

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, November 6, 1968

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

WIRRABARA ROAD

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Recently I asked the Minister of Roads and Transport when it was expected that main road No. 153 from Wirrabara to Wirrabara Forest would be sealed, and in his reply yesterday he said that the Highways Department had no immediate plans for extending the bituminous seal on this road. In August, 1965, when I asked the then Minister the plans of the Highways Department for sealing that road, he replied as follows:

The Wirrabara Forest main road No. 153 is scheduled in the five-year works construction programme for reconstruction and sealing, to commence in 1968-69 and be completed during 1969-1970.

As the present Minister has now said that the Highways Department has changed its priorities on this matter, can he explain why there are now no immediate plans for extending the bituminous seal on this road?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: As well as giving the reply that the honourable member has just quoted, I did add a little more yesterday:

The position is currently under review to ascertain whether the traffic volumes warrant improvements being carried out. However, at this stage it is not possible to say when such work will commence.

In regard to the point raised by the honourable member, that an indication was given in 1965 that as part of the five-year programme the road was to be sealed in the 1968-69 financial year, I point out that five-year advance programmes are necessarily flexible and subject to variation according to changed circumstances, overall priorities and availability of finance. I stress the point even further by saying that it is impossible to lay down with absolute certainty not only five-year road programmes but even annual programmes. They have to be flexible.

It is of interest to note that even in each year's programme, before the subject year is over, between 200 and 300 variations are

needed and, therefore, put into effect. I assure the honourable member, however, that the reply I gave yesterday indicates that the matter is under review, and in due course, when I have some further information that will interest him, I will advise the honourable member accordingly.

SCIENTOLOGY (PROHIBITION) BILL

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I seek leave to make a brief statement before directing a question to you, Mr. President.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yesterday, the Select Committee on the Scientology (Prohibition) Bill submitted a special report to this Council. On reading it, I am perturbed about the position, and more so about the report that appeared in this morning's *Advertiser*. According to the report submitted yesterday, on page 13 of the evidence Mr. Kenneth Eric Klaebe said to the committee:

(1) I am appearing as a witness before the Select Committee with several misgivings which I wish to have resolved. In view of the manner in which the 83 witnesses who appeared for scientology before the Melbourne inquiry were ridiculed and their evidence made little of in contrast to the 13 witnesses who appeared against it, I wish to be certain that this will not take place here.

The next part concerns me more:

Certainly, I do not want to jeopardize my present job as a result of giving evidence.

Later, the Chairman informed Mr. Klaebe:

Where you seek some assurance there of protection and express some fear of your employment being jeopardized, I refer to Standing Order No. 438, which states:

All witnesses examined before the Council or any committee thereof— (and this is a committee thereof)—

are entitled to the protection of the Council in respect of anything that may be said by them in their evidence.

46. Do you understand that? . . . Thank you.

47. This gives you that protection.

Further on, the Hon. Mr. Rowe informed Mr. Klaebe:

We have said we are prepared to look at the matter in an impartial way and that anything you say here will not prejudice you in regard to your position.

I understand that Mr. Klaebe, in fact, has said that he accepts that position, but today, as a result of the report given to the Council yesterday, we find Mr. Klaebe's name on a letter written to the Secretary printed in today's *Advertiser*, as a result of which Mr. Klaebe's position will now be jeopardized because of the publicity resulting from this,

notwithstanding his having been given an assurance by the Select Committee that his position would in no way be jeopardized. I understand there may be a number of other witnesses who, not being in favour of Scientology, would be in favour of the Scientology (Prohibition) Bill, but who fear that their position will be jeopardized if they appear before the committee to give evidence. Therefore, Sir, can you say whether any further witnesses can be assured that, if they come before the Select Committee, their identity and their evidence will not be disclosed publicly, which would jeopardize their position, as I feel this man's position has been jeopardized as a result of something that has happened contrary to an assurance he was given by the committee?

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member has already quoted Standing Order No. 438, so it is not necessary for me to repeat it. Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice* states, at page 59, under the heading "The Protection of Witnesses, etc., concerned in proceedings in Parliament":

Witnesses, petitioners, counsel and others are protected from molestation, threats or legal proceedings on account of what they may have said or done in either House or a committee thereof. Such persons may be regarded as being participants to that extent in proceedings in Parliament, which, as Article 9 of the Bill of Rights declares, "ought not to be impeached or questioned in any court or place out of Parliament". In practice, when such cases of molestation, threats or legal proceedings have been brought to the notice of either House, the procedure adopted for the protection of witnesses and others concerned has been that regularly employed in cases of breach of privilege and contempt.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Is it possible for evidence not to be made public through the press, or is that not possible?

The PRESIDENT: No, because minutes of evidence that are taken down, printed and ordered to be tabled are then public property and are available to the press and to the public.

MINING

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The Elcor Chemical Corporation of the United States of America has an Australian affiliate company called Elcor Australia Proprietary Limited. The American parent company claimed to have built the first plant in the world to recover elemental sulphur or brimstone from gypsum. I believe this company is interested in coming to Australia to try and establish a similar industry here to make sulphur, and that it is interested in South Australia's gypsum

resources. Can the Minister of Mines therefore say whether this company may set up a manufacturing works in South Australia?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: What the honourable member has said is true. This company is interested in setting up in Australia and has found much of interest in South Australia. Recently special mining leases were issued to the company over certain areas in relation to gypsum, and in this regard research is being carried out to ascertain whether such an industry would be viable here.

BUSH FIRES

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: In view of the very real possibility of serious bush fires occurring in South Australia, will the Minister of Agriculture look into the matter of compensation for loss of life or disablement of those working in the Emergency Fire Services? Also, will the Minister inform the Council of any steps the Government proposes to take to relieve to some extent the anxiety of families whose breadwinners are risking their lives in these voluntary services?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It is fairly clear that Emergency Fire Services volunteers are at present protected under a system worked out some years ago whereby South Australian insurance companies and the State Government have contributed to a trust fund, which is administered by a committee. I think the honourable member is perhaps thinking more of volunteers who are not members of the Emergency Fire Services. Very soon I will be introducing an amending Bill in this Council concerning recommendations of the Bush Fire Research Committee. The Bill will provide for a new section in the Act dealing with volunteers. At that time I will be prepared to make a more detailed explanation. I assure the honourable member that the matter is well in hand.

FREIGHT RATES

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I ask leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads and Transport. Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I realize that the Minister sincerely desires to correct anomalies arising from the replacement of rail services with road services. In this connection, the rail freight charge on a 10-gallon can of cream sent from Wharminda to Port Lincoln is 40c. However, at present the cost for such a can sent by road to Arno Bay is 25c, where it must remain for 16 hours with the lid on

in a cool room. The can is then freighted to Port Lincoln by Birdseye's Motor Service, which makes a surcharge of 25c, plus 1c a lb. A 10-gallon can of cream weighs about 100 lb. I said that the rail freight was 40c but the present charge by road amounts to \$1.45. Will the Minister investigate this anomaly with a view to correcting it?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes, I shall be only too pleased to have another look at this matter. I well recall that when I visited Eyre Peninsula some weeks ago this matter was raised. I was armed then with some statistics which I supplied to one particular gentleman who was vitally concerned (I believe he was a cream producer). I will obtain the information and bring down a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

HANSARD DISTRIBUTION

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I have received complaints that *Hansard* is not normally available in the periodicals room of the State Library until about a month after its publication. In view of the recognized necessity for speedy distribution of information on Parliamentary debates so that the interested public may be informed of Parliament's actions while Bills are still before the Council, will the Minister ascertain from his colleague the cause of the delay in this matter, and will he ask his colleague to use every facility to improve this important public service?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes, I shall refer the matter to my colleague. I am sure every endeavour will be made to rectify the position. I hope that once *Hansard* is supplied speedily to the State Library it will be read well.

