agents in any matters involving discrimination, while clause 13 exempts the clergy and religious organizations from the provisions of this Bill. Part III of this Bill deals with the Sex Discrimination Board. Clause 14 establishes a Sex Discrimination Board with a chairman and four members, two of whom shall be men and two women. Clause 15 relates to the terms of appointment of the various members, while clause 16 relates to the proceedings of the board. Clause 17 deals with the powers of the board. It may be said that the powers it is intended to give to the board are wide-ranging, but I believe this is necessary if the board is to adequately fulfil its objectives. As I said earlier, it is hoped that the board will be instrumental in bringing about a settlement of disputes on an amicable basis with a full understanding of the principles involved, and that, because agreement has been reached, many complaints will thus not be taken as far as the civil court.

Clause 18 provides that the board shall furnish an annual report on its general activities and may, at the request of the Minister, furnish reports on any specific matters which lie within its province. Clause 19 provides that it shall be the duty of the board to receive and investigate any complaints of discrimination, provided they are made with the knowledge and consent of the person involved, but the board shall not be required to receive any complaint if it is made later than six months from the date of the

act complained of, unless the board considers that special circumstances are involved. The board is not required to receive any complaint which appears to it to be trivial, frivolous or vexatious. The board will make all the necessary inquiries as to the facts surrounding the complaint, and will form an opinion as to whether or not an act of discrimination has been performed. It will use its best endeavours to secure a settlement of any differences between the parties involved in any complaint, and will further seek an assurance that there will be no further repetition of the discrimination complained of. If no such settlement is possible, or no such assurance is obtained, it shall be open to the board, having given written notification to the parties concerned, to take action as outlined in Part IV of this Bill.

Clause 20 allows the board to investigate possible acts of discrimination in the absence of any specific complaint, if the members of the board so agree. Clause 21 establishes the right to initiate civil proceedings in respect of any contravention of the foregoing provisions of the Bill, either by the board as outlined in clause 19, or by an individual claiming to have suffered injury by reason of discrimination, where the board has determined not to bring proceedings. The clause further provides that proceedings under it shall be commenced in a local court of full jurisdiction, and establishes that, where neither the board nor the complainant has taken action, it shall not be competent for any other person to do so.

Clause 22 sets out the relief which may be obtained in proceedings before the courts. The court may grant an injunction restraining the defendant from engaging in further acts of discrimination, and may grant special damages for expenses incurred by the complainant in relation to the activity out of which the discrimination arose, and such general damages as the court thinks justified for any loss of benefit which the complainant might reasonably have expected to have had but for the discrimination. Clause 23 provides that offences under this Act shall be dealt with summarily. Clause 24 outlines the additional functions of the board in conducting or assisting to conduct inquiries into the relative status of men and women in particular trades, industries, professions and occupations, in taking steps to make public their findings, and to promote equality between the sexes in the various fields.

Clause 25 provides that a Minister of the Crown shall consider women equally with men for the purpose of appointing the members of any board, commission, committee or other public body. I must express my indebtedness to many learned members of the legal profession, of both sexes, who have helped me so much in the preparation of this Bill, and to the many concerned women in the community who have given me the benefit of their opinions and advice, including my mother and my family. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE secured the adjournment of the debate.

MINISTRY OF SPORT AND RECREATION

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I move:

That in the opinion of this House a Ministry of Sport and Recreation should be established in this State.

In moving this motion, I hope that the Government will accept the need for a co-ordinated effort from all Government departments, as well as at semi-government level, to meet the challenge and help by encouraging the community to accept the concept that a healthy body and mind will result in a healthy and vigorous nation. I am especially moved in this respect by a letter which I recently received and which is addressed to a sportmen's association by a young man. The letter states:

Having been involved in junior sport for the past 12 years, and closely observing the anomalies involved, through a lack of common constitutional control, for example organization, finance and general liaison at all levels of junior and senior sport, I personally feel that not enough time, thought or money is spent in training, facilities, amenities and general observance of the personal interests of the many and varied sports in which Australian men and women of all ages participate throughout the nation. Of course I realize the enormous difficulties involved nowadays, particularly in finance, to provide the facilities and education for sport in general, but these difficulties have been present for years, and the longer the whole situation is pigeon-holed with the waste of existing funds in the wrong direction, the greater the increase in costs towards all and any projects that are needed for general improvements in any sport. I believe there are many men and women from all walks of life involved in sport of some kind, who are daily hampered by the lack of a common avenue of investigation towards complaint or advice in assistance towards the betterment of the particular sport they are fostering. I feel just as many people have fallen by the wayside through the above-mentioned frustrations they have been up against over the years, and, therefore, one or another sport has suffered through this loss of volunteer help, so necessary to sport everywhere in Australia.

That letter is signed by the Assistant Secretary of the Norwood-North Football Association (Mr. Brian T. Uppington). I believe that letter accurately expresses the thoughts and opinions of those people in the community who desire to do whatever they can to help amateur sport, to encourage the establishment of recreation facilities in the community, and to achieve the involvement of youth in these projects. It is especially pleasing to note that the Liberal Party of Australia (Victorian Division) has a "Youth, Sport and Recreation" policy, as follows:

Development of a positive programme based on the following principles:

1. Maintenance of the principle of voluntary effort and local involvement in youth work and in the development of community, sporting and recreational activities and facilities.
2. The recognition of governmental responsibility—*(a)* to facilitate the growth of individuality and develop the character of young people, to ensure their involvement in community life and to encourage activities in which family groups may participate; *(b)* to assist with the improvement of the fitness and general health of the people including all age groups by providing more opportunities for active participation in sport and remedial exercise; and *(c)* to provide assistance to voluntary community organizations and youth and sporting associations.

I am Chairman of the Liberal and Country League Parliamentary Committee considering this matter, and the guidelines we are asking the Government to accept are similar to those expressed in this policy. We want to do all we can to encourage youth and to have facilities for recreation and amateur sport provided wherever practicable, and to do this we must establish at State level a Ministry of Sport and Recreation. It is not necessary for there to be a separate Minister, but a Minister should hold this portfolio, as this would help to co-ordinate all the areas of the various Government departments that are involved in sport.

For many years, the National Fitness Council of South Australia has undertaken much work and research in this field. Recently, the council called on all amateur sporting bodies to attend a meeting with a view to establishing a representative sports committee. This step has now been taken, with investigations being under way. The following circular, dated May, 1973, was forwarded to organizations:

National Fitness Councils are established in each State of Australia to encourage and assist people to take part in regular activities that will help to keep them physically healthy. The obvious avenue is via sports and outdoor activities. Established associations and clubs are therefore the agencies with which national fitness must work in order to make an increasing impact on the public, and it becomes incumbent for the National Fitness Council to assist the associations and clubs so that they in their turn can reach a greater number of people and give them better service. In short the council, in the process of achieving its aims, has to use and to support the associations. To do both it needs a much closer contact with the administrators of sports and recreation bodies, and the most reliable way is to have occasional meetings with representatives of all sports and regular and fairly frequent meetings with a policy-making smaller group.

This group has now been established. The circular continues:

It would appear that some of the advantages of a representative sports committee would be:

(1) The political value of such a concerted voice in approaches to local, State and Commonwealth Governments;
(2) rationalization of the use of available facilities;
(3) partnership in the planning, financing and development of facilities;
(4) advising the State Planning Authority on the space needs of sports and outdoor activities in general;
(5) the establishment of a policy for the support of interstate and international competition;
(6) a clearing-house for information on matters of interest to all sports such as the visits of prominent coaches, the dissemination of international information on facilities, coaching conferences and competitions;
(7) the encouragement of idea-sharing in such things as coaching method, conditioning procedures, a sports medicine centre, player insurance;
(8) access to a library of sports buildings information, reference material, films, coaching method, space requirements, sports research; and
(9) use of residential training facilities.

That covers a tremendous area, and it could be dealt with under a Minister of Sport. Undoubtedly it would be advantageous for an organization to be able to approach the Government, at the level of one department, for the assistance it needed. I cannot criticize the State Government which, when requested, has given whatever assistance it can to sporting bodies. However, at present it is difficult for an organization seeking help to know whether to approach the Community Welfare Department, the Department of the Premier and of Development, or the Tourist Bureau. If all the relevant sections of the various departments were co-ordinated, organizations would know exactly where to go for help. A separate department to deal with these matters would be of great value.

We know that the Commonwealth Government is determined to play its part in this field. In the Commonwealth Budget, $20,000 is made available to each State to undertake certain research work to find out what recreational facilities are available and how they can be used to the best advantage. One co-ordinated body is really necessary to help in this research. In its Budget, the Commonwealth Government has also provided about $3,000,000 to help competitors from the various States to compete at interstate or international sporting fixtures, and to help in the sporting and recreational field generally. Our share of this money could be channelled through a separate department.

As the National Fitness Council suggests, the rationalization of the use of available facilities should be considered. In this area, the facilities at our schools should be used. First-class multi-purpose halls and recreation facilities should not be left lying idle for one-third of the day and one-third of the year: they should be available to the community during the evening hours and at odd weekends. The problem is that it will be necessary to have caretakers on school properties. However, I believe that the benefits to be derived by the community in this way offset the cost of providing caretakers. I am fortunate to have in my district Plympton High School, at which a new multi-purpose hall has just been opened. As this school also has two large ovals, the community should make full use of these facilities.

The National Fitness Council refers to the need for a partnership in the planning, financing and development of sporting facilities. Here again, this aim could be achieved through our having one department, rather than having anything up to five Government departments involved. The council says that it is important to keep the State Planning Authority fully informed about the space needs of sport and about outdoor sporting facilities and requirements. It is most important that, when a new subdivision is planned, recreational and sporting needs are considered. We can appreciate this need more fully by looking at the lack of suitable recreation areas and reserves in some of the older suburbs. We must get under way in this field now. With proper planning, we can provide for the future generation.

I believe it is necessary that there be a central building that can be used as a clearing-house for information. In this respect, we can follow the lead of Great Britain, establishing somewhere in the metropolitan area a building which can be the headquarters of all smaller sporting associations and at which a secretarial service can be set up for the benefit of these bodies. Rather than give out large sums in grants to these organizations, it would be better to provide clerical staff and expertise in administration because this is what the organizations really need. The National Fitness Council also recommends that the sharing of ideas on such matters as coaching methods should be encouraged. The standard of coaches is most important in any sport. Every Sunday on television one can see commentators analysing the Australian rules football matches played on the previous day. They give their so-called expert views on the performance of the umpire, and these poor people are shot at from all angles. From any grants made for coaching, a sum should be channelled into the coaching of Australian rules football umpires, and television critics should be trained to leave them alone.

Conditioning procedures are also necessary. Although a sports medicine centre is probably not yet required in this State, additional funds should be made available for further research in this field. In all, the suggestions that have been made by the National Fitness Council to sporting bodies illustrate the need for an awareness within the community of the need for future development.

Reference has been made to some of the mistakes that have been made in the past. The National Fitness Council has referred to the Campbelltown council, which, although it has almost enough park lands to meet the standards laid down by the National Fitness Council, now finds that the areas are not distributed in a way that brings them close to the homes of people in the area who ought to be using them. This is another illustration of the need for co-ordination with the State Planning Authority. People in the Para Hills area find they have insufficient sports areas close to their homes, and players have to travel long distances to find areas large enough for competition play. This is the tragedy of the planning in the past.

All States but South Australia and Tasmania now have a Minister of Sport. In New South Wales the Minister of Sport was appointed on December 1, 1972, and a Sport and Recreation Service has been established, it being managed by the National Fitness Council. Western Australia has had a National Fitness Council Act since 1945. An Act to establish a youth council was passed in 1965, and in 1972 the Youth, Community Recreation and National Fitness Act was passed and a Minister of Recreation appointed. Victoria has had a Minister of Youth, Sports and Recreation since 1972. Since 1972, Queensland has had a Ministry for Tourism, Sport and Welfare Services, which is using the framework established over 27 years by the National Fitness Council. In Tasmania the National Fitness Council is responsible to the Minister of Health; that State does not appear to have a Minister of Sport.

I do not see why we should be the last State to enter this field. Generally we pride ourselves that we are first, but we have been left behind in appointing a Minister of Sport. I am not saying we have been left behind in relation to financial assistance. I believe it is now a matter for co-ordination. The Premier, through his portfolio of Minister of Development and Mines and Minister in charge of tourism, is involved in assisting sporting bodies; the Minister of Community Welfare is responsible for youth work and certain assistance programmes; the Minister of Environment and Conservation is responsible for town planning; the Minister of Education is involved with grants to sporting bodies and is the Minister in charge of the National Fitness Council; and the Minister of Local Government is involved with local government facilities for recreational purposes. There is much to recommend that all this work be put under the control of one Minister.

I believe that it is now most important to provide the facilities and to encourage all sections of the community to use them to the best advantage. Under a Minister of Sport the most successful way to achieve this would be to establish a sports advisory council or a sports and recreation advisory council. The council should operate on similar lines to that which has been established in New South Wales, and should comprise someone involved in amateur sports, a person involved in tourism and a person involved in sporting administration. I believe we would have one representative from the National Fitness Council, one from the sportswomen's association, one from amateur athletics, and one from the sportmen's association, because over the years the sportsmen's association has shown considerable interest and expertise in assisting amateur sport in this State, particularly in promoting and encouraging amateur sport.

Whether or not we should then involve experts in amateur athletics or Government departmental heads is a matter for debate. As has been done in New South Wales, the State could be divided into a metropolitan and a country area, with a supervisor in each. Each supervisor would have at least six regional representatives under him to oversee a certain district, which could comprise two or three local government districts. The regional representative would co-ordinate with the sporting bodies or recreational clubs in the area to ascertain the needs of those organizations, handle inquiries and offer assistance, whether it be assistance on acquiring finance or on administration. He could then collate and dispatch the information to the central point. The district representatives in New South Wales, I understand, will have clerical staff, and this will be of great help to those sporting clubs that have the difficulty each year at the annual general meeting of electing to the administrative positions persons who take on the jobs reluctantly and then find they have not the time to carry out the duties.

I have always believed that in this State we should have done more to encourage amateur sport and to encourage the development of sporting facilities for athletics. We should have been one of the contenders for the Commonwealth Games when Perth was successful, and I do not think it beyond the realms of possibility in the future for us to consider seriously applying for future Commonwealth Games to be held in Adelaide. It may be argued that the cost is astronomical and the benefits are debatable, but if we plan and develop properly now we could establish those facilities, and whenever the opportunity arose we would be ready, and we would not have a great strain on State finances. If we planned now to provide for future generations we could be ready whenever the opportunity arose. There is no doubt that successful sporting functions do encourage tourism, and we are going to experience that in this State in the next few months. No matter what the type of sport, persons are encouraged to visit this State for State championships, Australian championships, and sometimes world championships.

If South Australia is keen to promote tourism, I believe this is an area we should be looking at rather than casinos for raising revenue. After all, any encouragement for sporting facilities would give us a healthier nation. The work of developing and encouraging sport, sport awareness and physical education should commence at primary school level. We may argue that in some cases insufficient physical education instruction is given in our schools, but I consider that the young people going through our colleges of advanced education at the present time are more aware than ever of the need for physical education. If we encourage physical education from grade 1 at primary school level, the children will proceed right through their school life mindful of physical education and, when they leave school, they will remain interested in sport and in using their expertise in recreation facilities.

When one finishes playing competitive sport, one must become involved in other recreation interests. In Victoria an organization known as the Early Planning for Retirement Organization was formed about 12 or 18 months ago. This organization saw the benefit of people in their mid-30's becoming involved in interests in which they could continue to take part when they retired. A big tragedy in the community at present is that a person is pensioned off when he reaches a statutory age, being no longer useful to his employers. Many people who have led active and busy lives suddenly wither up and die when this happens.

Interests that are encouraged at local community level, including recreation facilities, allow people to keep active and to keep their minds alert. We know of the need to provide recreation facilities for the benefit of the community. I hope that, when the Government makes a decision, it will consider these points as the main items embodied in any Bill that is introduced. I cannot introduce such a Bill, as it would involve expenditure of money: I can only move a motion. If this motion is carried and a Bill is introduced, I should like the matters that I will now mention to be included in it. The objects of the measure should be:

(a) To assist in the growth of the individuality and character of the youth of South Australia, and for that purpose it should be the duty of the Minister:

(i) to encourage and facilitate the participation and involvement of youth in community life and, in particular, in the attainment of the objects of the Act;

(ii) to encourage and assist community interest in matters pertaining to youth, and, in particular, in community centres and activities which family groups and persons of any age as well as youth may enjoy;

(iii) to promote co-operation between voluntary organizations;

(iv) to encourage the co-ordination of the activities of Government departments, public statutory bodies, municipalities, and other persons or bodies concerned with youth;

(v) to provide or encourage the provision of facilities for the training of workers with youth and the training of persons in other related activities which in the opinion of the Minister are necessary or desirable to enable this object to be achieved; and

(vi) to assist voluntary organizations, Government departments, public statutory bodies, municipalities and other persons or bodies to provide facilities and services for youth and to improve existing facilities and services.

(b) To promote the fitness and general health of the people of South Australia, and for that purpose it should be the duty of the Minister:

(i) to encourage active participation in sporting activities;

(ii) to encourage and assist in the attainment of higher standards of safety performance and proficiency in sporting activities;

(iii) to assist voluntary organizations, Government departments, public statutory bodies, municipalities and other persons or bodies to provide facilities and services for sport and to improve existing facilities and services;

(iv) to promote co-operation between voluntary organizations; and

(v) to encourage the co-ordination of the activities of Government departments, public statutory bodies, municipalities and other persons or bodies concerned with sport.

(c) To improve the facilities available to the people of South Australia for leisure-time pursuits, and for that purpose it should be the duty of the Minister:

(i) to encourage and assist with the provision of additional opportunities for recreation for individuals and family groups;

(ii) to encourage and assist voluntary organizations, Government departments, public statutory bodies, municipalities and other persons or bodies to provide facilities and services or to improve existing facilities and services for recreation of all kinds;

(iii) to promote co-operation between voluntary organizations;

(iv) to encourage the co-ordination of the activities of Government departments, public statutory bodies, municipalities and other persons concerned with recreation; and

(v) to encourage and assist the attainment of high standards of safety in recreational activities.

For the purposes of the Act, the Minister could:

(a) arrange for such surveys, investigations and research to be carried out as are in his opinion necessary or desirable;

(b) cause the results of any such surveys investigations or research to be published;

(c) cause any information relating to the objects of the Act to be published and disseminated;

(d) authorize the payment of financial grants or subsidies;

(e) initiate or encourage planning and co-ordination;

(f) promote means of communication and consultation; and

(g) provide or assist with the provision of training and coaching courses, programmes, services and facilities.

For the purposes of the Act, the Minister, with the consent of the Minister administering any other Government department, could make use of the services of any officer or employee employed in such other department (this would avoid engaging additional staff). The Minister could make available to any other Government department, public statutory body, voluntary organization or other appropriate body the services of any officer of the department.

It is now more important than ever before to consider establishing a State Youth Council, as well as a Sports Advisory Council. I have an open mind about the size of the Sports and Recreation Council, but I consider that a statutory figure of nine should be the starting point and that the members should be selected as persons having a special interest in the administration or promotion of sporting and recreational activities (other than horse-racing, trotting racing or greyhound racing). The Minister should appoint one of the members to be Chairman of the council. The functions of the Sports and Recreation Council should be:

(a) to establish and maintain regular consultation with authorities, associations, organizations and persons conducting and participating in sporting and recreational activities (other than horse-racing, trotting racing or greyhound racing); and

(b) by means of this consultation and with the assistance of the facilities, services and resources of the department to inform the Minister at regular intervals as to the best ways of promoting sporting and recreational activities and of providing opportunities for the greater participation of people in such activities.

The State Youth Council and the Sports and Recreation Council should, from time to time and at any time at the request of the Minister, consult on matters in which both councils were interested or concerned. The thirty-third annual report of the National Fitness Council, at page 9, states:

A Victorian who has visited Sweden in the interests of the sport of orienteering found that "government support for participant sports is very impressive", the attitude being that "it's cheaper to encourage people to enjoy keeping fit than to provide them with medical services when the diseases of affluence take their toll".

I commend the motion to the House.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1936, as amended. Read a first time.

Mrs. BYRNE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The present section 5 (1) *(i)* of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1936-1970 requires the owner to reasonably exercise a habitually chained dog once a day. The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals believes it is necessary for any dog to receive exercise for at least

one hour in 12, otherwise its health and temperament will suffer. Thousands of dogs in South Australia spend the greater part of their lives tied up or closely confined. Apart from humanitarian considerations, a continually chained dog often becomes vicious, and therefore a potential danger to the public. It generally seeks relief by barking and whining: this constitutes a definite nuisance to other citizens, and it is the subject of much public complaint at this time.

