

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, August 3, 1976

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

PETITION: SEXUAL OFFENCES

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS presented a petition signed by 210 electors of South Australia stating that the crime of incest and the crime of unlawful carnal knowledge of young girls are detrimental to society and praying that the Legislative Council would reject or amend any legislation to abolish the crime of incest or to lower the age of consent in respect of sexual offences.

Petition received and read.

QUESTIONS

SUCCESSION DUTIES

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Treasurer.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have a letter concerning an accountancy congress held at Tanunda recently. The letter refers to the case of an orchardist who died. His widow undertook to carry on the business of primary production on their small property in the Adelaide Hills. The widow was 65 years of age and, after six months to eight months of physically working on the property with the help of neighbours, etc., she decided that it was too much for her to carry on at that advanced age. First, she sought permanent labour without success, and she then sought a share-farming operation, but was unable to obtain a suitable share farmer. She then, as a last resort, decided to let the property to another farmer. At that stage, 12 months had passed since the death of her husband. Having reached a near final stage of probate and succession duties formalities, she was advised that, owing to her action in letting the property, the rural rebate would not be applicable in her case. This case is only one of two or three instances brought to my notice of this kind of thing happening. I therefore ask the Chief Secretary to draw this matter to the attention of the Treasurer and see whether the legislation should be amended so that people are not caught in this way with the loss of the rural rebate, or whether the department can, in assessing these cases, be a little more lenient.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

CUMMINS TO TUMBY BAY ROAD

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question refers to the main road between Cummins and Tumby Bay on Eyre Peninsula. I think the Minister in another place will recall that this road was built up to a considerable degree some years ago, apparently in preparation for bitumen. However,

work on that road has ceased now for about five or six years. It is always regrettable that, when a road has had much money spent on it, its sealing is not completed. As much money has been spent on this road, and as many constituents must still put up with the open surface, will the Minister ascertain from his colleague when the Highways Department is likely to complete its construction and seal it?

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

TOURISM

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a short statement before directing a question to the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Recent press advertisements called for applications for the position of Research and Development Manager and Marketing Manager in the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department. The Research and Development Manager's role involved work on statistical and policy research, while the Marketing Manager was to be responsible to the Director of Tourism for promoting tourism in South Australia. As applications closed on June 23 last, can the Minister say whether the applicants who applied were satisfactory and whether these positions have been filled?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The only indication I can give the honourable member at this stage is that the appointees have not yet been decided. As I am conscious of the fact that these two positions are of major importance to the development of the South Australian tourist industry, I hope that some finality can be reached soon.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a short statement before directing a question to the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: In the journal *Trade Magazine*, I notice that the Minister has claimed that the South Australian Tourist Bureau is living 20 years in the past; he has called for reports and hopes to upgrade the department, which is under his control. Many people have considered the Tourist Bureau in its present form to be extremely efficient and well conducted for the purpose of promoting tourism in the State. I point out to the Minister that the Premier himself is very proud of South Australia, and, one presumes, of the Tourist Bureau, which has been operating under the Government for some years. Was the Minister speaking literally or metaphorically when he stated that the Tourist Bureau was 20 years behind the times?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The article referred to by the honourable member appeared in the publication some months ago.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: June 14, 1976.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Almost two months ago. I do not apologise for the fact that I am not responsible for what gets written up not only in the local press but also in magazines of this nature. I was approached by the woman who wrote that article, and I indicated to her that there were certain areas in the Tourist Bureau that should be upgraded, and should have been upgraded many years ago. I make no reflections whatsoever on any of the bureau's staff: they are all competent people. However, the fact remains that they have over the years had to work under extreme difficulties, particularly in Victoria, for

instance, whose bureau office is of nowhere near the same standard as that of bureaux in other capital cities. The Victorian office had no amenities and, indeed, was so small that one could hardly swing a cat in it. However, the office has been upgraded, and I hope that early next year, or perhaps even earlier, a new office will be opened in Elizabeth Street, Melbourne, that will enhance the prospects of attracting tourists from Victoria to South Australia. As was indicated in the reply to the honourable member's previous question, when these new officers are appointed they will do an immense amount of good in promoting South Australian tourism in other States. Newspaper headlines often highlight the fact that some journalists are trying to hop on the bandwagon.

STEEL

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to directing a question to the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The Industries Assistance Commission is presently conducting research into the steel industry, various States having made recommendations to the commission. As I understand that South Australia is to make such a submission, can the Minister say what the South Australian Government's attitude is to lifting or reducing tariffs on imported steel? I understand that some of the other States have already declared their attitudes concerning tariffs on imported steel, and I should like to ascertain the South Australian Government's attitude to this matter.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: As this is a matter of Government policy, I will seek a reply for the honourable member.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief statement before addressing a question to the Minister of Health, representing the Premier.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: Mr. Graham Inns, Chairman, Public Service Board, stated last September that the Government and the board would continue to merge or eliminate Government departments in South Australia in order to improve the efficiency of the public sector. He added that the Public Service Board was not in business just to soak up unemployment, and he expressed the hope that the existing 42 departments could be reduced to 30 before the end of 1976. The Minister, in bringing down an earlier reply on this matter, stated that further amalgamations and regrouping of departments would occur on a continuous basis. Will he now say, first, how many and which departments have been merged or eliminated since Mr. Inns made his predictions in September last year? Secondly, do the Government and the Public Service Board expect to achieve their worthy objective of reducing the number of departments to 30 by the end of 1976?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Several departments have already been merged, but I do not know the total number involved. We expect to achieve the stated objective by the date specified, having already achieved it in certain areas, but I will ascertain the total number for the honourable member.

BREAD

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to directing a question to the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Labour and Industry.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Last week there was an announcement about the bread industry that seemed to be quite definite. However, I understand that about an hour later some doubts about the announcement were already arising, and I understand today there has been a complete reversal of the announcement. Has the Chief Secretary any information from the Minister he represents in this Council regarding the situation in the bread industry? Also, does the rather unusual method used to announce the reversal of the decision mean that in future the public will be listening to announcements by Ministers and by Cabinet, not knowing whether an hour, a day, or a week later that same position will hold? Will the Minister ensure that in future, whenever announcements are made by Ministers or by Cabinet, they are carefully thought out and will not tend to confuse the public?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Government's record in this respect is very good: the public is not at all confused by 99.99 per cent of the Government's decisions or announcements.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I understand that, as a result of the announcement made last week about the industry, bread manufacturers approached the Government, and I believe some of the unions also approached the Government, with the result that the Government had another look at this matter. As a matter of fact, at present the Minister in another place is possibly making a Ministerial statement. As I do not have a copy of that statement—

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: It is very bad organisation.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: —I direct the honourable member's attention to *Hansard* tomorrow morning; and, no doubt, a statement will appear in the press this afternoon.

STANDING ORDERS

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: May I direct a question to you, Mr. President? On one occasion, when we had a visiting delegation here (the current one has not arrived in the Chamber yet), you saw fit to enter the Chamber and give notice of an alteration to certain Standing Orders. I trust you will acquaint the Council with the Standing Order on which you intend to accept advice when the French delegation enters the Chamber. I hope it will be Standing Order No. 1.

DROUGHT

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Recently, the *Advertiser* published a map outlining the drought-affected areas in this State and, presumably for convenience, the areas outlined thereon followed the boundaries of the hundreds. As nature is not always so kind as to affect areas within hundred boundaries, and as the drought-affected regions obviously must extend in some cases beyond those arbitrary lines, will

the Minister say whether consideration will be given to those affected areas outside the lines delineated on the map?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Yes. It is difficult under the present legislation to define exactly what areas are affected by drought in South Australia. As areas generally cannot be declared, it is done by hundreds. I assure the honourable member that Cabinet has examined my recent submission and that full consideration will be given to all areas outside the hundreds which have been affected and which, unfortunately, have not been included on the map. These will be considered and treated in exactly the same way as will the areas outlined by the hundreds on the map.