FLUORIDATION

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. R. A. Geddes:

That this Council considers that before fluoride is added to our water supplies, Parliamentary approval should be sought for such action,

which the Hon. V. G. Springett had moved to amend by striking out all words after "that" second occurring with a view to inserting in lieu thereof the following words "while the procedure adopted by the Government for introducing fluoride to the water supplies

without reference to Parliament may be open to criticism, nevertheless the Government is to be commended for its wise decision to safeguard the dental health of the community by so adding flouride".

(Continued from October 22. Page 2019.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I rise to give some qualified support to the motion of the Hon. Mr. Geddes regarding fluoridation, and I hasten to endorse the comment of previous speakers that this motion does not question the introduction of fluoridation but queries the manner in which the Government intends introducing it. I use the term "qualified support" because I realize that, apart from whichever Party occupies the Treasury benches, many things must be done by regulation or by executive action. Although it is quite within the power of the Government to act as it has done in this matter, this is a somewhat controversial subject and might well have been brought before Parliament in order to get the views of a full cross-section of members elected to represent the people.

However, although the Hon. Mr. Geddes's motion was not intended to criticize the introduction of fluoride into our water supplies, it is inevitable that in a debate of this nature widely differing opinions will be expressed. Such differences occur not only between political Parties but also amongst the general public as well as amongst experts. For instance, the Leader of the Opposition in another place was reported as speaking out strongly in support of fluoridation, and I have not heard that the Hon. Mr. Dunstan has criticized the Government's action in any way. In fact, I think the Leader, as reported, has gone as close to praising the Government on fluoridation as he could be expected to praise it on any matter.

However, two ex-Ministers (at least one for certain being a prominent ex-Minister in this Council) have spoken against fluoridation. My friend the Hon. Mr. Banfield, who is a backbencher in the Opposition Party and not always given to understatement, said that he thinks fluoride is a poison. Having instanced these divisions of opinion amongst members of the Opposition, I would be the last to suggest that similar divisions do not exist amongst members of our political Party; as I said earlier, similar divisions of opinion exist between professional people. I believe that a large majority of professional people are in favour of fluoridation. I suggested to the Hon. Mr. Banfield recently that probably about 85 per cent would be in favour of fluoridation. Whatever the figure is, I am certain it is a high one.

I favour the use of fluoride, which may be used or rejected by individuals if its use is confined to the taking of tablets or the use of toothpaste. Many people say that such methods are not sufficient. In fact, some experts have said that and have pointed out that people are not forced to take the tablets or use the toothpaste. The argument used is that, with pills or toothpaste, fluoride would be used only by some people who would benefit from such a method; their argument is that the fluoridation of thousands of millions of gallons of water is the only answer if everyone is to receive the benefits. I point out, in response to this, that even if a person does not have to take the pills or use the toothpaste he also does not have to drink the water, 99 per cent of which in any case (and here again I am speaking in round figures) will run down drains of one sort or another anyway.

Many people still have rainwater tanks, and many more will no doubt obtain them if they are sufficiently opposed to fluoride. This applies particularly, I would imagine, to my honourable friend Mr. Banfield. Other people who, like the Hon. Mr. Banfield, are inclined to think fluoride is poison, will also go to the trouble of securing rainwater tanks.

I asked the Minister of Health, some months ago I think, in what reservoirs fluoride would be used, and the honourable gentleman informed me, if I remember correctly, that it would be used in all the metropolitan reservoirs and also in the South Para, Barossa and Warren reservoirs, which are partly used by metropolitan people. Of course, Mr. President, a very considerable amount of water from these latter three reservoirs, and probably from some of the other reservoirs as well, goes into country areas, so a person will not have to be in the city to be affected, as it were, by the use of fluoride or to have fluoridated water made available to his property.

I took out a rough calculation of the capacities of the reservoirs in this State. They are not big ones, such as exist in Western Australia, but Mount Bold has a little over 10,000,000,000 gallons and South Para has 11,300,000,000. Of the smaller ones, Millbrook and Happy Valley total between them about 6,000,000,000 gallons; Myponga has another 6,000,000,000 gallons, and there are several other small ones. The total capacity at present is about 30,000,000,000 gallons of water. I am thankful to say (and I am sure all other honourable members are also thankful) that all these reservoirs are full at the present time.

All this water will be subject to fluoridation. Large quantities of it will be drunk by stock, and large quantities will be drunk possibly by people like myself who have no further use for fluoridation. Also, large quantities will go down the cisterns all over the place, and very large quantities will be used to irrigate gardens.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Do you think it would do the teeth of stock the world of good?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I do not think so; some of their teeth grow long enough now, and perhaps my colleague on my left would agree that fluoride might make their teeth grow even longer.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Many people have false teeth, too.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I would imagine that quite a few people would have false teeth. Of this 30,000,000,000 gallons that will be fluoridated (and it will probably be more than this because pumping from the Murray will boost this total very considerably), something less than 1 per cent will be consumed by human beings. Therefore, despite the conclusions reached by the members of the Government, and despite the learned comments of my honourable friend Dr. Springett, I wonder whether this is the best and the most effective way to provide fluoride.

However, the motion to which I am referring, as I said earlier, refers to the method of introduction of this procedure and not to the merits of fluoride. The Hon. Mr. Rowe in his speech gave some examples of the many things that had to be done by administrative action, and I agree that that is so. While I do not wish to censure the Government for doing this, I consider that this matter, which is perhaps more controversial and the subject of more divided opinion than many other matters that are decided by administrative action, could well have come before Parliament. Therefore, I support the motion.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): I thank honourable members who have spoken on this motion. History, in so many of the erstwhile free countries of the world, has shown ever so clearly how easily the Parliaments can lose so many of their rights and privileges by permitting the Executive to assume too much power.

The fluoride decision by Cabinet is of major importance to many sections of the community in South Australia, and it is only

right that Parliament should be able to tell Cabinet of its disapproval at the way it has handled this matter. We can always take the extremes of this case, which are that should Parliament in South Australia become lax, and in fact should we fail to appreciate the principles of the bicameral system, then our children may well be ruled not only by fluoridation but by executives who have a dictatorial outlook, and our children will then have little or no right of reply to any legislation that may be brought in.

I have the greatest respect for the opinion and judgment of the Hon. Mr. Springett, who has moved an amendment to the motion. However, his amendment in no way conveys to the Government the folly of its attitude over this issue. Therefore, I remind members of this Council that the motion is not on whether the State should or should not have fluoride. It clearly states:

That this Council considers that before fluoride is added to our water supplies, Parliamentary approval should be sought for such action.

I have little to reply to the Premier's press statements over this issue in the early stages of the debate. I believe that the Legislative Council has a proud record over many years in giving full consideration to the opinions and expressions of the smaller groups of people who are not happy with some of the particular legislation of the day. I believe that this is a House of Review and that it would fail to be such if it did not put forward the other point of view when members who are here consider that to be necessary.