One quarter of the complaints recorded by the R.S.P.C.A. in the metropolitan area concern the habitual chaining or confinement of dogs. To prove a case under the present Act, observation must be maintained on the restrained dog for a period of 24 hours. To maintain such continual observation is generally beyond the capacity of the R.S.P.C.A. because of the society's shortage of staff, and would prove difficult to any law-enforcement agency or individual. It is desirable to impose specific timings such as detailed in the proposed amendment.

Penalty fines were increased to the sums detailed in the present Act in 1960. It is believed reasonable to seek a further increase this year to the present maximum limit of all penalty fines for offences in the Act. It is believed that there should not be any increase in the maximum terms of imprisonment detailed in the present Act. Birds are regarded as animals for the purposes of the present Act (section 4, definition). Section 5b in the present Act, which will be repealed by the proposed amendment, controls the caging of birds only. The proposed amendment is framed to include animals and birds, and is believed to be necessary.

The exclusion, as provided by section 5b (2) *(b)* from the provisions of the proposed amendment is framed specifically to allow an animal to be displayed by its owner on a temporary basis, either for interest or competitive purposes, in a smaller cage than that in which it is usually kept. Pet shops are not excluded from the provisions of the amendment, but consideration will be given to the limited display space available to the pet shop owner when detailing regulation cage sizes for the confinement of animals held for the purpose of trade. Regulations in terms of the proposed amendment will be formulated by the R.S.P.C.A. in conjunction with recognized experts in the field of animal management, and will specify acceptable cage sizes for the various circumstances under which the animal is confined.

No specific section in the present Act refers to the offence concerning the abandonment of animals. In the past, offenders have been charged with ill-treatment by abuse, and failing to provide proper and sufficient food and water where the animal can be proved to have been left uncared for for any length of time. This is unsatisfactory. Abandonment, a prevalent offence in South Australia, is one of the principal causes of suffering of dogs and cats in the State.

The R.S.P.C.A. handles 10 times the usual number of sick, injured, and distressed dogs during the period of the year these animals are required to be registered, and an equal increase in the number of dogs and cats at the commencement of the Christmas holiday period each year. At these times the irresponsible animal owner abandons his domestic pet rather than pay the registration fee or the kennelling fees. It has been established by the R.S.P.C.A. that the introduction of these amendments would gain full support from a large section of the general public and also other bodies concerned for the protection of animals in this State.

Clause 1 is formal, while clause 2 creates the offence of failing to exercise a chained or closely confined dog for at least one hour in every 12 hours. The penalty for all offences under this section is increased to $200. Clause 3 increases a penalty, and clause 4 inserts a new section dealing with the caging of animals. An animal or bird cage must be big enough to permit the occupant reasonable opportunity for exercise, and must conform to the regulations that prescribe cage sizes. Certain exemptions are made from this obligation. Clause 5 increases a penalty, while clause 6 inserts a new section. New section 5d creates the offence of abandoning an animal in circumstances likely to cause it suffering. Clauses 7 to 14 (inclusive) increase penalties.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

DARTMOUTH DAM

Mr. HALL (Goyder): I move:

That the Prime Minister be informed that it is the opinion of this House that Dartmouth dam should proceed as planned because:

(a) the urgency of its construction has not diminished since the signing of the agreement;

(b) its priority of claim on Commonwealth funds is at least equal to many other items included in the Commonwealth Budget; and

(c) South Australia's extra water entitlement which is part of the Dartmouth agreement will not be available to this State until Dartmouth dam is declared operational.

I believe that this motion has an element of urgency. I know that the Premier has written to the Prime Minister expressing in strong terms the need to construct Dartmouth dam in order to bolster future development in South Australia, and that he has pointed out the great difficulty of sustaining projects that are now in the planning and organizing stage if the Prime Minister approves of the delay in work on this facility. I have a huge file of material that was collected during the previous controversy on the Dartmouth *versus* Chowilla issue in which I was involved. No doubt the issue about which dam South Australia needs has been settled, because tenders were called within the last week or fortnight for construction work at Dartmouth to commence in June next year. Included in this year's Loan Estimates is a substantial sum allotted for the cost of the initial works of that dam. The unfortunate thing about this controversy now is that the man directly responsible for the present threat to South Australia's development is the Premier of the State; it is his responsibility alone, and no-one in the community would deny that.

As I have said, I have here the file containing documents relating to the long arguments of opposition advanced by the Labor Party in South Australia to Dartmouth dam (arguments it shamelessly used for political gain). Also, I have a copy of the Bill, entitled "an Act to ratify and approve an agreement relating to financial assistance for the construction of the Dartmouth reservoir, and for other purposes", dated April 28, 1970. Every member opposite who was here then refused to support that Bill, and they will be responsible for any dire consequences that may arise in South Australia if the Dartmouth dam project does not proceed. Had those members voted for the Bill, the project would have been far beyond the point of being able to be abandoned; it would have been a fact of construction, the dam wall would be taking shape, and the Prime Minister of Australia could not be taking the antagonistic attitude to South Australia that he now takes.

As I have said, it is a fact of political life that the Premier jeopardized South Australia's possible growth for his own selfish political ends, when he stood up in this

House and, leading his Party's opposition to the measure, directly voted against the Bill providing for the Dartmouth dam. His argument is made very shallow now that he has written that brave letter, on behalf of his Government, to the Prime Minister, saying that he urgently wants the dam, whose construction he so urgently refused to support in the past. The Premier's attitude to that Bill is not as cynical as that to the measure, dated March 18, 1971, appearing in the Statutes. Having gained office through trickery and subterfuge by opposing Dartmouth dam, the Premier introduced a Bill, entitled "an Act to ratify and approve an agreement for the further variation of the agreement . . .". At that stage, the Premier still opposed the project, as did everyone sitting behind him.

It was not until August 19, 1971, that the Premier admitted that he wanted Dartmouth dam in its final and present form of planning; it was not until then that he became in this House a proponent of the project. He now finds that that project is essential to the development of this State. When the Premier stood up in this House at the time, using (as we said then) South Australia's future for his own Party's political ends, he never foresaw that the future of the State would be in jeopardy because of the action of someone, who is of his own political persuasion, controlling the Commonwealth Administration. The chickens have now come home to roost, and the Premier is faced with the removal of a project that is the only factor responsible for meeting South Australia's future water needs.

Something that I believe has escaped the reports on the matter so far is that the increase in South Australia's water entitlement does not become operative until Dartmouth dam itself is operative, and so today we are left, as the Premier has said in his letter to the Prime Minister, with the possibility of water restrictions every three years. We know that in 1967 (I think these figures have been included by the Premier in his letter) our water entitlement of 1 250 000 acre feet was cut by 260 000 acre feet. If and when the Dartmouth dam is operative, we will have an entitlement of 1 500 000 acre feet guaranteed under all known past conditions. Therefore, it is not just a matter of bolstering the quota which we now enjoy (I say "enjoy" advisedly) but which we did not enjoy in 1967; it is not just a matter of confirming an entitlement of 1 250 000 acre feet. If the Prime Minister proceeds with his intention, the Premier, by his action, has denied us the chance to obtain the only increased quota that we have ever been able to negotiate since the River Murray Waters Act was passed.

Having examined the Prime Minister's statements on this matter, I believe that either he is completely naive and politically inexperienced or he is determined that the Dartmouth dam simply will not proceed. If the Prime Minister were experienced and really did not want to cause a delay in the project, he obviously would not create an argument of this dimension with the Premiers of the three States concerned and, indeed, with the people of South Australia (not just members of this Government). One must suspect, through the Prime Minister's presentation to Australia of his policies, that he means to delay the project and, as I have said, the Premier is responsible for giving him the chance to delay it because, if the Premier had voted in the interests of South Australia in 1970, instead of in the interests of the South Australian Branch of the Australian Labor Party, the project would have been so far advanced that it could not now be stopped.

I do not intend to go through the long and tedious detail (made tedious by the South Australian Labor Party's opposition to the measure for so long), because this House knows the situation and clearly must agree with the letter that the Premier has now written. The House must make a concerted move, not on behalf of the Labor Party, the Liberal and Country League or the Liberal Movement but on behalf of South Australia, whose developments such as those at Monarto and Redcliffs cannot proceed without Dartmouth dam. We must cohesively approach the Prime Minister and ask him to be sensible about this matter. I believe that the House can do nothing other than support this motion, which is not framed in a political sense.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Oh!

Mr. HALL: If the Premier can read politics into that, I believe he has not lifted his attitude above the low level of political attitude that he adopted in 1970, when he sold out South Australia's interests. I ask him to be bigger than that now and to adopt an attitude other than a partisan one, so that he will speak on behalf of the public instead of furthering his own political ambitions. It is on that basis that I move what is obviously a non-politically worded motion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMMONWEALTH POWERS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That this House, while acknowledging that the Commonwealth Constitution should be reviewed and amended to suit contemporary conditions, support the federal system of Government and oppose any action to clothe the Commonwealth Parliament with unlimited powers, to invest the High Court of Australia with final jurisdiction by abolition of appeals to the Privy Council, and in particular action by the Commonwealth Government or Parliament to weaken the sovereignty of the States.

(Continued from August 22. Page 463.)

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I move:

To strike out all words after "That" first occurring and insert "this House acknowledge that the Commonwealth Constitution should be reviewed and amended to suit contemporary conditions, affirm that the distribution of legislative powers between the Commonwealth and the States should be that which is most conducive to the government and welfare of the Australian people, and support the abolition of appeals to the Privy Council and the clothing of the High Court of Australia with final appellate jurisdiction and with jurisdiction to give advisory opinions".

The occasion on which this debate arises is a most important occasion in Australian history, because we are on the eve of the first convention to review and consider the Australian Constitution which has occurred since the Commonwealth of Australia was founded in 1901. The convention, which will be representative of all Parliaments (the Commonwealth Parliament and the six State Parliaments), will also represent all shades of political opinion in those Parliaments and have the presence, for certain purposes, of local government representatives. There is no doubt that in this sort of convention many points of view will be expressed and strongly held. There will be conflicting political and social philosophies represented, and there will be conflicting interests of Commonwealth and State Parliaments. Of course, local government has its own interests. Not only will there be conflicts of philosophy and conflicting points of view: there will be conflicting interests represented at the convention.

Further, we face the situation that we have a history of proposals for the alteration of the Commonwealth Constitution which have failed in the history of Federation. Indeed, very few of these suggestions have succeeded because, ultimately, no matter what the convention decides,

any proposals that emerge, if they are to become law and if a change in the Constitution is to be effected, must be passed by the Commonwealth Parliament and must be approved in a referendum by a majority of people voting and by a majority of the States. The end result, if there is to be any change, must be a referendum approved not only by the Australian people as a whole but by a majority of those voting in a majority of the States.

That fact considered with the history of constitutional proposals makes it appear obvious that there can be no overhaul of the Australian Constitution unless a consensus is found at the convention: that is, unless a sufficient degree of consensus can be found amongst those delegates representing differing and at times conflicting points of view and interests, we shall be unlikely to emerge with a proposal which can command an especially wide acceptance among political Parties at both the Commonwealth and the State levels and which is likely to commend itself to the Australian people.

The motion moved by the member for Mitcham recognizes the need for a review of the Constitution and an amendment of the Constitution to suit contemporary conditions. The honourable member acknowledges that, as do I, and we therefore start from the common ground that the Constitution needs an overhaul: it needs amendments to meet and suit contemporary conditions. It is also apparent, as I have said, that that can happen only if a consensus is found among the conflicting points of view that will be represented at the convention.

I believe that the approach of this motion is not the approach likely to produce such a consensus. That is because it starts from a special point of view— the point of view of a States-righter. The motion emphasizes the rights of the States; it emphasizes an opposition to any extension of Commonwealth legislative power. That is expressed to a degree in the motion, but it is implicit to a much greater degree.

If this convention is approached by certain delegates from an *a priori* or fixed centralist point of view, having a desire simply to have more power transferred to the Commonwealth Parliament simply for the sake of having more power transferred to it and, if it is approached by others on the basis that they want to retain all the existing powers of the States and increase such powers simply because they are States' powers, and an *a priori* expression of States' rights, then the convention is doomed to fail. There is no way that we can produce the sort of change needed if delegates are so attached to narrow points of view and, therefore, cannot deal with the real questions of constitutional reform.

Mr. Gunn: Where will we be if the Prime Minister has his way?

The Hon. L. J. KING: By that interjection the honourable member demonstrates that type of small-mindedness that will certainly doom the convention if it is allowed to reflect itself at the convention. Unless delegates are able to rise above that sort of petty-mindedness that is manifested by that interjection, there is simply no prospect for the success of what is one of the most important events in the history of the political life of this country.

Mr. Gunn: We don't want the rights of the people of this country to be sold out.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The honourable member cannot help his own petty approach, and I would think that he would pause and think about the future of Australia and forget for a while his petty desire to score political points. If the member for Eyre knows as much about this subject as he would like to make it appear from his seated position, he will have the opportunity of following me and demonstrating his knowledge of the subject as well as the contribution he would have made had he been chosen by his Party as a delegate to the Constitution Convention.

There are many areas in which the legislative power, unless exercised by the Commonwealth, cannot be exercised at all. Therefore, there are areas in which the question is not whether the Commonwealth should exercise the power or whether the States should exercise the power, but rather whether the Commonwealth should exercise the power or whether there should be no agency that could effectively exercise the power. This applies virtually to the whole area of what has been termed economic legislative powers: that is, powers to make laws for the purpose of planning the economy. This includes the whole area of prices, capital issues, restrictive trade practices and many other sections for which it has been impossible for the States to legislate separately in an effective manner.

Unless the Commonwealth has that power, no-one has it. This whole matter is therefore open for consideration at the convention, so the matter of centralism against States' rights does not enter into it and should be kept right out. It should not be allowed to blind and prejudice people's minds with preconceived notions that can lead nowhere in the end. There are other areas where the constitutional history of the country has shown that further provision is needed in the Commonwealth Constitution for more effective consultation between the Commonwealth and the States, and for more effective and satisfactory financial arrangements for the carrying on of the government of this country, whether by the Commonwealth or by the States. Therefore, the most critical areas in the changes to the Constitution can be approached in a dispassionate and detached way if delegates are resolved to come to grips with the constitutional problems of the country and try to solve them. For those reasons, I have moved my amendment.

It seems to me that the matters stressed in the motion are precisely those which are likely, if expressed, to lead to the breakdown of the convention rather than to its success. I believe we should be looking at the matter from a different point of view. Consequently, my amendment seeks to stress the positive aspects that can lead to agreement if they are sufficiently to the fore in the minds of delegates. What is stressed in the amendment is the need for the Constitution to be reviewed and amended to suit contemporary conditions, and for an affirmation that the distribution of the legislative powers between the Commonwealth and the States should be that which is most conducive to the good Government and welfare of the Australian people. I suggest that the delegates should not be asking whether this involves more Commonwealth power or State power: they should be asking what distribution of powers between the Commonwealth and the States would be most conducive to good Government in this country and to the benefit of the people. We should start by asking that question and not with some preconceived idea about States rights, centralism, or something else.

We have a federal system that will remain. Whatever theoretical views people may entertain about federalism as a desirable form of Government, it is the form of Government that exists in this country as a matter of political and constitutional fact, and that form of Government will continue to exist during the lifetimes of all of us in this House, anyway. That means that our job is to ensure that the Commonwealth Constitution is made to work in the way that is most conducive to the good of the Australian people and of the nation. Consequently, it is important

that, when every constitutional question arises, we ask ourselves what is in the best interests of good government in Australia and for the benefit of Australian people. We should forget these preconceptions about centralism and States rights that bedevil so much of the constitutional discussions that take place in this country. If this Constitution Convention fails, it is unlikely that an opportunity to overhaul the Constitution will recur for a great many years. The planning behind this convention is that there will be an initial session, which will be devoted primarily towards trying to identify the areas in which a consensus may be found for a constitutional change.

Dr. Eastick: That would be a good reason for not caucusing it, wouldn't it?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not know precisely what the Leader means by "caucusing" in this context. Although he may have some difficulty in talking to his political colleagues from the other States, I certainly intend to talk to my political colleagues from the Commonwealth and State Parliaments. I shall be most interested to hear their views and to see what proposals they have in mind. I hope I will have some influence on them; I have no doubt they will have an influence on me. The convention will be better as a result of the discussions that take place at that time. I strongly recommend to the Leader that he talk to some of his colleagues, because he might have some influence on them or they on him, and that would be a good thing, too. I should be happy to talk to the Leader's colleagues from the other States, also.

Dr. Eastick: You won't get a predetermined idea?

The Hon. L. J. KING: In such a convention we cannot have predetermined ideas. If the delegates from this Parliament met together and tried to form a predetermined idea about something, we would be acting in a way likely to frustrate the convention, because delegates from other States would do the same and we would all arrive with preconceived ideas. I agree with the statement of the Commonwealth Attorney-General reported in, I think, the *Australian* in the last few days that it is of great importance that delegates go to this conference without preconceived ideas about the outcome. That is not to say that we will go to the conference without preconceived viewpoints about the Constitution. We will not go there with vacant minds, as though we had never thought about the constitutional problems of Australia before.

Of course we have thought about them; I hope some of us have reached conclusions about how we would like to see the Australian Constitution develop. However, if we are realists, all of us know that there can be no change unless a consensus is reached between the Commonwealth and the States and among the political Parties, and I do not refer only to the major political Parties, as the history of the constitutional proposals in this country shows that even a minor political Party, if it sets about opposing a constitutional change, is likely to bring about the defeat of that change. If we seriously believe, as the motion states, that this Constitution needs review and amendment to suit contemporary conditions, we should be serious enough about it to be willing at the convention to listen to other points of view, and to engage in give and take in an effort to come out with some proposal that will make the Australian Constitution and Federation much more workable than is the case at present.

The other limb of the motion relates to appeals to the Privy Council. I assume that the member for Mitcham really meant appeals from State courts to the Privy Council. The motion opposes the abolition of appeals to the Privy Council. It surprises me very much to see this in 1973. As the honourable member did not in his speech give any arguments in favour of retaining appeals to the Privy Council, I do not know what arguments he had in mind. The fact is that appeals to the Privy Council are a relic of a political and constitutional relationship between Australia and the United Kingdom that has ceased to exist. An appeal to the Privy Council was the means by which British subjects living in colonial areas could go to the Queen in Council to have their wrongs redressed. This was essentially an appeal system set up for British settlements which formed part of the British Empire and which had not reached a sufficient stage of development to be able to provide their own complete system of justice. Consequently, there was provision for an appeal to the Privy Council as a means by which the courts at the centre of the Empire (the Queen in Council) could redress wrongs or errors perpetrated by the Queen's judges in the colonies.

With the passage of time we have an entirely different situation. The great dominions of the Commonwealth of Australia and Canada (and previously South Africa and the Irish Free State) have now reached the stage where they are independent countries. Further, the Queen as head of the nation is, in the case of Australia, the Queen of Australia, and, in the case of Canada, the Queen of Canada, and the whole basis on which an appeal to the Queen in Council was instituted has disappeared. The Statute of Westminster, enacted in 1931 and ratified in Australia in 1942, provides that no law of the British Parliament can apply to Australia except with the consent and at the request of the Australian Parliament.

It gives the Australian Parliament the power to amend the laws of the British Parliament applying to Australia, and therefore recognizes as a matter of constitutional law and practice that Australia is an independent country capable of having its own foreign policy and its own relations with other countries, and producing a situation in which the Queen or her representative in relation to Australian matters acts solely on the advice of her Australian Ministers. There is a complete independence, and the association that exists between Australia and the United Kingdom is now an association between two free and equal nations associated together in the Commonwealth of Nations and having the same monarch as head of the representative nations. But in no sense is Australia subordinate to the United Kingdom, nor is the Australian Parliament subordinate to the United Kingdom Parliament, and the only vestige that remains is the appeal to the Privy Council from State courts.

In 1969 the Liberal Government in Canberra abolished appeals from Commonwealth courts to the Privy Council and, if it had had the power, would undoubtedly have abolished appeals from all courts to the Privy Council. That was the action of the Liberal Government in Canberra, and it is one of which I most heartily approve because it recognizes the reality of the independent constitutional position of the Australian nation at the present time. We are left quite illogically with this relic of a bygone colonial age, an appeal from State courts to the Privy Council: it produces no advantage at all. The Privy Council is composed for the most part of judges, law lords who have no familiarity with Australian conditions and no familiarity with Australian law so far as it differs from the common and Statute law of England (and it does differ in many respects) and they have to start from scratch when examining an appeal from an Australian court.

They have to acquaint themselves with Australian Statutes and with decisions of Australian courts, and

in doing that they sit in review of Australian judges who have been familiar all their lives with Australian conditions and Australian law and have made a considered decision on the case. How can this be justified? What possible justification is there for putting litigants to the expense of an appeal to a tribunal thousands of kilometres away which can have no possible advantage over the courts in Australia that make the decision? At the moment there is an appeal from State courts to the High Court of Australia. What possible justification can there be for continuing this system by which there can be a further appeal from the High Court to the Privy Council?

