HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, March 13, 1975

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, intimated the Governor's assent to the following Bills:

Kindergarten Union,

Public Service Act Amendment (Consolidation),

South Australian Council for Educational Planning and Research,

Underground Waters Preservation Act Amendment.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

STUART HIGHWAY

In reply to Mr GUNN (March 6).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This road is a national highway, and its reconstruction will be funded by the Australian Government. The present Australian Road Grants Act for the period up to June 30, 1977, is such that any construction work is unlikely before that date. In the interim, the Highways Department will continue to maintain the road and undertake minor improvements where necessary.

CLARE HOUSING

In reply to Mr. VENNING (February 26).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The South Australian Housing Trust is now holding a total of 37 rental applications and seven sale applications for housing in the township of Clare. The waiting time for rental accommodation in Clare is such that the Housing Trust is processing applications that were lodged in July, 1973. The present construction programme is as follows: two timber-frame single units and one brick-veneer single unit are under construction; one timber-frame single unit and three brick-veneer single units have been contracted for but not yet started; and four timber-frame single units and two brick-veneer single units have been sited, but no contracts have been let at this stage.

In addition, six pre-made (transportable-type) houses have been scheduled for delivery to Clare. Two have already been placed on site, while the remaining four are awaiting delivery to the town. These six units are all three-bedroomed units of the double-life type, and it is expected that the other four will have been delivered to their respective sites by the end of this month. Any on-site work necessary to bring these houses to the point where they are ready for occupation should be completed shortly thereafter.

However, the major problem the trust has encountered at Clare is the difficulty in obtaining suitable subdivided land in the town. Those areas considered suitable for residential development have been inspected but, unfortunately, all are in broad-acres form, and are too large for the trust's requirements. Officers of the trust have held discussions with the Clare District Council on this matter, and it was agreed with council that the assistance of both the South Australian Land Commission and the Department of Urban and Regional Development in Canberra should be sought in regard to this problem. The council's district clerk has made an approach to the Land Commission that underlines the point that the problem is one of a supply of developed land rather than any unwillingness on the part of the Housing Trust to build.

PETROL TAX

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say what assistance the Government will provide for petrol resale operators who are unable to make petrol franchise tax payments by the due date? Many operators are concerned about this matter because of the general financial liquidity problem. I have had drawn to my attention two instances of this difficulty. First, I refer to the case of an operator who is operating this year on a much smaller turnover of petrol than that on which he operated at the time the franchise tax was determined. Therefore, he has not been able to obtain sufficient funds to meet the tax commitment that was fixed at that time. Secondly, I am told that operators who allow credit for the supply of fuel, particularly to large business organisations and interstate freight companies, have a problem because, in the normal course of events, they have not obtained returns for sales made during February and March and, in some cases, late January. Other combinations of factors may affect the funds available to operators. The circumstances I have described are entirely different from those applying to a person who has relinquished his licence before the payment date, therefore being able, in effect, to abscond with funds obtained during the period from January until the time he relinquished the licence. This serious problem could force several operators either to operate outside the law or to close down because they are unable to fulfil their financial commitment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The matter having been raised with me by the Automobile Chamber of Commerce, I have written to that organisation to say that we would be grateful to know about specific instances of hardship or the likelihood of it. We will have a full examination made to see whether some specific amendment should be made to cope with the difficulties.

MAJOR ROADS SYSTEM

Mr. COUMBE: Does the Minister of Transport intend to introduce in South Australia the system of major and minor roads? In view of the considerable confusion at present about the new "stop" sign laws, in what way will the major and minor road system improve road safety? Although I know that this system operates overseas, has the proposed new system been adopted uniformly throughout Australia? More importantly, what type of sign does the department intend to use to warn motorists about entering main roads?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I hope that I can remember most, if not all, of the honourable member's questions. The Government has adopted the relevant recommendation of the Road Traffic Board and the special committee on road safety that I established some time ago. In fact, only five minutes ago I gave notice that on Tuesday I would introduce a Bill to amend the Road Traffic Act, and the purpose of that Bill is to give effect to the introduction of a minor and major road system in South Australia. From the advice the Government has received and certainly from my personal observations overseas, it is clear that the minor and major road system has many advantages from the point of view of road safety that the give way to the right rule that currently applies in South Australia does not have. I suppose one could give no better example than the old chestnut of which vehicle has the right of way when four vehicles arrive simultaneously at an intersection. With a give way to the right rule, one must fall back on the provision that people must drive with due care and

consideration for other road users. However, that example still highlights the weakness in the give way to the right rule, and this will be removed with the major and minor road system. It is intended that major roads will be marked in the conventional way in accordance with the national code that has been adopted by the Australian Transport Advisory Council and by National Association of Australian State Road Authorities. The method of marking to be used will involve a longitudinal line drawn across the junction or mouth of a minor road where it abuts a major road. Therefore, a motorist coming into a major road from a minor road will have to cross that line, which will be a signal to him that he is entering a major road and is therefore required to give way to vehicles travelling in either direction.

Mr. Coumbe: No signs?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Oh, yes. Likewise, a motorist coming along a major road will, because of the line painted on the road, see that the road at the intersection or junction to his left or right is a minor road. In addition, in many cases the road lines will be supplemented by either a "stop" sign or a "give way" sign. Major road users will also be assisted in many cases by the use of what are called "rocket" signs, which look very much like rockets. I will not try to describe the sign, but I can provide illustrations of what it will look like. Such signs will indicate to a motorist on major roads that he is on a major road and that any vehicle on his left or right will be coming from a minor road. In that way he will be protected.

Mr. Coumbe: Has this system been adopted throughout Australia?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No, it has not. I believe Victoria is experimenting with it; Western Australia has introduced a few priority roads, but that is not a major and minor road system, so it is fiddling with the system; and New South Wales is now proceeding with the system. While it would be desirable to have uniformity (and I have always strongly advocated uniformity), I believe at some stage one must put the safety of motorists in his own State ahead of all other considerations. That is what South Australia will do in this case, and I believe other States will follow the good example we will set.

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY

Mr. NANKIVELL: Does the Minister of Works have for me a report on departmental plans to control salinity along the Murray River? In addition, can he report on the present position regarding salinity in the Riverland section of the Murray River especially, and indicate what effect, if any, he considers the release of water from up-river storages such as Lake Victoria has had on the present position?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have the report to which the honourable member refers. An inter-departmental committee convened by the Engineering and Water Supply Department to examine recommendations contained in the Gutteridge report requested the Mines Department to carry out an investigation on sites that could be used as off-river evaporation basins. This involved an extensive drilling programme, and the only site in the Berri-Loxton-Renmark area which had potential as a basin was near Noora, to the south of Loxton. The effects of a basin at this site on inflows of saline groundwater to the Murray River still have to be assessed, and this work is now in hand. At the same time studies have commenced to determine the optimum use of a basin there, in terms of cost and benefits arising from improved river water quality, used either as the sole method of drainage water disposal or in conjunction with existing river basins and controlled discharges to the river. These studies should be completed by the end of July.

The second part of the honourable member's question refers to the present salinity levels in the Murray River districts: the honourable member would know that, following a deputation at which he and the member for Chaffey were present, I said that we would examine the possibility of the release of water. I thought then that it would be necessary to gain approval from the Governments of Victoria, New South Wales and the Commonwealth in order to release water, but further investigations made following the deputation showed that, under the River Murray Waters Agreement, we could, through the River Murray Commission and with the agreement of other members of the commission, release water for a specific purpose. Following an approach to the other members of the commission, it was agreed that we would release water from Lake Victoria to the extent of 150 000 megalitres. This was done on the following day (the Friday), and I am pleased that, although probably not entirely because of that action, the results were felt in some areas; if not already felt in Waikerie, they will eventually be felt, and this position will be maintained for some time. Therefore, the critical position that had existed was relieved to some extent. On Tuesday, the additional entitlement agreed to by the Commissioners was achieved, because a gauging station near Rufus River indicated that the additional quantity (150 000 M*l*) had in fact passed that point. This was not entirely as a result of flows through the opening of the gates at Lake Victoria: it was partly because of the increased flow of good quality water down the river. Until Tuesday, about 100 000 M*l* of the additional quantity had flowed out of Lake Victoria, and about 50 000 M*l* had come down the river. In accordance with that agreement, I have had to close off some of the flow out of Lake Victoria.

Evidently, this will mean that there will be some increase in salinity as the river returns to pool level. This is inevitable because, as the honourable member and also the member for Chaffey know, there still will be a flow of groundwaters into the river, because I think this additional flow has raised the level by 1 m. When this gets back to pool level, groundwaters again will flow in, and probably it will take some time for the flows of groundwater to cease once the pool level is reached. There is therefore a possibility that we could have a problem again soon. However, I hope that, by the next irrigation season, we shall be able to solve the problem (of having to restrict the flows in the river) because of what we have just done. In other words, I think that we shall be able to pick up that amount and that we shall not have to pay it back before the next irrigation season. That is the prediction at present.

Mr. Arnold: This is the calculated risk.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, it was the calculated risk taken at the time, and I think it was made perfectly clear that we had to pay that back. We could be slightly short of water later in the year, but it would seem now not to be likely to happen. I think that what I have said covers the points that I wanted to make in reply to the honourable member. I will now tell members about the additional quantity of water that has flowed down the river since we opened Lake Victoria. It represents about 140 per cent of the waters currently held in the metropolitan reservoirs, and that is a large quantity. I am thankful it has had some effect. I am having the situation examined closely because, if it has that effect in the future in similar situations, we will have an additional form of management we can apply to overcome a critical situation.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation and the Government consider extending to the end of March the daylight saving period in South Australia in future years? The present period ends on the first Sunday in March. I have been told that, from the point of view of both the weather at this time of the year and the sun patterns, benefit would accrue to the majority of South Australian citizens if the daylight saving period was extended to the end of March.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I, too, have had many approaches from people who have suggested extending the period of daylight saving. Regrettably for them, however, we have legislation restricting the period of daylight saving to the first Sunday in March, bearing in mind that this period has been established by the other States that have taken advantage of daylight saving and introduced the relevant legislation. Such an extension would cause difficulties for industry as regards contacting its counterparts in other States, because the existing half-hour time differential would be varied. No such moves could be taken unless those other States were willing to extend the period or initiate a move in that direction. I agree with the honourable member that there seems to be much merit in the suggestion made by many people that, as March is a period of fine weather, advantage should be taken of it.

FEMALE TITLE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Notice of Motion, Other Business, No. 5 to be taken into consideration forthwith.

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

Mr. BOUNDY: Yes, Sir.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The motion I intend to move, which was No. 1 on the Notice Paper for other business yesterday, is as follows:

That this House disagree with his decision, announced by the Premier on Saturday, March 8, that all Government departments in South Australia are to adopt the title "Ms" for women in their documents and correspondence and express the opinion that—

(1) the large majority of women in this State prefer to be known either as "Mrs." or "Miss", as appropriate, and regard as an insult the attempt to force on them the title "Ms";
(2) the use of such titles should be a matter of choice for women; and
(3) any instruction given by the Premier or anyone else for such use of the title "Ms" should be immediately cancelled.