CEREAL CROPS

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Lands, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The Minister will be aware that in many of the cereal-growing districts of the State grain has not been sown at all because it has been too dry, whereas in other areas crops have been planted. The likelihood of those crops reaching any degree of fruition is receding with each dry week that passes. Concern is now being expressed in these areas that the whole of the grain that would be suitable for use as seed wheat has been removed from local silos. Should such a catastrophe eventuate, seed wheat for next year's sowing will have to be purchased. Will the Minister of Lands confer with his colleague in order to study the situation closely and to ensure that sufficient seed wheat is left in South Australian silos to enable replanting to be done, should that necessity arise?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will comply with the honourable member's wishes.

DENTAL TECHNICIANS

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I am sure that the Minister, in common with all honourable members, has recently received a letter, dated July 4, from the Australasian Dental Technicians Society. The letter states:

We have desperately been trying for several years to achieve our goal to obtain registration of dental technicians, and so be able to deal directly with the public, as our counterparts in other States.

This letter was followed later in July by a letter from the Australian Dental Association, giving the other side of the question. This question has also been the subject of two petitions presented in the House of Assembly. Consequently, I am sure that the Minister has considered the matter. Can he say whether the Government intends to introduce legislation to provide for registration of dental technicians?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: True, we have had representations from the dental technicians, seeking registration and seeking permission for them to deal directly with the public. This is a serious question. As well as considering the question of benefits that may accrue to the public by allowing the technicians to deal directly with the

public, the Government has received certain reports and has inquired from various people outside the Australian Dental Association and the Australasian Dental Technicians Society. No decision has yet been made, but we are considering the dental technicians' request.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What is the opinion of the Australian Dental Association?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It has sent a circular letter to all honourable members. I understand that at this stage the association is against the technicians dealing directly with the public but that the association favours the registration of dental technicians.

WATER RESOURCES

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In addressing my question to the Minister of Lands, I have no doubt that, if necessary, he will refer it to another Minister. First, was it the Government's intention, in introducing the water resources legislation, to affect the ownership of the drainage system in the Millicent District Council area? Secondly, does the Government intend proclaiming the surface waters in the Millicent District Council area under Part III of the Water Resources Act, 1976?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the Leader's question to the Minister of Works and bring down a reply.

PRAWN FISHING

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: First, can the Minister acting for the Minister of Agriculture say whether any prawn licences or Ministerial permits have been issued recently to take prawns in the St. Vincent Gulf zone and, if they have been issued, to whom they were issued? Secondly, have any prawn licences or Ministerial permits been issued recently to take prawns in waters south of Kangaroo Island, and, if they have been issued, to whom they were issued?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the questions to my colleague and see that the Leader gets a reply.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from July 29. Page 300.)

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: At the conclusion of my remarks last Thursday I indicated that I intended to deal with the state of the Opposition. I wish to refer to the somewhat surreptitious and shame-faced announcement that the Hon. Mr. Cameron made in this Council on June 8 (an announcement that he would prefer to forget about) that he was no longer the Leader of the Liberal Movement in this place but a back-bencher under the leadership of the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. It must have given the Hon. Mr. Cameron a great sense of *deja vu* to return to this Council and find, after having left the Liberal Party on April 20, 1972, that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris was still the Leader. It must have been galling for him to have to capitulate to the very person he sought to destroy.

The story is one of intrigue, deceit and double dealing. It would be comical if it were not so serious in its implications for the people of this State. The simple truth is that the Opposition's unity is a complete sham, and the

public should know that the Opposition is a medley of misfits. The history of this matter goes back to the early days of 1972. It arose from attempts by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and his supporters in this place to impose their will on the House of Assembly, and to oust the then Leader of the Opposition, Steele Hall; in other words, a take-over by Liberal members of this Council of their compatriots in the Lower House. As a result of this move by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, the then Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly, Steele Hall, resigned on March 15, 1972. Shortly afterwards, he wrote to the *Australian* as follows:

I was knifed. The events leading up to my resignation are a clear example of how deeply the "wooden horses" of the Legislative Council have entrenched themselves in the ranks of the Assembly membership . . . I am sure it will not be any easier for the new Party leader, Dr. Eastick, coming into office in this fashion but I can assure him, however, I do not intend to knife him in the back as I have been knifed . . . The Council attack was made all the more successful by the "wooden horses" within the Assembly Party. They carried the elected Cabinet issue for a variety of reasons—ambition, envy, and conservatism, to name a few . . . Quite apart from my resignation what has taken place will establish the supremacy of the Legislative Council over the Assembly. It is now likely that only a protege of the Council will be tolerated in the leadership of the Party.

In response, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, in an exclusive interview to Mr. Mark Day of the *Sunday Mail*, commenced with a somewhat patronising statement, as follows:

He's such an impulsive fellow. I wish he hadn't done it. I honestly didn't know anything about it until 2.15. Don Banfield told me . . .

The following question and reply then appear:

Steele talks of having to watch his back constantly. Were you out to get him?

No, not at all. There has been so much talk about this. But I have not entered into it at all. They said I was running a candidate against the new fellow (Martin Cameron) in Southern. Steele was openly supporting him and you should have heard some of the things they were saying about me down there. They're still saying them. Stories are being spread.

The report continues:

I do not believe that Party politics should intrude into the Council. I believe a Councillor should be independent. I don't see the Council as 16 L.C.L. members and four A.L.P. I see it as four A.L.P. and 16 independents—well, perhaps there are one or two there that want to get involved in Party matters and liaise with the Assembly but we don't like them.

You mean Martin Cameron?

Well, he's one that comes to mind. But, you see, I have learned.

The views of the Hon. Mr. DeGaris on democracy are set out in the question and the answer in the report as follows:

How can you advocate putting so much power into the hands of people who have no responsibility to the voters? You just can't do that in a democracy!

Democracy! Pah!

A further question asked of the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and the reply are as follows:

So what's the future now for Steele?

I don't know. I really don't know. I don't think the Party will forgive him for talking about what went on in the Party room. Some of the things he said today were straight out of a Party meeting. Now, that's just not done.

The following report appeared in the *News* of March 26:

Opposition Leader, Dr. Eastick, today accused Mr. Steele Hall of acting without dignity and decorum in the present Liberal Party upheaval in South Australia . . .

The report continued:

In his strongest statement so far on a likely establishment of a new Party, Mr. Hall said today: "Assessments I have

made and my colleagues have made show it is impossible to reform the L.C.L. from within, in a reasonable period of time".

Under the banner headline "I've never involved myself in Party politics and I won't let politics be discussed in the Party room", we have another aspect of Mr. DeGaris's philosophy expressed, but that, Mr. President, is not borne out by the facts. As you know, Sir, in your contribution to this idealistic foray *The Liberal Movement Story* you said you disagreed with the Leader of the Opposition, and stated on page 59:

The mistrust of Mr. Hall and Mr. Millhouse by many Council members deepened. Councillors began to talk consistently of the need to have a Parliamentary Constitution to exert some internal discipline on members and to control the leadership.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat for a moment. I notice in the gallery the French Senate Delegation led by Senator Leon Jozeau-Marigne and comprising Senator Jean Bac, Senator Jacques Eberhard, Senator Paul Pillet and Monsieur Alain Delcamp. I extend to them a very cordial welcome to the Legislative Council of South Australia and wish them a pleasant and interesting sojourn in this State. I ask the Leader of the Government, the Hon. D. H. L. Banfield, and the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. R. C. DeGaris, to escort the members of the delegation to seats on the floor of the Council to the right of the Chair. The Hon. Mr. Sumner.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I now refer to the comments of the Hon. Martin Cameron on what the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said about not allowing Party politics to enter into his deliberations. In a report in the *Advertiser* of October 6, 1972, the Hon. Mr. Cameron stated:

I am also sick and tired of M.L.C.'s saying the Legislative Council is an independent House of Review when they well know that every move they make is designed to extend their influence and make them the dominant section of the Parliamentary Party.