In support of his motion, the member for Mitcham referred to the platform of the Australian Labor Party. Really, except in one respect (the abolition of the Senate) he referred to it without disapproval and pointed out that the platform of the Australian Labor Party called for the transfer to the Commonwealth of such plenary powers as were necessary and desirable for the good of the Australian people; that is what it comes down to, though expressed in somewhat different words. I should have thought that was a sentiment to which one could hardly take exception, and I do not think the honourable member did, except that he said it could mean anything or nothing. However, he continued to use a phrase that he has used more than once, and I refer to it not because I want to engage in recriminations (because that would be a most undesirable approach to a Constitutional Convention) but because it emphasizes the point I have been making. He said it was impossible for one to be both a member of the Australian Labor Party and a good South Australian. That is a most significant phrase, because when people think in terms of being a good South Australian in contradistinction from being a good Australian they are demonstrating the sort of narrowness of approach which, if it is allowed to dominate the convention, will inevitably result in its failure.

Surely, every delegate who goes to the convention ought to go there as a good Australian. In any case, we are South Australians, and in this Parliament we have a responsibility not only to the people of South Australia but also to promote the welfare of this part of the nation for which we are responsible. However, all of us form part of the Australian nation. We are all Australians, and, if we ever get to a situation of saying that one cannot be a good South Australian because one favours a distribution of powers between the Commonwealth and the States that will produce the maximum good for the whole of Australia but that, because that might involve some vesting of powers in the Commonwealth that would otherwise be exercised by the South Australian Parliament and, therefore, one is not a good South Australian, a narrowness of viewpoint is being introduced into the whole approach to Australian national life which must result in the failure of the convention and which, indeed, would be disastrous for the future of this country.

I ask that we should not therefore worry too much about whether we consider ourselves good South Australians Victorians, New South Welshmen, Queenslanders or the like but that we start to think of ourselves as good Australians and, while we must pay and are in duty bound to pay proper regard to the protection of the interests of this part of the nation in which we live and for which we are responsible, we should go into this convention thinking not simply about that part of the country within the lines drawn on the map which is called South Australia and which is governed by this Parliament but about what is in the best interests of the Australian people as a whole.

If we do that, we will find a situation in which we can say, "It is in the interests of the whole Australian people that these additional powers be exercised by the Commonwealth Parliament. It does not matter that they would otherwise have been exercised by the Parliament of New South Wales or by the Parliaments of South Australia, Victoria or Queensland: it is in the general good that they be exercised by the Commonwealth Government". We will find other situations in which we will be able to say, "It is best that these powers be exercised by State Parliaments", and then we can look to the Commonwealth delegates to show that they, too, are thinking in the interests of all Australian people and are prepared to say, "We will not insist on those powers going to the Commonwealth simply for the sake of having powers transferred to the Commonwealth, but we are prepared to say that it is in the best interests of the people that State Parliaments should exercise these legislative powers." It is for that reason that this amendment has been moved, reframing this motion in a way that shifts the emphasis from this futile and barren centralism against States' rights argument to a consideration of what is in the best interests of the people as a whole.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That this House disapprove of the intention of the Commonwealth Government to reduce or cut out altogether grants to certain independent schools and is of opinion that the State Government should, by additional grants, make up to those independent schools so affected what they will lose from the Commonwealth.

(Continued from August 22. Page 469.)

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I am amazed by this motion. Many matters contained in it are wrong, not the least of which is that, like most of the public debate on the matter, it has concentrated on one relatively minor aspect of the report of the Karmel Committee to the neglect of the major recommendations which that committee has made and which, for Government and non-government schools alike, represent for the first time the establishment of a national charter for education and the prospect of achieving reasonable standards in all schools, be they Government or non-government.

Dr. Eastick: The effect is not the same, though.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will come to that, and I may be able to explain certain matters to the Leader, perhaps even to his satisfaction, although whether he will admit this or not is another matter. I therefore move the following amendment:

To strike out all words after "That" and insert:

this House, recognizing that the recommendations of the interim committee of the Australian Schools Commission—

(1) represent a charter for improved educational standards for the vast majority of Australian schools, both Government and non-government; and

(2) that as a consequence, for the first time in Australia, all school students can expect in future years to receive an education which will develop their particular talents to the fullest possible extent;

approves the action of the Australian Government in accepting those recommendations.

The Karmel committee recommendations involve in total over a two-year period the provision of an additional $467,000,000 for Government and non-government schools. For Government schools the additional sum over that two-year period is $396,500,000, whereas for non-government schools it is $50,200,000, with a further additional

sum of some $20,000,000-odd in relation to programmes that are available for Government and non-government schools.

The only part of the programmes for non-government schools recommended by the Karmel committee concerns itself with the per capita payments, about which we have heard so much in recent weeks. There are other programmes for non-government schools—the continuation of the science laboratory programme, the continuation and expansion of the programme for secondary school libraries in non-government schools, and the commencement of a programme for primary school libraries in both Government and non-government schools. There are programmes with respect to special education common to both Government and non-government schools. There is a programme with respect to disadvantaged schools common both to Government and to non-government schools. There is a programme for capital assistance with buildings for Government schools, and there is an additional programme for non-government schools as well.

A simple fact that has been neglected in the public discussions of this matter is that, whereas a certain school may be in a certain category in relation to per capita assistance with running costs, it may or may not qualify for other forms of assistance. It is perfectly possible, once we understand the way in which the committee operated, for a non-government school to be classified in category A in terms of assistance with running costs but for that school to have poor quality buildings and to qualify for capital assistance in the provision of new buildings, a new library, new science laboratories, and so on. It is also perfectly conceivable for a non-government school to be in category G or category H and qualify for a very high rate of assistance with running costs and yet to have relatively good quality buildings and not qualify for any capital assistance.

The member for Mitcham mentioned one school in this State, Walford Church of England Girls Grammar School, which is in category A and which next year will not receive any assistance from the Commonwealth Government with running costs; but that school, as the honourable member indicated and as those who know it are aware, has very poor quality buildings, in the main, and there is no statement in the report to suggest that such a school would not qualify for a capital grant. In fact, the report at no stage refers to wealthy schools in determining the various categories of assistance with running costs; at no stage does it talk about wealthy schools. The term is never used. It is a term adopted not by the Karmel committee but by its critics. In the way in which it has approached the matter, that committee has not attempted to make that kind of distinction. In fact, the committee throughout distinguishes problems of capital or of buildings and facilities from problems of staffing or providing the necessary materials that are required in a school to keep it functioning. That is a basic fact, which distinguishes the way in which the Karmel committee works from the way in which the Cook committee operates, because the Cook committee in determining its overall categories does not attempt to set out separate programmes for recurrent assistance and for capital assistance.

Some of the criteria it uses relate to recurrent resources available to the school; others of its criteria are capital criteria and, by awarding points under the various criteria it uses, it comes up with a final category which combines both recurrent problems (problems associated with running expenses, if I may put it that way) and capital problems. It is clear that on that ground alone the Cook committee would achieve a different categorization from that which the Karmel committee would achieve. That is the first major point that needs to be made, because members opposite in particular have been endeavouring to make it appear that category A schools will receive, in all circumstances, nothing from the Commonwealth Government; but that simply is not true, or is not necessarily true. Certainly, as category A schools, they are not entitled, under the proposals, to receive assistance with their running costs but, if their buildings do not qualify or they think them unsatisfactory or if they need to participate in in-service training programmes for their teachers, they can qualify for other forms of assistance, and it may be that the other forms of assistance would be substantial. Assistance at a rate of $100 a student would give assistance with running costs amounting to (if there were 400 students) $40,000 a year; and assistance with a capital project could mean assistance of about $100,000 a year. That kind of misleading account of the Karmel committee's report that has been given by members opposite in this debate needs to be corrected.

The second important point needing to be established is that many people, including members of this House, have been attempting to suggest that the Karmel committee's method of categorizing schools is non-understandable, not available to be understood or completely wrong. Let us be clear what the method is. It is, first, to consider for each school the costs of teachers and to express those costs in terms of standardized costs. So it is not a matter of the actual salaries paid to the teachers that a school employs: standard salaries are used. For example, a Catholic school is not given any extra advantage by the practice of using teachers of a religious order. Those teachers are put in at standardized salary costs. The supplementary report of the Interim Committee for the Australian Schools Commission makes it clear how that is done and what are the standardized salary costs for primary schools and secondary schools. Then this is added by the committee:

> To the standardized expenditure on teachers was added expenditures on equipment, ancillary staff, and other operating items, the latter two components being adjusted according to variations in award wages between States. This was then expressed on a per pupil basis relative to the national average running cost per pupil in Government schools to form the index of recurrent resource use.

So they are working out for non-government schools a standardized running cost in terms of teacher and material resources that a school is using, and comparing it to the Government standards over the whole length and breadth of Australia. From that comparison the most extraordinary results were obtained. I think they are worth mentioning to honourable members who have not already read the report, because the Karmel committee found, in terms of its assessment of the teachers and ancillary staff and the materials resource use at non-government schools, that there were extraordinary variations amongst those non-government schools.

Whilst the Government schools tended, from State to State, to be more or less at the same average standard, with some variations amongst States and with the smaller States of South Australia, Tasmania and Western Australia having higher standards than the Eastern States, in non-government schools the range of variation in resource use was extraordinary. For example, excluding the Catholic parish schools and considering non-government primary schools, with a Government resource use index of 100, the non-government resource use index varied from 60 to 270, so non-government primary schools outside the Catholic parish system were varying, in resource use,

between 40 per cent below the Government school standard and 170 per cent above that standard.

Much the same was found with non-government secondary schools, where the variation was from 40 per cent below the Government school standard to as much as 170 per cent above that standard. The committee, in making its recommendations for all schools, set down what it regarded as reasonable targets to be achieved by 1979, and these targets for the Government school system represented an improvement in resource use, involving materials, equipment, teachers, and ancillary staff (it had nothing to do with buildings), of about 35 per cent to 40 per cent a student.

That means that, over the six-year period to 1979, we should be able to achieve, in our Government schools, an improvement in resource use of 35 per cent to 40 per cent, or about 5 per cent to 6 per cent a year. That is something to which we have never been able to look forward previously, and that is why the amendment that I intend to move refers to the charter for improved educational standards. Furthermore, the committee set out to recommend grants for non-government schools so that those that were below the 1979 standard objective could, by that year, achieve the same standard as the Government schools. The question then arose about what to do regarding those schools which, in 1972, already had standards of resource use in terms of their use of teachers, on a number of students basis, and in terms of the use of ancillary staff, etc., that were higher than the 1979 standard. That was because, after all, the grants recommended by the committee for Government and non-government schools are aimed, if the index is put at the standard of 100 for the Government schools in 1972, at achieving a standard in terms of an index number of about 140 by 1979, but some non-government schools already have a standard of more than 140 now.

According to the index number used, some are as high as 270; that is, they are already about double the 1979 standard for the rest of Australia. Whether honourable members like it or not, the committee, when faced with this evidence, had to decide what it would recommend regarding the allocation of Government funds (which do not grow on trees and which are scarce) to those schools that already had standards in excess of the 1979 target for the remainder of Australia. The committee concluded that a greater degree of improvement could be achieved for those schools, both Government and non-government, that were below the 1979 target if the money that otherwise would go to those schools that were above the 1979 target figure was redirected to those schools that were below, so the committee's approach was egalitarian. It was saying that as well as raising the target standard for all schools in Australia below that target to that level by 1979, it should try to achieve those targets more quickly by redistributing funds that otherwise would have gone to schools that already had, according to the committee's criterion, a satisfactory standard of education in terms of their resource use for each student, not in terms of the quality of the school buildings.

Mr. Speaker, you may or may not agree with the committee's conclusions on this matter, but to suggest, as the member for Mitcham has done, that this policy is designed particularly to favour Roman Catholics, or that it is a purely political solution, is completely wrong and an insult to the distinguished members of that Karmel committee. The committee included the Director-General of Education in South Australia; a former President of the Australian Teachers Federation, who is now the Teacher Liaison Officer in the South Australian Education Department (Mr. White); Mrs. Blackburn, lecturer at the Sturt College of Advanced Education; and Professor Karmel himself, who is a distinguished Australian, a former Professor of Economics at Adelaide University and Vice-Chancellor of Flinders University.

Whilst he was Vice-Chancellor at Flinders University, the Liberal and Country League Government in this State saw fit to ask Professor Karmel to conduct an inquiry into education in South Australia. Are members opposite willing to stand up in this House and say that those people have no idea about what they are doing, that they are politically biased, and that they are pro-Catholic? I suggest that what some members opposite have said on this matter offers one of the worst kinds of insult to distinguished public servants who have served not only Labor Governments but also L.C.L. Governments truly and well over a long period, and I am becoming more and more disgusted at some of the remarks that have been made, particularly by the member for Mitcham, on this matter.

Mr. Becker: The L.M. won't help you in Brighton next time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have no doubt that the member for Hanson will support the motion that the member for Mitcham has moved. That is the ridiculous kind of vote to which I would expect the honourable member to commit himself. I think this sort of slur that has been peddled in the press and in this House about distinguished and competent educators in this country has reached a critical stage. Those people, under a big strain, have been concerned to produce recommendations directed to the educational benefit of most Australian citizens, and the slur should be removed and members opposite should not indulge in that conduct in future.

In this connection, let me also make clear to members the magnitude of the problem that concerns the member for Mitcham. The number of students attending category A schools in South Australia this year is about 4 400; the number attending category B schools is about 2 700; and the total number attending private schools is about 37 000. So, of those 37 000 students, 4 400 are associated with schools to which the Commonwealth Government proposes to give nothing at all next year, and 2 700 are associated with schools that will receive reduced assistance next year. A further 3 800 students are associated with schools in categories C and D, which will receive about the same amount of aid next year. The remainder of the students are attending schools that will receive substantially more aid next year.

So, of those students attending non-government schools in South Australia, about 10 900 are associated with schools that will get either less aid or about the same amount of aid, and of that number only 4 400 attend schools that will get nothing at all; the remaining 27 000 students attending non-government schools will be associated with schools receiving substantially more aid. Yet the member for Mitcham, supported by the member for Davenport, had the gall to suggest that the Commonwealth Government's purpose was to destroy independent schools in circumstances where over the length and breadth of the country in 1974 and 1975 an additional $50,000,000 will be paid to such schools. Nothing could be further from the truth, and nothing could be more typical of the kind of aunt sally that members opposite are accustomed to peddle in public in relation to matters such as this, but it is an aunt sally that has no foundation in fact whatever.

In this State independent schools will receive an increase in funds from the Commonwealth Government in 1974

and 1975 of about $3,000,000. The amount of assistance they will receive will change from what would have been $6,750,000 to about $9,750,000. Yet we are told that the Commonwealth Government is out to destroy non-government schools. What absolute rubbish! Government schools, on the other hand, over the same two-year period in South Australia will receive additional support amounting to about $40,000,000, and all we can hear from Opposition members are repetitious remarks about category A schools, condemnation of the Karmel committee, and slurs on that committee's integrity. Yet we have a report which for the very first time in the history of this country sets out to achieve reasonable educational standards for all children, not only for the 1½ per cent in category A schools, not only for the 1 per cent in category B schools, but for 100 per cent of children attending schools throughout Australia, whether they be Government or non-government schools.

Yet the member for Mitcham, the member of the so-called progressive Liberal Movement, tells us a long sob story about category A schools which, on the Karmel committee's measurements, are shown to have been in our educational history the only schools ever to have achieved reasonable standards, the only schools to have achieved in 1973 standards which are above the target for 1979 for the remaining schools. The other 98.5 per cent of students are attending schools with standards that are below the 1979 target, and the vast majority of those students are attending Government and non-government schools where the educational standards, by comparison with the educational standards of the best schools in the community in terms of the resources they are able to use, are nothing short of being a disgrace, and those standards have been a disgrace for a very long time. What this report demonstrates is that at least 90 per cent of the students who have attended school in Australia have for years had a second-rate education and been brought up as second-class citizens.

Mr. Mathwin: Oh, no!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: What I have said is absolutely true. If the member for Glenelg is not aware of it, the Liberal Movement is lucky he did not move back. It is no accident that, when an objective measure of resource use is taken in Government and Catholic schools, for example, the greatest measure of assistance goes to those schools, because educational standards in many of those schools have for years been second-rate. Children who have attended those schools have been brought up as second-class citizens under Governments associated with the Party or Parties that are represented by members opposite. Instead of welcoming a report which for the first time—

Mr. Hall: Who are you saying are second-class citizens?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member was the head of a Government that tolerated students being brought up as second-class citizens.

Mr. McAnaney: Rubbish! Who opposed State aid in the first place?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Heysen has been in this House long enough to know that remarks made from the place where he is now sitting are out of order, and the honourable member will be dealt with if he continues to interject from his present position.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Not only is the honourable member out of order, Mr. Speaker, but his knowledge of historical facts is incorrect. The first State aid assistance in the form of per capita grants in South Australia was announced by the current Premier of this State in 1967. The first commitment to pay per capita assistance in any form to non-government schools was announced by the Hon. Don Dunstan in 1967, prior to any statement whatever coming from any official organ of the Liberal and Country League.

Mr. Coumbe: You're getting down to fine points now.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Is the member for Torrens suggesting that a commitment made by the Premier at that time was not worth anything?

Mr. Coumbe: Not at all.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Heysen tried to suggest by interjection that the Labor Party in this State had opposed State aid, but the facts show the reverse of that position.

Mr. Hall: Why don't you—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I understand the willingness of the member for Goyder to get off this subject, because he never understood it when he was Premier. He never backed his Minister of Education, and never gave her the resources to do a proper job. At that time he and his Cabinet colleagues never gave the then Minister of Education the kind of financial support which she should have had and which the kids in the schools deserved to get.

Mr. Hall: That's rubbish. It's untrue, and you know it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not know it. Let the honourable member consider the improvements since then.

Mr. Hall: Why should I? You know you are telling untruths.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Goyder is becoming embarrassed, but when he received extra Commonwealth assistance in the 1969-70 financial year he reduced the amount of State Loan money that was used for schools.

Mr. Hall: And that's rubbish, too.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A no-confidence motion was moved against him in this House as a consequence. It was admitted that, because extra Commonwealth funds were being received, less in State funds was being provided. That is the kind of priority that the Hall Government gave to education. In fact, it did not give it any priority at all, although it spoke about being progressive.

Mr. Hall: How can you say that without smiling? You are pretty good at that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the honourable member cannot take it, I am sorry. I know that Mrs. Steele did not become a member of the Liberal Movement, but she had plenty to complain about in the support that she as Minister received in financial provisions for education. The fact that she did not complain is only a consequence of her sense of loyalty to her Cabinet colleagues at that time, because she had every right to complain. She certainly had the can tipped on her for not doing the job, and unjustifiably so in many instances. The criticism that Mrs. Steele had to endure should have been directed at the Government and in particular at the Premier (the present member for Goyder) and the then Treasurer (Hon. Sir Glen Pearson).

Mr. Hall: You know that is not true, so stop saying it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: They are the facts of the matter. At that time there were schools—

Mr. Hall: You are telling one untruth after another.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Methinks the honourable member protests too much, because he has been caught on the raw and is upset at the consequence. I am sorry about

that, and dreadfully sorry that the then Premier did not see fit at that time to arrange for an effective school-building programme, as well as the funds for it, even in the area he now represents, because that would have been a help.

Mr. Hall: You've gone down in my estimation. I am beginning to think that the Opposition is a match for you.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I notice that, while I am giving the member for Goyder the cane, they are all being quiet, and I see a few Opposition members smiling. I suspect that the Opposition, rather than being a match for me, is enjoying considerably this situation, and I guess that the member for Goyder would agree with me in that judgment.

Mr. Mathwin: No wonder they call you the tired Minister.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: When the member for Goyder was Premier, some class sizes were 55 to 60 children, and classes of that size covered more than one grade and were being coped with by one teacher. Classes of that size were not to be found in the Government system at that time, although there were plenty of classes with 40 children. Also, these large class sizes were not to be found in category A and B schools, as applying to the Karmel committee classification, but they were to be found in some Catholic parish schools. No Opposition member can suggest that a child in a primary class with 50 or 60 other children covering two grades is getting a first-rate education. Many children who passed through primary education at that time are now trying to cope with secondary education but, because of the lack of adequate grounding, are unable to cope with it as well as they might have coped if their primary education had been better.