I had intended yesterday to seek suspension to have this motion debated when, as I said, it was Notice of Motion, Other Business, No. 1 on the Notice Paper, and I so informed the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition. About half-way through Question Time, I also informed you, Mr. Speaker, that I intended to seek a suspension, although I did not tell you what it was, but you did not give me the call at all yesterday. It was only the second (or, at the most, third) time during this session that I have not had the call when I have sought it during Question Time—

The SPEAKER: Order! Standing Orders prevail.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I make that point only to show that I wanted to take the first opportunity I could, which was yesterday, to raise this matter in the House. As I suspected (and it turned out to be correct) the Government did not intend to allow me to go on with this motion in the usual way in its order on the Notice Paper. I am sure that, unless I take this action now, it will not allow me to do it today, either. The decision of the Premier (and I say that advisedly, because I do not think that at the time it was a Government decision) that in future Government departments would refer to all women—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows full well that Standing Orders give him the opportunity for a maximum time of 10 minutes to explain the reason why he seeks to suspend Standing Orders; they do not give him the opportunity to debate the subject that he would talk about should a suspension be agreed to.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not intend to debate the subject matter. I was about to say that this decision was announced on Saturday. Since then it has blown up (and I use that phrase advisedly, too) into a major issue. I cannot remember any other issue that has so spontaneously and immediately aroused such annoyance and indignation among a large section of the community. I have received letters (and I guess my experience is duplicated by that of other members on both sides of the House) and telephone calls about the matter, which has also been the subject of letters to the Editor. I notice that in today's newspaper those letters are running seven to three against. There have also been radio talk-back programmes on the topic. One lady known to us has said that she personally resents having to be referred to in future as "the back-end of plums".

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is debating the subject matter in relation to which he seeks the suspension of Standing Orders. I repeat for the last time that the honourable member must not do this; he must speak in accordance with Standing Order 463, and nothing else will be permitted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On Tuesday, the Premier dug his toes in, saying that the decision would stand and that there was nothing else to it. That is why I sought immediately to have the matter debated in the House. If this motion to enable it to be debated is not carried, it will show that the Government is either so afraid of the issue or so embarrassed about it that it is not willing to allow it to be debated at all. I suggest that this is the place in which matters such as this should be thrashed out, and that they should be dealt with while, as issues, they are white-hot. That is why I have moved to suspend Standing Orders so that the matter can be debated. I ask all members to support my motion so that we may see where members on both sides stand on the matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I oppose the motion. I am sure the honourable member is not surprised about that, since the procedures of the House have been clearly laid down. The Government has often said before that it will not have Government business pre-empted by a suspension of Standing Orders to discuss some matter that members want to raise. There are means in the processes of the House for members to move urgency motions or motions of no confidence, or they may raise matters of grievance during the daily adjournment debate.

Mr. Millhouse: That's if you can get in.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member chose the way he got in on this, and I think he is probably stuck with it. The situation is as I have stated: the Government will not have its position pre-empted in this way.

Mr. Millhouse: You're frightened to have it discussed; that's the trouble.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Consequently, I do not intend to agree to the motion, as I would not agree to any other motion of the kind that took the business of the House out of the hands of the Government.

Mr. Millhouse: Will you make an opportunity available for it to be debated this session?

The SPEAKER: Order! I have warned the honourable member already. I now warn him for the second time today. If another occasion arises, I will name the honourable member; the matter is now in his hands. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Members have ample opportunity to raise matters of this kind during Question Time, in the adjournment debate, or in one of the other ways in which members can bring what they consider to be matters of urgency before the House, if they can get other members also to consider them matters of urgency. As to the issue's being white-hot, the honourable member seems to get himself or his parts in a knot, whereas other people frankly do not.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, and Venning.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Gunn, Nankivell, and Wardle. Noes—Messrs. Duncan, McRae, and Wells.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

QUESTIONS RESUMED

OIL EXPLORATION

Mr. SIMMONS: Is the Minister of Development and Mines aware of the Prime Minister's statement yesterday welcoming the participation of oversea companies in searching for oil, and, if he is, what effect does the Minister think this will have on oil exploration in South Australia?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It can be only of benefit to the State. The statement appears to be much in line with statements that this Government has made now for some time. I believe it was only last week in response to a question by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that I reiterated a joint announcement made by the Premier and me about 12 months ago in which we indicated that we were unconcerned about the equity structure of mining companies at the exploration phase, but that, at the exploitation and development phase, it would be necessary for these companies to seek Australian equity. In fact, we were willing to put a figure of 51 per cent on what should be the Australian holding in company development. We would underwrite the statement made by the *Financial Review* only a few days ago in which it asked rhetorically, "Why should it be only Australian money that is risked at the exploration stage? Why should not the French, Italians, British and Japanese also be allowed to put their money at risk when it comes to exploration for mineral resources?" This is something we have always believed to be the case. What has actually happened relating to various companies that have continued to exploit our resources has been largely what the Australian Government has allowed to happen. However, it is heartening to hear from the Prime Minister that the conditions under which the companies that are operating in Australia have been operating will continue. In answer to the honourable member's question, we would expect the announcement would have a beneficial impact on present oil search in South Australia.

HOSPITAL WAITING LISTS

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Health, say what steps are to be taken to relieve the present unsatisfactory situation regarding waiting lists for surgery in public hospitals in South Australia? In reply last Tuesday to a Question on Notice, the Attorney-General indicated that, among other waiting list times, there is a waiting list of between 12 and 18 months or between 12 and 24 months for operations for bunions; from 12 to 18 months for an operation at the Royal Adelaide Hospital for varicose veins; and 12 months for an operation at the Royal Adelaide Hospital for hernia. This is—

Mr. Slater: How about hair transplants?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bragg.

Dr. TONKIN: Members opposite may think this is funny, but the people on these waiting lists do not. This is not a new problem: as regards public hospitals there has always been a waiting list of some kind. Sometimes the list has been longer than it is now, and sometimes it has been shorter; however, this is about par for the course. It is not the fault of the staff, because the medical and nursing staffs are working to capacity; and it is not the fault of the facilities, because we have modern facilities in South Australia. However, the fact remains that these waiting lists exist and are part of the public hospital services. If Medibank is introduced in South Australia, undoubtedly there will be an increased demand for the facilities available. It seems absolutely essential that the present waiting list situation should be improved; indeed, waiting lists should be cut back to virtually nil before the Medibank scheme is brought into operation. Otherwise, if members of the community are to listen to Medibank advertisements, they will be misled into allowing their private insurance contributions to lapse and will be obliged to go into public hospitals, thus creating tremendous pressure on public hospital services.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am sure that everyone will agree that everything practicable should be done to reduce waiting lists for surgery at public hospitals. It is regrettable that the honourable member should see fit to make use of this topic as part of his non-stop campaign against Medibank, because he would be aware that when Medibank operates in South Australia many additional public beds will be available throughout the community, other than those that are now available in public hospitals.

Mr. Payne: The situation will worsen if doctors don't co-operate.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Gunn: Nonsense!

The Hon. L. J. KING: To say that Medibank will result in an increased demand for these beds is simply another way of saying that, under the existing health arrangements, there are many people who need these services but who are unable to get them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. L. J. KING: However, I will refer the question to the Minister of Health and invite him to comment not only on what steps can be taken to reduce waiting lists in relation to surgery but also on the impact that the introduction of Medibank will have.

PETERBOROUGH RAILWAY WORKSHOPS

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Premier give the same assurance regarding the Peterborough railway workshops as he gave yesterday to the member for Davenport in relation to the Islington workshops? Yesterday, the member for Davenport asked the Premier whether he discussed last Thursday with the Prime Minister matters in relation to the Islington workshops. The Premier replied by saying that the future of the Islington workshops would, in any arrangement with the Commonwealth, be assured. On January 21, I wrote to the Premier, asking him, when conferring with the Prime Minister, to insist on retaining in future the railway workshops at Peterborough. People living in Peterborough are worried that the workshops might be removed from the area, thus taking away one of the few industries in this town. Many people in the railway work force own their own houses in Peterborough and, if the workshops are removed and people have to seek work elsewhere, the value of their houses will be considerably reduced.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In discussions with the Commonwealth, the workshops at Peterborough have been taken into account equally with those at Islington.

GLENELG TRAM

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Transport tell the House what are the results of investigations of the suggestion of operating the Glenelg tramline underground along Jetty Road and extending the tramline and looping it along the foreshore, Anzac Highway, Brighton Road and back to Jetty Road? I understand that a gentleman from Woodville, on December 2, 1971, wrote to the Minister making the suggestion to which I have referred. The Minister replied on January 14, 1972, that the suggestion was being considered. An article appearing in the *News* of February 26, headed "M.T.T. Plans a Big Face-lift", states:

> New buses, more bus shelters, increased charter operations and a better Glenelg tram service are among M.T.T. plans for improving suburban transport . . . The special projects unit, with its headquarters at Hackney, will tackle long-range plans involved in running 1 000 buses by the year 2000.

Can the Minister say whether such a suggestion has been referred to the Transport Planning Division of his department and to the Municipal Tramways Trust, and can he also say what are the findings on feasibility and the estimated cost?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not recall the letter that is the basis of the honourable member's question but, as it reached me in 1971, I suppose I can be excused for not recalling it readily. Many letters come to me. I do not remember having an investigation undertaken on the feasibility of the Glenelg tram going underground along the sea-front. In fact, presumably we would have to put it in a waterproof tube to do that. However, I did put forward to the Director-General of Transport a couple of years ago, for preliminary investigation, the proposal that the trams should go underground a little east of Brighton Road, then remain underground, and probably come up around somewhere near Colley Terrace.

Mr. Becker: That would be more logical.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is right, and I may add that most of the things that we do are logical. Then the tram would link up with the old North Terrace route, making the whole thing a circular scheme. However, this proposal depends on several factors.

Dr. Eastick: Money?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Of course, but one factor was what the member for Hanson stated last week that he opposed, namely, the conversion of Jetty Road and Moseley Square into a pedestrian mall. The whole project is one of several projects that are under continuing surveillance by the Director-General of Transport and his staff. When the provision of new cars for the line was submitted to the Bureau of Transport Economics about two years ago, the proposal did not come out favourably and it had to be resubmitted in a different way in order to get the cost-benefit result required if it was to qualify for Commonwealth assistance. We consider that, probably with the passage of time and improvement in the service generally, we now may well be able to resubmit this proposal for new cars, and it may come out satisfactorily. The overall study of the underground part of the proposal has not yet come out at a ratio to justify support for it, but the proposal certainly has not been abandoned. It will be kept under surveillance, for adoption whenever possible.

TEA TREE GULLY QUARRY

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation obtain for me a report on the progress that has been made on, and the success of, the project to transform a quarry site adjoining North-East Road and Perseverance Road, Tea Tree Gully, into a sports and recreation park on land acquired by the State Planning Authority as part of the planned 345-hectare Anstey Hill regional park?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be pleased to get an up-to-date report on the current situation and let the honourable member know what is the position.