The story continues and hots up as the years go by, and I now refer to comments that Opposition members have thrown at each other during this period. On March 28, 1972, Mr. McAnaney, Chairman, Parliamentary Assembly Party, and supported by Mrs. Steele and Messrs. Brookman, Rodda, and Goldsworthy (the latter two still being members of another place), made a statement on this matter and the report on it is as follows:

It says it is a pity the personal image achieved by Mr. Hall through personal promotion given by his own Party in a bid to boost his electoral popularity is being turned against those who had so loyally supported him. "Because of the statements he has made it is impossible for Mr. Hall to return as Leader of the L.C.P.," the statement adds.

On April 21, statements by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris are reported as follows:

"I'm hot under the collar about many of the platforms put forward by Mr. Hall," the Legislative Council Opposition Leader, Mr. DeGaris, said today . . . Mr. DeGaris claimed the majority of the L.M. platform was L.C.L. policy and had been examined in depth by members of the Party over recent years. "It makes my blood boil to see Mr. Hall claiming credit for this when members of the Party have worked, without fuss, behind the scenes to formulate plans and policy on these very topics," he said. "In the past Mr. Hall has continually refused to undertake research on policy matters. He has also refused to accept advice from people who have carried out research and know what they are talking about."

Again, on April 29, 1972, the *Advertiser* published the following report:

The Liberal Movement was "a sham based on the idea that its members are more progressive than their L.C.L. colleagues," Mr. Brookman (L.C.P., Alexandra) said in Kingscote last night.

How prophetic that statement turned out to be. A report in the *Islander* on April 26, 1972, states:

Messrs. David Brookman, Ren, DeGaris, and Allan Rodda vigorously defend their actions in the recent L.C.L. blow-up which led to the resignation of the Leader, Mr. Steele Hall . . . They said that Mr. Hall refused to accept the majority decision and "held a gun at our head" with his threat to resign.

Mr. Hall responded, the report on July 19, 1972, stating:

Working people cannot identify with the leadership of the league, composed of persons said to represent wealth and privilege. We lose votes and Government because of this. Mr. Hall said L.C.L. members have long been told what a great Party it is, when in actual fact it has been declining rapidly, having little attraction for the vast middle-of-the-road, white-collar workers.

The bitterness that grew up in those years is indicated in several articles. On August 3, 1972, the following report was published:

South Australian Liberal Senator Jessop described Mr. Hall as a "disaster" for both the L.C.L. and the L.M.

In the *Advertiser* on September 9, 1972, under the banner "Hall wants Party ballots run by electoral office", appeared the report of another statement by Mr. Hall. We have heard honourable members opposite continually refer to the necessity for secret ballots for union elections. What have they done themselves? Mr. Hall indicated that the Liberal Party had rigged its ballots, and the report of his statement is as follows:

The Parliamentary Leader of the Liberal Movement, Mr. Hall, said yesterday the State Electoral Office should conduct L.C.L. Party ballots. He said this after failing in an attempt to check the L.C.L. presidential ballot papers.

Although Mr. Hall is again a member of that Party, clearly he must have little faith in the electoral and democratic systems operating in it if he has to call for State Electoral Office participation in Liberal Party elections. A small exchange on August 3, 1972, in another place indicates the nature of the divisions and the bitterness. The *Hansard* report states:

Mr. McANANEY: I have been here all the afternoon, and he hasn't.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Gouger has the call.

Mr. VENNING: Why not sit on the other side of the Chamber?

Mr. HALL: Because then I would be looking at you.

We have heard, completely erroneously, much about what honourable members opposite consider to be the unions' tactic of standing over of their members. It is interesting to see what the Liberal Party has to say about those members of the Liberal Movement who are now part of their establishment again. On June 14, 1972, the following report appeared:

Some Liberal and Country League members of Parliament had been pressured by the Liberal Movement to take action foreign to their normal activity, it was claimed last night, Dr. Eastick said . . . He said one member had been warned he would be named publicly unless he paid his Liberal Movement membership subscription . . . Dr. Eastick said the L.C.L. must show unity in the manner in which it presented its policies to the public, not by any Tammany Hall effects.

Of course, you, Mr. President, will recall that, during that period of Party dominance by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and the conservative members of the Council, you languished on the back bench. When you had the temerity to break with the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and join the Liberal Movement on November 11, you were opposed and removed as Party Secretary and as a delegate for the Constitution Convention, as a result of the manoeuvrings of the Leader of the Opposition.

On September 20, 1972, it was recorded in the *News* that the Legislative Council had the image of a House of geriatrics. This was a quote from Mr. Ross Bain, the Liberal Movement candidate for Southern in the Legislative Council. The Opposition has not changed a great deal since then.

The Parliamentary Leader of the Liberal Movement, Mr. Hall, on October 5, 1972, described a combined Parliamentary Party meeting at Parliament House on the previous day as "a secret society". "It has no official standing in the Party," he said. On September 21, Mr. Hall was referred to as "mistletoe Hall"—an innocent appellation except that mistletoe, as everyone knows, is a parasite. Mr. Claude Allen said:

Mistletoe is a growth which derives its nourishment from the parent tree until eventually both the parent tree and mistletoe die. It is very similar to the Liberal Movement—it should be known as the Mistletoe Movement.

As we go on through this sorry tale, the invective gets even greater. On April 2, 1973, Steele Hall was quoted in the *Advertiser* as saying:

The old negative attitudes of the Liberal and Country League are still present in that organisation.

The report continues:

The last edition of the official L.C.L. newsletter featured an article headed "One vote one value is emotional—senseless" . . . It is the blind support of the Legislative Council as the most important safeguard of the Liberal and Country League's ideology which has brought them both tumbling down together . . . The Upper House is crumbling and it will be washed away in the flood of Labor votes at the next election, or the one thereafter.

In the same article, he states:

For 12 long months, the Liberal Movement tried to reform the Liberal and Country League from within. Despite some notable successes in forcing the adoption of a new constitution, it did not succeed in conditioning it to accept the need of new and liberalising policies.

What has changed since then? Very little. The report continues:

It is obvious now that the two geographically placed groups, the rural community and the metropolitan community, cannot be accommodated within the one Party.

Not so prophetically, he said in the same article:

The Liberal and Country League has come to the end of its useful life.

Mr. Hall, talking about his new movement which on April 2, 1973, had just broken away from or been thrown out of the Liberal and Country League, said:

A new Liberal Party would succeed, because the L.C.L. was finished. The strength has gone from the L.C.L. It has been handed back to the right wing conservatives who now possess it fully.

Mr. Millhouse's comment was:

I know there are people in the L.C.L. who are out to get me if I stay—and they may well succeed.

On March 24, 1973, Mr. Hall is reported to have said:

Today saw a victory for the conservative group, acting on prejudice and confirming that prejudice by the wealthy league of Adelaide. It means the Party is hopelessly beyond repair.

He said, again on March 24, 1973, in the *Advertiser*, to Eric Franklin:

Burning the last bridge, he said, "I will be leaving a Party which I consider to be completely hypocritical and decadent."

The other day we heard the Hon. Mr. Dunford commenting about where members opposite spent their time out of session, and not surprisingly Mr. Hall had something to say about the role of honourable members opposite and the role of the Upper House. On August 9, 1973, he is quoted as saying, under the banner headline "Hall seeks inquiry into Upper House":

The Leader of the Liberal Movement (Mr. Hall) urged the Government yesterday to set up a commission to investigate the role of the Legislative Council. Such an investigation would do nothing but good for a House that had fallen so low in repute, he said. Mr. Hall's attack came during the Assembly Address in Reply debate. He often referred to his allegations of the previous day that some Liberal and Country League members had misappropriated taxpayers' money in sending out electioneering material for Saturday's Southern by-election.

Mr. Hall was taking the Hon. Mr. DeGaris to task in this regard.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Will you quote the investigation that took place on that occasion, while you are about it?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: No, I am quoting what Mr. Hall said about the Legislative Council. I am not here to justify either the Leader's actions or Mr. Hall's actions in this matter; I am here merely to put the record straight and to show the people of South Australia what a sham the Leader's Party is. Mr. Hall went on to say:

"I believe the latest small instance of the actions yesterday and early this week indicate what an unhealthy state the Upper House has reached," Mr. Hall said. "The Upper House is not sitting today or tomorrow—

there were two days holiday—

and everyone knows that this is to allow members to go electioneering."