Much the same is true of many students in Government secondary schools at present. All the evidence we have in the department suggests clearly that there are students in our secondary schools who have educational problems as a result of the inability of our education system to provide adequately for them in earlier years. Does anyone suggest that children in that category have not had a second-class education and have not, as a consequence, been brought up as second-class citizens, because the education system has not provided them with the kind of educational opportunity that it should have provided? Some of the qualifications that these students may otherwise have obtained will, in all probability, not be available to them now. That was not a new situation in the 1960's. Much as Opposition members may like to blame the member for Goyder for the whole box and dice, that would not be fair.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: The member for Mitcham had a share in it, too.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes. That situation existed in the 1950's, in the 1940's, and in the 1930's: it has existed in this country since compulsory education was introduced. To most students there never have been decent and reasonable educational standards; such standards have applied to a small minority only. We have received a report that basically attempts to provide reasonable educational standards across the board, but we are asked to direct our attention to a small group that may get less assistance than it has had for the last couple of years and to forget about the 97½ per cent of students who can face their educational future with greater confidence than has existed in the past.

This report, which is a national charter for education, is denigrated because, after all, the media is not interested in the good things that have been done but is interested only in controversy and rows that develop. Some people develop a great row in relation to a small section, and the media play it up because it is considered that that situation may help to sell more newspapers. An impression being created throughout the country is that this report, which for the first time sets reasonable standards for everyone, is a nonsense document, and is unfair and unjust. There may be difficulties with the report, but we should never lose sight of the basic characteristics of the report and of the recommendations it makes. For that reason alone (and there are other reasons) the motion should be rejected.

The motion asks this Government, no matter what the continuing needs of 97½ per cent of the kids in the State might be, to pay out of State funds the money that the category A schools are losing from the Commonwealth Government, without our paying any attention to other priorities. No matter how many educational problems we may have elsewhere within the Government or non-government school system, the member for Mitcham (and the Liberal Movement has been identified with this motion, and should be ashamed of itself if it thinks it is a progressive Party) is asking the State Government to forget about all other priorities and to supply from State coffers the $500,000 that the category A schools are losing from the Commonwealth Government. That is not an acceptable proposition.

In line with its election commitment, the Government is expanding assistance. However, the allocation of those funds will be based on an overall assessment by the Cook committee; there will be no allocation as a consequence of some arbitrary and misleading motion moved by a member of a rump Party in this House. I ask honourable members to reject the motion out of hand. I hope that at least a few Opposition members will recognize the basic point that I am making. Finally, I wish to deal with the points made by the members for Mitcham and Davenport about the alleged difficulties that will be experienced by these category A schools. I am willing to admit that a category A school which has only a small number of pupils and which has problems establishing a reasonable, economically-sized class could run into difficulty. It may be that a school such as Marbury school could run into difficulty.

Dr. Eastick: Are you willing to admit that some of them will be at a disadvantage?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No, they will have higher educational standards than the rest of the schools will have; that is what the report is all about. If the Leader does not understand why the Karmel committee has reached that conclusion, I advise him to read the report again.

Dr. Eastick: I'm referring to the statement that the Commonwealth will not disadvantage any school.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not responsible for all the statements of the Commonwealth Government any more than I am responsible for statements made by Opposition members or their confreres; I am responsible for my own statements. With regard to category A schools, I would not deny for a moment that they face a difficult period of adjustment during the next year. We will certainly co-operate with them to ensure an easing of those difficulties. However, to suggest that those schools will be destroyed or closed down or that they will lose many students is to create a completely false impression. Surely the Leader is not suggesting that St. Peters College will lose many students next year or close down. After all, I understand that that college has existed for 123 years, and

for 119 of those years it did not receive a cent from the State Government or the Commonwealth Government.

Dr. Eastick: The affluence of the college is not necessarily the affluence of the parents.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I know. However, if a parent can pay $900 a year to send a child to St. Peters College, he is not on the basic wage. The average income of parents who send children to such a school would be significantly higher than the average income of parents who send their children, for instance, to Sienna College, Findon, where the fees are $30 a term and where they try to provide (and they succeed as far as they are able to succeed in the circumstances) a reasonable supply of teachers, ancillary staff, materials and equipment. That is the magnitude of the problem we are talking about, and the degree of affluence between the group of parents whose children attend a school where the fees are $90 and the group whose children attend a school where they are $900 is quite different. The Leader of the Opposition would also want me to say, because he would want me to put the facts, that the education deduction of $400 allowed under Commonwealth income tax produces a bigger tax rebate the higher the income, and the average tax rebates of parents of children at St. Peters would be higher than those of parents at a school where the fees were very much lower.

Because he is a truthful man and would want me to state the facts, the Leader would want me to say that the tax rebate, at the maximum, can be as high as $267 a year for a student, if the income is sufficiently high. That is more than two and a half times the current level of Commonwealth per capita assistance. Further, the Leader would want me to say that the tax rebate is far more important than the per capita assistance to those schools where the average income of parents is high and the fees are high, because he believes the truth should be stated. He would want me to say that the Commonwealth Government did not cut out those income tax deductions for education, because he would want the facts to be fully known.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the future?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There was no change in the Budget regarding concessional education deductions. The Leader would also want me to say, because he is a firm believer in having all the facts stated, that the amount of direct and indirect assistance previously received from the Commonwealth Government (direct assistance by per capita grants and indirect assistance through tax rebates) for the average parent of children at category A schools was greater than (and in some cases a number of times greater than) the amount of direct and indirect assistance given to parents of children at schools where the fees were very low.

Mr. Venning: That is understandable.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Rocky River is absolutely incapable of understanding; he thinks that the better off one is the more one deserves to get.

Mr. Venning: You are talking a lot of rubbish. Talk some common sense for a change.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The common sense of the member for Rocky River is that, the more one has in this world and the higher the income, the more one is entitled to direct and indirect support from the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He is a fat cat.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: He is a fat cat, and he is in favour of fat cats in all circumstances; that is why the Country Party will knock him off. There are people in the Country Party who are not entirely in favour of fat cats, and no doubt the member for Flinders will make that clear to the member for Rocky River.

Mr. Venning: When are you going to allocate some of the buildings for the Gladstone High School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have never known such a member in this Parliament! The member for Rocky River does not merely lead with his chin but he also bends over a bit and invites anyone to have a real slap at him. The rebuilding of the Gladstone High School was originally promised by Sir Thomas Playford in 1938, but the students at Gladstone moved into the new building in 1973, 35 years later. The member for Rocky River is carrying on now because there have been some bids for the wooden buildings on the old site at Gladstone and we have occupied our time to sort out the priorities. He is asking in this debate why something is not done quickly to allocate the temporary buildings.

That is his idea of educational priorities. I wish some of his colleagues would take him to one side and advise him very gently that he must not make a fool of himself. I hope the Leader or the Deputy Leader will have a quiet word to the member for Rocky River and say, "Before you get involved in one of these debates by way of interjection, please consider what you are saying and do not make a fool of yourself again as you have this afternoon".

The SPEAKER: Can the honourable Minister link up his remarks to the motion?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Mr. Speaker, I confess that it is impossible to link the member for Rocky River to this debate in any substantive way whatsoever; therefore I would be out of order in further discussing that gentleman in any way. I had been pointing out to the Leader of the Opposition that we have in Australia at present a system of assistance for education, both direct and indirect, which operates to provide more assistance for those with higher incomes. Of course, that is what provoked the member for Rocky River; he thinks that is justified. I happen not to think that way. My view on the matter is that the Government's responsibility is basically toward the education of children. The basic responsibility of the Education Department, the Minister, and the teachers is toward the children in the schools, no matter what schools they attend. We have a prior responsibility to act, if we are capable of acting, immediately to raise educational standards for all those children who currently do not have reasonable education standards, because if we fail to do that we may condemn those children to a life less full than it otherwise might be.

That is the basic responsibility. In so far as there is responsibility in this area of education, it is fundamentally toward those who have lower standards. That, after all, is the basic message of the Karmel committee report. I ask members on both sides of the House, including the member for Mitcham when he returns from those activities to which he gives a higher priority than to the business of this House, to support the amendment rather than the motion.

Mr. HALL (Goyder): I am pleased, having heard the Minister in full flight, that the member for Mitcham has been absent from today's debate. One word that describes the Minister is "tricky", because his speech today was not worthy of a Minister of the Crown. The Minister made fun of the whole subject before him: he was nothing more than a buffoon in his approach to this argument, and he laced his arguments with one untruth after another. The Minister knows that he has been telling untruths, and he smiled as he did so. He has done this so often that he

has successfully ingrained these untruths in the public's memory. That is how he could say the things he did about previous Ministers of Education and previous Governments that were responsible for education in this State. The Minister knows that some years ago one of the great problems of education in this State was the tremendous influx of migrants into South Australia at a rate greater than into most other States and greater in some years in this State than in other States per capita. This placed a tremendous load on the educational facilities of this State, coupled with the local population increase.

The Minister knows that our education system has been the envy of other States. We have maintained a standard in buildings and teacher-pupil ratio that other States could not approach during all that time. He also knows that, under the Walsh-Dunstan Government, expenditure on school buildings was substantially decreased in absolute terms, not in relative terms. When my Government came into office in 1968 it had to set about the task of increasing Government expenditure on school buildings, and it did this at a tremendous rate of increase. Yet in the light of all that, the Minister today told one untruth after another, and laughed as he did so. We know that he was the leader of what was supposed to be a crisis in education that ended on May 30, 1970, when the Labor Government came to power after it had repudiated the Dartmouth dam project.

Mr. Mathwin: The Minister is leaving the Chamber; he doesn't want to hear you.

Mr. HALL: Obviously not. The one word that describes him is "tricky", which I use with its full implication, if the Minister speaks such untruths inside and outside the House. Having said that, I say there are points in the Minister's speech which I need to study before replying to them. The truth needs to be told, and I will need some time to decipher all his meanderings and buffoonery today in order to be able to answer the untruths he has uttered. In the light of that, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

OFFSHORE RIGHTS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That this House call on all South Australian members of the Commonwealth Parliament, and particularly the Senators, irrespective of their Party allegiance, to oppose by every means in their power the Seas and Submerged Lands Bill and the Seas and Submerged Lands (Royalty on Minerals) Bill now before that Parliament.

(Continued from August 15. Page 347.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The proposal of the member for Mitcham is that we oppose the Seas and Submerged Lands Bill and the Seas and Submerged Lands (Royalty on Minerals) Bill now before the Commonwealth Parliament. The purpose of these Bills is to give to the Commonwealth overall control of offshore areas to ensure that matters of national importance are controlled on a national basis. There is no really feasible means of dealing with offshore areas other than on a national basis. That does not mean that the States should not have, as regional designated authorities, responsibility in this area. To say that the States are able to deal with these matters effectively is simply to ignore matters of national ecology and the satisfactory development of offshore areas.

No doubt, there needs to be a uniform offshore mining code and a uniform provision in relation to most of the laws in offshore areas, but that cannot be achieved overnight. Undoubtedly at present the gravest anomalies occur in almost every area of law. Indeed, the position which this Government has put to the Commonwealth Government is not in opposition to the provision of a national code in offshore areas. Rather, until general national codes can be prescribed, State laws should continue to apply; otherwise, administratively there will be a grave hiatus and no-one will quite know what the law is. Those representations have been made to the Commonwealth Government, which has taken knowledge of them. I have outlined that procedure in reply to the member for Mitcham in the House earlier. The position the honourable member has taken is contrary to that taken by the Party of which he was at some time a member and to which I suppose he has some kind of allegiance federally, although I do not quite know what the relationship is. The Liberal Party in Canberra has supported this legislation, which was originally proposed by Mr. Gorton; it was continued subsequently, and it has now been supported in the Commonwealth Government.

Dr. Eastick: Not in total.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, there was some deferment in the Senate, but again there has been a change of ground on that score.

Dr. Eastick: No.

Mr. Coumbe: The measure was split.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I appreciate that. On the other hand, both of these measures before the Commonwealth Parliament are, in effect, those that were introduced into the Commonwealth Parliament by a Liberal Government. They were introduced because of the grave situation that had occurred off shore in Queensland, where the coalition Government of Mr. Bjelke-Petersen had been responsible for the gravest danger to the Barrier Reef and the offshore islands as a result of oil-drilling and sand-mining operations. There was no way of controlling these great national assets and conserving them for the benefit of the Australian people than by taking a national attitude to the whole question of the preservation of the ecology off shore. The States have been through the processes of suggesting to the Commonwealth Government that the correct way to proceed is by having some form of mirror legislation. That has been rejected by both Parties, federally. In consequence, the situation now is that the Commonwealth intends to proceed on the basis of the legislation now before the Commonwealth Parliament.

What the States need to do is to get a satisfactory working arrangement with the Commonwealth Government under the umbrella of this legislation. I do not believe there is any sensible purpose to be achieved by this House endeavouring to pass an instruction such as that proposed to be contained in this motion.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 15. Page 355.)

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I oppose this Bill. It is, of course, another attempt to put forward the proposition that voting for Parliamentary elections should not be compulsory but should be on a voluntary basis. This issue has been debated in this House on several occasions. I have often put arguments for compulsory voting in this House and the member for Mitcham really added nothing to what has been said previously regarding this matter.

The plain truth of the matter is that it is impractical to get a real consensus in a community, a real estimate of what the community really believes regarding a Parliamentary election, unless citizens are under a duty to

record their vote. This fact has been proved many times and, if we want a recent reminder (something to keep it vividly in our memory), I refer to the Southern District by-election, where just over 30 per cent of the electors voted in that election. Although I had the exact figures on that election with me when I thought this debate would take place, I do not have them now. No doubt the member for Goyder could tell me off the top of his head the percentage recorded by the Liberal Movement candidate.

I do not intend to occupy the time of this House in going over the same arguments again. We have had the recent example in Southern District of a handful of people virtually electing the member to represent that district. It is a ludicrous situation, which I would have thought no-one would want to revert to. To some extent I am fortified in that belief by the singular lack of success achieved by the Leader of the Opposition in his efforts to persuade his Commonwealth colleagues—

Dr. Eastick: The Leader didn't even take part in the debate.

The Hon. L. J. KING: If he favours voluntary voting as he has said in this House, it may not have been such a bad idea if he did take part in the debate and get some support for the idea. The Federal Council of the Liberal Party took the view which I take, and which the Government takes, that it is a duly of citizenship to record a vote. It would be anti-democratic folly to revert to a system of voluntary voting.

In this House we are accused of favouring compulsory voting because we think it is to the political disadvantage of the Liberal Party. The odd thing is that apparently in the other States, at least, some of the arguments addressed to the Federal Council of the Liberal Party included the view that the reverse was the case: that a voluntary system would be against the interests of the Liberal Party. However, that latter view is not held by L.C.L. members in this House or by Liberal Movement members, either. All of them seem convinced that they would derive considerable advantage from voluntary voting. As a result, they continue to peddle the issue every so often, this effort to revive the lost cause of voluntary voting which, as I say, would be an anti-democratic and reactionary move. Of course, it has been repudiated by the Federal Council of the Liberal Party, which cannot see merit in this proposal.

Dr. Eastick: Do you believe in democracy?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes, I believe in democracy; but by that I mean the right of the majority of the people to determine who shall represent them in Parliament. There is no way of ascertaining the will of the majority of the people except by imposing a legal obligation on citizens to record their wishes through their vote. This has been accepted by all political Parties in Australia for the greater part of this country's political history.

Dr. Eastick: What about the people who didn't vote at the Semaphore by-election?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not know what is the significance of that interjection. I have heard that sort of interjection often. If the honourable member thinks that further action should be taken, and if he indicates what it is, I will be happy to consider it. Certainly, citizens are under an obligation to vote, and if they do not vote the penalty is there to be imposed. This is a discipline the community imposes on itself so that it knows the Parliament elected to represent it truly represents the will of the people and not the will (as in the case of the Southern District by-election) of 30 per cent of them. The member for Goyder could tell me what percentage was achieved by the successful candidate (Mr. Burdett), but I think he would have got only about 15 per cent of the vote from those eligible to vote in that by-election. How can he claim properly to represent that district in the Legislative Council, and does this not make absolute nonsense of the voluntary voting move that we get over and over again?

Dr. Eastick: How could Mr. Wilson claim to be the Prime Minister of England?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Because he was put there, but how does the present Prime Minister claim to be the Prime Minister of Great Britain? Let us worry not about how Mr. Wilson got into office but about how he was put out of being Prime Minister. In the United Kingdom every opinion poll a week before the election demonstrated clearly that the Wilson Government would win by 4 per cent or 5 per cent of the popular vote. However, the people of Great Britain, being satisfied that the Party they wanted to support was going to be elected, sat home and watched the world soccer series on television and did not vote. As a result, the poll in the last United Kingdom general election was about 5 per cent down on that of the previous general election, and that was just the margin needed to reverse the public opinion poll predictions. That is what accounted for the defeat of the Wilson Government, and the fact that there is an electoral system that enables this to happen is a disgrace. It is something that we have not got here in Australia because we have compulsory voting, a system to which we should continue to adhere.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

[Sitting suspended from 5.53 *to* 7.30 *p.m.]*

CONSUMER CREDIT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

MARGARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It arises from an agreement amongst the Agriculture Ministers in the States of the Commonwealth that the quotas of the production of table margarine be increased. The increase in quota for South Australia agreed at that time was from 528 tons (536.5 t) to 700 tons (712 t). I now deal with the Bill in some detail. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 16 of the principal Act, which provides that no licence under that Act shall be granted to any premises situated within 100yds. of a butter factory. This figure has, by this clause, been altered to 100 m.

Clause 3 repeals and re-enacts section 20 of the principal Act, which deals with quotas of table margarine. Subsection (1) of clause 20 provides two definitions which are substantially the same as were contained in the original section 20. Subsection (2) permits the Minister to specify the maximum quota of table margarine that may be manufactured in the State during the period specified in the notice. The period is generally one calendar year. Subsection (3) is formal. Subsection (4) provides that the notices should be published in the *Gazette* not less than one month before it is expressed to come into operation and, in fact, these notices are published in the *Gazette* in November in the year preceding the year in which they are to come into operation.

Subsection (5) makes it an offence to manufacture margarine in excess of the quota. Subsection (6) makes it an offence to sell margarine in excess of the quota but, at subsection (7), provides that amounts from previous quotas may be sold during any quarter. Subsection (8) limits the total amount that may be manufactured in this State in any period of 12 months to 712 tonnes. Subsection (9) is a transitional provision.

Subsection (10), in effect, increases the quota that may be manufactured in this State during the last nine months of this calendar year by one-quarter, which is equivalent to an increase of one-third for a full year. The reason for this increase is to ensure that manufacturers of margarine in this State are not placed at a disadvantage compared to manufacturers of margarine in other States of the Commonwealth. Since the decision to increase quotas was taken in February of this year, it seems equitable that the increase should have effect for the last three quarters of this year.

Mr. WARDLE secured the adjournment of the debate.

STOCK MEDICINES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes a number of disparate amendments to the Stock Medicines Act, 1939, as amended, and can probably be best explained by a consideration of its clauses in detail. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 3 of the principal Act, which relates to definitions, and inserts a definition of "expiry day", which is consequential on the establishment of a new, rather longer, registration period for stock medicines. It also inserts a definition of "registration period", which again is consequential on that proposal, and finally this clause amends the definition of "sell" to make clear that "sell" includes, in the context of this Bill, advertising for sale.

Clause 4 amends section 4 of the principal Act, which sets out certain exemptions, and this amendment is to make clear that stock medicines prescribed and compounded at the direction of a veterinary surgeon will be exempted from the Act. In its original form, the scope of this provision was not entirely clear. Clause 5 amends section 7 of the principal Act, which provides for the registration of stock medicines. By this clause and clause 7 it is proposed that the registration period for stock medicines will be increased from one year to three years. This should result in greater convenience of administration of the Act and impose a somewhat reduced burden on those whose duty it is to have all medicines registered. Consequent on the establishment of this longer period, there is proposed an increase in the fee for registration. The fee will be $15 for three years, with a system of pro rata reduction for registrations that extend over a lesser period.

Clause 6 repeals section 8 of the principal Act, which preserved the confidentiality of information provided by the Stock Medicines Board relating to its consideration of the registration of stock medicines. Everyone would agree that in this area this confidentiality should be preserved, and there is no doubt in the Government's mind that it will be so preserved. However, the existence of this provision has somewhat inhibited the proper exchange of information between the States, particularly where it is a possibility that a substance at first thought to be harmless but later found to be deleterious was being used in stock medicines. On balance, it is thought better that this provision should be removed, since it goes without saying that exchanges of information between official bodies are of vital importance if full effect is to be given to the purposes and objects of the principal Act. Any improper disclosure of information can, of course, be dealt with under the Public Service Act.

Clause 7 amends section 10 of the principal Act and is intended to relieve the Chief Inspector of the duty of publishing the register of stock medicines in the *Gazette* each year. This publication is quite expensive and, in fact, serves little purpose. New subsection (2) provides that the register shall be maintained properly and be available to the public. This clause also contains amendments consequent on the the proposal to establish a three-year registration period.