In my considered opinion, the Premier's statement that this motion is an expression of no confidence in the Government can in no way be a justifiable interpretation of the motion submitted in my name. I commend the motion to honourable members.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Chair is that the words proposed to be struck out stand part of the question.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. President. I consider that members of this Council may not have understood the question that you have put.

The PRESIDENT: I thought I put it very audibly and distinctly. Honourable members have the question before them on the Notice Paper, which reads:

That this Council considers that before fluoride is added to our water supplies, Parliamentary approval should be sought for such action, to which the Hon. V. G. Springett

has moved the following amendment: "Leave out all words after "that" second occurring with a view to inserting in lieu thereof the following words 'while the procedure adopted by the Government for introducing fluoride to the water supplies without reference to Parliament may be open to criticism, nevertheless the Government is to be commended for its wise decision to safeguard the dental health of the community by so adding fluoride'."

This is no more complicated than dealing with a clause in a Bill where certain words are struck out and the question "That the words proposed to be inserted be inserted" is put. The question is "That the words proposed to be struck out stand part of (in this case) the motion". For the question say "Aye"—against "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Divide.

The Council divided on the question:

Ayes (10)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, S. C. Bevan, Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. A. Geddes (teller), G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, A. F. Kneebone, A. J. Shard, and A. M. Whyte.

Noes (8)—The Hons. R. C. DeGaris (teller), C. M. Hill, Sir Norman Jude, H. K. Kemp, C. D. Rowe, Sir Arthur Rymill, V. G. Springett, and C. R. Story.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus negated.

The PRESIDENT: Before putting the question "That the motion be agreed to", I will read it. It is as follows:

That this Council considers that, before fluoride is added to our water supplies, Parliamentary approval should be sought for such action.

The question is "That the motion be agreed to". For the question say "Aye"—against "No". I think the "Ayes" have it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Divide.

The Council divided on the motion:

Ayes (9)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, S. C. Bevan, M. B. Dawkins, R. A. Geddes (teller), G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, A. F. Kneebone, A. J. Shard, and A. M. Whyte.

Noes (9)—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, R. C. DeGaris (teller), C. M. Hill, Sir Norman Jude, H. K. Kemp, C. D. Rowe, Sir Arthur Rymill, V. G. Springett, and C. R. Story.

The PRESIDENT: There are nine Ayes and nine Noes. There being a tie, it is necessary for the Chair to give a casting vote, which is usually to maintain the *status quo*. The *status quo* is rather hard to decide, but I decide in favour of the Noes, in view of the question that has already been decided.

Motion thus negated.

ABORIGINAL CHILDREN

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. H. K. Kemp:

(For wording of motion see page 1733.)

(Continued from October 23. Page 2068.)

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): From the scanty figures I have been able to obtain concerning the Australian Aboriginal population it would appear, although I cannot verify the figures, that they represent about 1 per cent of Australia's total population. It has been suggested that the annual increase in their birth rate represents about 2 per cent of their own population compared with an increase of 1 per cent in the white population. This means that the Australian Aborigines will double their population in the next 20 or 30 years.

Many complex issues cloud the facts about Aborigines, mainly because they lack the ability to communicate their problems to the people and the Government and also because those who are genuinely interested in them, who try to help them and who are concerned with their welfare, find it difficult to get their ideas across in the right places so that corrective action can be taken if it is necessary. The problem is that minority groups, who are concerned and genuine in their ideals, cannot be heard in the right places. Because of this problem and because of the *laissez faire* attitude that so many Australians adopt, there is an overriding problem regarding Aborigines that could rue the day for Australia in future if the problems that these people face are not considered now and acted on in a constructive manner.

The suggestion that this Council should concern itself with the welfare of the Aboriginal children of South Australia is most interesting. In moving the motion, the Hon. Mr Kemp has emphasized the social problems that alcohol and its excessive use has on the parents of Aboriginal children who spend more money on alcohol than they do on the care of their children and, therefore, bring great suffering to their children. This is, no doubt, an extremely correct summation of the problem.

In his motion the honourable member suggests that we should concern ourselves with the welfare of Aborigines generally. However, when one examines some of the welfare measures of today for Aboriginal children, it is only fair for one to comment that this State is doing a remarkable job in trying as hard as it can to give these children the education they need. I have visited Aboriginal reserves

in the Northern District and, having examined them, I am full of praise for the work they are doing, not only in rehabilitating adult Aborigines but, more particularly, also in their attempts to make the educational needs of these children of prime importance.

The Hon. Mr Kemp has implied that there is a problem regarding the children who are neglected by their parents. Although the parents have in a way been neglected, too, I refer now to the children; I will mention adults later. We have similar problems with white children whose parents go off the rails and neglect their kith and kin. I humbly suggest that the honourable member should look at his motion and try to spell out in clearer terms that the Select Committee should report on the welfare of Aboriginal children in necessitous circumstances in this State rather than on the welfare of Aboriginal children as a whole. How many welfare workers have we? How much money is being allocated for Aboriginal welfare compared with the allocation for welfare for the rest of the population? What steps can be taken to introduce a type of Alcoholics Anonymous to help look after those adult Aborigines who find the convivial glass is the temptation that leads them further downhill as they become obsessed with the need for more alcohol?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They are not barred from the present Alcoholics Anonymous, are they?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: They are not, but is Alcoholics Anonymous doing any work with them? Should we ask a voluntary organization such as that to help the Aboriginal population, or would it not be better to have trained Government people keeping a fatherly eye on them, not on a voluntary basis but on a daily or weekly basis? Every community has this problem of talking of helping, but of doing not as much as it says it will. If we are genuine in our desires to help Aborigines we should examine the problems of the neglected children rather than examine the general welfare of the Aboriginal population of this State. This is a vexing problem, and is not new to South Australia. This State can be proud of the record it has tried to maintain in relation to Aboriginal welfare when compared with the help given to these people in other States. Nevertheless, as the Hon. Mr. Kemp has suggested, nothing but good could result if this problem could be stamped out now. As responsible citizens, we must ensure that future generations are not allowed to come into

society with a chip on their shoulder because of the neglect that may occur now. I support the motion.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): I do not oppose the motion because, as the Hon. Mr. Geddes has said, I think some good could result from an inquiry by a Select Committee into the welfare of the Aboriginal children of this State. Anything that can be done to assist our Aboriginal children deserves support. I do not claim to be an expert on Aboriginal affairs, although I have had some contact with the people of this race in both South Australia and Western Australia. Indeed, only a few years ago I visited the Point Pearce reserve on more than one occasion, and I have visited the North of this State as well as Alice Springs and have had conversations with these people. I have formed a high opinion of them. The fact that they have been treated by the white man in the manner in which they have been treated since settlement of this country occurred without any serious retaliation since the early days on their part indicates the moral calibre of these people. However, there has been a certain amount of resentment by them against white people who took their country away from them. I agree with some of the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Geddes in regard to these people. Investigations have proved that Aborigines are as intelligent as people of any other race. Only a few years ago it was widely held that Aborigines were incapable of proceeding beyond the primary level of education, but we find today that more and more Aboriginal children are receiving secondary and even tertiary education. We should be doing all we can to encourage Aborigines to become full members of the community. We should not, by insinuation, classify them as second-class citizens. I wish to refer to portion of the speech of the Hon. Mr. Kemp, which I was horrified to hear—I do not think it is accurate. It is as follows:

Every member who has Aboriginal population within his electoral district is aware of the disaster that has overtaken all but a small section of the Aborigines since they were given free access to alcohol.