The report continues:

Mr. Hall said he was a firm supporter of the bi-cameral system and the retention of the Upper House. But this did not mean he believed the Upper House "should be allowed to go along as it is today . . . as a self-perpetrating kingdom serving the selfish interests of Parties or individuals who inhabit it."

He believed that the Legislative Council was a selfish, self-perpetrating kingdom of the Hon. Mr. DeGaris serving his self-interest and the interests of individuals who supported him. That is what the Hon. Mr. Hall said about the Leader of the Opposition. Those two gentlemen are now in the same Party. On December 2, 1973, when talking about the Parliamentary wing of the L.C.L., Senator Hall said:

The L.C.L. is the most ineffectual that carried the name of Opposition in South Australia, and its Federal members both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate are notorious for their ineffectual role. Senator Hall said that the myth could be promoted no longer in South Australia that the L.C.L. represented all sections of the community. "In fact, it represents a very few wealthy South Australians, and it will never again have electoral success."

There, again, I suspect that he was being prophetic. The Hon. Martin Cameron, commenting on Mr. Wilson's attempts to get the two groups together, said:

He's got to be joking. The man who moved for our expulsion is now the President of the Party (Mr. Ian McLachlan). The Liberal Movement and myself were unacceptable in March of this year. And we still are. It would be acceptable for the L.C.L. to join us.

It seems as though he has gone back on that. He continued:

But they would have to lose some of the conservative element. It's just not on.

Then, going into February, 1974, what did Senator Hall say about the then Leader of the Opposition in another place? A report in the February 21, 1974, edition of the *Advertiser* is as follows:

An angry Mr. Hall said, "The L.C.L. is God's gift to the Labor Party. Dr. Eastick has taken a stand for the first time in his political life . . . squarely with the Labor Party. His members are a strange sort of political animal without a backbone."

He is referring there to honourable members opposite, who were not members of the Liberal Movement. What was the response to that of Mr. Trevor Griffin, the current President of the Party, who presides over these warring factions? On May 24, he made the following remark regarding the Liberal Movement:

So far as the Movement is concerned, previous experience indicates that it is impossible to negotiate on reasonable grounds in confidence and trust with its leadership.

On May 2, 1974, Senator Hall, still presumably having some semblance of principle, said:

I hasten to add that merging will not be with the Liberal and Country League, which is so obviously redundant in South Australia.

Then, in a report written by journalist John Hamilton which appeared in the May 22, 1974, issue of the Melbourne *Herald*, Senator Hall was reported as saying:

The Establishment stronghold is still the Legislative Council, known here as "those awful old men in their feudal machine." But the L.C.L. is popularly supposed to be ordered from the bastion of conservatism, the Adelaide Club. Steele Hall says abruptly: "It still is."

He then went on to name four men with large business, pastoral and brewing interests in South Australia who, he says, influenced the L.C.L. "The influence of people like Sir Arthur Rymill, Ian MacLachlan, Hurtle Morphett and Geoff Cooper is still supreme," he said. Steele Hall's leadership of the L.C.L. came to an end in 1972 after "three years of looking over my shoulder and guarding my back".

He was guarding his back from the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and his supporters. Then, on May 27, after Senator Hall had won his Senate seat, the following report appeared in the *National Times*:

Mr. Hall is emphatic that there will be no rapprochement until the L.C.L. is split into a basically urban Liberal Party with support from the rural districts close to Adelaide, spitting out what he describes as its reactionary and dominant hinterland influence, which, presumably, would join with the Country Party.

In the same report, he was quoted as saying:

In the Opposition's case, he says, this philosophy, as practised by Liberal Party founders like Sir Robert Menzies, has been lost and replaced by subservience to business interests, irrespective of the cost to the individual.

The Party of which he was then speaking is the Party of which he is now a member. He was reported to have said the following on July 30, 1975:

As long as the Liberal Party adopts its nineteenth century attitudes that country people are superior to city people I'm afraid we cannot work closely with them. He also said:

One of the problems for the Liberal Party is that it has always seen the differences between the Liberal Party and the Liberal Movement as being basically of a personal nature. It is quite the opposite—they are deeply ideological.

We have seen how deeply ideological and principled the Liberal Movement was when its members scurried back to the ranks of the Liberal Party. I now refer to the constitutional crisis that occurred last year, and to what Senator Hall said about the Party of which he is now a member and about many of the individuals in it. In the debate on the deferral of the Appropriation Bill on October 15, 1975 (page 1177 of Senate *Hansard*), Senator Hall said:

Mr. Fraser has brought Australia to within the first day of this most divisive action which anyone can take in this Parliament. When we need, above all in Australia, a unifying consensus of thought we have a political leader who will snatch power and divide the country irrevocably in so doing.

Senator Young, a colleague of Senator Hall, then interjected as follows:

What did the honourable senator do in his State—the great Messiah!

To that, Senator Hall replied:

This division is not made in a very pleasant fashion, because every time that Senator Young walks across the floor he takes a dead man's vote with him in his pocket. Later, he said:

The Bill was defeated in that fashion only by the vote of a dead man which the Opposition has, contrary to the convention of this country.

Then, referring to the Queensland Premier, Senator Hall went on to explain the breach of the convention. After an interjection from Senator Young, Senator Hall continued as follows:

Senator Young is very vocal. I believe he has never wavered in his stance, unlike Senator Jessop. I remember that after Senator Bunton and I had clearly stated our position, which was that we would not support the rejection of Supply, Senator Jessop rushed into print in Saturday's *Advertiser* to say that he, too, would not reject Supply. Yet, of course, a few hours later he retracted that, or a retraction was made on his behalf, whichever was the case. In any event, he watered down his earlier statement. Senator Young has never been in that position because he represents the small Establishment class in Adelaide. That is an area of operation which I know very well, and which I regret has disgraced the name of liberalism in my State in the past.

That is what the L.C.L. in this State has done, according to Senator Hall, who has now rejoined that Party. He continued:

I am ashamed to know that it is now disgracing the name of liberalism on the Federal scene.

Later (page 1177 of *Hansard*), Senator Hall said:

I may say that there are some men of principle among the Liberal Party whom I admire for the stand that they have taken. I am sorry that they have been so subjugated by the steamroller of the Party that they have been unable to vote according to their conscience.

Later, he said:

As I said earlier, I am surprised that the Liberal Party, a Party which should represent a classless society, which should want to set up a classless society, and which I had thought cared for every person, should so seriously divide this community.

I have no doubt that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, in the pre-selection battles that are to follow, will quote that up and down the country to prove that Senator Hall is a red-ragging Marxist with Communist affiliations.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: He's very quiet.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes. Honourable members opposite are stunned into silence.

The Hon. C. W. Creedon: The Hon. Mr. Dawkins is extremely quiet.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes. Members opposite are quietly squirming in their seats as these facts are recited, realising that it is a considerable embarrassment to them, and I can understand their silence. They look pale and sick. The story is so tragic that it even pains me to have to tell it. I could commend Senator Steele Hall for the comments that he made when he spoke in that debate. Undoubtedly, it was one of the best speeches he has made, and I am sure that it will not be the last that we will hear from him. Continuing his remarks about Liberal and Country Party senators, Senator Hall stated:

For whom do the Opposition's Senators speak? They have not told us. I suspect, of course, that in their impatience they speak for their own lust for power, which is so evident in the public statements which cannot be given as the reasons why they have acted in this way . . . they will fracture the federation which we have developed over 75 years.