Clause 8 repeals section 14 of the principal Act, which over the years has been shown to have had no practical value and merely to have imposed a quite unnecessary burden on dealers in stock medicines. In its place a new section 14 is proposed. This new section sets out the grounds on which the registration of a stock medicine may be cancelled. It is suggested that the grounds are self-explanatory, but I would advert specifically to the ground related to in paragraph *(d)* of subsection (1) of proposed new section 14. This provision is directed specifically at the protection of our export markets and is intended to deal with the situation where the country to which our exports are directed places or threatens to place an embargo on animal products affected by certain chemicals that may be used in stock medicines. It is quite clear that action in this case must be swift and uniform throughout the Commonwealth.

Clause 9 amends section 15 of the principal Act and somewhat enlarges the categories of persons who shall be competent to undertake analysis of stock medicines. Clause 10 amends section 19 of the principal Act, which contains the general power to make regulations. The new heads of power, it is suggested, are self-explanatory and, in the nature of things, regulations made under these heads will be subject to the scrutiny of this House.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

AGED AND INFIRM PERSONS' PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PROHIBITED AREAS (APPLICATION OF STATE LAWS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

POLICE ACT REPEAL BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CONSUMER TRANSACTIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:

Page 4—After clause 11 insert new clause 11a as follows:

11a. Section 43 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by striking out from subsection (1) the passage "No guarantor" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "Subject to subsection (2) of this section, no guarantor"

and

(b) by striking out from subsection (2) the passage "to the performance of any obligation to the credit provider that is independent of the guarantee" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "by an agreement that is independent of the guarantee to perform any contractual obligation.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General); I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

The amendment, which is really not related to the subject matter of the Bill as it left this place, was inserted as a result of an instruction in the Council, being designed by its mover to clear up what he conceived to be an ambiguity in the principal Act. Section 43 (1) of that Act provides that a guarantor may not be bound by his contract of guarantee to any greater extent than is the consumer whose obligations he has guaranteed. In subsection (2) there is provision for the guarantor to enter into contracts independent of the guarantee, which provision has the effect of imposing further obligations. Section 44 provides that, where the guarantor undertakes certain specified obligations, there must be a certificate by a legal practitioner for the contract to be valid. The Legislative Council apparently considered that there was some ambiguity there and that it might be thought that there was a conflict between section 44 and section 43 (1). Although it does not appear to me that that is so, I suppose that if one or more members of the Legislative Council can read it in that way, it may be so. At any rate, it is well that the matter be put beyond doubt, and this amendment does that.

Motion carried.

MONEY-LENDERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third reading.

The SPEAKER: As this is a Bill to amend the Constitution Act, its third reading requires to be carried by an absolute majority and, in accordance with Standing Order 298, I now count the House. I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I put the question: "That this Bill be now read a third time."

Bill read a third time and passed.

MOTOR FUEL DISTRIBUTION BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to regulate and control the distribution of motor fuel; to control the number and location of motor fuel retail outlets and for purposes incidental and related thereto; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for the licensing of certain retail petrol outlets, more commonly known as service stations. It is part of a scheme to rationalize the establishment of service stations and to reduce their proliferation in the interests of those in the industry as much as in the general public interest. Members will be aware of the consequences of the adoption of the "one brand" service station policy by the major distributors of petrol. The apparent effects of this policy have become increasingly obvious over the last decade or so. Competition in the industry has resulted in the proliferation of service stations with, in many such service stations, a general low level of profitability. In some cases the lessee is receiving a return less than the minimum wage and there is a marked degree of overcapitalization by the oil companies in this aspect of their distribution. This situation has given rise to concern not only in South Australia and some other States but in many oversea countries as well.

In the past, attempts have been made by the companies involved to come together voluntarily in a scheme which will alleviate this situation, and the Government would be less than fair if it did not acknowledge that certain arrangements entered into pursuant to such a voluntary scheme have gone a long way towards overcoming some of the more undesirable features of the present situation. However, voluntary schemes have certain disadvantages, and an important one is that there is no sanction that can be applied to companies that do not co-operate fully with others. This results in companies which try to play their part fairly being considerably disadvantaged. The Government acknowledges the proper desire of the companies involved to retain their existing share of a highly competitive market and recognizes that this situation will not continue to obtain if, say, when one company closes down a service station in a given area, a rival company then is allowed to proceed to open a service station in that area or even on the same site.

During the discussions with representatives of the oil companies concerning the preparation of this Bill, it seemed that it still might be possible for all the companies to agree amongst themselves as to an effective voluntary arrangement that would achieve substantially the same objects as proposed by this measure. The Government is willing to permit such a voluntary arrangement to operate while all oil companies agree to observe it. However, the Government considers that this Bill should be proceeded with so that it will be on the Statute Book, and should the voluntary scheme prove ineffective can be quickly brought into operation. If this Bill serves no other purpose, it will ensure that those companies that co-operate in the voluntary scheme will not in the future be disadvantaged by their co-operation.

Clauses 1 to 3 are formal. However, I particularly point out in the light of my earlier remarks that clause 2 will enable the Bill not to be immediately proclaimed if the voluntary scheme is observed by all oil companies. Clause 4 sets out the definitions necessary for the provisions of the measure. Clause 5 makes clear that certain other Acts relating to motor fuel will not be affected by this Act. Clause 6 establishes a Motor Fuel Licensing Board, and I draw members' attention to subclause (2) of this clause, which sets out the functions of this board. Clause 7 provides for the appointment of three members to the board, each to have a term of office not exceeding five years in the first instance. Clause 8 provides for the appointment of deputies of members.

Clause 9 is a clause, in the usual form, providing for vacation of office by members, and clause 10 provides for payment of members. Clause 11 ensures that acts or proceedings of the board will not be invalidated by a vacancy in the membership of the board or by any formal defect in the appointment of a member, and is a usual clause in measures of this nature. Clause 12 provides for a quorum, of two members, to be present before proceedings

of the board can be conducted, and clause 13 empowers the Chairman of the board, or deputy of the Chairman of the board or member presiding, to exercise a casting vote. Clause 14 provides for a Secretary of the board.

Clause 15 empowers the board to carry out hearings, and requires it to conduct hearings when it is considering the matters referred to in subclause (2) of that clause. Clause 16 provides for the procedure to be followed at a hearing before the board. Clause 17 provides that the board may issue summonses to witnesses; clause 18 empowers the board to make orders as to costs; and clause 19 provides that the board shall give written reasons for its decisions.

It will be clear from the explanations I have given in relation to the clauses immediately preceding that the functions of the board are to be exercised in a *quasi*-judicial manner, since it is realized by the Government that a licence to operate a service station is a valuable proprietary right. For this reason clauses 20 to 23 establish an appeal tribunal which will be constituted of a judge of the Local Court. It is to this tribunal that appeals from decisions of the board will lie.

Clause 24 provides for the appointment of inspectors, and clause 25 sets out, in some detail, the powers of an inspector. Clause 26 provides for the fixing of an appointed day for the purposes of the Bill, and on and from this appointed day the regulatory provisions of the measure will come into operation. Clause 27 is the nub of the measure and provides that, on and from the end of the third month next following the appointed day, it will be an offence to sell motor fuel from any premises unless those premises are licensed or are the subject of a permit.

I draw members' attention to the wide definition of premises contained in clause 4. For the purpose of clause 27, certain retail sales will be exempted and it may be of some assistance to members if I refer briefly to these exempted sales. First, sales from so-called industrial pumps to employees of the operator of the pump will be exempted. Secondly, sales in quantities of 200 *l* (44gall.) or more will be exempted and, thirdly, prescribed sales will be exempted. The reason for the inclusion of this last class of sales is to ensure that the legislation contains an appropriate degree of flexibility.

Clause 28, when read with clause 29, provides that service stations which were carrying on business in the month of December, 1972, will, in effect, be entitled to the grant of a licence, thus the number of service stations that were in operation in the State during that month will be kept the same. Clause 30 deals with applications for licences for new service stations and, before such a licence can be granted, the board will be required to take into account the matters referred to in paragraphs *(a)* to *(h)* of subclause (2) of this clause, and here I draw members' attention to the criteria set out, as in the Government's view these are the matters that should be taken into account to ensure the provision of a proper number of retail outlets.

Clauses 31 and 32 are formal, and clause 33 provides that those undertaking business from licensed premises must comply with any conditions or restrictions on the licence. Clause 34 provides for the expiry of a licence, and clause 35 provides for an annual fee for the licence. Clause 36 is again a most important provision, and I draw members' attention to it. It provides for the alteration of a licence either by changing the name of the holder of the licence or, more significantly, by changing the premises to which the licence relates. In the terms of the measure, the board must, before granting a fresh licence, turn its mind to the question as to whether or not the premises proposed to be the subject of a fresh licence can be made the subject of a transferred licence. By a prudent use of these powers it should be possible for uneconomic service stations to be gradually phased out, the licences attached to them being transferred to economically better locations.

Clause 37 ensures that the board will not be obliged to consider several applications in relation to particular premises when it has already refused a licence for those premises. Clauses 38 to 46 relate to the granting of permits in relation to premises and, in fact, these provisions mirror the licensing provisions to which I have just adverted, the substantial difference being that premises that will be the subject of a permit are those premises from which the principal business is not the selling of motor fuel by retail. Many premises of this nature will be found in country areas. Clause 47 confers additional powers of inspection and inquiry on an inspector, and clause 48 permits the board to conduct certain formal inquiries into the conduct of persons engaged in the business of selling motor fuel by retail.

Part IV of this measure, being clauses 49 to 52, is commended to members for their most careful study. It is an endeavour to ensure that the board has some control over the arrangements that some lessees of service stations are obliged to enter into to secure fuel from their lessor oil companies. While it is true that many such arrangements are quite unobjectionable, it is the Government's view that some at least are worthy of scrutiny, not only from the point of view of the economic position of the operator of the service station but also in the interests of the public generally. In effect, this Part will give the board power to declare an arrangement that affects the business being carried on in the premises, the subject of a licence or permit under this Act, to be an undesirable arrangement, where such an arrangement is not in the economic interests of those engaged in the retail selling of motor fuel or not in the public interest. An undesirable arrangement will be void and of no effect.

In clause 52 provision is made for arrangements to be submitted to the board for its approval before they are entered into, and such approved arrangements will not be liable to be declared undesirable arrangements. Clauses 53 to 55 when read together will limit the installation of industrial pumps, as defined, to circumstances where there is a real and proper need for the installation of those pumps. The Government considers that the inclusion of these provisions is warranted, since a proliferation of industrial pumps can, to some extent, defeat the objects of the measure.

Clause 56 provides for an annual report by the board; clause 57 is an evidentiary provision; and clause 58 exempts the board and other persons from liability for acts done in good faith. Clause 59 enjoins the board and other persons to keep matters before them secret, clause 60 is a formal financial provision, and clause 61 is a formal provision. Clause 62 provides for default penalties; clause 63 relates to offences by bodies corporate; and clause 64 provides for the making of regulations.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SCIENTOLOGY (PROHIBITION) ACT REPEAL BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to repeal the Scientology (Prohibition) Act, 1968. Read a first time.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It repeals the Scientology (Prohibition) Act, 1968, which was passed by this Parliament in 1968, and is in the same

form as a measure that was passed by the House of Assembly last year but which failed to become law. As members are aware, that Act prohibits the teaching and practice of Scientology, and prohibits the use of an instrument known as an E-meter which is used by scientologists in the course of practising Scientology. The Act requires scientological records to be delivered to the Attorney-General who is empowered to destroy those records.

The Attorney-General is empowered to issue warrants authorizing the searching of premises where he has reason to believe scientological records are kept, and the seizure of such scientological records. What is suggested against scientologists is that they have provided services in the nature of psychological services for reward, that they are unqualified to do this, and that this has been harmful to those who have been involved in the practice of Scientology. The Government's view is that psychological services should be provided for fee or reward only by people who are qualified so to provide them, and only by people who have registered and are subject to the discipline of a properly constituted tribunal. It is to this end that the Psychological Practices Bill is to be introduced.

In the view of the Government, if scientologists regulate their activities so that they do not infringe any law applying generally to all people, it is wrong that they should be prohibited from professing their beliefs and carrying on their activities. To consider the Bill in some detail, clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the Act proposed by this Bill will come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Subclause (2) of this clause is intended to ensure that the Act will not be brought into operation until the Governor is satisfied that an Act regulating psychological practices, of the nature referred to earlier, has been passed and is in force. Clause 3 repeals the Scientology (Prohibition) Act, 1968.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

PSYCHOLOGICAL PRACTICES BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) brought up the minutes of evidence of the Select Committee on the Psychological Practices Bill, 1972.

Minutes of evidence received.

The Hon. L. J. KING obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the registration of psychologists, the protection of the public from unqualified persons and certain harmful practices, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is introduced with its complement, the Scientology (Prohibition) Act, 1968, Repeal Bill. Members will note that these Bills are in substantially the same form as Bills bearing similar titles that were introduced last year. The Bill now before the House provides for the registration of psychologists and, consequentially, the protection of the general public from the dangers of the misuse of psychological practices by unqualified persons. No legal barrier exists at the present time in this State to prevent unqualified persons styling themselves psychologists and offering services to the public to which the established psychological sciences relate. Disciplines of psychology at our universities, however, provide courses for the training of psychologists and set high standards of assessment to be met by students for qualification.

"The practice of psychology", in the words of the report of the South Australian Committee of Inquiry into the Registration of Psychologists, "involves rendering to individuals, groups, organizations or the public any psychological service involved in the application of principles, methods and procedures of understanding, predicting and influencing the behaviour of people. These principles may pertain to learning, perception, thinking, emotion and interpersonal relationships. The methods used include counselling, conditioning and measurement. Measurement will involve constructing, administering and interpreting tests of mental abilities, aptitudes, interests, attitudes, personality characteristics and emotion". Clearly, the practice of psychology, in any of the various fields in which psychological services are offered, requires considerable training and acquired skills, and, as the very nature of its concern is the psychological well-being or assessment of the individual, it is this Government's policy to prevent untrained and unskilled persons practising as professional psychologists.

The public is entitled to protection from possible unethical psychological practices, and it is believed that only by legislating for the registration of qualified persons as psychologists can protection be afforded. The legislation proposed provides for the establishment of a board, entitled the South Australian Psychological Board, responsible for the administration of the Act, and for the appointment of a registrar of psychologists. The registrar shall under the Act keep a register in which the names of professional psychologists (those persons who are properly qualified and adequately experienced) are entered.

No other person shall, for profit or reward, assume the title of psychologist (or any other title likely to mislead one to believe that he is a psychologist) or practise as a psychologist. It is not intended, of course, that legislation should relate to any personal counselling or guidance offered by one person to another for which no fee or reward is sought. The proposed board has power to investigate, upon the application of any person or of its own motion, the conduct of any psychologist under the Act. It may also regulate the practice of hypnotism, which is a psychological practice for the purposes of the Act, but which may, with the approval of the board and subject to any conditions which the board may stipulate, be practised by persons other than registered psychologists.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the Act shall come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 provides for the division of the Bill into its various parts. Clause 4 contains the definitions necessary for the interpretation of the Bill. Clause 5 is an exemption clause; legally qualified medical practitioners are, in the ordinary course of medical practice, exempt from the application of the Act; so, also, are students and teachers, in the course of study or research at any proper institution. Clause 6 empowers the Governor to exempt any person or class of person from the application of the Act, and to revoke or vary that exemption. Clause 7 creates the South Australian Psychological Board, a body corporate with powers, duties and functions under the Act, and provides for the judicial recognition of the common seal of the board.

Clause 8 provides for the constitution of the board. The board shall consist of seven members, appointed by the Governor, and nominated, as the case may be, by the Minister or the Australian Psychological Society (South Australian branch). Where the society fails to appoint a member within the allotted time, the Minister may nominate a person to fill the vacancy. Members of the board are not subject to the Public Service Act, 1967, as amended, unless they are already Government officers. Clause 9 states the terms and conditions under which board members hold office. A term of office shall not exceed three years, but members may seek reappointment

on the expiration of this time. When a member fails, for any reason, to act in his capacity as a member of the board, the Governor may appoint a deputy, who assumes all the rights and duties of the replaced member. The Governor may remove a member from office for certain reasons, and the office itself may fall vacant in stated circumstances. In these situations the Governor may appoint a new member. However, if the office has become vacant before the expiration of the term of the former holder, the new member shall be appointed only for the balance of the term of his predecessor.

Clause 10 provides that four members of the board shall constitute a quorum and that no business shall be contracted at any meeting unless a quorum is present. All decisions shall be reached by a majority. Where there is a deadlock in voting the chairman has a casting vote. If the chairman is absent from a meeting the board shall elect one of their number to act in his place. This member assumes the full powers and duties of chairman for that meeting only. Clause 11 provides that any vacancy in any office of the board, or defect in any appointment to the board, is not a ground for challenging the validity of any act of the board. Any acts performed in those circumstances are valid. No member of the board shall be personally liable for anything he does or that is done on his behalf, when the act is done or purported to be done in good faith and in the discharge of his powers and duties. This immunity also applies to acts done under the same conditions by or on behalf of the board.

Clause 12 provides that the common seal shall be used only following a resolution of the board, and witnessed by any two members of the board. Clause 13 empowers the board to appoint a registrar and employ all the staff it considers necessary to administer the Act. Government employees may be seconded with the approval of the Minister for their department. Clause 14 sets out the powers of the board. Clause 15 is an evidentiary clause. A certificate to the effect that a person is, or has been for a certain period, registered as a psychologist, and signed by the registrar shall be *prima facie* evidence of that fact, as is the production of the register or a certified extract. Clause 16 provides for the composition of the funds and assets of the board, and the ways in which these funds may be used. Clause 17 provides for an annual report to be prepared by the board and tabled in Parliament by the Minister to whom the administration of this measure is committed.

Clause 18 provides for the keeping of proper accounts, and the annual audit. Clause 19 empowers the board to delegate any of its powers or functions to any member of the board, excluding only the power of delegation. No delegation can prevent the exercise by the board of any of its powers or functions. Clause 20 provides for the keeping of a register of psychologists. Clause 21 provides for the issue of certificates of registration to registered psychologists. Clause 22 sets out the qualifications an applicant must obtain to be entitled to registration. All registrations must be renewed annually. Clause 23 sets out the circumstances under which an applicant may be refused registration. Clause 24 empowers the registrar, in certain circumstances, to remove names of registered psychologists from the register.

Clause 25 empowers the registrar to make all inquiries that he, or the board, considers should be made into any application, or other matter before the board. Clause 26 empowers the board to inquire into the conduct of any registered psychologist. It sets out the circumstances which constitute a proper cause for disciplinary action, and the forms which such disciplinary action may take. Clause 27 sets out the procedure to be used in inquiries into the conduct of psychologists. Clause 28 sets out the powers of the board in all such inquiries. Included are the powers of requiring attendance; inspection of books; asking questions to be answered on oath. Any person who fails to submit to the exercise of these powers commits an offence, but no person shall be required to answer any question the answer to which would tend to incriminate him. Clause 29 gives a right of appeal to the Supreme Court, against any order made by the board. Clause 30 enables the suspension of an order of the board, when an appeal against the order has been instituted. The suspension remains until the determination of the appeal. Clause 31 orders the surrender of his certificate of registration, by any registered psychologist, against whom an order of cancellation or suspension of registration has been made. Failure to comply is an offence.

Clause 32 sets out the rights of registered psychologists, including the recovery of fees, and right to practise. Clause 33 sets out the effects of registration. Clause 34 makes it an offence for anyone, except a registered psychologist, to practise psychology for a fee or reward. Clause 35 forbids the advertising of psychological services by any person, unless he is a registered psychologist or has the consent of the Minister. Clause 36 forbids the employment by registered psychologists of unregistered persons to practise psychology, except in prescribed circumstances. Clause 37 limits a registered psychologist, in relation to advertisements or descriptions concerning himself, to the description inserted in the register. Clause 38 imposes restrictions on the use of names that can be used by companies or associations, which consist wholly or partly of registered psychologists. Clause 39 makes it an offence for an unregistered person to use any titles or descriptions which are likely to create the impression that he is a registered psychologist. Clause 40 concerns the titles of educational institutions recognized by the board for the teaching of psychology. There are no limits in the choice of title or description for these institutions.

Clause 41 permits certain persons, approved by the board, to practice hypnotism. Clause 42 concerns minors. Any person who practises hypnotism on a person under 18 years of age, without the consent of the board, is guilty of an offence, as is any minor who practises hypnotism. Clause 43 limits the practice of hypnotism to cases under the direction of a legally qualified medical practitioner and a dentist in the practice of dentistry. Approval of the board may be given in other circumstances as it sees fit. Clause 44 provides that all proceedings for offences under this Act shall be dealt with summarily. Clause 45 empowers the Governor to make regulations.