SEXIST TEXTBOOKS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Education say whether he intends to press on with the removal from schools of books that have been described by some people as sexist? The Government seems to have jumped on the bandwaggon that a group calling itself the women's libbers is pushing along steadily, and the Minister has declared that he will phase out from South Australian schools books that are described as sexist, on the grounds that they show women or girls entering into a supportive role, whereas the men and boys are shown in more assertive and achieving roles. A report in the *News* this afternoon refers to this sort of book. It is gratifying to see that the President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers thinks that this is much ado about nothing, but be that as it may. The report shows two pictures from books, one of a boy carrying a saw and a hammer and the other showing a girl dressed as a mother and carrying a basket. It is claimed that this puts the woman in a supportive role, but I point out that many women find the role of wife and mother an achieving role. I think that most women in the community still consider this to be an achieving role. Indeed, it is a role that is biologically impossible for the male of the species. This links with the decision of the Premier to refer to all women in the Public Service as "ms" as in "plums", and it seems that the Government has gone overboard in seeking to pander to the ideas of a minority that wants to turn this society into a sexless society.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Kavel is becoming something of an expert at taking one or two statements, expanding on them by using his own imagination,

reaching conclusions on what the Government intends to do, and then using his usual sarcasm—

Mr. Gunn: Answer the question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will answer the question in my own way, without any help from either the member for Kavel or the member for Eyre. I assure them of that. The member for Kavel, after doing what I have said and having set up his Aunt Sally, then proceeds to pour scorn on it.

Dr. Eastick: Aunt Sally? That would be sexist.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Perhaps we will have to change that term to Aunt Bruce, because he also has been known to indulge in the practice I have referred to. The position taken by the Government and the Education Department is that in textbooks there ought to be a balance on how the roles of men and women are depicted. It ought not be the situation that the books in general give a significant and serious bias one way or the other. This means that, as well as being shown in supportive roles, women should also be shown in achieving roles. Clearly, one achieving role is as a wife or mother, but there are other achieving roles that women can play and do play that ought to be depicted in the books that children use. I think that what is far more important on the issue of sex discrimination is the attitude of people, and the extent to which attitudes are formed by textbooks probably is fairly limited. Consequently, we would not proceed to replace textbooks, except when they were falling due for replacement. In other words, the Government would not intend that any additional expenditure should be incurred consequent on this decision. It should be done over a period. A more interesting proposal which was announced by the Premier on Saturday, but which has not received publicity, is the proposal to establish a pilot scheme involving a few schools to ascertain the way people's attitudes affect the traditional approach to the role of men and women, and to ascertain whether progress is possible in altering such attitudes.

I should think there would be more prospect of achieving something significant in that regard than by altering textbooks. Nevertheless, concerning textbooks, as I have said, no proposal has been considered to downgrade the role of a woman as wife or mother. We have tried to make clear, as far as possible in this type of material, the roles that women can play within our community and to show that the positive achieving roles that women can play are many and varied and include the traditional roles, but that they can also be extended into other areas. We know that the way the male-female relationship is often depicted should have far more balance to it than has been the case in the past. I think this is a perfectly reasonable policy to adopt. Textbooks will be reviewed progressively over a period. There is no intention of adopting panic measures, rush measures, or anything of that description. The comments made by the honourable member when explaining his question are completely and utterly unjustified.

BONE MARROW GRAFTS

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to consider establishing laboratory facilities at Flinders Medical School to enable bone marrow grafts to be performed? I have been told that establishing this type of laboratory would cost about $20 000 a year, and I understand that many members of the medical profession have offered to help in this matter.

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

COMMON EFFLUENT DRAINAGE

Mr. BOUNDY: Can the Minister of Works say whether the recent injection of money into this State by the Commonwealth Government to foster employment will have the effect of hastening the provision of common effluent drainage schemes throughout the rural areas of this State? I refer to the town of Ardrossan. The Progress Association and the District Council of Yorke Peninsula have written to me setting out the justice of their plea for this scheme. Ardrossan has been seeking such a scheme for many years, and some years ago it achieved a high priority. However, as the need to protect the catchment areas of the State had a higher priority, the Ardrossan scheme had to be further deferred. However, the situation now is that insanitary conditions prevail in domestic, community, and tourist facilities, caused by poor drainage and the clay base under the surface of the soil, and night-cart facilities must be used. This situation is also affecting the development of tourist facilities. The seepage from the pit system is now finding its way to the cliff face fronting the town and causing erosion, with a consequent breakdown of those cliffs, and that in itself has created a serious situation. A common effluent drainage scheme would remedy this state of affairs.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The amount the Australian Government made available recently to the State Government will not help in the situation referred to by the honourable member, who would be aware that there is a national sewerage scheme directed to sewerage reticulation but not to common effluent drainage schemes. It is not so long ago that, for the first time, the South Australian Government stated that it would subsidise councils that were embarking on common effluent disposal schemes in towns under their control. I think that Mount Pleasant was a classic example of the reason for the announcement. One reason for the Government's action in this regard was that the cost of installing such schemes was beyond the resources of the council, and would have proved an extremely heavy burden to ratepayers without help from some other source. Although we allocate money annually, there is a long waiting list. This subject is handled by the Health Department, because it helps councils prepare plans and specifications for common effluent drainage schemes. Also, the Minister of Local Government is involved because he decides whether subsidies shall be paid. I will not discuss the question of when subsidies are to be paid, but, if a council is eligible for a subsidy, the Minister must decide whether it should be paid. However, as the honourable member has referred to a specific problem at Ardrossan, I shall have the matter examined to ascertain whether this facility can be installed in that area soon and so relieve the present situation.

BUS SERVICES

Mr. EVANS: Is the Minister of Transport aware of the unsatisfactory situation in respect of public bus transport that tries to serve the Mitcham Hills and nearby areas and, if he is, can he say what is being done to solve the problems? Buses that travel on the new Belair Road through Windy Point carry as many as 30 standing passengers, and this is a dangerous practice on one of the most narrow and winding roads in the State. On the other hand, buses used by the private contractor who operates the service from Meadows are often only partly loaded. Whereas at one time these buses picked up passengers in the Belair and Blackwood area, such passengers are now picked up by buses operated by the Municipal Tramways Trust. The operator who has the run to Coromandel

Valley and thence to Meadows believes he will have to discontinue that service soon. I am aware of the problems facing the Minister in finding enough M.T.T. buses to serve the area, but I believe that there is a risk that we may lose some private enterprise bus operators in the area. Another problem concerns the unsatisfactory time tables of buses serving Blackwood High and Primary Schools, and I understand that M.T.T. inspectors are fully aware of that problem. Will the Minister obtain a report on the latter part of my question, and rectify the situation in which M.T.T. buses are overloaded whilst buses operated by private operators are not fully used?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The whole question of bus operations is constantly being reviewed, and the M.T.T. faces a mammoth task, as I indicated in my announcement last weekend on behalf of the Government, concerning the expansion programme on which it is currently embarking. Because of the inability of Australia to provide suitable buses, delivery time on new buses is a regrettably extended period and far greater than anyone would desire. However, we have to learn to live with that fact. Many improvements now on the drawing boards will be introduced as soon as we have sufficient vehicles, but at present we do not have vehicles available. At this stage we cannot effect the improvements we desire with the vehicles we have. I think it is also worthy of note that many of the vehicles we inherited are not of the standard we would desire, so that is another problem. I will have the matter investigated to see whether we can provide immediate relief for the people in that area.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (CITY PLAN)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Libraries and Institutes Act, 1939-1974. Read a first time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

The Bill makes several disparate amendments to the principal Act, the Libraries and Institutes Act, 1939-1974. At the request of the Institutes Association of South Australia, the Bill makes provision for amendments to the principal Act designed to facilitate the integration of institute libraries with subsidised libraries established under the Libraries Subsidies Act, 1955-1958. On the recommendation of the Libraries Board and with the agreement of the committee of the Adelaide Circulating Library, the Bill provides for the dissolution of the circulating library and the transfer of its books and property to the Libraries Board. This move has been prompted by the continuing financial difficulties experienced by the Adelaide Circulating Library.

The staff of the circulating library will be absorbed into the Libraries Department and that part of the book stock which is useable will be transferred to the adult lending section of the State Library. As a consequence, former borrowers of the circulating library will be able to obtain a similar service from the State Library. The Libraries Board has yet to determine the way in which the space occupied by the circulating library will be used once the library is dissolved. The Bill also provides for the appointment of deputies of members of the Libraries Board and increases the money amounts specified in the principal Act so that they accord with current money values. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure shall come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 is a consequential amendment.

Clause 4 amends section 8 of the principal Act to provide for the appointment of deputies of members of the Libraries Board. Clause 5 amends section 16 of the principal Act by converting pounds to dollars. Clause 6 amends section 31 of the principal Act by increasing the penalty fixed in 1939 from £10 to $200. Clause 7 amends section 32 of the principal Act by increasing the penalties from £10 to $200 and from £1 to $20 for continuing offences. Clause 8 increases the penalty fixed in section 61 of the principal Act from £20 to $200. Clause 9 is a consequential amendment. Clause 10 increases the penalty fixed in section 65 of the principal Act from £5 to $100. Clause 11 amends section 76 of the principal Act by converting pounds to dollars.

Clause 12 increases the penalties fixed in section 78 of the principal Act. Clause 13 increases the penalty fixed in section 89a of the principal Act. Clause 14 amends section 105 of the principal Act relating to the dissolution of institutes by providing that a resolution to dissolve an institute may have effect at a future time and subject to the fulfilment of conditions expressed in the resolution. This is intended to enable the members of an institute intending to dissolve to ensure that a library service replaces that provided by the institute and to enable the establishment of the new library to proceed upon the definite basis of the dissolution of the institute library. Clause 15 amends section 107 of the principal Act by increasing the penalty from £5 to $100. Clause 16 amends the heading to Part VI of the principal Act.

Clause 17 repeals sections 132 to 145 of the principal Act relating to the Adelaide Circulating Library and enacts new sections 132 and 133. New section 132 provides for the dissolution of the circulating library and the transfer of its rights, powers, duties and liabilities to the Libraries Board and its books and other property to the board for the purposes of the State Library. New section 133 provides for termination of memberships of the circulating library and the refund of subscriptions. Clause 18 amends section 147 of the principal Act by converting pounds to dollars. Clause 19 increases the penalty fixed in section 148 of the principal Act. Clause 20 increases the penalty fixed in section 149 of the principal Act. Clause 21 is a consequential amendment.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

LAND AND BUSINESS AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (FEE)

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Land and Business Agents Act, 1973-1974. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This Bill is designed to solve a minor problem in the Land and Business Agents Act. The Act at present provides that a person who is licensed or registered under

the Act may be required to pay $20 in the month of February to be credited to the consolidated interest fund. This provision would not normally cause any problem where the person holding a licence or registration under the Act intends to renew it. However, as a number of part-time salesmen will not be seeking renewal of their registration in the present year, the provision may operate harshly in some cases. The purpose of the Bill is, therefore, to provide that the sum need be paid only where renewal of a licence or registration is sought.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 5 of the principal Act. The present provision requiring the payment of $20 in the month of February is removed and a new provision is inserted providing that the sum is to be paid with an application for renewal of a licence or registration. Where payment has been made by a person prior to the commencement of the amending legislation, and he does not seek renewal of his licence or registration for the period of 12 months between April, 1975, and March, 1976, an appropriate refund will be made.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (MISCELLANEOUS METRIC CONVERSIONS) BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Agricultural Chemicals Act, 1955; the Agricultural Seeds Act, 1938-1973; the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act, 1966-1972; the Brands Act, 1933-1969; the Chaff and Hay Act, 1922-1938; the Electricity Supply (Industries) Act, 1963; the Liens on Fruit Act, 1923-1932; the Phylloxera Act, 1936-1974; the Soil Conservation Act, 1939-1960; the South Australian Gas Company's Act, 1861-1964; the Stock Diseases Act, 1934-1968; the Stock Mortgages and Wool Liens Act, 1924-1935; and the Water Conservation Act, 1936-1972; and for the purpose of replacing expressions of measurement in imperial terms with expressions of measurement in metric terms and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This is the first omnibus Bill prepared for the purpose of effecting metric conversion amendments to Acts of the South Australian Parliament. Previously, important conversions have been made by specific Bills and other conversions have been effected when the Act concerned was amended for other reasons. Some of the Acts affected by this Bill are rarely amended and some of the amendments, although necessary, are so trivial that they are most appropriately introduced in a Bill of this kind. The rights and duties of members of the public are affected by some of the conversions, and for this reason the Act will not come into operation until a day to be proclaimed.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 provides for the automatic repeal of the relevant Part of this Act if any of the amended Acts is repealed. Part II amends the Agricultural Chemicals Act, 1955. Clause 5 is formal. Clause 6 amends section 25 of the principal Act, which sets out the procedure to be followed by an inspector taking samples for analysis and makes special provision for packages containing not more than 2 lb. avoirdupois. The mass specified is now one kilogram, which is 2·2 lb. Part III amends the Agricultural Seeds Act, 1938-1973. Clause 7 is formal. Clause 8 effects an amendment to the principal Act similar to the amendment to the Agricultural Chemicals Act. Section 11 of the principal Act sets out the procedure on taking samples and makes special provision for seeds contained in packages of less than 4 oz. avoirdupois. The mass specified is now 100 grams, which is 3·5 oz. Part IV amends the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act, 1966-1972. Clause 9 is formal.