In discussing, in the same debate, the Party machine in Canberra which called the tune and which insisted that all Liberal senators toe the line or lose their preselection, Senator Steele Hall stated:

It has caused them to vote against their conscience. That is the antithesis of liberalism. If one reads the definition of liberalism in any Liberal handout book in Australia one will find that it gives supreme authority to the individual member of Parliament under the Liberal pre-selection system. It indicates that he should be responsible solely to his electorate. In this case, there are good and noble members of this Senate who are not responsible to their electorates for this decision but are responsible to the decision taken by the Federal Council of the Liberal Party. It is something I deplore on our side of politics.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: The Hon. Mr. Laidlaw was fairly hot on that.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: After Senator Steele Hall made that speech, the normally mild-mannered Hon. Mr. Laidlaw weighed in heavily. He did that on November 6, 1975, in commenting on what Senator Steele Hall had said.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: He is the boss.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: What the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw said about Senator Steele Hall on this matter is interesting. The two of them may have come closer together since then, but one wonders what sort of friendship and co-operation it is.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Isn't the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw a conciliator?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: He was not being very conciliatory on this occasion. A report by Eric Franklin, published in the *Advertiser* of November 6, 1975, of what Senator Steele Hall said was as follows:

I believe Labor will be defeated whenever a general election is held. In this event it is very important that the manner in which you assume office should have the long-term approval of most Australians. We ought not to underestimate the ability of the public to recognise shabby behaviour.

The report by Eric Franklin also states:

In debate Senator Hall used adjectives which did not endear him to the Liberal Party. Mr. Laidlaw M.L.C., a new member of the State Legislative Council, in a letter to the *Advertiser*, described Senator Hall as Mr. Whitlam's running mate. Mr. Laidlaw said that he despised Senator Hall for his about-face.

He has done so many about-faces over the years, as have all Liberal members. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris has been like a dancer, pirouetting around the stage.

The Hon. J. R. Dunford: He is still there, though.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes, but how long will he be there? I am sure that the Hon. Mr. Cameron and the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw may have something to say about that when preselection time comes up. The same report continues:

Mr. Laidlaw said he considered some of the remarks made by Senator Hall were reprehensible.

Then we come to the final chapter, for the time being, in the story, as the Liberal Movement scuttled back into the Liberal Party fold. What did the Liberal Movement do soon before it cheated its supporters and returned to the Liberal Party? About two months before it did this, what did Senator Hall say to a meeting of his supporters? On February 5 this year, as reported in the *Nation Review* of April 30, he stated, when championing the continuance of the Liberal Movement:

Now a new Liberal Government is making changes in Canberra and there is a new reason for our existence. . . . In fact, it is most likely the Fraser Government will try to apply 1950 solutions to 1980 problems, and our philosophy could be a useful brake and accelerator as the need arises . . . and in the face of these new complexities the Liberal Party is now again setting up a system of double income tax for us all to enjoy.

The next part of the report is important, in view of his treacherous actions about two months later. That part of the report states:

The Liberal Movement is certainly needed and especially so at the State level. . . . These electoral obligations and opportunities are the reasons why we have come into existence and why we must continue. Our Party must ensure that it grows into a continually more efficient and attractive organisation. . . . Whatever our really long-range plans may be (and no-one can see that far from here) you need to be dedicated to building our Party strength and our Parliamentary muscle which comes from it. We enjoyed our politics. There is every reason why we should continue to do so, and very publicly. We have plenty of L.M. stickers at head office and now is as good a time as any to proclaim our Party membership. Everyone of you should take one tonight and start wearing our label again.

What a tragic epitaph! What of our own Hon. Martin Cameron, who graces this Chamber and has been very silent during the tale! He has now come back into the Liberal Party in this Chamber, led by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, about whom he said so much during those four years. What did he have to offer to his supporters soon after the election in December, 1975? In a letter to the *Advertiser*, he stated:

However, I wish once and for all to make clear to Mr. Kelly M.H.R. and others like him that the L.M. is a separate political Party, with its own members of Parliament and its own financial management.

How hollow that sounds now! The Hon. Mr. DeGaris is chuckling on his front bench. In his letter, the Hon. Mr. Cameron also stated:

Our objective is to build a new Party based on true liberal philosophy. If the non-Labor Parties are ever to win Government in S.A. this is essential . . .

The Hon. J. R. Dunford: How long ago was this?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: It was soon after the election in 1975 and about three months before he capitulated and rejoined the Liberal Party, back in the ranks of the DeGarises, Rymills, and Geddes's, the conservatives whom he had vilified so much in the past. The merger of the two Parties was announced on April 7, 1976. The conclusions that one can draw from this are clear. As an Opposition Party, it cannot be taken seriously. The Hon. Mr. Cameron and Senator Steele Hall, just three or four months before returning to the fold, could deceive their supporter by asserting the principles of small "l" liberalism. They were going to promote a separate Party and fight for the things that they believed in. However, they deserted the supporters to whom they had promised so much so recently. What credit have the Hon. Mr. Cameron and Steele Hall left? How can they be trusted by South Australians? They have crawled back to the same Party, their excuse being that they have won the reforms for which they fought. What nonsense! They have won nothing.

They voted for electoral reform in this Chamber, but who tried to destroy the electoral reform proposals? It was the same people with whom they are now co-operating on the other side. In October, 1975, amendments to the electoral reform legislation were moved by the Hon. Mr. Hill to increase the tolerance to 15 per cent. Who combined to vote for the amendments? It was the old guard—the Hons. Burdett, Cooper, DeGaris, Geddes, Hill, Laidlaw, and Whyte. The Hon. Mr. Carnie and the Hon. Mr. Cameron are now colleagues of theirs. A further amendment by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris to negate completely the tolerance and to give the Electoral Commission discretion to increase it beyond 10 per cent was supported by the Hons. Burdett, Cooper, DeGaris, Geddes, Hill, Laidlaw, and Whyte.

The Liberal Movement achieved nothing by its break-away—nothing in terms of reform of the Liberal Party. The Liberal Movement's return was a complete capitulation to political expediency. There is one rider I add to that statement. Perhaps the Hon. Mr. Cameron, although he has deserted his principles, may have acquired some rat-like cunning. It may not have been a capitulation; perhaps a deal has been done between the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw and the Hon. Mr. Cameron to depose the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and his supporters. We do not know that at present, but it is obviously a strong probability. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris will be fighting for his political life at the next pre-selection ballot.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Where do you get your information?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: From the political grapevine. That, combined with circumstantial evidence, could indicate that the Hon. Mr. Cameron will be making a bid for the Leadership in this Chamber.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: I said that the other day.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes. It could well be true.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: He would make a good Leader, too—another farmer.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Whatever one says about the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, however misguided he may be and however confused about his political principles, he is at least a hard worker, and I am sure that the Liberal members, the rural supporters of the Liberal Party, will appreciate that fact and will certainly fight hard to retain him, instead of the upstart, the Hon. Mr. Cameron, with his near-communist, classless society friend, Steele Hall.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Is there any outside influence on the Liberal Party? They are all supposed to be independent.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I cannot comment on that. Indeed, I do not need to comment on it, because Steele Hall has said it all. I am sure he will continue to say it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you think the question of hard work comes down to the question of lunch at Parliament House?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: No, it comes down to adjourning the Council and fighting by-elections when a member should be legislating for the benefit of the people. I was not even in Parliament when that happened.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Who got the House up?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I do not know. I am relying on Steele Hall's statements. If the Leader has an argument with him, I suggest that he have it out with Mr. Hall; no doubt he will. Perhaps the Leader could chat to the Hon. Mr. Cameron, whom he now leads in this Council. The record speaks for itself.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The record does not say that we got the House up.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Leader can make an explanation about this if he wishes. I am interested in what Steele Hall said about the Leader. In case it escapes the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, my purpose today has been to indicate to the Council and to the people just what a shambles the Opposition is in in this place and in South Australia generally. Whatever the machinations and deals done to erect a facade of unity, the indisputable fact remains that the Opposition is a medley of misfits: the assassins and their victims, those who had no backbones and those who have lost theirs, liberals and democrats with those who say "Pah" to democracy and support racism and the League of Rights, men who gave away their principles and men who never had them.