In view of the effect this measure will have on professionally qualified persons, other than psychologists, such as social workers, mental health visitors, occupational therapists, psychiatric and mental deficiency nurses, ministers of religion and marriage guidance counsellors, I intend to propose that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee to enable submissions from such persons and other interested people to be made on the provisions of the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

PAY-ROLL TAX AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from August 28. Page 560.)

Clause 3—"Exemptions from pay-roll tax."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I understand that last evening the member for Torrens asked why it was necessary for the Government to charge

pay-roll tax in relation to the work of Government departments. The reason for this is that it has been found that, for accounting purposes, this is the simplest method of ensuring that, where pay-roll tax ought to be charged under contract, it is done, and that, where charges are made for Government departments as against instrumentalities or other Government departments, the costs lie where they ought to go. This is the practice of all other State Governments, and the Treasury advice, after an examination of the situation, was that it was advisable for us to fall into line. This will affect several major contracts the Government has with outside bodies and matters under indenture in respect of which it is now contended by the people concerned that the services performed by the Government should not have pay-roll tax calculated in relation to them for charges that are made.

Mr. COUMBE: I thank the Treasurer for his explanation. I realize that a certain amount of book work is involved and that in some cases it will be a case of Peter paying Paul. However, I realize that in departments such as the Public Buildings Department, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and the Highways Department, it could lead to confusion. Can the Treasurer assure me that statutory bodies and Government bodies presently exempted will continue to be exempted?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 and 5) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LAND COMMISSION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 23. Page 499.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I oppose the Bill mainly because it is another arm of the Commonwealth octopus taking control of the States and gradually taking power from them. In the short term it may be argued that that is not the case, but I can see that in the long term that will be the case. We have had examples of this in education, health and housing, where gradually we have been passing our powers over to the Commonwealth Government. This Government is bound by the decisions that its Party makes, and this legislation is an example of Australian Labor Party policy being foisted on the State by a 49-man executive that controls the A.L.P. Federal Conference. I believe it would be fitting, first, to refer to the A.L.P. and to the report of its Federal Conference held at Surfers Paradise earlier this year. Page 4 of *A Complete Guide to Labor's Policies* contains a short comment by Alan Reid, as follows:

> The A.L.P. conference is the Party's supreme policy-making and governing authority. Its decisions are binding on every member and section of the Party from the Federal Parliamentary Leader down to the rank-and-file member.

Mr. Crimes: But that is the Federal Conference.

Mr. EVANS: Even though the member for Spence suggests that he is not a rank-and-file member of the A.L.P., I assure him that he is. The conditions laid down by his Party bind each and every member of it from, as stated by Alan Reid, the Prime Minister right down to the back-benchers who sit in Government here but who rarely speak. This legislation will be another example, because Government members will not utter one comment about it. Page 11 of the same publication (if we wish to get down to the basic issues we are discussing this evening) expounds on the eventual nationalization of the housing industry. Clause 4 on page 11 states:

> With the object of achieving Labor's Socialist objectives, establish or extend public enterprise, where appropriate by nationalization, particularly in the fields of banking, consumer finance, insurance, marketing, housing, stevedoring, transport and in areas of anti-social private monopoly.

No doubt the Government has been instructed by its 49-man executive to attempt to carry this legislation into the State sphere. One could argue that some A.L.P. members nowadays do not believe that it is necessary to nationalize any field in order to have the authority they would like to have, and the Commonwealth Minister for Labour (Mr. Cameron) is reported as stating, in the *Advertiser* of August 11, that members of the trade union movement are saying that it is not nationalization they need, but control. If one studies the Bill, the one thing that it really tends to give the Government, the bureaucracy, is complete control in the field of urban development. The Premier may argue at a later date that that is not the intention. True, it may not be the immediate intention, but I know from past A.L.P. policies that this is the end result, if the Government gets the opportunity. I now refer to the matter of leasehold, as referred to in the Bill. The Premier has recently stated that he believes in the leasehold system and that the intention is to introduce the leasehold system, but I believe this is only a recent line of thinking that he has accepted. Indeed, I do not believe a man of the Premier's intelligence would believe it necessary to move to the leasehold system. I believe he has accepted instructions from others in this matter.

In such matters, however, I believe it important to think of opinions held by others, and I refer to article 17 of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, as follows:

> Everyone has the right to own property, alone as well as in association with others. No-one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

That is exactly what this legislation will do. In fact, it will take land in a way by which no-one else can gain a full right to it, as it will be under a leasehold system. Who was the President of the United Nations General Assembly when that charter was published in 1948? I refer to the publication *Evatt Politics and Justice.* At least one key member of the A.L.P. did not believe in the leasehold system, because he put his signature to article 17: he did not believe in the taking away from people of property. At page 235 that publication states:

> But, in Paris, the most far-reaching result was the acceptance of the document that Evatt himself fostered, the Declaration of Human Rights. It had been linked in his mind with the World Court, a court of ultimate appeal, and it would state the minimum demands that humanity made on its rulers. The Declaration of Human Rights, which Evatt proclaimed on December 10, 1948, is one of the documents that mark a leap in history. It ranks above the Declaration of Independence in the American Revolution, above the Gettysburg speech of Lincoln, certainly above Magna Carta, in that it declares, for every human being, a dignity and a status.

There is no doubt that, if this legislation is passed, the dignity and status of human beings who wish to own their own houses and land will be taken away.

Mr. Crimes: Come off it!

Mr. EVANS: The member for Spence knows full well that this is the case regarding leasehold land. I will later refer to the effect of leasehold land. We face the problem of deciding on legislation such as this now because of the lack of Government foresight. True, it may not be just the Government's failure, because it is Government departments which may have lacked the foresight, but the departments are the responsibility of the Government of the day. There is no doubt that it is the shortage of supply that has caused the massive escalation in the price of land allotments in the metropolitan area, and there is

no doubt that, if we had been wise to the fact, we could have overcome or avoided the problem, and we would be in a much better position today. I congratulate members of the Working Party on the Stabilization of Land Prices. The committee's report refers to this matter. The report is sound and, as a result of the evidence it has collated, it is factual in determining what are the major problems in the area of urban development and the task involved in keeping building allotments at a reasonable price. However, I do not accept the ideology used at arriving at the recommendations, because there is no doubt that there is a bend in one direction: to the left. Point 1.1.4 on page 9 of the report provides:

Nevertheless—

and I speak now mainly about the effects of high costs, which cannot be totally avoided—

although the committee accepts the objective of home ownership for all who desire it, it does not believe that land prices should be artificially lowered by subsidies. It is tempting to regard land as a free gift of nature. However, urban land—like houses themselves—is a costly commodity to produce. In most cases allotments represent land which has been taken away from rural production. But more important, it embodies substantial capital equipment in the form of roads, mains for sewerage and water, and power, resources which could otherwise have gone into the construction of schools, hospitals, libraries, etc. The committee therefore believes it proper that the price of land should reflect the resources which have gone into producing it.

The first point we need to establish regarding an increase in costs is that we must put the resources into the field. The second matter involved in the increase of cost concerns under-supply; indeed, under-supply has been created by Government departments and local councils not being able to handle the applications made to them by potential subdividers, whether they be developers seeking only to develop, or whether they be surveyors acting for individuals on a smaller scale. No matter which it is, there is no doubt that this has cost the average young couple more than $1,000 in the price of a building allotment.

The Government can say that Government departments are short of staff and do not have the personnel available to handle applications, but I do not believe that is entirely true, because part of the problem concerns the fact that we have tended to run away from subdivision: we have been afraid to subdivide because of public criticism. We have tended to look more at scenic trails, the Flinders Range, Hallett Cove, Sturt Gorge or other areas that create much public sympathy, and, in so doing, we have forgotten the requirements of the average young couple in the community. We know from the committee's report that there is a hold-up in the processing of applications by the Engineering and Water Supply Department and also by the State Planning Authority.

The State Planning Authority has not been able even to process applications. I have been informed that during the year ended June 30, 1973, it was able to handle and process applications for the creation of about 6 000 allotments, yet each year between 8 500 and 10 000 allotments are needed on the market. We have been falling behind badly. I am not sure that it can be said that this has not been done deliberately, that it has not been a deliberate action by the Government or its departments under instructions from the Government to slow down the process so that we would have to consider such legislation as this. Some would argue that this is the case, but we will never know whether it is the case or not, but we are told that currently there is a change of heart within the department, and it is attempting to handle applications. In this respect, I read a circular-type letter which has, I believe, been distributed to surveyors and others and which is available for inspection on the State Planning Authority's notice board. This letter shows that those involved have received some form of instruction to get on with the job. At the same time, they have received many more applications for subdivision within the last few weeks. Part of the letter is as follows:

It is with regret that as from Tuesday, August 21, 1973, and until further notice, the staff have been directed to discontinue the telephone and counter inquiry service about progress of subdivision, resubdivision, strata titles and lease applications. The volume of applications has increased to such an extent that considerable difficulty is being experienced in keeping up to date with filing, indexing and processing applications and every phone call and inquiry only adds to the delay in processing.

Dockets will be made available for perusal on the understanding that 24 hours notice is first given and the application has been in this office for at least two calendar months. In all cases inquiries will be answered only where arising from the agent lodging the plan. Your co-operation in this matter is appreciated. Should you wish to discuss a particular problem or application with a member of the staff, an appointment must be first made, to ensure that relevant documents can be obtained before you attend.

The State Planning Authority has realized, because of public criticism levelled against it, that it must get the pipeline moving. We also face a problem regarding the Planning and Development Act, which has been criticized strongly by the Chief Justice as a result of problems that have arisen because of bad drafting. I say that without wishing in any way to reflect on those who help Parliament in this area.

We as Parliamentarians should be able to locate faults and ensure that this type of legislation does not leave this Chamber. If one wanted to seek out the reason why unsatisfactory legislation was passed, one could use as a comparison a comment made in Western Australia recently regarding three Bills being considered in that State's Parliament, some of which were similar to the Bill the House is now debating. I refer to the Land Control Bill, the Land Commission Bill and the Salvado Development Bill. One Western Australian, speaking on those proposals said:

The time given, in effect, was 2½ months—hardly enough time adequately to study three Bills of this magnitude.

Here, a Bill is introduced one week and is expected to be passed by the House the following week, yet in another State (a Labor State) the Government at least had the courtesy to give members 2½ months to consider those proposals. I have often argued that we tend to push legislation through too quickly, and that the processes of passing legislation would probably be speeded up if members were given more time to consider matters more thoroughly before having to debate them and, if they wished and as is often necessary, to seek information from outside of the Parliament. The Chief Justice has said that the Planning and Development Act is difficult to interpret and that it should be reviewed in several places.

Mr. Coumbe: He used some very picturesque language, too.

Mr. EVANS: True. Here, then, is another area of concern that has created the problem at present confronting us. One must also be critical, as was the working committee, of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and its operations. Although one cannot point to a certain individual, one must say that the department's operations are inadequate. If one criticizes legislation, saying that one is not willing to accept parts of it, one should offer alternatives regarding how the problem can be solved. The Engineering and Water Supply Department does not make sufficient use of its plant and manpower. I am unable to

refer to the administration section, because I know nothing of it. However, I believe it is fair to say that in the field sufficient use is not made of equipment and manpower. I am not saying that the men are bludgers, however.

Mr. Crimes: You'd like to, though.

Mr. EVANS: The member for Spence can be sarcastic if he wishes, but I do not say the men are bludgers. The plant is used for no more than five or six hours a day. As much as Government members may hate the term "private enterprise", I assure them that private enterprise could not survive if it used equipment for only five, six, seven or eight hours a day. In the summer months particularly one has to be prepared to use the equipment for as many hours as possible, and on much of the work that the department does it would be possible to work the plant for 24 hours a day. Indeed, there have been examples in this State of private enterprise operating earth-moving equipment for that number of hours. This is, therefore, yet another area of concern: the price of allotments has been increased and the shortage has been created by the inefficiency of a Government department.

The working committee set up by the Government to investigate the issue made this point strongly. It will hurt some Government members to have to support the Cabinet in saying that private enterprise will need to get some of the contracts. However, this will have to happen, and the sooner it happens the better it will be. One realizes that heavy initial costs are involved in buying different types of plant. I refer, for instance, to timbers used for shoring-up. Therefore, some continuity of work will have to be guaranteed to contractors or they will not venture into this field.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. EVANS: The Premier referred to the arresting of spiralling land prices and said that the promotion of orderly expansion and development was the Bill's main intention. I believe all those points can be covered with the present structure, by upgrading certain Government departments and possibly strengthening the Planning and Development Act to give the State Planning Authority extra powers. Indeed, I believe the authority has some, if not all, of the powers that the commission is to be given. Sitting here tonight before rising to speak on this matter, and hearing that two more boards were to be set up, I thought we in this country would end up with a white ant's paradise, having as we will so many boards and commissions.

The structure of the State Planning Authority can be upgraded to carry out any function to enable it to overcome a temporary problem; it is not necessarily an all-time problem. We face an initial problem now (which, on all indications, seems to be being rectified) because of the number of land matters going through the State Planning Authority. I consider that it is wrong at this stage to establish a commission, using the argument that we must make more allotments available at a lower price, because the State Planning Authority could overcome the problem in the short term, and in the long term the problem would not exist.

If ever again there is in South Australia a shortage of allotments similar to the shortage in recent years, the Government in office then, or just before then, should be ashamed. We should learn from one mistake, and that position should never occur again. The Premier made the point that we should make residential land available at fair prices and that we should consider human values. I accept his statement about fair prices, but then the question of defining what is a fair price arises. What is fair to one person may not be fair to another. Some people think that the fairest price is to get the land free, but in this community we get nothing for nothing, and no more than that.

When this Bill becomes law, the Act will operate mainly through regulations. We do not know what the terms or conditions of a lease will be, or what the conditions will be, if a free title is given for any of the land made available to the public. What if a condition is that the person must build on the land within 12 months so as to use the resources, if the economists make that point? Will we have a total community developed overnight comprising people of about the same age group, with all the children going to school at about the same time and all completing their schooling at about the same time? That would happen if we did not have the gradual development that we have had in other suburbs. At one time, a primary school would be needed but, when those children left school and commenced tertiary education or entered the work force, the school would be hardly worth having.

This could happen, and we would be getting not an integrated society but a society of people of about the same age group in one community at the one time. Honourable members know that that would be the case. The committee that investigated the stabilization of land prices made the point that we could not afford to have too many allotments lying idle, because of the cost to society. However, later in its report the committee stated that it accepted that we need an over-supply of allotments to be able to maintain prices at a lower level. I was amazed at this thinking but more amazed that the committee was not willing to say how many allotments it thought should be on the market and that it did not think it had a duty to say so. At page 10, the following comment is made in the report:

> How many vacant allotments should be created is a matter of planning their costs against their advantages.

I suppose that any one of us can arrive at that line of thinking. The report goes on:

> The committee finds that it is not able to put a number on the appropriate stock of vacant allotments. Nor do we believe that it is necessary for us to do so. We consider that as long as those who hold vacant allotments are forced to pay all the costs of doing so, then the individuals in the market place—developers, builders, and home buyers—will themselves determine the appropriate stock.

I consider that that is correct: the market-place will decide the issue. It has decided the price of the allotments today and it has foreseen that Government instrumentalities were inactive and that there was a shortage of allotments coming up, so people who wanted to invest and, to use the term that some people think is horrible, wanted to speculate moved into the field, because the Government and the Government departments had given them the opportunity to do so.

How many allotments should we have available? I, and people in the industry, consider that we need at least five years supply to give people the opportunity to choose and select and to make it impossible for the speculator to move into the market and gain any real advantage. At the same time, we should have a sufficient supply to give opportunity to buy to the thrifty, the young people enterprising enough to buy an allotment before buying a motor car and perhaps before they need the allotment but also before any other inflationary trend affects the price.

In that way, they can build on the allotment when they decide to do so. There is nothing wrong with that procedure, and surely society should encourage it. We should

encourage all young couples to invest in an allotment. "Investing" is not a nasty word; it is a practical word. It gives people the opportunity to benefit from being in society.

Mr. Coumbe: They take a risk, too.

Dr. Eastick: It's their right to invest.

Mr. EVANS: There is a risk, too, and, as my Leader has said, it is a right. That right should be kept free and open to the individual at all times. We are faced with the need to quantify, and the State Planning Authority and the responsible Minister should know every month, or within three months at the latest, about how many vacant allotments there are in the community and how many allotments are being built on at that time. We should always have at least five years supply (about 40 000 to 45 000 allotments) available in the State. If we have that, we will have no problems with excessive inflationary trends.

Some people will argue immediately that that would use resources and take money from the community. The working committee stated that it could see nothing wrong with this situation, because the individuals were paying the cost of maintaining the allotments, such as water and sewerage rates, council rates, land tax, and whatever other taxes the A.L.P. may think up. The individual pays those charges, and that is a matter that he considers when he invests in a block of land, so there is no problem there.

If a developer enters the field and gambles that he can sell all or part of the land on that day or the following day, that is his decision. As the member for Torrens has expressed it, he takes a gamble, a risk, and people in the community are willing to take that risk. If we have fallen down in another area, it is in the area I have mentioned first, namely, that of being afraid to subdivide, being afraid to declare another area a residential area.

Some land, according to our thinking until recent times, would be tied up until 1981. The State Planning Authority should have been telling the Government of the day and the councils, "We really must make this land available to the public. There is demand for it. People are waiting to buy allotments and build houses, and we were not accurate in our original estimates that 1981 or some time after that would be the right time to rezone the land and free it". The authority should say that the right time is now, that the community needs the land, and the authority should tell the community that we must now rezone as residential land some parts of the Adelaide metropolitan area as defined in the 1962 report. That is one other way in which we can help. If we are not willing to do it as a blanket approval, why do we not encourage negotiated contractual rezoning? We could invite developers to come along with details of land that they believe is suitable for urban development. If they have an option over the land and if they can submit a plan involving sensible subdivision, allotments of reasonable size with the correct allocation of open space, and the right sort of planning for a modern society, with areas for schools and other buildings, they could then negotiate with the State Planning Authority, which could suggest any necessary changes. Why can we not allow that sort of negotiation, even if it is desired, in the short term, to get over the problem by having as a condition of rezoning a range of prices, with a maximum? That could all be done in a contract before approval was given. A land commission is not needed to do that—only the State Planning Authority and a sensible Government. In that way we could get allotments on the market just as quickly as the land commission could get them on the market; in fact, we could get them on the market more quickly. This is not a case of my opposing a Bill and failing to offer alternatives: there are alternatives. There is no need to set up this octopus, which will gradually drag every section of the State towards socialized centralism, which the Australian Labor Party believes in. The member for Gilles can laugh, but that is what we are heading for, and he knows it only too well.

Mr. Max Brown: What would you do with the Housing Trust?

Mr. EVANS: If the honourable member was allowed by his colleagues to have a frank and open discussion, the trust would inform him that the whole process of getting approval in connection with broad acres and getting new titles takes up to 27 months. I would like to wipe the tears from the eyes of the trust's officers, which tears they shed as a result of waiting so long for approvals. I have never attacked the Housing Trust in general terms, but I have attacked some principles of the system of rental housing, and the Premier finally agreed with me last night on that matter. I believe that the Housing Trust performs a vital role in our community. It has the power to acquire land, and it exercises that power; it subdivides the land and makes it available for purchase housing at low interest rates and for rental housing to needy sections of the community. If members opposite think about it, they will realize that the Housing Trust is one of the biggest speculators in this State.

Mr. Hopgood: The trust acts in the public interest.

Mr. EVANS: In the last 12 months, if the trust and the Government had wished and if the State Planning Authority and the Engineering and Water Supply Department (I will refer to councils later) had been willing to push proposals through, the Housing Trust would have had enough land to put between 3 600 and 4 000 allotments on the market before now, but the land has lain idle while people have waited for allotments. And the member for Mawson says that that is in the public interest! He made his comment because of the economic advantage of speculating. If the Housing Trust had sped up the procedure, it could have had the money available to buy other land, if it had so desired.

Delays occur in the local government field. I think the Government may have pointed the bone at councils and said, "You must ensure that you approve applications more rapidly." I support a suggestion that has been discussed in the community that we should have a fail-safe system, whereby we give councils the opportunity for two months (this is the requirement at present, but it is not abided by) and if, at the end of that period, councils have not lodged a report, it is taken that they have approved an application. That is what we should be doing. I believe that is the approach that the Government has made, and I hope it can get that sort of support from councils.

I said earlier that I would come back to the question of leasehold land, because it is the greatest area of concern in connection with this Bill. I do not think that the Government really believes that all the other areas cannot be covered by the present regulations and legislation, but the question of leasehold land is an important part of the total A.L.P. plan. South Australia is the first State to move seriously in this direction. We may end up being the only State, except for the apple isle, Tasmania, that will accept the leasehold system. There is every indication that even Mr. Tonkin, the Premier of Western Australia, will not be willing to accept the direction of his Commonwealth colleagues and of the A.L.P. conference. The following is an extract from an article in the *Australian* of July 31:

A Federal Government offer of $5,000,000 for housing blocks "would not even clean up a backyard," the Premier, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen, said yesterday.