I believe that this statement does not in any way help the Aborigines, and it could be classed, I think, as the kind of insinuation that I referred to just now (the insinuation that these people are second-class citizens) and I do not agree with it. If this motion is carried, I am sure the committee will find that this problem is not nearly as acute as the

statement I have quoted indicates. I am sure that the words of Mr. James McFarlane that were quoted by Mr. Kemp were taken out of context. Surely—

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member should use the term "The Honourable".

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Hon. Mr. Kemp. I am sorry, Mr. President; I apologize to the honourable member for that. He quoted Mr. McFarlane as saying:

You cannot put the clock back and, hard though it may be, you must accept that the present generation is lost; but something must be done, and done quickly, to save the children. Does Mr. McFarlane know every adult Aboriginal in South Australia? I know many of them, and I would not admit that some of these people are completely lost. Much has been done recently to remove the causes of the resentment that Aborigines may hold against us. The Labor Government, by legislation and other measures, endeavoured to remove these causes as far as possible. Regarding restrictions on the sale of liquor to Aborigines, the Playford Government on April 16, 1963, and on July 25, 1963, by proclamation, removed these restrictions in all parts of the State with the exceptions of that part of the State north of the Peterborough District Council area and of Eyre Peninsula.

The Labor Government extended the lifting of restrictions to these two areas by proclamation in the *Government Gazette* of April 1, 1965. It was an amendment moved by the Labor Opposition to a Bill on Aboriginal affairs in 1962 that permitted these proclamations to be made. The Bill, as it went to the other place in 1962, provided that there should be a register of full-blood Aborigines and no person on that register was to be supplied with liquor. However, anyone who was not a full-blood Aboriginal was able to get liquor wherever he might be.

When the 1962 Bill was debated in another place and when the restrictions were subsequently lifted, all shades of opinion agreed that there would be problems. However, I think every honourable member would agree with me that, before the restrictions were lifted, there were very serious problems, too. I refer to the illegal supply of liquor that was common at that time. Because it was illegal, hole-in-the-corner methods were used to supply liquor to Aborigines, who were charged extortionate amounts for cheap quality wines and even for methylated spirits laced with boot polish and other harmful substances.

We hear that some people are afraid there will be violence because of the lifting of liquor restrictions, and some people say that there has been violence. I ask: what was the kind of situation that prevailed earlier? The inevitable result of Aborigines' drinking "rot-gut", as I would call it, was violence, because such stuff would have that effect on anyone. Also, there was concern at that time at the amounts of money being taken from these people by those who batted on to them and sold them this horrible mixture.

I do not doubt that some problems have been caused because some Aborigines have been unable to adjust themselves to their new-found freedom. As the Hon. Mr. Geddes said, there are people in the white community, too, who cannot adjust themselves to alcoholic liquor, but there has been no great restriction on their ability to procure liquor. Many who have been unable to adjust themselves have been able to procure it for a long time. Ever since I have been a member of Parliament—and before that time—I have been approached concerning people whose children have been neglected because not only the father but also the mother drank alcoholic liquor.

Every honourable member here knows that there are problems with us as well as with Aborigines. The fact that Alcoholics Anonymous exists indicates that we have this problem in the white community. There are legal provisions to take care of people in this category who cannot look after themselves in respect of their desire for liquor. Do not let us fool ourselves and say that these are the only people affected; provision is made under the Licensing Act for all people, regardless of nationality. A licensee who supplies intoxicated persons with liquor may be brought to heel by applying provisions of the Act and in addition he could jeopardize his licence by such action. Therefore, provision is made to look after people of that type, not because they are Aborigines or white people but simply because they are people and should be looked after. Another section provides that a person may not buy liquor and resell it to Aborigines as has been done in the past. The Act makes it an offence for a person to secure liquor for the purpose of selling it to others.

When in power, the Labor Government introduced legislation such as the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act and the Prohibition of Discrimination Act, as well as introducing training programmes on Aboriginal reserves, as referred to by the Hon. Mr. Geddes. Such legislation was introduced to help the Aboriginal to help

himself; surely such action would give these people more assurance and confidence in handling their affairs. I think that is what we should endeavour to do—help the Aboriginal to help himself.

The introduction by the Labor Government of payment of the basic wage to Aborigines employed on reserves also helped these people to look after themselves. This has happened more in the Commonwealth arbitration sphere where payment is now being made to Aboriginal employees, thus ensuring that each receives a just wage commensurate with the work performed. Unfortunately, many people in Australia resent any attempt being made to gain proper recognition for the worth of Aborigines and a proper return for their labour. If a Select Committee is appointed and if it recommends further methods that could be introduced to assist Aboriginal children I believe it will be doing them a service. I support the motion.

The Hon. L. R. HART secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 5. Page 2175.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Minister of Agriculture) moved:

That this debate be further adjourned.

Motion carried.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

That this debate be made an order of the day for tomorrow.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2) moved:

That this private member's Bill be adjourned to the next private members' day on Wednesday, November 13.

The PRESIDENT: It will have to be an amendment to the motion, that "tomorrow" be struck out.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Then I move:

That "tomorrow" be struck out with a view to inserting "Wednesday, November 13".

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Under Standing Orders, am I allowed to debate the motion and the amendment?

The PRESIDENT: Yes.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I hope this amendment is not adopted because if it is it should apply to every private member's Bill. At the time when I had the honour to be Chief Secretary objection was not taken to an honourable member placing a private member's Bill

on the Notice Paper at the conclusion of the next day of sitting. To the best of my knowledge, the present proposal by the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill has not been attempted in this Council at any time in its history. If it is agreed to it will create a bad precedent, because let it be clearly understood that the next time a similar situation arises it will be tested on every occasion. I do not consider that such action accords with a sense of fair play, and it certainly would not allow the will of the people to be exercised in this Council in debating a Bill in accordance with accepted procedure.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member may only discuss the date of the adjourned debate.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I hope that the Council does not agree to the matter being adjourned until the next private members' day. This procedure has never been adopted before, and I hope the amendment will be defeated and the matter placed on the Orders of the Day for tomorrow.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): I oppose the amendment moved by the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill. As time goes by our business sheet will be much longer and I believe we should get items off the Notice Paper as soon as possible. Tomorrow is not early enough as far as discussion on this Bill is concerned, and to delay further discussion on the Bill for another week simply shows the contempt in which some people are prepared to hold this Bill in this Council. We are here to discuss the measures before the Council but the amendment is that we are asked to defer further discussion of this Bill for another week. This is being done at a time when the eyes of Australia are on this Council waiting to see the outcome of the Bill.