As an alternative Government, the Opposition is a group of poseurs, posturing their way around the State and in the Parliament, totally devoid of substance. They are a caricature of an Opposition, whose absurdity is manifest; they have no coherent philosophy, no ideas of a consistent, constructive programme for the betterment and welfare of the people of this State. The Leader's sole role is to snipe at and denigrate the State and frustrate the efforts of a Government that has done so much over the last 10 years. Condemned out of their own mouths, they will remain condemned by all South Australians.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: In supporting the motion, I join with other honourable members in expressing sincere appreciation to His Excellency and Lady Oliphant for the services they have willingly rendered to South Australia. I wish them a happy retirement in the Australian Capital Territory, where I believe they intend to return to live. I express my deep regret at the passing of three esteemed former members of this Parliament. Although I did not know Mr. Hogben and Mr. MacGillivray, I know something of their contribution to the welfare of this State. I express my appreciation of their services to South Australia and also my condolences to their relatives. I knew very well Mr. J. R. Ferguson, who was the member for Yorke Peninsula and later the member for Goyder. I was shocked, on my return from last year's Commonwealth Parliamentary Association conference in India, to hear of the untimely death of Mr. Ferguson, who was a most sincere and painstaking member of another place for just over 10 years. He was a friend and colleague to all.

He did not have an easy task, because he spent a considerable amount of his period of service in Opposition, and he followed a situation in which Yorke Peninsula (his original district) had been represented by a Minister in another place and also, in effect, by a Minister in this Council. It is not easy for a new back-bencher to follow such a situation, because he is expected to get the sort of results that can come from a close connection with Cabinet. It was not appreciated by many, except those of his colleagues in this place who worked closely with him, just how hard he tried to get (and eventually succeeded in getting) the Giles Point installation (now Port Giles) back into the pipeline after it was pigeon-holed.

One must be fair and give credit to the then Minister of Works, Hon. C. D. Hutchens, whom I saw in Parliament House today looking very well, for a realistic and common-sense approach to the problem of getting the project back into the pipeline. I hope the people in Southern Yorke Peninsula who read *Hansard* and who do not already know these facts will realise that they owe much more to the late Mr. Ferguson than has generally been conceded. I hope they will also realise the great pleasure that it gave him to see this project come to fruition. I had the highest regard and respect for the late honourable member, and I offer my condolences to Mrs. Ferguson and other members of the family.

The third matter raised by His Excellency in his Speech was as follows:

There has been an exceptionally dry autumn and early winter season . . . The aggregate number of stock in the State is about 40 per cent higher than at the beginning of the 1967 drought but the overall feed situation is about the same as it was in that year.

Unfortunately, that statement was made about two months ago, and the position now is indescribably worse in many areas than it was then. I point out to the Council the serious consequences of drought. In many cases, as Mr. Grant Andrews said recently on radio, the drought means

that it will be as long as 15 months before some people will get any reasonable return from the land, because the drought has reached a point of no return in many areas in South Australia.

Only a few areas of the State are in a reasonably good position, while many large areas are suffering from the drought. Stock feed is abnormally low and an extremely serious problem will be facing South Australia in the coming summer. Many areas are virtually a write-off. Certainly, I find it hard to understand how the Minister of Agriculture could say on July 21 that the situation was not as bad as it appeared. The Minister must have had his eyes shut regarding the position in the Mallee when he recently visited the area.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: He's good at making such statements.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: But his optimism is not backed up with any real knowledge, or so it would appear. Obviously, the Minister saw a green crop or two here or there in the Mallee, but apparently he failed to realise that there is no foundation of moisture. We have a drought of substance, and the first bad wind could completely ruin the position for many farmers. I was surprised to hear the Minister say recently (I think in reply to the Hon. Mr. Burdett, who asked a question concerning a wider declaration of drought areas) that many areas of South Australia were still in good condition. Of course, the Minister was referring to pastoral areas.

We have always known of the great difference between farming areas and pastoral areas. The circumstances applying in those situations are vastly different, and I am talking about the farming areas of South Australia when I say that the situation is serious and that the Government should take due note of the position. In the fourth point raised in his Speech the Governor stated:

My Government has taken steps to increase the involvement of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department in the field of management of the State's fisheries resources.

I believe that the amalgamation of the Agriculture and Fisheries Departments was not a good move. These departments do not work well together and they should be separate departments. I welcome, at long last, the appointment of the Director-General, but I express disappointment that a South Australian was not appointed to this position. Many worthy men with long service, valuable experience and considerable knowledge of the department's workings were regrettably overlooked. I believe it is a bad thing when such men with know-how and long experience in a department are overlooked in favour of someone being brought in from outside the department. Although I do not believe it is good management, I am not criticising, in any way, the man who has been appointed to this position. However, I question the fact that the Government has seen fit over a long period to appoint people to such positions from outside departments instead of appointing one of the several able departmental officers, who could in this instance have filled this position. Also, in the same paragraph His Excellency the Governor stated:

A comprehensive programme of research, development and extension to improve the quality of grape-vine stock is planned for the South Australian viticultural industry. That is a good move, and I note it with interest and commend the Government for its work in this area. The ninth point referred to by His Excellency was as follows:

My Government's aim of extending the scope of secondary education is being realised. As part of its policy two special music schools were successfully established.

I am pleased that this was done. I am pleased to see the breadth of secondary education existing today in South

Australia because, as all honourable members know, in our day one went through school between two straight rails and, if one was not good at the eight or so subjects offered in secondary school, one was probably wiped off. The fact that education is more broadly based today is a good thing. However, I point out that, in addition to those schools in the metropolitan area to which His Excellency referred, there is an excellent music school in the making in the Barossa Valley at Nuriootpa High School. A young woman, Mrs. Andrea White, an honours graduate from Adelaide University, is doing excellent work, not only in that school but also in three or four other schools in which she has oversight of music study. The problem is that she is working under great difficulties, because the facilities available to her are much out of date. On several occasions I have asked the Minister when Nuriootpa High School will get adequate facilities required for this work, especially as that school is the local centre in this subject for two or three other schools.

In my travels around the State I had the recent privilege of examining in some detail two good high schools, one at Port Lincoln and the other at Gawler. Port Lincoln High School is half completed; stage 1 of the school is excellent in every way but the second stage has yet to be completed. I referred to Gawler High School in a question I asked in this Council last week: when the school was built 10 or 12 years ago it was constructed to accommodate an enrolment of about 600 students but, as more than 1200 students are now enrolled, there is a crying need for extra facilities at this school. This need exists not only at Port Lincoln and Gawler High Schools but also at other high schools.

I am not attaching any blame to this Government, or to the previous Government, in this matter because I believe that the department and successive Governments have coped well with the explosion of student numbers over the past 20 years. The Hon. Mr. Loveday, when he was Minister of Education, stated that the explosion in student numbers was much greater proportionately in South Australia than in the other States. Generally, the Education Department has coped well with the numbers explosion. Nevertheless, many transportable and temporary classrooms leave much to be desired in terms of accommodation. I am concerned because of the way the department is spending its funds. True, facilities provided in new schools are excellent. One might almost be tempted to say "superfluous" in some cases and might be tempted to say that they should be shared by other schools.

I bring to the notice of the Minister that, at one of the schools I have recently visited, the total staff has been about one staff person to every 10 students. When I say "total staff", I include the auxiliary as well as the academic staff. I wonder whether in providing that number of staff we are in fact failing to provide some other facilities that should be provided for young people. I am sure that the advancement of education is excellent but I am concerned whether we are providing, perhaps, rather more staff and fewer buildings and whether there should be another examination of that situation. However, as I have said earlier, I commend the Education Department, generally, for its work.

As regards transport, I am pleased to note that the Eyre Highway is due to be completed and will be sealed and open for traffic, hopefully, in September of this year. I am also pleased to note that the Highways Department plans to build a new bridge to replace the structure damaged by floods near your own area, Mr. Acting President, but I am concerned about the situation at Dry Creek,

because the bottleneck of traffic there in the mornings, and as well as in the evenings at the conclusion of work, is serious. The duplication of that bridge over the railway line is long overdue.