Mr. Duncan: It would certainly not clean up the Queensland backyard, in view of all the corruption there.

Mr. EVANS: I hope the honourable member is not talking about his colleagues. The article continues:

State Cabinet yesterday rejected the terms of the Commonwealth offer. The Premier said land seekers would face an interest payout of 7.4 per cent to the Federal Government, plus payment to the State for development. Cabinet yesterday set out guidelines for discussions with the Federal Government.

Another report stated that Queensland was entering into a discussion with the Commonwealth Government in order to reach a compromise. We can be sure that New South Wales and Victoria will do the same, and that Mr. Whitlam will not give us any greater percentage of money for housing or land development than he will give to New South Wales and Victoria, because his political neck relies on votes in those two States, and Government members know that. This State could be the only major State in Australia that accepts this proposition, if we accept it. I ask Government members to think seriously about this matter.

I have heard the Premier say that he believes that the leasehold system would give the Government greater control. What greater control does a Government need than it has now with the freehold system? It can walk in and take a person's property overnight; serve a notice of acquisition on him and give him 12 weeks in which to dispute the price that may be offered; the Government can go ahead with the project; and the person has to wait until the case is heard in court. A Government does not need greater control: there is enough now, and some of the few freedoms that we still have should be preserved. The Australian man and woman enjoys the right (and has always enjoyed it) to have free title to his little bit of dirt, his little bit of Australia, and I challenge any Labor member, Commonwealth or State, to ask the man in the street whether he would accept a leasehold instead of a freehold system. Government members know what the result of that survey would be. I am reminded of a story about an American Communist (I do not say that members opposite are of the same political leaning) who wrote to his superior about a problem he was having in reaching the downtrodden masses. He put it as follows:

In the spring they are forever polishing cars; in the summer they take vacations; in the fall they go to football games; in the winter you cannot get them away from their television sets. Please provide suggestions as to how I might let them know of their oppression.

It would seem the answer is to gain power and then to legislate your own ideology. That is what is happening, and there is no doubt that the ideology of the A.L.P. is for a leasehold system, for a centralist Government, to do away with State Governments and, in the long-term, to do away with the Upper House in the Commonwealth Parliament.

The SPEAKER: Order! That subject matter is not contained in the Bill. The honourable member for Fisher.

Mr. EVANS: What is contained in the Bill is a move to pass some of our powers in the long term and short term to the Commonwealth Government. I refer specifically to one or two details of the Bill. The clauses are fairly general, and most people would consider that there is no real problem. That last clause is typical, and is included by most Governments in most Bills: it enables the Government to have the power to make regulations to do whatever it wishes. We do not know the terms or conditions under which land will be sold, because those details will be introduced by regulations. I wonder whether the regulations will be introduced on the last sitting day of Parliament so that they become law until Parliament sits again six months later! Members who oppose these regulations will have to wait until Parliament sits again before the regulations can be debated.

Mr. Langley: Did your Government ever do it?

Mr. EVANS: For the two years that I was lucky to be a member of a Government, at no time did we introduce regulations on the last day of a sitting.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You never did anything, that's the trouble.

Mr. EVANS: When I referred to the Commonwealth Government and centralism, you, Mr. Speaker, rightly said I was moving away from the Bill. Clause 6 provides:

The Commission shall consist of three members appointed by the Governor of whom two shall be persons nominated by the Premier after consultation with the Prime Minister.

Who says that we are not being controlled by Gough's octopus in Canberra!

Mr. Langley: He would buy and sell you.

Mr. EVANS: He probably would, too, for a gain. The clause continues:

(b) one shall be a person nominated by the Prime Minister after consultation with the Premier.

Why bother to put it that way? Why not provide that the Premier and the Prime Minister will consult together and appoint three members? That is exactly what it says, yet we are being led to believe that there is no direction from the Commonwealth Government! In fact, we are setting up a commission of three people who will have control over the State, and the major control, I believe, will come from Canberra. Generally, moneys will be supplied from Canberra and the Commonwealth Government will have an equal opportunity to nominate board members. I believe that Government departments (especially the State Planning Authority) require more qualified staff, and no-one would deny them the extra staff. It would be cheaper than setting up a commission. Also, I believe that we could say to developers, "Now is the time to make submissions, and we will try to speed up the processes," because the Premier has given an assurance that is happening.

The Premier's statements that price control will be introduced on land (in other words, legislation by newspapers) has had some effect, and I do not condemn him for these statements. I think his action has proved that speculators can be kept out while the Premier's Department makes an effort to have applications processed, so that by the time that we debate the Urban Land (Price Control) Bill prices will have levelled out and allotments will be coming on to the market, so the legislation will be unnecessary. I think the Premier's action had the desirable and necessary effect at that time, as there was a great shortage of land and a high demand for it. One does not condemn that area of operation. However, we should be encouraging sensible subdivision, and I am sure that can be done without passing this Bill. To sum up, we have had a working committee investigating this matter and one of its main recommendations was to form a land commission. We know, however, that the working committee was appointed by a Government with a bent towards centralism as part of its Commonwealth and State policy, so it is only natural that the committee should bring down a report leaning in that direction.

I ask the Government, for the sake of South Australians, not to do what it is proposing in this legislation, but to give the people in the industry the opportunity to solve the

problem and, in co-operation with Government departments, it will be solved. In the month of July, 2 800 applications for subdivision were made to the State Planning Authority. Already people have realized that allotments can be created, and they will be created. I cannot support this Bill, which leans toward Socialist centralism. The ordinary man is not concerned until it affects him, so the person who owns a house or a block is not involved. People wanting blocks at the moment are in the minority and are voices in the wilderness. The Government can kick this minority about without much fear, but in the long term, when the effects of leasehold are made known, the man so affected will say to the Government, "We do not require your services".

I ask the Government to be honest in its approach to this matter and to say whether it believes in nationalization of the subdivision or housing industry; not to do it behind closed doors, but openly and frankly. In no circumstances do I support the Bill. I believe it is a "Gough octopus" that should be disposed of, because the control is going to Canberra and leasehold is no good to our community.

Mr. HOPGOOD (Mawson): I am continually amazed at the compliments paid to the Australian Labor Party by members opposite. The member for Fisher has said in effect that this is a nasty Socialist plot: a few years ago someone, possibly the Premier, woke up one morning with the answer staring him in the face as to how he could get a leasehold system in this State; what he had to do was to introduce a considerable amount of complicated planning legislation and to take action to keep serviced blocks of land off the market, thereby creating an artificial shortage, and in the fullness of time this would have its effect on land values in such a way as to have people screaming out for a change in the system, thereby opening the way for this type of legislation.

That analysis is a considerable compliment to the planners and strategists on this side of the House, and I would like to think we were indeed capable from time to time of that sort of guile and forward planning, but I assure the honourable member that in this case it is a complete figment of his imagination, because he would have to go back at least to 1967 when the present Premier, as Minister of Local Government, introduced the Planning and Development Act. I understand from what the honourable member says that that is one of the snakes in the grass.

It is amazing how often this type of compliment is paid to the Labor Party. We rather get the impression, from what has been said opposite from time to time, that changes in the federal structure of this country and what is likely to happen are things the Prime Minister and our own Premier cooked up in some dark basement in the early hours of some morning and that the plot will gradually unfold as time goes by. These conspiratorial views of history are something peculiar to the advocates of right-wing thinking. They are always considering that there is a small committee of something-or-others making the whole thing go. Of course, the world is far more complicated than that.

The fire power of the member for Fisher was particularly concentrated on the leasehold system, the system under which the faces of Australians will be ground into the dirt. This is the tyranny which faces us in the future! I wonder how many of the honourable gentlemen opposite have had the opportunity of examining the land tenure system of the Australian Capital Territory, because the thing I find extremely interesting about it, despite the attempts made during the Prime Ministership of Mr. Gorton to alter the situation (there were some alterations, and they were for the worse), is that there has never been any suggestion during the many years that the Liberal Party was in office in Canberra that the system should be altered and that a freehold system should be introduced into the Australian Capital Territory.

Mr. Dean Brown: We in the Liberal Party are masters in our own State.

Mr. HOPGOOD: I see! In other words, this wisdom we are having placed before us this evening is a wisdom peculiar to the Liberal Party in this State. Unfortunately, it has not been possible for it to permeate, perhaps by a system of osmosis, to the Commonwealth colleagues of members opposite. Perhaps they should start talking to their colleagues. Now that their colleagues are in Opposition in Canberra, and now that they are essentially in an irresponsible position, it may be good politics for them to start advocating a freehold system for the Australian Capital Territory. They would not be game to introduce it in the unlikely event of their being returned to office, but it may be good politics for them to start talking about such a system in the A.C.T.

There is no significant demand in that part of Australia for a change back to the freehold system. If there were, then perhaps there would be some point to the comments we have just heard from the member for Fisher. If the leasehold system is so dreadful, why is it that, in that part of Australia which has had such a system for so long, there has never been any significant demand for its removal? Let members opposite talk a bit of sense about this. They talk a great deal of nonsense about freedom, and the member for Fisher went on about how our freedoms are being removed in this country. Let us have an end to this nonsense about freedom.

Mr. Mathwin: You wouldn't know what it was.

Mr. HOPGOOD: I have a commitment to freedom in the sense that I believe that those who would restrict freedom must have the onus of proof on them to prove the restriction, but no-one would deny that there are many areas in which this restriction is absolutely necessary.

Mr. Gunn: Oh!

Mr. HOPGOOD: The member for Eyre would not deny that; nor would he deny that we have to restrict freedom in relation to our roads, and freedom as to what one can do with property, particularly property belonging to other people. The member for Fisher read from a document which, if interpreted literally, would mean that compulsory acquisition of land simply was not necessary. What sort of nonsense and chaos would that bring about? I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Later:

Mr. HOPGOOD: When I sought leave to continue my remarks, I was suggesting that leasehold tenure was not quite the tyranny that the member for Fisher had tried to make it out to be. Before leaving this matter, I should like to quote, in support of my contention, from a book written by a person who is regarded as an expert in this field. I refer to Mr. Hugh Stretton, who in his book *Ideas for Australian Cities,* which has attracted much favourable comment among those involved in the urban planning process, states:

What effect does public ownership of the land have on individual shares of it, and on private rights and freedoms? In free land markets most of the citizen's luck looks like his own affair. The market may be affected by plenty of politics—development requirements, zoning, rating and taxing, public housing policies, controls on lending—but government can still detach itself from responsibility for most of the private profits and losses. Canberra is different. Where government is the monopolist owner,

planner, developer, landlord and auctioneer, some private risks become public responsibilities. Some of what used to be private gains and losses may become public scandals. All new town experience suggests that some form of public land ownership, permanent or temporary, is vital for launching new cities. If the citizens find they can't trust the Government as landowner they will soon abolish its monopoly and, with it, any prospect of launching new cities. It is not enough to satisfy them that the new deal is no riskier than the old. When they deal with government they may pretend to expect dreary inefficiencies, but in fact they demand many honesties and certainties and protections they never dream of expecting from their fellow citizens in open markets. In most respects Canberra people use their leased land about as freely as they could use freehold under the planning regulations of other cities—as long as they use it. But they cannot hold it out of use. This is hard on firms and individuals in occasional cases, but its social advantages are outstanding. The public investment in services is efficient, because predictable, compact development makes full use of them straight away. But the effects on private investment are the most important. Speculative building—a productive activity—is not hindered. But there are no opportunities for speculation in the rising value of vacant land. Of all the uses of private capital in the freehold cities, land speculation is probably the most worthless. It usually prevents coherent planning. It helps nobody except its profiteers. It adds nothing to social assets, or to any but the speculators' private assets. Its gains arise from the increase of population and from public developmental expenditures; they should naturally and properly be public, not private, gains.

I have quoted at length from this book which, as I have said, has created much public interest in the past two or three years, and I have quoted it because I think that what the writer says makes sense. This is not extreme thinking but pragmatic thinking. I conclude my remarks on this aspect of the matter by saying, first, that, having defended a leasehold system, I am not pretending that it is the be all and end all of land tenure, nor is there any suggestion in this Bill or in statements by the Government that we see leasehold tenure as the be all and end all of everything.

Freehold tenure will continue as one of the two major bases of our land tenure system, but my second point in rounding off my remarks is that I invite members opposite to turn their attention to what has happened in the large capital cities of the Eastern States of Australia. How easy is it for the young low-income earner setting up a family around Melbourne or Sydney to purchase freehold property at a price within his means and the means available to him through the various credit agencies? How easy is it for the young worker in "Askin's paradise" to become an owner of freehold land?

When we speak of freedom, let us remember that the restriction of freedom often arises not from legal considerations but from economic considerations. How free is Joe Blow to be a freeholder, if the price of freehold land has escalated completely beyond his means? What is important is that government should ensure that land is available to people who want it, irrespective of the system. If a leasehold system can deliver what is needed in certain circumstances, we should encourage that system: if a freehold system is needed in other circumstances, we should encourage that system. We will have a sensible mixture of the two policies, and any black and white judgment on this matter is complete ideological nonsense.

Honourable members opposite seem to have a naive faith in the efficacy of the market place. I have quoted Hugh Stretton to some effect as to the ramifications of the market place so far as land is concerned. We must remember that land is a fixed resource, not something of which we are creating more all the time. Surely members opposite know that land, under so-called free-market operations, is often deliberately held out of use. Why was the Labor Party, in its very early days of involvement in local government, so enthusiastically in favour of the unimproved land value system for rating? Was not the reason that the Labor Party wanted to provide a financial penalty for those who would seek to hold land out of use?

That matter is less relevant in the extremely built-up parts of the metropolitan area but, nonetheless, it still has some validity in, say, a district like mine or in the District of Tea Tree Gully. The fact that these things have had to be done and have been advocated surely shows that this happens and that these free-market forces are by no means free, and a distortion is introduced into the system merely because those who are working the system do not want it to be free, as it is in their interests that it should not be.

Doubtless, certain action taken in recent years has increased our difficulties concerning the provision of serviced subdivided land. One of these matters is the whole concept of planning controls, and another is the need to service blocks of land. Surely members of this House would not want us to put the clock back to the days when subdivision might merely mean some completely unserviced paddocks and dusty tracts of earth that were called roads. Some such subdivisions still exist in my district: I think of a subdivided area beyond Noarlunga that still has not a fully reticulated water supply. The member for Fisher would share my concern that parts of the metropolitan area still are not fully serviced by sewerage facilities, and this is because they were subdivided before the Planning and Development Act of 1967 was passed.

The need to service allotments has created difficulties. Nonetheless, the servicing had to be done in the interests of planning and in the interests of the purchasers of these allotments. Servicing adds to the cost of the land but it is easier to raise the finance to pay for these things at the time of purchase than to have to pay back the cost through some sort of rating system over many years. So, it has had to be done. The same is true of the planning that has been introduced. I remind members opposite that when we are talking about the problems that we have had in putting land on the market let us remember that the leasehold system solves them far more easily. In place of complicated zoning regulations, we can have "use" clauses in the leases of the type adopted in the Australian Capital Territory. If the member for Fisher does not like compulsory acquisition, fixed term leases solve that problem.

Finally, I refer to a remark made about the Housing Trust. It is a complete myth that the shortage of serviced blocks arises from the fact that the trust is holding so much land out of use. I imagine that the trust would have as much unoccupied land in my district as it has in any other suburban district. Nonetheless, there are still many areas of unsubdivided land at present under private ownership which is available for subdivision. There is no shortage of land to be subdivided, given the willingness of the owners to subdivide it. The fact that a person on a low income in this society can get a Housing Trust house and eventually own it on no more than $100 deposit is due to the foresight of the Housing Trust administrators in buying up cheap land many years ago. The ramifications of that foresight are now obvious. If we want to continue the rental plan and the rental-purchase plan, which is such a great boon to people, that type of land must be made available to them.

I enthusiastically support the Bill. It is important that this scarce commodity, which is in fixed supply, should be made available to people in an orderly, planned fashion,

and at the smallest possible cost to themselves. We must do it in a pragmatic way. We cannot allow the extortion of private speculators to stand in the way of this facility being made available to people. That is why the Government must be involved in this process; hence this Bill, which I support.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): This Bill has been introduced with the highest intention of trying to help the people of South Australia, but somewhere along the road of trying to achieve a workable situation it has taken a wrong turn, and I believe it will end up in nothing but a blind alley. The member for Fisher has already ripped holes in the legislation, and we have seen a pathetic attempt by the member for Mawson to plug one or two of those holes. One hole that the member for Mawson tried to plug related to the valid point of the member for Fisher concerning the leaseholding of land. The member for Mawson made a feeble attempt to divert our attention from the real issues, and I shall fully rebut the honourable member's case later when I deal with the matter of leasehold land in Canberra. I said that the Government had set out with the best possible intentions in introducing this Bill. In explaining the Bill the Minister of Environment and Conservation said:

It deals with an important aspect of the Government's policy of arresting spiralling land prices, and of promoting orderly and efficient urban expansion and development.

That, of course, is what Mr. Average in South Australia would like. In fact, in his second reading explanation the Minister failed to put forward a case and prove to anyone, let alone the Opposition, that the proposals would work. The member for Mawson, too, failed to put forward a case; he simply tried to plug some of the holes. Why has the Government not put forward a case? What the Government is aiming at will not be achieved by establishing a land commission. It is a slight on the people of South Australia and on the dignity of this House that the Government has failed to put forward a case. Although this Government often purports to be a Government that is open to the people, it is really a Government of secrecy, a Government without reason, a Government tending towards dictatorship, and a Government that is certainly not acting in the interests of South Australia.

It is a sad day for democracy when the Government of South Australia cannot put forward a case to justify its legislation. The reason is that, if it tried to prove that this legislation would work, it would find holes in it. I return to the object of this Bill—to freeze spiralling land prices in the Adelaide metropolitan area. The Opposition accepts this object as a worthwhile cause and one that can only help all South Australians. Let us look at the problem of spiralling land prices logically and rationally; that problem is created by two factors—inflation and the short supply of land in relation to demand.

Taking inflation first, I point out that, with the current inflation rate in Australia of 13 per cent per annum, based on the July quarter figures, the price of land will increase. As a result, sensible people will realize that they must get their money out of a liquid form and into fixed assets. Surely the best form of fixed asset that is a protection against inflation is land or similar real estate. For that reason, the people of South Australia have bought a great deal of land. If we made a serious attempt to control inflation throughout the community, we would automatically control the inflationary spiral in connection with land prices in the Adelaide metropolitan area.

The second factor that creates the inflationary spiral in connection with land prices is the short supply of land in relation to the demand. It is simply returning to the old law of supply and demand. We could possibly control the price of land by influencing demand instead of trying to control the supply. In fact, the Government attempts to influence demand by controlling the amount of finance available for purchasing land. I believe that to alter the demand is to hit at Mr. Average, the man in the street. What we should do is to control the supply, because that would be far more efficient and effective. It is for this aspect that I should like to see legislation introduced have its major effect. I refer to the two points again, before passing to the really important issues in relation to the legislation. The first point is that the general inflation at its present level will cause land prices to rise and people will put their money into land, so that the best way to control land prices is to control general inflation. The second point is that we should try to control the supply of land in relation to the demand for it.

This legislation has within it a provision for leaseholding land, and this is the point the member for Mawson tried to protect by quoting at length from Hugh Stretton. If one considers that quotation, however, one must realize that Hugh Stretton was referring to the need to leasehold land in new cities. Is Adelaide a new city? Of course not. I accept the fact that Canberra is a new city, and there may have been a justifiable reason for introducing leaseholding in Canberra, but the whole case put forward by the member for Mawson crumbles, because we are referring to Adelaide and not to Canberra. Will the provision to leasehold land stop the spiralling inflation of land prices? If the answer is "Yes" possibly the legislation will work, but if the answer is "No" we are wasting our time by passing such legislation.

If we consider the only large city in Australia where there is leaseholding of land, the answer must be "No". In Canberra we see a rate of inflation in land prices as great as that in any other major city in Australia. The present situation of leasehold land in Canberra is that two classes are provided: restricted and unrestricted land. The restricted class applies to those who at the time of auctioning do not have other land in Canberra, and the unrestricted class applies to those who already hold property in the Canberra district. Land prices in Canberra have risen dramatically. I refer to figures showing the average annual open-market price between 1962 and 1973. In 1962 the average price of a block was $1,155. I jump to 1970, because during those years the price basically was stationary. In 1970, it was $1,674; in 1971 it was $2,762, almost a rise of 100 per cent; in 1972 it had jumped to $4,681, again almost a rise of 100 per cent; and so far this year the price is $6,875, a jump of 50 per cent.