I believe that not only this Bill but every private member's Bill should receive due hearing as it appears on the Notice Paper. As the Leader has said, by attempting to delay the debate on this matter a precedent is created and it is something that has not occurred in this place at least during the three years while I have been a member here. I hope honourable members will not accept the amendment.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: If I may reply, I would merely like to point out that the Leader and the Hon. Mr. Banfield, who have just resumed their seats, are entirely incorrect in what they have said. It is absolute normality that a private member's bill be debated on private members' day, and if it is done otherwise then it is done for some very special

reason. There is no special reason in this case. The Hon. Mr. Shard, I think, asked for a week or got a week before he replied to a Bill that was recently debated in this Chamber, and I consider that we are entitled to the same consideration.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I would like to have that Bill quoted; I have never asked for a week.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: My amendment is purely normal procedure; the Leader has been acting abnormally, not me.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1): I oppose the amendment of Sir Arthur Rymill on the very grounds that he said that this is purely a procedural matter, that it is a private member's Bill and therefore it should be debated on private members' day.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: We do have a private members' day.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: It seems remarkable to me that exception to a similar motion has not come forward on other private members' Bills that have been on the Notice Paper and which have been debated on days other than private members' day. Those Bills have been on the Notice Paper all the time that this Bill has been on it. These Bills can be debated when business of the Council permits it. As far as the Notice Paper is concerned, the bringing on of private members' business has always been permitted in this Chamber and discussion has continued on it. It is obvious (and it must be obvious to all members and to people outside) that this action in this case has been done for one purpose only. The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill a few moments ago said that a procedure such as this is followed only on important matters and on special occasions.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It is done every week.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: When we look at the Notice Paper today, can we say that all the private members' business shown thereon is of special importance and that it should take precedence over other matters?

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Private members' day is Wednesday.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Was yesterday private members' day, and is tomorrow private members' day? During the last week that this Council sat, and in the week before that, private members' business was proceeded with on days other than Wednesdays. Why was exception not taken to the procedure then?

It was not taken because the boot was on the other foot. It is obvious why this amendment has been moved and, because of the precedent that will be established in this Chamber if it is carried, I hope the Council will not accept it.

The PRESIDENT: I think I have allowed ample debate on this question. The motion is for the adjournment of this matter to a certain day, and the amendment to the motion is for the adjournment to a different day, and that is all that can be debated.

The Council divided on the amendment:

Ayes (11)—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, C. M. Hill, Sir Norman Jude, H. K. Kemp, C. D. Rowe, Sir Arthur Rymill (teller), V. G. Springett, and A. M. Whyte.

Noes (6)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, S. C. Bevan, R. A. Geddes, A. F. Kneebone, A. J. Shard (teller), and C. R. Story.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried; motion as amended carried.

SCIENTOLOGY (PROHIBITION) BILL

Consideration of Special Report from Select Committee.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern) moved:

That Mr. Kenneth Eric Klaebe be summoned to appear at the bar of the Council on Tuesday next, November 12, 1968, at 2.15 p.m., to answer such questions as the House may see fit to put to him regarding his letter dated October 30, 1968, concerning the Hon. C. M. Hill, Chairman of the Select Committee on Scientology (Prohibition) Bill, 1968.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern) seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

STATE BANK ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

PUBLIC EXAMINATIONS BOARD BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to establish a statutory body to control public examinations. As honourable members are no doubt aware, public examinations are at present controlled by the Public Examinations Board of the University of Adelaide.

With the progress of education in South Australia, and, in particular, the establishment of Flinders University, it has now become

necessary to establish an autonomous public examinations board, guaranteeing adequate representation for all major interests in secondary education. There has been some modification in the membership of the board as compared with that of the Public Examinations Board of the University of Adelaide, a modification made necessary by the passage of some 30 years since the representation on that board was determined.

During that time the public schools have assumed a much greater relative importance and the proposed composition of the board to some extent reflects the changed character of South Australian education. Nevertheless, the Bill ensures adequate representation for the various interests in secondary education, and hence public examinations.

Undoubtedly the most important task that the board is to perform, apart from the conduct of examinations, consists of the preparation of examination syllabuses. The board cannot itself devote its time to the specialized task of preparing these syllabuses, and the Bill therefore provides for the appointment of a subject committee for each subject, or group of related subjects, in which the board is to conduct examinations.

These subject committees are to submit to the board syllabuses upon which, in their opinion, examinations should be based, and the board may decide either to approve the syllabuses or to vary them as it thinks fit. The Bill does not attempt to take away from the universities their right to control Matriculation, and consequently it contains a provision that any syllabus upon which a Matriculation examination is to be based must conform to the statutes and regulations of the universities.

A chief examiner is to be appointed for each subject. It will be his function to prepare the examination papers and to assess the results of candidates. In the case of a subject upon which Matriculation candidates are to be examined, the chief examiner is to be a member of the academic staff of one of the universities.

The board is a body corporate and is invested with general powers to hold property and to appoint and dismiss servants. There is, however, a provision that those persons who are at present engaged by the University of Adelaide solely for the purposes of the Public Examinations Board of the University of Adelaide are to become, upon the commencement of the Act, officers or servants of the board.

The board may require the university to transfer to the board property at present held by the university solely for the purposes of its Public Examinations Board.

Moreover, the university at present holds certain funds in trust for the purpose of establishing or endowing scholarships and prizes awarded on the results of public examinations, and the university is empowered to transfer these trust funds to the board. The board is further invested with powers to make rules governing the conduct of public examinations and other matters incidental thereto.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows: Clause 1 is merely formal, clause 2 deals with interpretation, and clause 3 establishes and incorporates the board. Subclause (4) provides that the board is to consist of 32 members appointed by the Minister, of whom—

- (a) 10 are to be members of the teaching or administrative staff of the Education Department, nominated by the Director-General of Education;
- (b) six are to be persons engaged as teachers in, or in the administration of, private schools in South Australia, two of whom are to be nominated by the Director of Catholic Education in South Australia, two by the Independent Schools Headmasters Association, and two by the Independent Schools Headmistresses Association;
- (c) two are to be members of the academic or administrative staff of the South Australian Institute of Technology, nominated by the council of that institute;
- (d) seven are to be members of the academic or administrative staff of the University of Adelaide, nominated by the council of that university; and
- (e) seven are to be members of the academic or administrative staff of the Flinders University of South Australia, nominated by the council of that university.

Clause 4 provides for the conditions under which members are to hold office. Clause 5 provides for the appointment of a chairman and deputy chairman of the board. Clause 6 provides that 16 members shall constitute a quorum of the board and provides for the manner in which the board is to conduct its business. Clause 7 provides that the Minister may determine allowances and expenses to be paid to the members of the board.

Clause 8 establishes the duties of the board. The board is obliged, first, to conduct annually such Matriculation and supplementary Matriculation examinations as may be prescribed by the statutes or regulations of the universities. Secondly, it is to conduct such examinations and supplementary examinations as may be approved by the Minister on the recommendation of the board. It is required to prepare and supply as soon as practicable to the respective councils of the universities and of the South Australian Institute of Technology lists of the candidates who presented themselves for any Matriculation examination conducted by the board, and the results obtained by them in that examination.

The board is required to publish candidates' results in all examinations conducted by it in such manner as it may determine. The board is required to consider the syllabuses prepared by subject committees and to approve or vary them as the board thinks fit. Subclause (2) provides for the manner in which the results obtained by candidates in an examination are to be assessed and the manner in which those results are to be indicated in the lists published by the board.

Clause 9 provides for the appointment of subject committees by the board. In the case of a subject upon which candidates for a Matriculation examination are to be examined, the chairman of the subject committee must be a member of the academic staff of one of the universities. The subject committee is to prepare and submit to the board for its approval the syllabus upon which the examinations are to be based, to report to the board upon examinations previously conducted by it in that subject, and to advise the board generally on matters in respect of which the board may request advice or to which the subject committee may think it expedient to direct the board's attention.

Clause 10 provides that a syllabus that is to be the basis of a Matriculation or supplementary Matriculation examination must conform to the statutes and regulations of the universities.