I understand there have been some delays because of planning for the standard railway. Nevertheless, I bring to the Government's notice the situation as I see it, as I frequently go home in the late afternoon and see the continuing build-up and bottleneck in that area. I also notice it in other parts of the city where it is necessary that something should be done, and in some cases duplication has already been carried out. In this case, I would not know offhand of any area where there is a greater need for a second bridge to be built on the main highway than at Dry Creek. I bring that to the notice of the Government and the Highways Department and hope more money will be available for construction and sealing work by local councils, because I know from experience that often they can do the job better and more efficiently, much as my friend Mr. Johninke of the Highways Department might like to disagree. It has been the case, not always, but on occasion that councils can do the job more efficiently and more economically than can the Highways Department. If local government was given the opportunity to do this, it would do it, and do it well.

I come now to water resources. I am concerned with the statement made by the Minister of Works (Hon. J. D. Corcoran) the other day about the situation on the Northern Adelaide Plains. I will repeat some of the statement. I know most honourable members know it fairly well but it is of sufficient moment for it to have further consideration now. The Minister said:

The annual intake of the basin is of the order of 7 500 megalitres a year. At the present time the water extracted is 21 000 megalitres a year—or approximately three times the natural intake. With this state of imbalance, the Mines Department estimated that localised salinity problems would occur within 10 years and would be widespread in 30 years. The Government was therefore most concerned for the long term viability of the market-gardening industry in the Northern Adelaide Plains and the consequent socio-economic problems.

I believe the Government is rightly concerned about that. The Minister went on:

A study of possible alternative water resources was carried out which demonstrated that effluent from the Bolivar sewage treatment works offered the most attractive and least uneconomical supplementary supply.

I believe that to be true. I, too, had a report, which the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries was good enough to give me. It was a report from the Agriculture Department, and that study showed that the effluent could be used on free-draining soils and for salt-tolerant crops such as lucerne, potatoes, flood-irrigated tomatoes and cucumbers, onions and possibly cabbages, cauliflowers and wine grapes. That report was available not in June, 1976, but in June, 1974—over two years ago. The further report that the Government got, an in-depth report, consolidating all the previous work on this matter has now been completed, and the Minister tabled it the other day.

Briefly, the report finds that there is sufficient effluent that could be used in conjunction with ground water to maintain the major part of the agricultural industry and the aquifer. It is very important, because it is essential, in my view, to maintain that underground basin and the vegetable-growing industry in the Virginia and Angle Vale areas, for if we are to maintain and develop horticulture in the area this land must be reserved for this use. I am prompted to ask whether the Government is thinking that the building up of housing in the Virginia and Angle

Vale areas will get it off the hook. If it builds up that area, it will build up an area that should be preserved, just as the space around the abattoir has been preserved.

There is no other area so close to Adelaide that has the right climate and the right amount of water available so that vegetables can be produced there as economically as the Virginia and Angle Vale area, and any thought in the Government's mind that that area should be built up so that it does not have the problem of reticulating this water should be dismissed because, if we want to produce vegetables in quantity effectively and economically for the city of Adelaide, that is the place to do it. Therefore, I regret the situation that the Government seems to come to when it says that the revenue from a scheme of irrigation would produce only \$727 000 a year, and involve a loss of over \$2 000 000 a year. The Minister concludes:

The scheme is therefore most unattractive economically and could not be financed by the State.

If the Government is thinking in terms of financing relatively few people in Virginia and its surrounds, that is one thing; but, if it is thinking of providing an economic supply of vegetables that will benefit South Australia as a whole and the city of Adelaide in particular, that is entirely different. I do not see that that is a conclusion to which the Government should come. The Minister said:

Nor am I optimistic that the scheme would receive favourable consideration from the Commonwealth Government.

That is just a political statement with no real basis. Obviously, the Minister has not gone to the Commonwealth Government to see what can be done. I am aware that two or three years ago it was made known through the local Federal member that money could be made available for this project. Also, it is over two years since the completion in June, 1974, of the Agriculture Department's report on the safety of that water for a large number of vegetables.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Refer back to what the Minister said. On present usage, we would see the end of that basin between 10 and 30 years. On that basis, can we justify using the water from that basin?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I do not think we are justified in doing so to the present extent. The Minister continued:

There is one new development which reduces the urgency of this problem. As part of the Government's new water resources management policy, two highly qualified officers of the Mines Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department were sent overseas last year to study new techniques in the assessment, development and management of underground water resources. At the same time, data collection on the ground-water basin in the Northern Adelaide Plains has continued. These initiatives have permitted a more rigorous and accurate analysis of the basin, and calculations to date indicate that, while salinity will increase over the next 30 years, the effects will tend to be relatively localised and the rate of increase in the long term will be considerably less than previously predicted.

How they came to that conclusion, apparently while they were overseas, I do not know. I intended to ascertain from the Minister what the situation is. He continued:

The projected overall life of the basin has been considerably extended.

If that is correct, why has it taken so long to find it out? Even so, the eventual undermining of the basin will continue. The Minister continued:

This means that irrigation will be disrupted in certain localised areas due to salinity problems. The projected overall life of the basin, however, has been considerably extended.

That is all very well, but I know now that the people are talking about leaving out certain crops next year because they will not have enough water to irrigate them. The statement that the water allocations will be maintained for five years means that they will get some limited water. I emphasise "limited" because this present allocation will limit people to their present restrictions, and it will cut out some crops because there will not be sufficient water for them.

I am not condemning the Government at present. I am concerned and want to know more about this matter. The Minister of Lands, when talking about sport the other day (I do not know whether he agrees with what His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh has subsequently said), said that the Commonwealth Government had shirked its responsibilities, or words to that effect. I am asking whether this State Government is shirking its responsibilities in relation to this water. Is it shirking its responsibilities in relation to the use of the very large quantity of recycled water that is being sent out to sea every day? Is it passing the buck to some future Government in putting off this problem?

If the Government is doing so, despite the conclusions now reached by these people who have been overseas, I say that the Government is in that case to be condemned. I want to know whether this is so and whether the Government can continue to allow the use of underground water at a use as to recharge ratio of three to one. First, there is only limited access to it, as a result of which people have had to cut down their activities. Also, we are not using the large quantity of recycled water that is going out to sea each day. I want to know what the Government intends to do with that water, and I hope that it will give the Council an indication of its intentions in this respect.

I also realise that the Minister said that a caravan, or something of that nature, to be used as an office, would be located at Virginia for about four or five days last week so that the people concerned could go along to the person in charge and say, "I want to use this recycled water." I am sorry that only four or five days was set aside for this purpose. I am given to understand that the people of the area want to have a public meeting about this matter in the next week or so. If this happens, I hope that the Minister of Works, who was good enough to discuss this whole matter with me, will not seek to enforce the time limit which was imposed and which expired last Saturday morning, and that the Government will take heed of what happens at that public meeting.

I refer now to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. I express my appreciation to this Parliament for giving me the opportunity and privilege to represent it at the Commonwealth Parliamentary conference which was held in India last year. Such conferences should be, and are for probably most of the time, non-Party political. Queries often arise as to the use and value of the C.P.A. I believe that its conferences are indeed valuable. Although no decisions are taken at the association's conferences, many matters are aired, and it is possible for the various Commonwealth nations at least to know more about the problems that exist in other areas of this large group of nations. This in itself is valuable, just as it is of value for delegates to be able to understand the attitude of other Commonwealth nations regarding certain problems.

I visited many other Parliaments and saw in a number of instances due recognition of geography and remoteness in the numerical size of electorates. This occurred notably in Canada and the United Kingdom. I also visited a number of other Houses. We have been told that this

Council and the New South Wales Upper House are reactionary Houses because they were (and, in the case of New South Wales, are) not directly elected. This is nonsense, as I visited a number of Upper Houses and saw some that were directly elected and others that were indirectly elected. A notable instance of that is India, where the Rajya Sabha or Upper House is completely indirectly elected by the States in the way that we would elect a Senator at a by-election. I also saw some Upper Houses of Parliament some of whose members were indirectly elected and some of whom were directly appointed. So, democracy works in different ways around the world.