Clauses 10 and 11 replace the word "grammes" with the word "grams" in section 5 and the thirteenth schedule. Part V amends the Brands Act, 1933-1969. Apart from clauses 12, 21 and 23, the amendments relate to the size or position of brands. Clause 12 is formal. Clause 21 relates to the impounding of stock seized under section 59 of the principal Act: the provision relating to stock seized at a greater distance than 5 miles from the nearest public pound is amended so that the relevant distance is 8 km. Five miles is slightly more than 8 km. Clause 23 is a formal amendment. Part VI amends the Chaff and Hay Act, 1922-1938. Clause 24 is formal.

Clause 25 amends section 9 of the principal Act, which provides (among other things) that bags containing straw chaff shall be so labelled in letters not less than 1½in. high. The measurement is changed to 35 millimetres, which is about 3 mm shorter than 1½in. The reference to the repealed Fertilisers Act is also amended. (The word "fertiliser" is spelled as in the original Act, not as in the 1939 reprint.) Clause 26 repeals section 11, which was enacted to prevent deception by the use of the short ton. There is no recognised practice of using a short tonne. Part VII amends the Electricity Supply (Industries) Act, 1963. Clause 27 is formal. Clause 28 amends section 3, which gives power to the Treasurer to declare that an industrial undertaking carried on outside a radius of 26 miles from the city is an approved industry for the purposes of the Act. The new distance is 42 km, which is 153 m longer than 26 miles.

Part VIII amends the Liens on Fruit Act, 1923-1932. Clause 29 is formal. Clause 30 amends the form set out in the schedule by replacing the word "acres" with the word "hectares" and by replacing the pound sign with the dollar sign. Part IX amends the Phylloxera Act, 1936-1974. Clause 31 is formal. The principal Act applies to vineyards exceeding one acre in extent and to their owners. One acre equals ·404 hectares, so that at first sight a conversion to ·5 h seems attractive. However, this would mean an expensive revision of the vignerons' roll; so, ·4 h has been chosen, and this is the amendment effected in clauses 32 to 37 inclusive and in clause 39. Clause 32 also amends the vineyard sizes specified as qualifications for extra votes for growers.

Clause 38 amends section 46 of the principal Act, which provides that the office of the Secretary of the Phylloxera Board shall be within 10 miles of the G.P.O., Adelaide. The new distance is 16 kilometres, which is slightly shorter. Clause 39 amends the third schedule by replacing "acres" with "hectares". Part X amends the Soil Conservation Act, 1939-1960. Clauses 40, 41 and 43 are formal. Clause 42 amends section 6a of the principal Act, which provides that occupiers of land in any area may present a petition to the Minister praying that the area be constituted a soil conservation district. "Occupier" is defined in subsection (8) by reference to the extent of the land occupied, and the amendment converts "five acres" to "two hectares"; an exact conversion would be 2·023 h. Part XI amends two of the several early Acts that are now incorporated in the South Australian Gas Company's Act, 1861-1964. Clause 44 is formal.

Clause 45 amends section 60 of the Act of 1861, which provides that the company shall, on request, supply gas to a municipal or district council, but that it shall not be compelled to supply gas beyond 30 yards from the company's main; the new distance of 27 metres is 2·5 m shorter. Clause 46 amends section 4 of the Act of 1882, which empowers the company to erect posts, standards and wires for the purpose of supplying electricity, with a proviso that wires crossing a street must be at least 16ft. from the ground. This distance is altered to 5 metres (16·4ft.). In the unlikely event that the Gas Company erects lines after this Bill becomes law, it will have to comply with the relevant Australian code. Part XII amends the Stock Diseases Act, 1934-1968. Clause 47 is formal. Clause 48 amends section 5, which requires the burial of diseased carcasses at least 3ft. underground. The new requirement is one metre, that is, 156 millimetres more than 3ft. Clause 49 amends section 42, which relates to the right to cross land with travelling stock. Persons availing themselves of this right must travel sheep five miles on each day and cattle 10 miles on each day; these distances are changed to 8 kilometres and 16 km respectively. Under this section, a lessee of certain Crown lands is obliged to provide a gate in every 10 miles of fence; the distance is changed to 17 kilometres, which is slightly longer than 10 miles. Part XIII amends the Stock Mortgages and Wool Liens Act, 1924-1935. Clause 50 is formal. Clause 51 replaces the references in section 23 to the size of paper on which memoranda of mortgages are to be engrossed with a reference to the new international paper sizes. Part XIV amends the Water Conservation Act, 1936-1972. Clause 52 is formal. Clause 53 sets out the powers of the Commissioner (now the Minister) and prohibits him from entering private property to effect repairs within 50 yards of a dwellinghouse. The amendment provides a distance of 100 metres (109 yards), which is the distance specified in a similar provision in the Waterworks Act.

Mr. McANANEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

PRE-MIXED CONCRETE CARTERS BILL

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to regulate and control the cartage of pre-mixed concrete; to control the number and distribution of pre-mixed concrete trucks operating within the metropolitan area and to provide for matters incidental thereto. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides a system of licensing in respect of the operators of pre-mixed concrete trucks within the metropolitan area of Adelaide. As members no doubt recall, the pre-mixed concrete industry suffered from acute industrial troubles during the first half of 1974, arising mainly from the fact that the number of trucks in operation was increasing to an extent not justified by the needs of the building industry. The so-called "little man" (that is, the man who owned and drove his own truck) found himself being virtually squeezed out of the industry. This, and other difficulties within the industry, culminated in a crisis that brought the carting of pre-mixed concrete to a complete halt in May, 1974. The repercussions on the building industry as a whole were considerable.

Representatives of the various factions involved (that is, the concrete manufacturers, the employed drivers and the "owner-drivers") approached me at that time, seeking some solution to the impasse and to the various problems involved in maintaining viability in the industry. I had many discussions with representatives of the parties, both alone and together, and the dispute was settled when substantial agreement was reached that the most appropriate solution would be to regulate and control, by way of licensing legislation, the number and distribution of pre-mixed concrete trucks operating within the metropolitan area. On the basis of these terms of settlement, the industry swung back into action without delay.

This Bill seeks to put into effect the agreement reached in settling the dispute. The Transport Workers Union and the Concrete Manufacturers Association have reached substantial agreement on the provisions of the Bill and I congratulate them all on the conciliatory manner in which they have conducted all discussions in the matter. I feel confident that the Bill now presents no insurmountable problems and I have no hesitation in commending it to members as a measure that is vital to the continued smooth running of the pre-mixed concrete industry. I ask leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 provides the necessary definitions, which are self-explanatory. Clause 5 establishes the Pre-mixed Concrete Carters Licensing Board. The board will have three members, one from the Concrete Manufacturers Association, one from the Transport Workers Union and one, the Chairman, nominated by the Minister. A member may hold office for three years and is eligible for reappointment. Clause 6 empowers the Governor to appoint deputies to any member of the board. Clause 7 provides for the removal of a member of the board from office and the filling of vacancies. Clause 8 entitles board members to certain allowances and expenses. Clause 9 preserves the validity of certain acts of the board.

Clause 10 provides for the manner in which the business of the board is to be conducted. Clause 11 provides for the appointment of a secretary of the board. Clause 12 provides the board with the necessary powers in relation to any proceedings (that is, inquiries, applications, etc.) before the board. Clause 13 requires the board to furnish any party to proceedings before the board with its reasons for making any decision or order. Clause 14 provides for the appointment of inspectors. Clause 15 provides inspectors with the necessary powers of inspection and investigation. An inspector must produce his certificate of appointment when requested, and may exercise his powers at any reasonable time. Clause 16 provides for the fixing of the appointed day, which will be some months after the Act is brought into operation. All existing truck operators will, therefore, have ample time in which to obtain the necessary licences.

Clause 17 provides that a person is guilty of an offence if he operates a pre-mixed concrete truck within the metropolitan area, otherwise than in pursuance of a licence. (It should be pointed out that the word "operator" is not intended to include a person who is simply employed on wages to drive a truck that is owned by a company or some other person.) Clause 18 provides for the granting of licences by the board. All "existing" operators (that is, persons who were operating trucks as at July 1, 1974) will be granted licences by the board without any consideration by the board as to the needs of industry. In the case of any other applicant, the board will have regard to the needs of industry, and this applies whether the applicant is applying for a licence in respect of a truck previously licensed under this Act or in respect of a truck that has never been the subject of a licence.

Clause 19 requires the board to give an applicant opportunity to make representations to the board before it may refuse his application. The board is given the power to specify a time before which a rejected applicant may not reapply without the prior approval of the board. Clause 20 empowers the board to impose conditions on the holding of a licence. Subclause (2) specifically empowers the board to "tie" the so-called "owner-drivers" to certain concrete manufacturers; this means that the big companies will each be apportioned a certain number of independent truck operators. Subclause (4) empowers the board to revoke or vary any condition of a licence that has become oppressive, etc. Clauses 21 and 22 provide for the application for, and form of, licences. A licensee may apply to have his licence varied if he wishes to replace a licensed truck with a new one. Clause 23 provides that a licence is not transferable. Any purported transfer would, therefore, be null and void, and the purported transferee would be unlicensed and guilty of an offence under clause 17 of the Bill. Thus "trafficking" in licences will be prevented.

Clause 24 deals with the renewal of licences, all of which will expire annually on the anniversary of the appointed day. Clause 25 empowers the board to inquire into the conduct of any licensee. An inquiry can be set in motion by the Minister, the permanent head of the department, or the board itself. A licensee the subject of an inquiry must be given the chance to make representations. The board may either cancel a licence as a result of such an inquiry, or suspend the licence for a specified period of time. Clause 26 gives any party to proceedings before the board a right of appeal to the Minister. The Minister may himself determine such an appeal or appoint some other competent person for that purpose. There is no right of appeal against the outcome of such an appeal.