Clause 11 provides for the appointment of a chief examiner in each subject. The board will appoint such examiners to assist him as the chief examiner and the board think necessary. The duty of the chief examiner is to prepare the examination papers and the other kinds of examination he thinks necessary properly to examine candidates, and to assess the results of those examinations.

Clause 12 empowers the board to make rules upon certain subjects pertinent to public examinations. Subclause (2) provides that section 38 of the Acts Interpretation Act, 1915-1957, shall not apply to rules made by the board under this clause.

Clause 13 provides that the board may make recommendations to the respective councils of the universities in relation to the Matriculation of students, the nature and conduct of Matriculation examinations, and any matter or thing incidental thereto.

Clause 14 provides that, where there are not sufficient candidates for an examination in any subject to justify the appointment of a chief examiner in that subject or there are not sufficient qualified persons in this State to act as examiners in that subject, the board may make such arrangements as it thinks expedient with authorities in other States for the examination of candidates for examination in that subject.

Clause 15 provides for the publication of a public examinations manual, and sets out the information it is to contain. Clause 16 empowers the board to appoint and dismiss officers and servants. Subclause (2) provides that those persons who were previously employed by the University of Adelaide solely for the purposes of its Public Examinations Board shall, at the commencement of the Act, become employees of the board.

Clause 17 provides for the transference to the board of property held by the University of Adelaide solely for the purposes of its Public Examinations Board. Subclause (2) provides that the university may transfer certain trust funds to the board.

Clause 18 provides that the board may conduct special examinations, not falling within the ordinary ambit of its activities, by agreement with the universities or other bodies that may require those examinations.

Clause 19 deals with appropriation. Clause 20 requires the board to keep proper accounts of its financial transactions. Clause 21 empowers the Governor, either upon the recommendation of the board or in his own discretion, to make regulations for the purposes of the Act. In particular, the Governor is to prescribe the fees to be paid upon entry to public examinations.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE secured the adjournment of the debate.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 5. Page 2168.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I oppose this Bill for many reasons, one of the main ones being that the Government has no mandate to introduce a Bill of this type. It was never mentioned in the election speeches, and the present Government in its campaigning gave no hint of and made no statement about raising taxation. To the best of my knowledge (and I followed the election campaign closely, as most honourable members did) at no stage was any indication given that this Government would introduce a Bill of this nature, which embraces a completely new form of taxation for South Australia. When the Labor Party went into office in 1965 it was told it had no right to introduce any Bill such as this one because it did not have a mandate from the people. However, I shall quote what you, Sir, as Leader of the Opposition said at page 2951 of 1965 *Hansard*, as follows:

The origin of this Bill comes from a slight hint—

There was not even a slight hint in connection with this stamp duty Bill—

that was included in the policy speech of the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Walsh, when he stated:

There are certain loopholes in the existing legislation where the legal avoidance of stamp duties is possible, such as conveyances on properties. The legislation will be amended in keeping with our policy to overcome this problem.

That was in the Labor Party's policy speech, and it was elaborated upon after the then Leader of the Opposition went off the air, but no further reference was made to any suggested amendment to the Stamp Duties Act or any increase in taxation in that regard. Now we find this Bill introduced in this Chamber and it is nothing other than a taxation measure that has been made a little bit more palatable in the early clauses of the Bill.

If I searched *Hansard* I could find many similar references where it was stated that the Labor Party did not have a mandate to introduce an amendment to the Stamp Duties Act.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Did the Government take any notice of those sorts of speeches?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No.

The Hon. C. R. Story: That is right.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I just wanted to remind the honourable member.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I want to get the precedent right.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It is not precedent. You had better not start this argument. You might not win it because I have the floor. Sir Lyell McEwin, as Leader of the Opposition, said that a slight hint was given in the then Leader's policy speech. However, no hint was given regarding any amendment to the Stamp Duties Act similar to the one before us now. Is that correct? Members opposite need not answer.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: We said we wanted to have a look at the books before we tackled the question of taxation, and we got quite a fright when we saw those books.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: There was no hint or even a word that the Government would introduce a Bill like this. Nor did it indicate to the people of the State that it would increase taxation.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: We said we would try to clean up the mess that you got us into.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: This Government is in a bigger mess than we were, on your own admission and after the introduction of your own Budget. The Government has increased the taxation of this State by about \$8,000,000 for a full year. Indeed (although I am speaking only from memory) the Government hopes to raise \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 this year, but it will have a deficit of at least \$4,000,000 this year, so do not talk to us about being in a mess. Of course, the honourable member has not had the experience of being a member of Cabinet. It is quite easy to sit here and smile and say that Governments and Cabinet should anticipate everything, including increases in expenditure. However, that cannot be done.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member must address the Chair.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am telling the honourable member for his own benefit that he cannot do those things.

The PRESIDENT: You cannot address the honourable member. You must do it through the Chair.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: We were told on numerous occasions that we should have budgeted within our means and that we should not have exceeded what we had in the Treasury to spend. However, with great respect, at least two or three members of Cabinet in this Council (it is definitely two, and could be three) were loud in their advice to us, but when they entered Cabinet themselves they

did not practise what they preached. I do not know, and I am afraid they may not know either, just how much they will be down at the end of this financial year.

The proposed stamp duties go further than any amendments proposed by the Labor Government during its term of office. The effect on the community and on the State generally, if not disastrous, will be very damaging. It will have a dampening effect on the State's business; it will impose additional costs on business; and, what is more, it will hit every household budget in this State. While it is simple to say that it costs only 1c in every \$10, I understand that that is not correct, and that it could cost as much as 5c in \$10. If a person goes to a shop on five different occasions and buys articles each worth \$2, for which a receipt is given, he could pay 1c each time so that he would eventually pay 5c.

The Hon. C. R. Story: And if he went 10 times, it would cost 10c.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That is right, and that is how crook it is.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Many people, through their own circumstances, must do this.

The Hon. C. R. Story: They get paid once a fortnight or once a week, so I don't see how it is any different if they go there four times instead of once.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Many of these people, by force of their own circumstances, have to visit their butcher or grocer frequently.

The Hon. C. R. Story: If they went four times they would have spent \$8. That would be a fair bit of meat, wouldn't it?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, but I am quoting what could happen.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Pigs might fly, too, but it isn't likely.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: This will happen in this city and in our country towns. We were told that the work involved in giving receipts was unproductive work that would do no good, and that this was a bad Bill because any Bill brought in that was not productive was not a good Bill. On that point, I refer to page 3342 of *Hansard* on September 1, 1965, when the present Chief Secretary said (and one or two parts of this are gems):

I am not over-interested whether or not the costs are passed on. That does not concern me at all, but I am concerned about what the Minister said, that it will increase employment. It reminds me of the old story of everyone taking in everyone else's washing: it may maintain employment but no-one gets very fat doing it.

A little later (on page 3343) the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said:

The whole point is that we shall raise the cost to commerce in this State and it matters not whether the costs are passed on or whether the price is reduced when this is taken off: we are going to engage a number of people on a completely non-productive form of employment. The Hon. Mr. Potter called it "in sterile employment". Our standard of living depends upon the productivity of this State, how much each man can produce. If we are to have legislation that adds nothing to our productive capacity, I for one cannot see what benefits this legislation will confer. This whole matter of issuing compulsory receipts is Socialist stupidity.