During the last three years in Canberra there has been a constant annual rise of 100 per cent in land prices. These figures point to two important facts. The first is that land prices in Canberra have spiralled in proportion to the general rate of inflation within Australia. This fact simply confirms my earlier point that one of the important aspects of controlling inflation of land prices is to control general inflation. In Canberra at present one of the most irresponsible Governments one could imagine is trying to control inflation, yet the Budget introduced last week provided for an increase in Government expenditure of 18.9 per cent. However, this Commonwealth Government purports to be a responsible Government trying to control inflation. It is simply feeding the fat cats of Canberra rather than thinking of general industry throughout the country.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member can reply to remarks that have been made, but he has to link

up his comments with the Bill. The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was discussing the situation in Canberra, which is the only other major city with a leasehold system, and relating that situation to what will happen in Adelaide if we introduce leaseholding. I think it would be most appropriate at this stage to consider what certain experts and the general public think of the present situation in Canberra, where there has been a price rise and where a leasehold system operates. In *Canberra Times* of August 1, 1973, under the heading "Sharp rise at restricted A auctions", the following article appears:

> Prices rose sharply at yesterday's "restricted A" auction of residential leases in Canberra, bringing the increase in the past three months for leases in Evatt and Macgregor to more than 50 per cent.

That is a 50 per cent increase under leasehold ownership in three months, and that is far greater than the inflation rate in South Australia under freehold. The article continues:

> More than 500 people crowded into Albert Hall, bidding keenly for 73 leases offered yesterday. Thirty-three leases in Spence, the first Spence leases to be offered at restricted auction, were sold for an average of $6,406 each.

I think those facts speak for themselves and point to a dramatic rise in the price of leasehold land. It is interesting to note that so many people in Canberra are now criticizing the rise in land prices there. I refer to an article in *Canberra Times* of August 8, 1973, as a rebuttal to some of the comments made by the member for Mawson who attacked Mr. Gorton as Prime Minister, because it is apparent that under the present Labor Administration in the Australian capital we find much greater inflation than previously. The articles states:

> The remarks attributed to Mr. Enderby at a press conference on Canberra land prices *(Canberra Times,* August 3) must surely rank as one of the most pitiful confessions of confusion and sheer helplessness ever made by a Minister in control of the Territory for the seat of Government. The Minister is quoted as stating that he saw "little chance" of a halt to rising land prices other than the hope that demand and supply might eventually be brought into balance.

What a pitiful statement from a Minister trying to administer a proposal that the Government in South Australia is now trying to implement in this State! To say the least, it is a shame that the South Australian Government has not been able to learn from the mistakes made by its friends in Canberra. I quote from a book *Canberra in Crisis* by Mr. Frank Brennan. Referring to the situation in Canberra, to land values, and to the spiralling inflation that has taken place there, at page 181, he states:

> Dark clouds are gathering over Australia's experiment in land nationalization. The rosy dawn predicted by its sponsors is beginning to look suspiciously like a sunset.

What fitting words for the catastrophe that has taken place in Canberra and for the catastrophe the South Australian Government would like to see take place here! I hope the people of this State fully appreciate the disaster being brought on their heads. I think I have shown clearly that, under leasehold, land prices will spiral at a rate as great as (if not greater than) that experienced under the freehold system. The evidence from Canberra clearly supports this statement.

Mr. Keneally: What is the alternative?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I shall come to the alternative shortly. I come now to the moral aspects of leasehold, because I believe this is an especially objectionable part of the legislation. It is legislation whereby a Government commission can move in on any unfortunate individual and purchase his land. It is a threat to all South Australians, particularly those in the metropolitan area, but let us not be blind enough to think it applies only to the metropolitan area. All my friends who have country districts appreciate fully that the same threat applies there.

The legislation enables land to be purchased, but it also provides for that land to be leased out again. This again is a threat to the individuality of people in South Australia, a destroyer of the motivation of the individual. It is bastardization of the human race in South Australia. We have only to look at the opinions of the Australian people, given in a national opinion poll. The *Bulletin* of August 25, 1973, clearly indicates the position. The following question was asked of 2 156 people in six States:

> In your opinion should houses and flats built by the State Governments always remain Government-owned or should the tenants be allowed to buy them at today's value on easy terms?

It is a very simple and straightforward question, asking people whether they prefer freehold or leasehold, and 82 per cent of the people of whom the question was asked said they would like to see the tenants allowed to buy the houses on easy terms.

Last evening in this House we made available the finance to allow people who normally could not afford to own a house to buy a house on easy terms. The Liberal and Country League and my colleagues around me supported that legislation. We find from this Gallup poll that a great majority of the people (82 per cent, I repeat, for the benefit of members opposite who were not listening) in all States and in all age groups supported freehold as against leasehold for houses, and the same would apply in relation to land. Only 10 per cent of the people interviewed were in favour of leasehold, while 8 per cent were undecided. From these figures, we see that the people are violently opposed to any form of leasehold.

I am sure the Government has not got the guts to legislate for referendum and to ask the people their opinion, because if it did it would get a very embarrassing reply. Obviously, the Government is not game to go to the people on an election on this issue; it simply would not be game. I throw out the challenge, knowing full well that members opposite will not pick it up.

Members interjecting:

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I turn now to another rather unfortunate aspect of the current legislation—the intervention of the Commonwealth Government in South Australia. There are to be three people on this commission: two appointed by the Premier in collusion with the Prime Minister, and one appointed by the Prime Minister in collusion with the Premier. We all know the views of the Australian Prime Minister; in his view the States are insignificant. This intrusion by Canberra into South Australian administration is most unfortunate, and yet another nail in the coffin driven in by the centralists in Canberra, a nail that members opposite refuse to oppose in any way whatever. It is like driving a nail into a piece of soap.

Before putting forward possible alternatives to the legislation before us, I should like to refer to a submission made concerning the Western Australian legislation which was similar in style to that being debated in the House tonight. I will quote a report from the *Australian Financial Review,* from a special supplement (a land and property feature), and I quote from page 12 of the issue of August 20, 1973, as follows:

> The submission claimed that the aims expressed by the State and federal Governments could be achieved with existing powers. "To a substantial degree, the aims have been and are being achieved with existing powers in a

partnership of efforts between Government and private enterprise. It is therefore reasonable to ask why the proposed legislation seeks the vast additional powers, and, in so doing, withdraws basic rights from all Western Australians."

The group claimed that local government would be bypassed while non-elective Government corporations would take over from them for an indefinite period. In addition, it argued, the State Government would be virtually bypassed in favour of Commonwealth control of urban development in Western Australia because the development corporation and the land commission would rely heavily on federal money.

I think we have covered that point, which is extremely pertinent to our own legislation. The report continues:

The group contended that built-in arrangements for heavy dependence on federal advice and guidance paved the way for a big swing from the existing freehold land system to a leasehold system under Government control. "The proposed Bills set out to make possible a major involvement by the federal Government in Western Australia's urban planning. They provide a major opportunity for the federal Government to dominate the decisions of the State in the area they cover." The study group acknowledged that measures were needed to help low-income earners buy a home.

One way this could be done was by giving such families loans with repayments at a level determined on a basis of a percentage of income. Initially, such repayments might be less than the interest on the loans, but the Government could help by giving guarantees, with special insurance. On the general issues of land development, the study group urged that private enterprise be encouraged to play a bigger part.

The private sector should be encouraged to contribute the widest possible variety of practical ideas to urban planning to avoid dull standardization. Wherever possible, private and not Government funds should be sought for urban development "to avoid crippling dependence on tax funds supplied through the Federal Government, with the resultant loss of State initiative". Federal money committed for land acquisition should be channelled into public utilities and facilities and into important water and sewer headworks.

One can see there a valid case for rejecting the kind of legislation before us. There are also positive ideas on what could be done to control spiralling land prices in South Australia. I also refer to the report of the Commonwealth-State committee set up last May, as a result of the Premiers' Conference, to study land prices and building costs. The report gives some excellent ideas on how land prices can be controlled without setting up a massive bureaucracy and without having to resort to the undesirable practice of leaseholding land. An article on the committee's report, published in the *Australian Financial Review* of Thursday, July 26, 1973, states:

On the question of land price inflation the committee suggests that the Federal and State Governments look at ways in which the time between the private purchasing of land in areas ripe for development and its availability as residential building lots could be reduced.

The following five ideas are set forth in the article on the committee's report, as follows:

First, ways could be sought to speed up the provision of basic services to areas of raw land marked for development. Second, the report says that ways and means of discouraging private land purchasers from holding on to land solely in the expectation of increases in values. The suggestions on this score were various and the committee had differing opinions on the best course of action. Essentially the suggestions included selective income taxation (but there was a strong feeling that taxes generally were passed on into land costs), the imposition of building covenants, discriminatory local government rates, price control and where necessary the resumption of land by public authorities.

One sees at the bottom of one of the five recommendations that, as a last resort, land should be resumed by public authorities. Why does the South Australian Government latch on to that recommendation, after totally ignoring all the other recommendations of the committee? The article continues:

Third, a speeding up of private developers work on land development for sale as residential lots could be implemented. This suggestion calls for a greater degree of co-operation between public authorities and private developers. Fourth, ways could be explored to minimize procedural delays on approvals for subdivisions. The report says "the possibility could be examined of establishing uniform subdivisional codes on State-wide bases. But measures would also be required to ensure that the benefits were passed on to the final purchasers." Fifth, there would be study as to whether working capital for genuine and not speculative development be made available at much below reigning interest rates.

One sees there five excellent recommendations on how the increase in land prices can be controlled. I repeat again that all these recommendations could be adopted, without any major effect on the individual or without having to set up yet another Government commission, simply by improving the efficiency of existing Government departments, by speeding up the provision of services, by discouraging land speculation, and by speeding up land subdivision by developers. The Government could easily sit around a table and encourage developers to adopt these three procedures.

I point to the delays currently existing in the State for the processing of development or subdivisional plans. It takes about 2½ years from the time the developer submits his original plan until he can start selling lots, and much of this time is wasted within the Government bureaucracy of the State. From the time the developer submits his first plan it takes about six months for even provisional approval to be given by the State Planning Authority. Subsequently, it takes an additional six months for formal approval to be granted before work on the subdivision can proceed. Obviously, this is one of the biggest areas which is holding up land development in the metropolitan area of Adelaide and which is causing a short supply of land at a time when the demand is high.

I return now to the original points I made as to why the price of land in Adelaide is spiralling. My first point was the general inflation within the State. The State and Commonwealth Governments have not tried to control inflation: in fact, as a result of their actions they have encouraged it. The second area in spiralling land prices is the inadequate supply in terms of demand. It is possible to alleviate the supply position by improving the current administration of our Government which, as the member for Fisher said, has been severely criticized by people throughout Australia and which is the laughing stock of State planning authorities in Australia. Instead of trying to set up yet another Government body, we should be looking at the existing mess around us and trying to clean that up. This could be done, and we could control the rise in land prices. That should be the first and main objective of any legislation, and it could be done without the Bill now before us. The other feature in the Bill to which I object strongly is the leaseholding of land. I have already pointed out that leaseholding of land is against the best interests of individuals and against the desires of all Australians in general and South Australians in particular.

Finally, the third point is that we see yet another unfortunate attempt by the Commonwealth Government to muzzle in on State Government affairs, and an even weaker attempt by the South Australian Government to resist such a move. I therefore urge all members, on rational and logical grounds, to vote against the Bill. My request may be based on wishful thinking in respect

of Government members, because I know that the Australian Labor Party instructs its members how to vote on all measures.

Mr. Langley: Did you sign the pledge?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I have not signed any pledge. On the other hand, members opposite are instructed how they must vote on this legislation. It is a shame that they have not the courage of their convictions, which they keep well buried, to stand up and vote against it. If members opposite do vote against this legislation they will obviously be supporting the ideals, objectives and desires of the majority of the people in their districts.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 28. Page 536.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): In indicating my support for the Bill, I point out that it has been on my file for only about five minutes. However, I will not cast aspersions on anyone for this, as I had another copy of it. A Bill of this kind, which is introduced every year, deals with the statutory salaries of certain appointed officers who, as we all know, are independent of Parliament and who are outside the Public Service Board's jurisdiction in the normal ways. The Bill sets out the salaries that these officers are to be paid. It is interesting to note the two graded steps that the measure provides. The Bill will operate retrospectively, because it mentions August 27, whereas today is August 29. However, that is by the way.

The other matter contained in the Bill is an adjustment to the salary of the Valuer-General; this office has been tacked on to the Bill to overcome an anomaly that has been found. Put another way, it is a reclassification of the office. Obviously, some of these salary ranges are the result of recent inquiries and, without commenting on them and the extent of them, they are in line with some of the salaries that were announced in the press only last week for some heads of departments and other very senior officers. I point out with some envy (if I may add a personal note) that the salary of $25,400 that is provided is not an insignificant sum.

I realize the importance of the responsibilities of these officers but, at the same time, the Bill highlights the difference between these important officers and a humble back-bencher of this Parliament. There seems to be a vast difference in this regard, remembering, after all, that you, Mr. Speaker, are in charge of a House whose members have a great responsibility to debate legislation that these officers have a great deal of responsibility in administering. A simple Bill of this kind is introduced each year, except that, as I say, this measure includes a provision relating to the Valuer-General. I support the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I reiterate what I have said regarding a Bill similar to this one that was introduced last year, namely, that too big a discrepancy exists in the levels of wages in Australia today. This fact has been discovered in the United States of America, where the authorities are doing their best to solve the problem, whereas we are doing what has been done there in the past. However, I believe in salary differentials. Those people who worked hard and rise to high positions (and possibly some of these gentlemen are working longer than a 40-hour week) warrant being paid higher salaries, but there is too big a discrepancy in salaries. I suppose that I will be called inconsistent if I accept a higher salary if we are offered one later this year. What I would advocate is that everyone who receives a salary of over $80 a week should accept a 50 per cent salary cut. This would bring salaries down in reasonable proportion and would carry out the principles I have advocated, namely, that some people are entitled to a higher salary than others.

People in the higher-wage brackets are generally most unhappy and miserable and say that two-thirds of their salary goes in taxation and, by the time they have paid superannuation, they are worse off than they were before. It is incongruous that such highly trained people should say such things. We must face up to the fact that there is too big a difference in the wages that people receive. I know the case of a girl who, working in the Commonwealth Public Service, received two increases in a year: the national wage increase and the Public Service increase.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must come back to the terms of the Bill, which I suggest he study. The honourable member for Heysen.

Mr. McANANEY: I was talking about Public Service wages.

The SPEAKER: Order! Once again I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that the Bill deals with certain specified officers employed by the State. This is not a general debate on wage structures but only on the salaries of certain officers. The honourable member for Heysen.

Mr. McANANEY: I was trying to prove that the salaries are too high in comparison. I know that the Government wants a Socialist State, in which comparisons are not made, where competition does not exist but where someone makes a rough guess at what the figure should be. Surely in debating whether a salary is too high or too low, one must compare it with something else. The point I was trying to make was that this girl received two increases in a year. The officers mentioned in the Bill receive a combination of two increases a year, but the ordinary man who receives only one increase a year is getting so far behind this group that it is a serious matter. The girl who received two increases in a year became pregnant and had to give up working. Her husband, who was doing a five-year apprenticeship, was earning less than his wife was earning (this was before she received the maternity allowance), and it emphasizes the need for an inquiry.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in the Bill about pregnancy. The honourable member for Heysen.

Mr. McANANEY: I think I have made my point. This matter is getting out of hand and we must face up to it if we are to have justice in the wage structure. I am sure that, if most Government members were not scared stiff, they would support my contention.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

AGENT-GENERAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 15. Page 358.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill. It is significant that at the same time as we are considering this Bill we are to consider an amendment to up-date the up-dating referred to when the Bill was explained about a fortnight ago. The Bill corrects a situation which is to the disadvantage of the person who is the Agent-General, who represents South Australia in the United Kingdom. I pay tribute to the work undertaken on behalf of this State by the present Agent-General. Bearing in mind the salary and expenses to be paid the

newly appointed Agent-General, I am certain that South Australia will continue to receive the benefit that it should receive from such an appointment.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Salary and allowances of Agent-General."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

To strike out new paragraph *(a)* and insert:

(a) as from, and including, the fourth day of June, 1973, and until, but not including, the twenty-seventh day of August, 1973, a salary at the rate of eleven thousand two hundred and ninety-seven dollars a year and as from, and including, the twenty-seventh day of August, 1973, a salary at the rate of fourteen thousand seven hundred dollars a year;

This amendment is proposed to reflect, in relation to the salary of the Agent-General, the adjustments proposed in the Statutes Amendment (Public Salaries) Bill, which has just been passed. If it is accepted, the salary of the Agent-General will be $11,297 as from June 4, the day the national wage took effect, and $14,700 as from August 27. The sum payable by way of expense allowance for the Agent-General ($10,100 a year) is not affected by the amendment.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): Can the Premier say whether the new salary and allowance paid to the Agent-General is similar to that paid to other officers representing other States, or is the rate determined by comparison with other salary levels in our own State Government departments? Will the new appointee be disadvantaged in any way?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Agent-General's salary is recommended by the Public Service Board after consideration of the general wage structure of the State, expenses in London, and a comparison with salaries of other Agents-General. Special provisions were made in relation to the two last Agents-General, who came into the post from outside the Public Service and who were engaged on a contract basis. A contract basis, of course, will not apply in the case of Mr. White, who is already a public servant and who will retain all the benefits of Public Service membership. It is not proposed to make any alteration to the salary and expenses on that account. The position established in relation to Mr. Taylor will be maintained.

Under Mr. Taylor's contract, it was arranged that the appropriate adjustments to keep pace with senior posts in the Public Service in South Australia would be made in relation to the Agent-General while he occupied that post. This Bill gives effect to that contractual arrangement. I can assure the Leader that Mr. White will in no way be disadvantaged in the transfer from the post of Secretary of the Premier's Department to that of Agent-General.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 28. Page 536.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill, which is similar in substance to those Bills which were passed by this House in 1971 and 1972, the dates and the percentage increases being the variables. In 1971 there was a 5 per cent increase, and again in 1972 there was a 5 per cent increase, but in 1973 there is an 8 7/10 per cent increase. True, inflation has been much higher in the last year (especially in the last eight months) than previously. However, I question whether the rise in the cost of living is accurately reflected here. I suspect that the 8 7/10 per cent, although an improvement on the 5 per cent to which I referred previously, is not as advantageous as it should be.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The calculation of the adjustment is on exactly the same basis as that of the previous adjustments.

Dr. EASTICK: I still do not accept that the 8 7/10 per cent increase is a true reflection of the increase in the cost of living. I am also compelled to ask the Premier whether this is an interim measure before the introduction of the superannuation benefits promised the Public Service. It has been stated at a Public Service Association meeting, and subsequently in the press, that Public Service superannuation (indeed, all areas of superannuation in which the Government is involved) will be considered and a new scheme introduced. Although this is not part of the Bill the House is now considering, I am certain that those who will be advantaged by the measure now before us will want to know what alterations are likely to occur.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): As I told the Leader earlier, the amount of adjustment has been calculated on exactly the same basis as the calculation of the previous adjustments, and this is considered, both actuarily and statistically, to be sound. I refer now to the general provisions regarding Public Service superannuation. As I promised the superannuants and members of the Superannuation Federation, the working party has been preparing an entirely new Public Service superannuation scheme. I am informed that that working party's report in completion of the scheme will be in my hands on Friday. I expect then that the Government will take some little time to examine the scheme, and in the meantime it must be costed.

Dr. Eastick: After the Government has picked itself up off the floor!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The cost is not going to be light. The final costing has not yet been made, as the final report is only just being completed. However, I did not expect that the cost would be light and, indeed, I have forecast that we will have to meet a substantially extra amount in relation to superannuation in this area. I expect then that the scheme will be put to the Superannuation Federation in September, and it will be necessary for us to have fairly lengthy discussions on various aspects of the scheme, the transitional provisions of which are complex. The provisions regarding those disadvantaged by the scheme through its not being introduced in January this year necessarily will create additional anomalies that will have to be considered. It has indeed been a complicated business working out the scheme.

Dr. Eastick: Do you expect the report to be tabled?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. When I make it available to the Superannuation Federation, I expect also to make it available for members to examine. It will necessarily be the basis for discussion. The Government is putting forward the working party's report not as sheer finality but as a basis upon which discussion with the

Superannuation Federation will be undertaken. When we have achieved agreement, as I expect to achieve it, given the instructions which were issued to the working party and which I outlined to the Superannuation Federation, it will be necessary to draft the Bill, which will also be complex. In these circumstances, it is unlikely that the Government will be able to introduce the Bill earlier than next February. However, I will certainly want to do so as early as I can. I give the undertaking that I gave to the Superannuation Federation: the Government will carry out its promise this session, and that undertaking will be met.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 28. Page 537.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports this Bill, which is substantially the same as the Superannuation Act Amendment Bill, which the House has just passed. So far as the Opposition is concerned, this Bill can proceed without delay.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.42 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 30, at 2 p.m.