Clause 27 contains the standard provisions relating to the annual presentation of reports to the Minister and to Parliament. Clause 28 provides for certain evidentiary matters. Clause 29 gives the board and other specified persons the usual immunity from legal action in respect of acts done in good faith. Clause 30 creates an offence where any person in authority improperly uses or divulges information gathered in the course of his duties. Clause 31 is the standard appropriation provision. Clause 32 provides for the disposal of prosecutions in a summary manner. Clause 33 extends liability for offences by a body corporate to the directors of that body, with the usual defence. Clause 34 provides for the making of regulations for the purposes of the Bill.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

RUNDLE STREET MALL BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received and ordered to be printed.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That the report be noted.

This is an important report and I am sure that all members will study it with much interest. Accordingly, I seek leave to continue my remarks so that members may study the report.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

TEACHER HOUSING AUTHORITY BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from March 11. Page 2802.)

Clause 13—"Functions of the Authority."

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I move:

In subclause (1) (*a*) to strike out "houses and land for housing" and insert "land, or any interest in land, for the purpose of housing".

This amendment and two others are designed simply to ensure that the powers of the authority include the power to act as a tenant-at-large and to sublease accommodation that it may have rented from someone else, either the Housing Trust or a private owner. As we were not sure that the original wording of the provision covered the situation, this amendment and the others have been suggested.

Mr. COUMBE: We do not object to the amendment, which I believe removes some ambiguity that may have existed; the intention now expressed is what is desired.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I move:

In subclause (2) (*a*), after "lease", to insert "sublease".

This amendment, although circulated on Tuesday, did not get on to the file. It is part of the series of amendments relating to the alteration I have just described.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON moved:

In subclause (2) (*a*), after "land", to insert ", or interest in land,".

Mr. COUMBE: Although it is obvious what "land" means, what does "interest in land" mean? Does this refer to a case where the department, as the authority, has a partial interest in land for some purpose, or has a financial interest in land?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The interest in the land can cover an interest that arises in renting a house from someone else or in doing anything by way of a deal of any description by mortgage, charging, or encumbering a property in some way: that is, by gaining an interest in land in that way. This term virtually covers any of the traditional forms of dealing in houses and land.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 14 to 19 passed.

Clause 20—"Budget."

Mr. GUNN: In drawing up a budget, the authority will have to consider the rent to be charged for properties let to teachers. What basis will be used for calculating rents? Will Housing Trust schedules be used, or will the authority determine its own rates?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The current procedure (and I think this will be the initial basis used, anyway) is that, for departmental houses, teachers are charged 80 per cent of the Housing Trust assessed rental. On the Government housing we have at present, we ask the Housing Trust to assess the rental, and then we charge 80 per cent of that sum. For Housing Trust accommodation occupied by teachers, the department acts as tenant-at-large, paying the Housing Trust rental and then charging the teacher 80 per cent of that rental. In some cases, we would do this simply by charging teachers, or deducting the rent from their salaries, for 42 weeks of the school year, allowing them to occupy the accommodation for the whole year. That system effectively produces much the same result as charging 80 per cent of the assessed rental.

For private accommodation, we charge the teacher 80 per cent of the rental which, as a department, we have agreed with the private owner. The actual rental may be different from the Housing Trust assessed rental for an equivalent property, but we certainly would not enter into

an agreement that was regarded as onerous and unreasonable. Although there may be discrepancies between such rentals and the Housing Trust rental level, broadly speaking the discrepancies would not be great.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (21 to 25) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SAVINGS BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 6. Page 2734.)

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I support the Bill. I understand that the board of the Savings Bank of South Australia initiated discussions on this matter. Apparently, it is satisfied with the Bill before us. Where an entitled officer dies in service or retires through age or invalidity, the lump-sum payment will be increased by 15 per cent, and that is a good provision. I also approve of the provision that, should the recipient elect to do so, he may have the increased lump sum converted into a pension, with pension cover for a widow. I understand that some former bank employees are not covered by this measure. It is possible that such people do not have sufficient money to cope with modern inflationary cost trends. However, as we understand the people involved are happy about the Bill, members of the Opposition support it.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (JUDGES' SALARIES) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 6. Page 2734.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): The Bill appears to be a simple measure but, when one looks into it, it becomes a little more complex. I am a little uneasy about some of its provisions and the principle underlying it. It has been customary, when dealing with this type of measure, to introduce a Bill periodically to adjust judges' salaries, just as we have done for senior public servants who are statutory officers. Recently we passed in this place a Bill based on the same principle as the Bill before us but dealing with statutory officers. However, I believe that measure was completely different from the case of judges' salaries. We are now talking about the Judiciary, the third arm of Government, the others being the Legislature and the Executive.

If one looks at the various Statutes relating to this matter it becomes clear that Parliament intends that the Judiciary should be independent of the Executive. In explaining the Bill, the Minister of Works set out the way the salaries of various judges referred to in the Bill and their various jurisdictions are determined. The Bill provides that, instead of the salaries being adjusted by amendments to the several Acts involved, they shall be adjusted by determination of the Governor, which really means the Government. That is the crux of the measure. Previously, judges' salaries have been determined by Parliament. It is that tripartite system of Government that will adjust the salaries of Their Honours. The system that has obtained in the past has been satisfactory, but what the Attorney-General is trying to achieve, apart from the principle I have outlined, is a form of wage indexation. Automatic cost increases will be passed on to the recipients of the salaries under the provisions of the Bill. Although I have no grave objections to indexation, I believe that one must consider the principle involved. The Minister of Works, when explaining the Bill, went on to say that one effect of the Bill would be that in future the salaries of members of the Judiciary would be determined by the Governor, which means the Government (and I say that without any disrespect to His Excellency). The Minister continued:

> The salaries as determined may not be less than the "prescribed minimum salary".

As a necessary safeguard, that is fair enough. In fact, it is repeated in each Part of the Bill.

The Hon. L. J. King: It's a much better safeguard than they have under the existing procedure.

Mr. COUMBE: I am not cavilling over that. The Minister referred to the Supreme Court Act, the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, the Local and District Criminal Courts Act, and the Licensing Act, so that provision has been spelt out deliberately. The Minister went on to say (and this is where he seemed to be at variance with what he said previously, and he seemed to be trying to convince himself that it was so):

> Traditionally, the Judiciary has been protected from the vagaries of the Executive and Legislature in relation to tenure and salary—

that statement could not be more correct, because the Bill does not in any way affect the tenure of Their Honours: it is a matter only of remuneration—

and these provisions give legislative effect to that tradition. I could not really follow what the Minister meant, because he was changing from one concept to another. Retrospectivity of salary determinations to enable judicial salaries to be adjusted is valid. I have no argument about that. However, I object on the matter of principle to which I referred earlier. This measure is different from the measure passed last week dealing with the statutory officers, because the Constitution of this State provides that the Executive, the Legislature, and the Judiciary must be independent of each other. I would prefer to see the Judiciary separated completely from the Executive but, if there is to be a connection, it should be with this Parliament, which, after all, represents the people. I emphasise that the Bill does not reduce the salary. I agree with the Attorney that it at least maintains judges' salaries and does not affect the tenure, but I object to the principle, and on that score I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): The honourable member's opposition is really quite illogical. He has argued that there should be a separation between the Legislature, the Executive, and the Judiciary, and he has used that as a ground for opposing the fixing of salaries by the Executive, but somehow he finds that consistent with the fixing of salaries by the Legislature. If his argument is correct that the separation means that the salary of the Judiciary cannot properly be fixed by those partners, the same would apply to the Legislature.

The argument is illogical and cannot work, because, from the constitutional separation that exists between the Legislature, the Executive, and the Judiciary, we cannot conclude that the salary of the Judiciary should not be fixed by either of the other partners. Indeed, talk of the separation itself is a loose way of expressing the constitutional position. For instance, the separation between the Executive and the Legislature, in a system of responsible government, is very tenuous indeed. The Executive comprises Ministers who sit in this House and who are answerable to it. The practical situation is simply that, whereas the system of fixing salaries by Act of Parliament was workable in an era of relatively stable currencies, it is not practical in an era in which the value of currency changes as rapidly as it has done in the past few years. It

becomes necessary to make fairly frequent adjustments in salaries of all Government employees at any level and in any capacity.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You say that—

The Hon. L. J. KING: I ask the honourable member to try to keep his mind on the matter. I know that he has difficulty concentrating on any one point for any length of time, but he really ought to try to concentrate on what the Bill is about.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I'm right with you.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The difficulty that arises when we have the need for relatively frequent adjustments in salary and when the adjustments can be made only by Act of Parliament is self-evident. The reason for introducing this Bill is to enable adjustments to be made by Executive act at such intervals as are necessary. It makes no practical difference at all to the Judiciary or its independence.

Even though, in the present situation, increases in salary can be made only by Act of Parliament, in fact they must be initiated by the Executive, the Government, which must introduce a Bill and procure the necessary message from His Excellency to enable the appropriation for the increase to take place, so a Bill to increase the salary of the judges must be initiated and introduced in the House by the Government. The only practical power that Parliament has is one to refuse the increase, so it can have no effect on the independence of the Judiciary that the salaries are fixed by Executive act, as distinct from Government act, in approving a Bill introduced here for Parliament to pass.

Mr. Goldsworthy: We should get a chance to debate a Bill.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes, but the only thing that Parliament can do is refuse to pass it. The independence of the Judiciary could be affected only if the Government was able to use its power to reduce salaries, thereby bringing pressure to bear on the Judiciary.

Mr. Coumbe: On the other hand, you can bring pressure to bear by increasing salaries enormously.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I suppose we could. We could do that by introducing a Bill to increase the salaries enormously, but really there are some understandings and conventions that still exist in our Government, notwithstanding recent events, and there is simply no basis for suggesting the possibility that a Government will try to bribe the Judiciary.

Mr. Coumbe: I'm not suggesting that.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not suppose that the honourable member is, but that is the only basis on which that sort of argument can be put, and to mention it is so absurd that it does not justify further comment.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You don't see value in Parliament's debating that sort of matter?

The Hon. L. J. KING: No. I think Parliament has its means, by members asking questions at Question Time, moving urgency motions, or taking other action to raise the matter. From a practical point of view, it makes no difference whether the Government fixes the salary or introduces a Bill to fix it. In either event, the adjustment of the salary of the Judiciary depends on a decision by the Government.

Mr. Goldsworthy: If you follow that argument through, it's not worth while having this House sit.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I think the honourable member knows well that that is not so.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Yes, it is.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I invite the honourable member to concentrate, and I will go back over the matter: it will not take long. The only argument that can be raised to suggest that a change in this system would affect the independence of the Judiciary—

Mr. Goldsworthy: I'm not worried only about the Judiciary.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Will the honourable member please listen to what I am saying?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may not interject continually.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The only argument that can be raised to suggest that the change contemplated by the Bill will affect the independence of the Judiciary is an argument that the Government may use that power in some way to influence the Judiciary, the suggestion being that, if Parliament has control of the situation, that cannot happen. That is a fallacy, for the reason I have given. Whether the Government itself fixes the salary or introduces a Bill comes to the same thing in the long run. No increase in the salary can take place without an initiative on the part of the Government, so there is no effect on the independence of the Judiciary one way or the other.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Goldsworthy: You'll admit—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Kavel has interjected persistently right throughout the Attorney-General's speech. That will not be tolerated any longer. The honourable Attorney-General.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The practical advantage of changing to this system is that adjustments can be made at more frequent intervals to compensate the judges for changes in the cost of living and changes in the value of the salaries they receive, and if a system of indexation were introduced generally (and the Government has not made any decision on that: a decision will depend to some extent on events elsewhere) it would be unthinkable that we would have to introduce a new Bill each time any adjustment was made to the judges' salaries.