The Hon. Mr. Dawkins interjected:

That is quite right.

The Hon. Mr. DeGaris replied:

I cannot think of better words to describe it.

The Hon. Mr. Bevan interjected:

I can, but I cannot express them to you.

I will leave that to honourable members' imaginations.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: The Hon. Mr. Bevan said something else, too.

The Hon. C. R. Story: He said something about an industry to create employment.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That is taken completely out of context. If the form of stamp duty we tried to introduce was socialistic, what is the present form of stamp duty? It cannot be any different, and it has been introduced by a Liberal Government. If the type of legislation we suggested was non-productive, what production will this Bill produce? It will not produce anything other than a return to the Treasury of about \$1,600,000 for the balance of this year, and it will have a dampening effect on the community at large. In a full year it will raise \$4,800,000. If that does not have a dampening effect on the State and if that does not increase the costs of commerce and industry and the living costs of South Australians, I do not know what will.

The estimates of the amount that this stamp duty will raise have been on the basis of 1c in \$10, but did the Treasurer allow for parts of \$10? If he has not allowed for them, what will this stamp duty raise in a full year? I do not think anyone can correctly estimate this amount now. I am not criticizing the Treasurer's figures, because I know that these estimates are difficult to make. However, I will watch with interest how much is raised by this measure this year and in a full year. Another ground on which I oppose the legislation is that it is inequitable. It will be based

on what each person buys, irrespective of his ability to pay. This is neither fair nor reasonable.

In my speech on the Appropriation Bill (No. 2) I said that the Government said that if the Budget could not be balanced, supplementary legislation would be brought down to make it balance. The Treasurer said that, unlike the situation in Victoria, this tax did not apply to wages and salaries. Now that the Government is faced with an increase in the basic wage that it could not foresee and now that it is about \$4,000,000 in the red, I wonder whether supplementary legislation will be introduced that will impose this duty on wages and salaries or whether the rate of 1c in \$10 will become 2c or 3c in \$10. We all know that, once a taxation measure has been inflicted on the community, the tax rarely remains at its original level. Having seen the commencement of this form of taxation in the State, I am fearful of what may happen in the future. This tax has already affected the costs of business and industry in this State. Because business houses anticipated paying this stamp duty, they have already got in first by announcing that the usual cash discount on monthly accounts will be discontinued from next February. This date ties in with the effective date when business houses will commence payment of this stamp duty.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That is 25c in \$10, in addition to this measure.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. For the Government or for anyone else to say that a measure that will raise \$4,800,000 in a full year will not flow on to the community in the form of added costs is just too foolish for words—and this has been said. Increased costs will certainly result from this measure. Instead of the Government's honouring its election promise that it would stimulate business and industry, it is achieving the reverse effect through this measure.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield. That was predicted by the Opposition when we were in Government.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It was.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Business is beginning to pick up now. Did you see the announcement about the factory at Elizabeth?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have never queried that, but we have heard other announcements about industries: some have started but, unfortunately, have not flourished. I shall be interested to see what happens to this industry.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Some industries have gone out.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: They have.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: They started to go out in your time.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The Minister should not get too excited about that. I would not wish on the present Government the drought we had last year. If the Minister is fair and reasonable he will admit that last year was the worst period in this State in the past decade. Irrespective of Government, things would have gone back, but our friends opposite are not big enough to say that; they are not straight-forward enough to say it.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: You cannot blame it all on the drought.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Most of it can be blamed on the drought. I have heard the Hon. Mr. Kemp blame some of the problems of the industry with which he is associated on the drought and I have sat back with a tender heart and listened. I have the greatest sympathy for people trying to get a living off the land when there is not sufficient rain. At least I try to be fair and reasonable, and I wish the majority of members in this Council were as fair as I am. According to what we have been told, everything that went wrong in the period between 1965 and 1968 was the fault of the Labor Government. Further, the impression some honourable members have tried to create is that the beneficial rains of this year resulted from the change in Government. Nothing is further from the truth, and all members know it.

I do not like this Bill, and I think we will all live to regret it. If my memory is correct, I read that the Treasurer said that he did not like the Bill but that he could not think of any other way to raise the money.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They even called for suggestions from the public.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: This Bill was introduced at the behest of the Liberal Commonwealth Government and it will not finish at this. We will want more money in 1969-70, as costs must increase, and there is no more money to be had. However, I do not believe more finance will be available in that year from the Commonwealth Government because we know its form, and such aid could not possibly come before 1970-71. I can almost hear the Commonwealth Government saying, "Go back. You got away with 1c in \$10; now

make it 2c, or even 3c, in \$10 and get it from there; get it from your own people if they demand certain things." I do not like any aspect of the Bill; I am opposed to it in every way, and I will vote against it.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP secured the adjournment of the debate.

RAILWAYS STANDARDIZATION AGREEMENT (COCKBURN TO BROKEN HILL) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 5. Page 2171.)

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): On Monday of this week a full page advertisement appeared in the *Advertiser* inserted by the Commonwealth Railways of Australia depicting the route of the standardized railway line from Sydney to Perth. Linked to that railway line on the map in the advertisement were lines drawn from Brisbane to Sydney and from Melbourne to Sydney, but there was no line connecting Adelaide with Port Pirie or with the line running from coast to coast. It is a bad day for South Australia if money is spent on advertisements showing how far we have got with the railway system of one gauge from east to west which will be of enormous benefit to both primary and secondary industries of Australia if Adelaide is not connected to it.

The advertisement suggests that the 1,500-mile journey from coast to coast on standard gauge will operate from early in 1969. This has for many years been a dream of many Australians who have hoped for one rail link between all States of the Commonwealth, and particularly from east to west. As the Hon. Mr. Kneebone said yesterday, it was because of problems of transportation that arose during the Second World War that Australia realized the need to stop talking and dreaming and take practical action to improve our railway system. I agree with the sentiments expressed by the honourable member, and as a member of the Australian Imperial Forces I well remember the frustrations of travelling by rail from Perth to Brisbane, which took nearly three weeks to complete.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Did you march?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Sometimes we did, but at other times the train travelled more quickly than we could walk. An efficient railway transport system is needed not only for defence but for improving conditions in primary and secondary industry. I have no doubt that when this system is completed we will be able to present an efficient service to

all types of industry. The advertisement did not show a railway line linking Adelaide to Port Pirie, yet every other mainland capital city is shown as being connected to the line running from east to west.

In today's *Advertiser* appeared a report stating that the Commonwealth Government had agreed to provide a team of consultants to look into the State Government's submissions for a standard gauge railway line linking Adelaide and the northern towns on the trans-continental line between Perth and Sydney. That is the report of a statement made in the House of Assembly yesterday by the Premier. It was reported that Mr. Hall said that in its reply to the State's submissions the Commonwealth had said that it was not agreeing to requests made by this State but merely agreeing to look at the proposals through independent consultants.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It will take another 50 years to get around to it!