The judges themselves recognise this. They accept that it is necessary to vary the previous system for that reason and that it is to the advantage of everyone that the system should be more flexible and that the salaries should be fixed by Executive act. The existing constitutional guarantee has been up-dated and vastly improved. Under the existing law, the only guarantee that a judge has is that his salary cannot be reduced below the salary on which he was appointed, but under the Bill it will not be possible to reduce his salary below the level that exists at the time of passing the Bill or at the time of the most recent appointment to the bench, whichever salary is the higher. The judges are satisfied that this improvement has been rendered necessary by present economic circumstances. It is a practical method of fixing salaries, and there is no objection in principle or on constitutional grounds to its adoption.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (21)—Messrs. Max Brown and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wright.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Chapman, Coumbe (teller), Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Duncan, McRae, and Wells.
Noes—Messrs. Allen, Dean Brown, and Gunn.
Majority of 3 for the Ayes.
Second reading thus carried.
In Committee.
Clauses 1 to 3 passed.
Clause 4—"Salaries of judges."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I strongly oppose this clause. Traditionally, there has been the most careful separation of the Executive (the Government), the Legislature (Parliament), and the Judiciary (the judges) that we have been able to make, in which judges have been given the greatest possible measure of independence of the Executive by having their salaries fixed by an Act of Parliament, as we do with several public officers. At a time of rapid inflation it is a minor inconvenience to us to review these salaries frequently. However, that does not justify any breaking of what has been a tradition going back for many years. With great respect to Their Honours, I am not pleased with this legislation and do not wish to see this convention of our Constitution changed. Justice must not only be done to judges and everyone else: it must be seen to be done. If money values change downwards, it is necessary to increase salaries frequently but, if this is done by regulation, proclamation, or Executive act, Parliament has no chance to debate the matter.

It is not difficult to imagine lay people, especially, thinking of the bargaining behind closed doors that could go on between the Government and the judges over their salaries. This is a most undesirable thing. The judges, as well as being independent, must be seen to be independent, and the fact that we have had this convention for so long is of itself proof of its importance to us and its importance to the general community. The price that we pay for having to change salaries quite frequently at a time when money values are changing frequently is a small one for what is an important principle, and that is the Judiciary's independence, so far as it can be humanly achieved, of the Executive, and it can only be done in this way.

The next thing one might say is, "Why shouldn't judges be dismissed by the Government instead of it having to be done by an address of both Houses of Parliament?" That is a long step further than this goes, but it is the next logical step, and that would be even more objectionable. I do not want to take that too far, because the Attorney-General will spring to his feet and say there is nothing further from his or the Government's mind. I merely mention it as an example of the importance of having the Judiciary independent of the Executive. For those reasons I called a division on the second reading of the Bill when I suspected the Liberal Party was not going to call for a division, and I oppose this clause as strongly as I can.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I attempted to follow up one point during the second reading explanation of the Attorney-General but, as the Speaker rightly pointed out, it was an inappropriate time to pursue the matter. However, I will do so now. This clause is the most important part of the Bill because it provides that the salaries shall be determined by the Governor. The Attorney-General made two points in justifying this situation. The first point was, "What does it matter, anyway? The initial action must be taken by the Executive to increase the salaries of the Judiciary, even if it is done by the Governor or by way of a Bill brought into this House." That is a superficial argument, but if one takes it at face value it just shows what the Government thinks of the operations of Parliament. In effect, the Attorney-General is saying, "It does not matter if the Government decides to do something such as this, because it is going to happen, anyway, so why bring it into Parliament? If you want it before Parliament," the Attorney-General says, "you can always ask a question or move an urgency motion."

If we were to take that seriously as the Attorney-General's opinion of the operations of this place, we might as well close up shop and go home. The Attorney-General is saying that there is no point in Parliament's debating judges' salaries because the Government's will is going to prevail, and the move has to be initiated by the Government, whether salaries are fixed by the Governor or by Parliament. That argument is degrading to Parliament and certainly not worthy of the Attorney-General. However, it may explain some of the things that have been happening in this place since I have been a member of it. We have received a completely unsatisfactory explanation of the logic of doing what is contemplated in the Bill. If we pursue this argument to its logical conclusion, it is saying that, if the Executive initiates this action, it will go through to its conclusion, anyway, and so it is a waste of time to bring the Bill into this place.

That is a completely disgraceful attitude for the Government to adopt in this matter. It ignores the fact that, while the Legislative Council is not controlled by the Labor Party, there is a possibility of remedying any gross inequity in what is proposed. Of course, the Attorney-General does not give any credence at all to the operations of a second Chamber. The Attorney-General may from time to time get the impression that some of us do not hold him in high esteem, but I must say I held him in higher esteem before he put this argument. The only other point the Attorney-General raised was an argument of convenience: he suggested that, because of galloping inflation, fairly frequent changes and alterations to judges' salaries had to be made and that for this reason this Bill should be passed. The Attorney-General is prepared to throw aside what I consider to be a most important and democratic principle on the grounds of convenience.

I believe I have heard the Attorney-General at his worst this afternoon in seeking to justify this radical change to a fundamentally democratic principle. He is saying, in effect, that a discussion on these matters in Parliament is not worth while because it is the will of the Government, anyway. We should not be willing to accept that attitude, and for that reason I am totally opposed to this clause and to the Bill.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I sometimes wonder whether the member for Kavel is incapable of following an argument or whether it suits him politically to misunderstand at times. I said in reply to the second reading debate that, whatever happened with regard to increases in judicial salaries, they had to be initiated by the Executive, anyway, whether by way of approving a Bill to be introduced in this Chamber, or, as suggested in this Bill, by way of fixing the salaries by Executive act. The honourable member's argument about my suggesting that Parliament had no purpose is completely beside the point, because, if one argues that Parliament is disregarded unless it has an opportunity of debating salary changes, that should apply not only to judicial salaries and the traditional statutory salaries but also to the whole range of Public Service salaries. In fact, the overwhelming majority of salaries of those in the employ of the Crown are not fixed by Parliament.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you saying the judges are in the employ of the Crown?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Their salaries are not fixed by Parliament, and the argument used by the member for Kavel

simply proves too much. The only relevant consideration is whether the change could have any impact on the independence of the Judiciary, and that depends on a consideration whether the Government would be likely to erode the value of judges' salaries by not making adjustments, doing this as a means of bringing pressure to bear on the judges. As I have said, the position in that case would be the same whether the adjustments were made by the Executive acting entirely on its own responsibility or whether it was done by way of the Executive's deciding to introduce a Bill in Parliament to provide the increase.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Attorney has used the phrase "in the employ of the Crown" in making a comparison between the way in which judges' salaries are fixed and the way in which those of public servants are fixed. I absolutely refute the implication behind what he has said that judges are in some way in the employ of the Crown. I am surprised if, with his experience and background, he thinks that. He knows that the independence of the Judiciary from the Executive is one of the traditional pillars of our society. For him to compare the fixing of the judges' salaries with those of public servants in the employ of the Crown is absolutely and utterly wrong. Because I fear the outlook that pervades the Bill, I oppose it. If the Attorney did not mean to suggest that the judges were in the employ of the Crown, what possible comparison could be made between fixing their salaries and those of public servants?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The honourable member knows as well as I do what is the status of judges. His attempt to twist an argument out of the words I used in another context is absurd. I said that the argument whether Parliament has a role to play in relation to salary matters, if it is to be relevant to the discussion on this Bill, must be an argument whether the proposed change would or could have an effect on the independence of the Judiciary. I have explained my reasons for saying that I do not believe the change could have any impact on the independence of the Judiciary. All these debating points are a waste of time.

Mr. COUMBE: When a Bill is introduced in Parliament, it receives a public airing. Reports about it appear in the newspapers, and its place can be seen on the Notice Paper placed outside this building. The newspapers generally publish what a Bill provides as the new salary of a judge. However, under the Bill, the only notice of an alteration in judges' salaries will be in the *Government Gazette*. As not many people read the *Gazette*, this change could go unnoticed unless a keen journalist saw it and had it published in a newspaper. Parliament should be the forum in which these matters are raised.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It is all very well for the Attorney to suggest that I am twisting the argument, or that I am dense. He is interfering with what is a thoroughly democratic process. We must ensure in the mind of the public that the Judiciary is independent.

The Hon. L. J. King: This has all occurred to you since the previous statutory salaries legislation went through.

Mr. Coumbe: I explained that.

The Hon. L. J. King: The only difference is that you found out what the Legislative Council thinks.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Attorney seeks to avoid the real argument. The proper role of Parliament in this matter is to ensure the independence of the Judiciary. The Attorney suggests that, as the Executive initiates changes in judges' salaries anyway, there is no point in these matters coming before Parliament. His reference to salaries in the Public Service is irrelevant, as those salaries are fixed differently. Public servants can be dismissed under different provisions. A resolution of both Chambers of this Parliament is necessary before a judge can be dismissed. This is part of the process that ensures that the Judiciary is independent and is seen to be independent. The reason for this Bill is simply that the new procedure will be more convenient, following the inflationary spiral in salaries, and so on, brought about by the Attorney's Commonwealth colleagues. I am not convinced by the oratorical gyrations of the Attorney.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (20)—Mr. Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wright.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Coumbe (teller), Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Duncan, McRae, and Wells. Noes—Messrs. Allen, Chapman, and Gunn.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Salaries."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This clause contains the same objectionable principle as that contained in clause 4, and I intend to oppose it and all clauses that will alter the fundamental structure of our arrangements for the payment of judicial officers. I do not intend (and members will be pleased to hear this) to go over the argument I used before, even though I received no reply from the Attorney-General. I have learnt that in politics, in contrast with the courts where one must meet the arguments of one's opponents, if one cannot meet arguments the best way is to ignore them. The Attorney-General has learnt in the relatively short time he has been here just how to do that; he did it last night and he is doing it again today.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He won't be able to do that when he goes on the bench.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He will have to change his ways when he goes on the bench, as I know he intends to do at some time. I point out especially to members of the Liberal Party that, as these clauses are drafted, I do not think it is necessary even to gazette the changes in salaries. Clause 6 (2) provides:

> Subject to this section, the salary of the President of the Court and the salary of every Deputy President of the Court—
>
> and that, of course is the Industrial Court—
>
> shall be such salary as is respectively from time to time determined by the Governor.

It is not done by regulation or proclamation: it is merely a determination of the Governor. I may be wrong (perhaps the Attorney-General will reply on this point if I am) and there may be an obligation to publish a determination in the *Government Gazette*. However, I do not know of any, and I am fairly certain that when that obligation is to be imposed it will be imposed specifically by Parliament. What we have here is worse than what was forecast by a member of the Liberal Party when speaking on an earlier clause, namely, that the determination would simply appear in the *Government Gazette*. I do not believe there will be any requirement even to gazette any changes in the judges' salaries, because it is merely under this subclause a determination of the Governor. Perhaps that is a detail, but it

is a detail I do not like, and it is one which, if I am right in the point I have put, should be corrected by the Government, because it will certainly interfere with the principle which I strongly oppose but which it espouses. I stand steadfastly by the arguments I used in opposing clause 4.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (20)—Mr. Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wright.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Duncan, McRae, and Wells. Noes—Messrs. Allen, Chapman, and Gunn.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Salaries, etc."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This clause is on all fours with clauses 4 and 6. It is only five years since the Act was amended to provide for the appointment of the Senior Judge and the other judges in the Local and District Criminal Courts Department under the new system of courts, and at that time we deliberately adopted the arrangement for fixation of their salaries to coincide with that for the judges of the Supreme Court, because we realised the importance of their position and wanted to make clear that judges of the Local and District Criminal Courts Department had the same independence as Supreme Court judges, as distinct from the magistrates, who are public servants.

I remind the Attorney (he must know this well, because his experience has been the same as mine) that this is a sore point with the magistrates. One thing they have always wanted, although I acknowledge that there are practical difficulties about the matter, is judicial independence from the Government, and they have wanted to be taken out of the Public Service. When we set up the jurisdiction of the Local and District Criminal Courts, we deliberately did that with the judges, and one element in the scheme was to provide that their salaries should be fixed by Parliament. Now the Government is deliberately undoing that and providing that the salaries should be fixed simply by Government determination in a machinery way. This clause is equally as objectionable as the other two clauses to which I have expressed opposition.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (20)—Mr. Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wright.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Duncan, McRae, and Wells. Noes—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, and Chapman.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 9 passed.

Clause 10—"Constitution of Licensing Court."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This clause is in the same form as the other three clauses that I have opposed, except that it amends the Licensing Act and it therefore affects the salary of the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Licensing Court. In discussing clause 8, I referred to the establishment of the intermediate jurisdiction in the Local and District Criminal Courts Department, which had been achieved during our term of office between 1968 and 1970. The existing arrangements for the Licensing Court were made by the present Premier when he was Attorney-General. A Labor Government made the arrangements for the payment of the Chairman of the Licensing Court to be on all fours with the arrangements for payment of other senior judicial officers in this State, and it was done for the same purpose: so that there would be, and seem to be, the greatest possible measure of independence for those sitting in this jurisdiction. Now that independence is being taken away by this clause, which is as obnoxious and objectionable as the other clauses I have opposed, and I therefore oppose it just as vigorously.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (20)—Mr. Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wright.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Duncan, McRae, and Wells. Noes—Messrs. Allen, Chapman, and Mathwin.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Title passed.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): The process of putting the Bill through Committee and getting it into its final form is now complete. I oppose the Bill at this stage because of the principle involved. Whatever may be said by the Attorney-General, or by any of his followers, it is a change in the standing and status of the senior judicial officers of this State, the judges of the Supreme Court and the judges of the other courts, because it takes away a measure of their independence. It has been done for reasons which, on the Attorney's own admission, are reasons of convenience: there is no other reason at all. So, we are to sacrifice a principle to the convenience of the Government, and I do not believe we should do this. It has often been said, because this has been the experience throughout history, that if a tyrannous Government can get control of the judges and the Judiciary it is in a much firmer position than it otherwise would be. One has only to think about recent history in our generation, and to remember what happened in Nazi Germany and in other countries to realise—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in the Bill about Nazi Germany, nor will there be any debate on Nazi Germany. This is a third reading speech, and the honourable member must speak to the Bill as it comes out of Committee.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think you were following my line of argument, because I was using the example of Nazi Germany, in which the independence of the judges was lost, as one that we should avoid at all costs. People may smile at the thought that Parliamentary democracy in this State or in this country could be said to be in danger but, alas, the smiles are not quite so broad as they were even a few months ago. We should not take any step in that direction at all, but this afternoon, at the

behest of the Attorney-General and his colleagues, we have taken such a step. I do not believe that we should have done so; nor do I believe that we should have impaired at all the principle of the independence of the Judiciary. Therefore, I oppose the Bill at this stage.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (21)—Messrs. Max Brown and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wright.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Duncan, McRae, and Wells. Noes—Messrs. Allen, Chapman, and Mathwin.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

Bill passed.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 6. Page 2738.)

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): The first reason for the introduction of this Bill is to change the name of the Act to the Trade Measurements Act. The second reason is to change the measurements to metric, and perhaps the most important change is the change in wording to accord with the use of mass instead of weight. The Warden of Standards will become the Warden of Trade Measurements, and the Deputy Warden of Standards will become Deputy Warden of Trade Measurements.

Another change affects the frequency of instrument checks. I understand that from records kept over the years it has been found that some of the intricate instruments need checking more frequently than do other instruments. Perhaps the most contentious part of the Bill is clause 10, which takes away from the Local Government Association the right to submit to the Minister nominations so that the Minister may select two members for the advisory council. Section 13 (4) of the principal Act provides:

The advisory council shall consist of—

(*a*) the Warden of Standards who shall be chairman of the advisory council;

(*b*) the Deputy Warden of Standards who shall be a member of the advisory council and who in the absence of the Warden of Standards shall be the chairman of the advisory council;

(*c*) the Commissioner, who shall be a member of the advisory council, and three other members appointed by the Governor—

(*d*) of whom two shall be appointed from persons comprised in a panel of not less than five persons being elected members of a council nominated by the governing body of the Local Government Association of South Australia Incorporated (in this section referred to as "the Association");

and

(*e*) of whom one shall be appointed from persons comprised in a panel of not less than three persons nominated by the governing body of the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures Incorporated (in this section referred to as "the Chamber").

I am especially interested in paragraph (*d*), which gives power to the Local Government Association to submit at least five names from which His Excellency may appoint two members to that advisory council. Until 1971 local government accepted responsibility for weights and measures, although it was realised in the late 1960's that it was becoming difficult for local government to continue its involvement with weights and measures because of the more sophisticated instruments and the costly equipment that was difficult to operate. I have spoken to the member for Murray who was involved in that work and he assures me that it was difficult.

About that time schools were conducted by the Government so that local government personnel involved in the inspection of weights and measures might, with expert tuition, become more proficient. However, some councils voluntarily but reluctantly submitted, sometimes under pressure, to requests made by the central Government to surrender their control and power in this regard. I am concerned about the power that is being taken from local government. In a speech earlier this week the member for Murray said that power was being taken away from local government and he referred specifically to weights and measures in this regard. The second report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas makes general observations on the future of local government, some of which are pertinent to a discussion of this Bill. At page 8, the report states:

(1) The Future of Local Government

a. It is important that we make our position quite clear. We believe in local government. We do not wish to see the transfer of powers to central government either by default of local government or design by central government. We do not wish to see the transfer of powers from local government to any *ad hoc* bodies specifically set up for a particular purpose. We believe that if it is strong and effective, and properly staffed, local government is the appropriate tier of government to carry out the tasks currently committed to it, and no doubt many others.

If local government had been properly staffed to cope with weights and measures work, this task could have been retained by it. The report continues:

b. We believe that any further transfer of powers from local government will tend to make it a hollow shell.

I will refer to that term later. The report continues:

In our view, it is pointless to have a tier of government set up with all the outward indicia—

that term means "signs and marks"—

of government, and little power. And we believe, following the submission from councils, our hearing of evidence, our visits to councils, and our reading of submissions following our first report, that there is a real and ever-present danger of this happening.

It is difficult to undo something that has been done in the past. Local government has lost the administration of weights and measures. However, I point out that local government will now lose its right to have its say in appointing a representative to the advisory council. New paragraph (*d*) of section 13 (4) provides:

of whom two shall be nominated by the Minister as being persons capable of representing the interests of local government;

If that is not dictatorial I do not know what is, because the Minister is to have the power to appoint the two representatives of local government. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I wish to refer to two matters. First, this week, by way of question, I raised the case of Mr. W. K. Rooney. I asked the Attorney-General to say whether a bribe or coercion had been used in an attempt

to convince Mr. Rooney that he should not go on with an appeal against a conviction. The Attorney had in the House a prepared statement. Most reasonable people would believe that this matter warranted a Ministerial statement. However, the Attorney did not make such a statement, but gave a long answer skirting around the question I had asked. In his reply, the Attorney said that the letter sent by the Australian Legal Aid Office might have been badly worded. That letter, signed by Miss Wendy Purcell and dated February 18, states (in part):

I have recently been advised by the South Australian Crown Law Department that they have received recent instructions from the Community Welfare Department. Their instructions are that, should you withdraw your Supreme Court appeal, the department would not take action to enforce the sentence of imprisonment ordered by the late Mr. Humby, S.M. I have now been advised by our central office in Canberra that, in view of the State Crown's undertaking, this office will not grant you legal assistance to continue with the appeal.

Mr. Rooney is not worried about serving the 28-day prison sentence; he is worried about the conviction, because he believes he is innocent and has been convicted unjustly. He believes that collusion between the Community Welfare Department, the State Crown Law Department and the Australian Legal Aid Office is evident. Mr. Rooney had never been told (and he was not told until the Attorney-General replied to my question on Tuesday) that his ex-wife had asked the Community Welfare Department not to go on with the sentence. He had never heard a word about that. He went to the Australian Legal Aid Office to ask for legal assistance and for finance so that his own solicitor could continue with the case and appeal to Mr. Justice Zelling.

The Australian Legal Aid Office said that it was under instructions from Mr. Rooney to act for him. Mr. Rooney never gave such an instruction to anyone in the Australian Legal Aid Office or to the Community Welfare Department; they were both acting behind his back without his permission, and were really trying to sell him down the drain or place him in such a situation where, because of his lack of finance, he could not appeal. The Attorney referred to Mr. Rooney's being bound to pay maintenance to his daughter; unfortunately the Attorney did not tell us that she was married and had two children. Surely a man should not have to face up to that sort of maintenance. He made a plea about women and children. This is a distinct case where Government departments have tried to put a man in a position where he cannot get justice in our society. He believes he was falsely convicted and that there is a conflict between State law and Commonwealth law. He believes that, by law, he is not guilty.

The Hon. L. J. King: You think it's bad luck that he should be bound by law. Do you think the taxpayers should pay for this?

Mr. EVANS: I believe the Attorney-General wants to uphold the law (indeed, he may have an ambition to move into that field), but these departments should not be able to bribe or coerce a man into not going on with his appeal. That is what is happening. The community pays many accounts for people to act for others who are in no worse situation than is Mr. Rooney.

The Hon. L. J. King: You want the taxpayer to finance the Divorce Law Reform Association.

Mr. EVANS: That association may have some functions that do not appeal to the Attorney-General, to me, or to many other people in the community but, if it has found a fault in the law, that is not the fault of the association or of Mr. Rooney: it is a fault in the law. That law should be tested in the correct place and the fault should be rectified.

The Hon. L. J. King: At the taxpayers' expense?

Mr. EVANS: Yes. After all, it was the taxpayers' representatives who failed to pass adequate laws in the first place. Those representatives are elected in the Commonwealth and State spheres to pass laws, and no person should have to foot the bill simply because the taxpayers' representatives failed to pass effective legislation in the first place. That is what happened in this case. From the type of reply he gave on Tuesday, I believe the Attorney knows that. He gave a prepared reply, but not to the real question I asked: it was not a true and factual reply to my question. I believe that Mr. Rooney has a just cause because, according to many people, he has been falsely convicted under the laws of this land. Many people believe that a court should decide the question. Surely it should be decided and the man given a legal opportunity to prove his innocence. I thought that was the function of the Australian Legal Aid Office.

I should now like to move on to another area, which I cannot cover as broadly as I wished in the time available to me. The South Australian Film Corporation was set up to promote the film industry in this State. I shall not be as vicious on this occasion as I could be: I shall wait and see what are the reactions to my comments. However, I believe that later there will be time, if the position is not remedied, for a Royal Commission to inquire, or at least for a respresentative of the South Australian film industry to ask the Ombudsman to conduct a full-scale inquiry, into the matter. Mr. Brealey, the Director of that organisation, in a statement made publicly, said:

Unlike the mystery of the *Celeste*, which was found crewless in mid-ocean, the corporation will be abandoned, deliberately.