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Since 1949, when this State first agreed to the Railway Standardization (South Australia) Agreement Act, there have been plans and discussions as to how the Broken Hill to Port Pirie railway line could be standardized and Adelaide linked with this system at Port Pirie. That was 19 years ago; 19 years of thinking, talking, and planning. What have we today? Merely a magnificent offer that the Commonwealth is not agreeing to the State's request but is merely agreeing to look at our proposals and send consultants to do this. The condescending Commonwealth Government has agreed to send planners to look at our proposals, not to agree with them, and then send them back with amendments! After that, our Government will look at the amendments and put forward further suggestions. In the meantime, in order to compete and maintain employment under whatever Government is in power (and I am not throwing mud at any Government) industry must export. If it wants to export by rail, and if it is an economic system of exporting, then the only way it can do so at present is via Melbourne, with a break of gauge to Sydney, or via Port Pirie with a break of gauge at the new line. Surely industry is having enough trouble with spiralling costs at present. It must sell its surplus products, and it must sell them in the other States.

Two of the contributing factors in the cost spirals are wage increases and freight increases. Are we going to allow the industry of South Australia to stagnate because of this Gilbert and Sullivan type of thinking?

After 19 years we get the condescension from the Commonwealth Government that "We will look at your plans but we are not forced to agree to anything at this point of time."

The case put forward by Silverton Transport and General Industries Limited over the way the Commonwealth considered that company's requests for fair and reasonable compensation for its assets involved in this standardization deal does not make pleasant reading. Quite obviously, the various Governments have looked on the assets of that company as a mere small impediment as they have planned, like massive bulldozers, for the overall standardization scheme. Obviously, this company's requests have been ignored.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I agree with some of your earlier remarks, but I think you might be a bit hard on the Commonwealth in this matter.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The Minister agrees that there has been neglect in relation to a private industry, which should have had just compensation and consideration of its requests. I venture to say that South Australia has been ignored in a way similar to that in which the Silverton Tramway Company has been ignored. Of course, both the State and that company are small compared with the massiveness of the whole of this Commonwealth railways project going right across Australia, from the vast population of Sydney at one end to the industrial potential of Western Australia at the other end. Therefore, I suggest that this State and this Parliament will be putting its head in the sand by agreeing to this Bill without first having some firm agreement with the Commonwealth as to priority of construction and as to what will happen with the Adelaide to Port Pirie standardization and the standardization of the narrow gauge railway system in the Peterborough Division.

During the 3½ years I have been in this Council I have asked many questions on these very points, and I have always been assured that one scheme will go with the other, if not with the same priority then certainly that the planning for both schemes will be done concurrently. But how are we ever to get this proposition off the ground, and how are we ever going to get the spikes in on the rails?

The Hon. C. R. Story: To get it on the rails, as it were.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I think it would be a wonderful thing to get it on the rails, but the problem is that it is quite off the rails. What guarantee has this State that

once the railway system from east to west is finished the Commonwealth will honour its commitments within the State? What bargaining point have we got?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: The Commonwealth has not committed itself within the State, other than in respect of the transcontinental line.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Would the honourable member not think that it would be a good idea for the Commonwealth to commit itself on behalf of the State?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Yes. You said it had to honour its commitments, but I am pointing out that it has not made any, and that is where we fall down. We cannot get the Commonwealth to make those commitments.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: That is why I suggest that this House should not pass this Bill, and perhaps we will then get the commitments. When the Broken Hill to Cockburn section is finished, are we then to be left high and dry? The Commonwealth wants to run its railway from one part of Australia to another, and the Commonwealth Railways Department is prepared to put full-page advertisements in the newspapers in 1968 predicting what will happen at some point in 1969. It proudly says it expects to provide 1,500 miles of air-conditioned comfort. If the Commonwealth wants this, then somehow this State must do something to convince the Commonwealth that we want something of the tag end of it, too.

This whole project is essential to South Australia's prosperity and continued growth rate. Anything that rates transportation at economic costs must be able to move on one railway system. I know that there is now a fairly efficient bogie exchange operating in Melbourne and Port Pirie, and I know that this has much merit; but are there many members here who would like to drive from Adelaide to Port Pirie in their motor car and then have somebody take the wheels off and put on another set of wheels to enable them to go to Port Augusta? That is what railway exchange does, and it does not give efficiency.

This State has a wonderful record in the way it has tried to get some sensibility into the standardization of the railway system of Australia and of its own internal railway system. It has been presenting logical arguments since 1946, and it once went to the High Court to try to get some movement out of the reluctant dragon of Canberra. Here, 19

years later, what have we got? A Bill still to be progressive and constructive, to give the necessary authority to build a line from Broken Hill to Cockburn so that the necessary linkages can then be made. But what do we get for the State? Absolutely nothing.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE (Southern): In supporting this Bill, I congratulate the Hon. Mr. Kneebone on his very fine historical summary of the general situation. Undoubtedly, he gained considerable knowledge of this matter when he was Minister in charge of railways during the term of office of the Labor Government. It is interesting to note that the Bill is still before the South Australian Parliament. I can only hope that the work is proceeding in the way we have been told it is, and particularly that all the planning has been done and that this is merely a confirmation of the necessary financial provisions.

When I was speaking on the Estimates I said that we had to consider our priorities very seriously indeed in the light of the State's present financial position, and I mentioned the further standardization of our railway system. I went on to say that this was a time when we should endeavour to use what strength we had with the Commonwealth Government. Of course, that strength lies in the Senate representation, which is on an equal basis. I went further and suggested to our friends in the Labor Party in this Council that they should obtain the fullest possible support from their South Australian Senators in this matter, rather than tending to impede the State Minister of Roads and Transport regarding some of the quite minor matters coming up for consideration.

As I see it, this link-up from Port Pirie to Adelaide is the No. 1 priority for this State. We talk about boosting our business, particularly our motor car business both locally and in the export field as containerization is being rapidly developed as the new form of transport by ship. It may well be that our motor vehicles will have to be transhipped from Sydney or Melbourne to New Zealand (more probably from Sydney) and from Perth to the north and the east. Many people tend to think that it will be enough when we have installed a standard gauge line from Adelaide to Port Pirie, that we can then call a halt; but that is not enough. What we need is an integrated system of which this is only the first part.

It is interesting to note that the Minister has said that we are appointing (I have forgotten his exact words) consultants. I noticed

that the Hon. Mr. Geddes was not very happy about that, but I remind him that that was not quite correct, because the State Government had prepared plans for this No. 1 Port Pirie priority; it produced one or two alternative suggestions to those of the Commonwealth Railways authorities and discussed these alternatives with them. I agree entirely that the matter of consultants for the other schemes should be pressed on with, but I can now join with the Hon. Mr. Geddes in saying it is just as well to get on with appointing consultants because, if we do not, it will be a long time before we see them in the future.

I am aware, as is the Minister, that there is under consideration another project, over which we have virtually no control. Although it may be of value to the State, as all modern development naturally is, and I gather it will be paid for jointly with private enterprise and Commonwealth money (I am speaking of the Port Augusta to Whyalla line), it is important that we do not, through the Senate or through our State Parliament, support any suggestion that that line be constructed before the Pirie to Adelaide line is constructed, linking Adelaide

with the Sydney to Perth line. That would be almost a negation of the Commonwealth's attitude in supporting our standardization plans here. After all, it is only an extension of the Commonwealth Railways that is visualized in this line from Port Pirie to Port Augusta. As far as I know (and the Minister can tell me if I am wrong) it has not come under State control at all.

Having said that, the only thing I can try to impress upon honourable members is that, not only as a State Parliament and Government but also through our Senators, following the completion of the Broken Hill line after this Bill becomes law, we must insist on what are virtually our rights, and certainly are our moral rights, that the line to Adelaide should be a No. 1 priority. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. L. R. HART secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.36 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, November 7, at 2.15 p.m.