Mr. Brealey also stated:

. . . the corporation is subcontracting most of its projects to local film makers and companies.

That statement is not factual: they are "local" film makers only because they have been brought to this State from other States. We need to go back to Mr. Brealey's statement in the early days, when he said:

Our policy will be to use Australian talent as much as possible but every now and then we will put in international talent to encourage the possibility of overseas release.

We know that there has been very little activity for the South Australian film makers. We also know that the Premier was conducting an inquiry, or at least he stated publicly that he would inquire. We have heard nothing more of the inquiry, however, and we have not heard about the American company working in conjunction with a South Australian film company, apparently to deny a Sydney company its rights. The Premier was concerned only about saying that he would have an inquiry made: he has not been sufficiently concerned to say what was the result of that inquiry.

Mr. Brealey has chosen to attack a person who won a medal overseas, as though winning the medal meant nothing. However, the Minister of Environment and Conservation was quick to praise the South Australian Film Corporation for winning a similar medal. The Minister said that winning the medal had much merit, whereas Mr. Brealey attacked a person who had won it, stating that the medal had no merit.

The corporation has stated that it is making 42 films, but only seven of them are being made by South Australian producers. That is a disgrace and we should all be aware

of the facts. The corporation has a responsibility. I consider that many of those associated with the corporation at present want to break most of the film makers in South Australia by giving them no work and putting them out of business. Then, when the corporation is wound down in three or four years, those associated with the corporation will have all their mates set up in the one or two South Australian film-making industries that are getting most of the work at present.

One film maker (and I shall not name him now, although the corporation knows him) is getting all the work. If the position is not rectified, this Parliament will have to accept the responsibility of either appointing a Royal Commission or obtaining a report from the Ombudsman on this organisation. It is not acting as its charter intended it to act, and it was never given a charter to manufacture films.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): I will speak of the Medibank health scheme, which is a parallel service to the popular and successful Canadian scheme. When visiting North America last year, I often inquired about the health scheme operating in Canada, and the Australian Medibank scheme has been based on the health scheme operating in North America.

I spoke to such people as rangers, pensioners, business men, ordinary workers, and Parliamentarians when I was in North America, and I was convinced that the system operating in Canada was completely successful. It had met with the same opposition as the Medibank scheme has been facing here, but no-one in Canada would like the scheme operating there to be abandoned.

According to press reports today, there seems to have been a considerable change of opinion in three Liberal-governed States over the past 24 hours in relation to Medibank. Government Leaders in those States now realise that they may have missed the boat and that their Treasurers will require much money during the 1975-76 financial year. The Australian Medical Association and those who have a vested interest in defeating the scheme have been active over the past two or three years. The Australian scheme does not contemplate any change in the physical provision of health services or in the efficiency of such services. There has been no evidence produced that the efficiency of existing subsidised community and private hospitals will be in any way affected by the introduction of Medibank. It will not affect the standard of health services in South Australia, unless those providing such services reduce their standards. No doubt people with vested interests are threatening to take such action.

The scheme will eliminate many inequalities by providing health services for the various sections of the Australian community, whilst retaining for those who can afford to pay for insurance the same privileges as they had previously. As a country member, I believe that one of the most serious and disturbing statements I have seen relates to the involvement of the scheme in country areas. The method of financing under the Medibank hospital scheme has been thoroughly considered and every effort has been made to provide a scheme that will continue to provide an incentive towards community involvement. The value of community involvement is well known and respected, and it is considered to be an essential part of the continuing provision of high-quality health care in South Australia. There is no proposal in the scheme or arrangement that will result in the reduction of country hospitals, but rather the quality of the service available to country residents by a rationalisation of services will be improved. This is happening through community welfare and the many agencies that now help people in unfortunate circumstances.

Some of the community welfare services provided by the South Australian and Commonwealth Governments are well known in many areas, and they are especially welcomed and respected in my district. Hospital boards of non-government hospitals will not lose control of their hospitals: they will continue to be independent bodies, and operate as they do now. Charges based solely on political motives have been made regarding costs, but it must be remembered that, whatever the total costs of health services, they must be met somehow by the taxpayer, whether through the Australian Government, the State Government, or from personal contributions, as the Medibank scheme is law passed by Commonwealth Parliament at last year's joint sitting. The proposal to deduct 1·35 per cent from salary or wages was rejected by the Australian Senate and the Australian Government is being forced, because of the action of the Liberal-Country Party Opposition in the Senate to pay for the Australian health scheme from Consolidated Revenue.

As from July 1, all South Australians will no longer be required to contribute to a medical benefits fund, and those who could not previously afford the cost will now be covered. There will be no discrimination against pensioners as to the services that they may obtain, or against the medical practitioners as to the fee to be paid for such pensioner service. The Australian Government is seeking the concurrence of all medical practitioners for direct billing to Medibank for all services provided to pensioners so that they do not have any personal payments to make.

It is unfortunately true that in the discussions, newspaper articles, etc., that have surrounded the proposed introduction of the Medibank scheme, no publicity whatsoever has been given to the second part of the proposal, which is the provision of community-based services and which has as its objective the provision of more appropriate health care at the community level and the provision of a satisfactory alternative to hospitalisation in many instances. When Medibank is considered in the context of its correlation with the community health programme, it will be seen that there are very considerable advantages in these new joint concepts, compared to the former methods of health care delivery. It would be idle to suggest that the Medibank scheme could be introduced as from July 1, without any problems.

Mr. Venning: The scheme would not be so bad if it had some good points.

Mr. BURDON: The member for Rocky River might appreciate some of those good points one of these days. Obviously, any new scheme that involves a change from a situation that has appertained for a number of years will produce some areas of difficulty and possibly will reveal some anomalies that had not been expected. The important point, however, is that basically the Medibank scheme, if properly controlled, will eliminate many of the inconsistencies of the present scheme and, perhaps more importantly for the State of South Australia, will provide additional funds that could be used for other purposes, hopefully for extensions in other health fields that would not otherwise be possible.

Perhaps the most misrepresented aspect of the Medibank scheme is the question of choice of medical practitioner. In actual fact, there will be little change in the present situation. It might be construed that the provision of free medical treatment to hospital service patients by medical practitioners in recognised hospitals would constitute a reduction in such free choice, but in practice the situation is likely to differ very little from that which already appertains in teaching and non-teaching hospitals alike, although

individual cases may well arise where a change does occur. In respect of non-hospital medical services there will be absolutely no change regarding choice of medical practitioner for the majority of the general public. Pensioner patients will now be able to be treated by specialists without having to attend the out-patient departments of teaching hospitals where there is no choice of medical practitioner; for these people there will be an improvement in their ability to choose their own medical practitioner.

In the time left for me to speak, I should like to mention one other item. I am extremely concerned about the finishing off rate of Housing Trust houses in the Mount Gambier district. In that area we have a build-up of demand, and, although many houses are being constructed at the moment, I am concerned about the completion rate because of the many names on the waiting list. I make a plea to the Minister to take action to improve the completion rate of those houses now being constructed in my district. Time does not permit me to carry on to another small item I had in mind, but I welcome the opportunity to speak.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): Some years ago (if I remember correctly, during the 1970 election campaign) slogans were thrown around the metropolis of Adelaide and the country areas saying "Live better with Labor", and later "South Australia is doing well with Labor." Over the past five years the people of South Australia have been subjected to quite a campaign by the present Government to convince them that they are doing well under Labor. The financial statement to the end of February revealed that, for eight months, the State had a working deficit in the Revenue Account of $28 040 000. When we consider that the expected deficit was to have been $12 000 000 for the full financial year, we wonder whether we are doing well or living better, or whether we are going as well as we have been led to believe. When we look at the revenue situation and the additional taxes imposed on South Australians, and when we consider the 200 per cent increase in taxes in the past five years, it is hard to accept the slogan stating that South Australians are doing very well under the present Government. It is a continuing campaign.

The Government, at taxpayers' expense, has established one of the biggest propaganda machines that any Government has considered necessary in this State. This is all part of an endeavour to convince the people of South Australia that the Labor Party and its socialistic, so-called democratic policies are allegedly in this State's best interests. We have just heard the same kind of tripe during the references by the member for Mount Gambier to the Medibank scheme, which will cost more than $1 500 000 to establish, yet no-one knows the details. There has been a publicity campaign leading to the Medibank scheme.

This is the type of campaign to which the people of South Australia and, indeed, the whole of Australia are subjected. It is a typical, brain-washing campaign that has been cleverly worked out. It was commenced 10 or 12 years ago. It was originally mooted in the trade union movement, from which it has passed to State and Commonwealth politics. This propaganda machine encourages people to believe that the Labor Party is allegedly the only political organisation that works for the benefit of taxpapers in this State.

We have heard continually from the Premier that at the first opportunity he will abolish the petrol tax. There will probably be press announcements from time to time, leading up to the next State election. Unfortunately, people's memories are not long. The performance, of late, of the present Government has deteriorated considerably. Not long ago the Government was allegedly greatly concerned about the amount of unemployment, this State's financial position, and the need to introduce the petrol tax.

At one time the Premier said that no way would South Australia introduce a petrol tax. However, this was a cunning con trick. He told the people that he was bitterly opposed to the Commonwealth Government's policies, and he bitterly attacked the Prime Minister. He then ran to the Prime Minister in an attempt to get more money, but he failed, as he has done on every occasion. When the Premier failed to receive sufficient funds to maintain the Government's tremendous commitments going well into the future, the Government was in so much trouble, according to opinion polls, that the Premier made the grandiose, nation-rocking statement that he would establish a free beach at Maslin Beach. That is the way the Premier manipulated the media, taking the pressure off his Government with regard to the State's financial problems and the unemployment situation. The Government has not announced any solution to those problems; it has taken no steps to create additional jobs in South Australia. However, the Premier switched the attention to the stupid issue of permitting nude bathing at Maslin Beach, thus taking the pressure off the Government.

The Premier is full of these tricks. He relies on the gullibility of people. The present Government is dishonest, as it uses its press secretaries and monitoring system to confuse the people. In recent weeks, although it thought it had the situation under control, the Government suddenly began to face pressure with regard to Monarto. To shift attention from that, we have had the nation-rocking statement that women in South Australia are to be referred to as "Ms". I do not know of what benefit this will be to the State. The normal practice in commercial circles is that, if there is uncertainty whether the title should be "Miss" or "Mrs.", the title "M/s" is used. I do not understand the logic of the Government's saying that women in this State will now be referred to as "Ms". No wonder women in the State are taking this matter seriously: most of them feel insulted. They believe the present Government does not recognise them, International Women's Year or no International Women's Year.

The greatest insult that can be directed at a woman is to refer to her as "Ms". One wonders where this sort of thing will end. What will be put on toilet doors? The State Government has taken the pressure off itself by glossing over its real problems. On behalf of the women of this State—

Members interjecting:

Mr. BECKER: I join women in believing that the State Government should rescind this decision. It has no right to waste taxpayers' money by going through Government department files and making alterations. The women of this State deserve to be respected. I believe that the decision the Premier made in trying to avoid the pressures of modern Government by creating this silly business is an insult to all women.

Motion carried.

At 5.29 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, March 18, at 2 p.m.