I pay a tribute to my co-delegates in the Australian States delegation. There were six of us, one member from each State, and we added to our delegation the Northern Territory delegate. Because he was a delegate from a subsidiary branch who was left out in the cold, to some extent, we brought him into the Australian States area. We worked together as a team. There were three members from what one would term the right side of politics, as well as three from the left side of politics. This did not affect the situation as, indeed, it should not have done. Because we worked together as a team, Party politics did not enter into the matter. With all the disadvantages and frustrations that sometimes occur in relation to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, its value is still most significant in the relationship of the countries that have been related to Great Britain over the years. Many of those countries are now independent, but they still acknowledge the Queen, if not as Head of State at least as Head of the Commonwealth. This sort of contact between the nations is valuable and should continue.

When the present Premier was in Opposition and Sir Thomas Playford was Premier, Mr. Dunstan used to sling off at the then Premier, who had a department run by a Secretary and two typists. Often, Mr. Dunstan used to forget about the Secretary and say that the then Premier had a department with two typists. Unfortunately, Mr. John White, Sir Thomas Playford's Secretary, was forgotten altogether, but he has since been recognised and has done an excellent job as our Agent General in London.

Nowadays, the situation is very different: the Hon. Mr. Dunstan has more than 200 people doing various things for him. Admittedly, he has gathered into his department some other departments. Indeed, the Chief Secretary is now only Chief Secretary in name, by comparison with the role of the Chief Secretary in the days of Sir Thomas Playford. Although Sir Thomas Playford had a staff of only three members while the Hon. Mr. Dunstan has a staff of more than 200 members, the fact remains that Sir Thomas Playford secured far more industry for South Australia than the Hon. Mr. Dunstan has ever done, and Sir Thomas Playford secured it at infinitesimal cost by comparison.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Does Mr. Dunstan still have a Secretary?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Yes, and a few others who run after the Secretary. I read in a recent edition of the *News* that Mr. Anthony Steel has more than 300 employees at the Festival Centre. Mr. Steel has built up an empire, and he says that the deficit will go up and up and up. This could mean that the State Government will continually increase the grant to the Festival Centre which, admittedly, is a very good complex, of which we can be proud. However, I am sorry that Mr. Steel appears to be so financially irresponsible. We must get back to common sense in administering facilities of this kind.

If Mr. Steel thinks that the grants for the Festival Centre should go up and up and up, I think he may have to consider doing what Mr. Dunstan did — up, up and away, as we saw in a recent cartoon. A one-way ticket in an airline could be necessary, but I will not come down hard and fast in connection with that matter. Now, we are told that there is no money: we can afford \$800 000 and constantly increasing deficits for art, but there is no way we can afford \$2 000 000 a year to put vegetable supplies for South Australia, particularly Adelaide, into economic perspective!

An example of socialist overstaffing for which this Government is not to blame is the Australian Broadcasting Commission, which has a staff of more than 7 000, of whom more than 700 are in Adelaide. I am told that a staff of 40 should be able to run a radio station. I believe that station 5AA is run with a staff of about 25. Even allowing for the fact that the A.B.C. has four radio channels, including the frequency modulation channel and regional stations, and a television channel, I have been informed that, but for empire building, probably 250 people could do the job in South Australia. Yet the A.B.C. has seen fit to dismiss the Adelaide Singers, one of the best small choirs in Australia.

Mr. Fraser was criticised because the Adelaide Singers were dismissed, but such criticism is nonsense. The Adelaide Singers were dismissed because the A.B.C. had the wrong priorities. The A.B.C. does not provide as many opportunities for individual artists as it did in the past. The money involved has been swallowed up in staff costs. The reason why the A.B.C. has financial problems may be (and I stress "may be") related to problems in funding similar to the case in our Education Department. I query whether it is necessary to have one staff member for every 10 children at the secondary level.

Turning now to the taxation rip-off in this State, I point out that costs have escalated in South Australia. However, no-one can tell me that costs have escalated so much that the Dunstan Government has to rip off five times more in State taxation than was required six years ago. Of course, this has to be done to pay for the army of extra public servants and semi-public servants whom the socialists have employed. In 1969-70, the last year when the Liberals were in office, State taxation was about \$56 000 000, or 16.7 per cent of total returns. In 1975-76, State taxation was estimated to be \$275 000 000, but in fact it finished up at well over \$280 000 000, about 26 per cent—almost exactly five times more than it was in 1969-70.

This policy of ripping every available cent off the people of South Australia is an indictment of this Government and is to be deplored. It is to be hoped that the Government will come to its senses with regard to our grandfather of a drought, because people will not be able to pay their land tax and other taxes. The Hon. Mr. Sumner referred to the rural slump; that lets the cat out of the bag as to what the Government thinks about the people on the land. The Hon. Mr. Sumner also said that he did not know the facts: he certainly made that clear in two hours of poppycock.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: He said that he did not care what the truth was.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: He certainly did not bring the truth to the fore. He spoke of the troubles we had in 1972. Of course, we did have troubles in 1972, but the whole point is that those troubles have

been ironed out. There is much more point in the honourable member's examining the troubles of the Labor Party in 1975. Sir John Egerton stated:

Much of the fault lay in the arrogance of Whitlam and his inability to work with his team. He hated a large number of his Cabinet and they reciprocated that particular feeling. Cabinet meetings were a shambles. The reports coming through now are that Whitlam very often interpreted decisions without a clear vote. Some of the Ministers say that some of the alleged decisions were never properly made by Cabinet. It was an incompetent Government—

this is Sir John speaking—

one that made no attempt to settle down to the task of government. It surrounded itself with bloody eggheads and academics. People like Clyde Cameron and some of the old-timers of the Labor Party completely lost their influence.

I have respect for some of the old timers of the Labor Party, but I do not have respect for the academics who have entered the Party for the sake of their own aggrandisement. Sir John continued:

And the power fell into the hands of a very narrow vocal minority. Its that same authority now which further degrades the Labor Party introducing violence into demonstrations. They'd rather sit down in the middle of Collins Street and throw stones at the Governor-General than go about the job of planning the welfare of Australia. That is what Sir John said, and that statement shows what the Labor Party was like in 1975. Perhaps the Hon. Mr. Sumner should look at the problems in his own Party instead of scratching around in things which happened three or four years ago and which have been resolved on this side of the House.

Finally, I once again affirm my loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen. I wish to indicate my pleasure at the knowledge that Her Majesty and His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh intend to visit us next year. I am sure that the visit will be eagerly looked forward to by many people in South Australia, indeed, by a large majority of South Australians. However, I am shocked by the disloyalty and apathy that appears to be rampant in this country, especially in relation to the hostility shown to the Queen's Commonwealth representative and the foreshadowed disloyalty to Her Majesty. I refer to the complete incapability of some members of the community, including some honourable members opposite, to accept the verdict of the overwhelming majority of Australians.

In other words, such people believe in democracy only as long as it goes their way. To them, it is a one-way street. They are unable to accept the people's decision and they continue to squeal and show the nation how immature they are. The Hon. Mr. Sumner engaged in a puerile discussion. Indeed, the only thing that makes me believe that the Hon. Mr. Sumner is no longer a child is the large chip he has on his shoulder: no child could ever carry such a chip. The honourable member made a puerile contribution, but even he might some day come to his senses. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I, too, support the motion for adoption of the Address in Reply. The Governor in his Speech referred to plans of the Government with regard to further education. Unfortunately, he made no reference to the problems of apprenticeship training, although I understand that the Minister of Labour and Industry has initiated discussions once again with employers and unions and has also set up a committee within his own department to determine what steps should be taken to attract or train more apprentices.

First, I wish to consider whether we do need more apprentices and, secondly, whether the type of training should be varied. This is a field in which I have some experience because during an association of 20 years with Perry Engineering we have trained over 500 apprentices, and boys from Mile End have won the South Australian Apprentice of the Year award in three of the past four years.

Honourable members may have read a series of articles in the *Australian* and the *Advertiser* in recent weeks deploring the low intake of apprentices at a time when so many school leavers cannot find a job or, at least, not one to their liking. It was suggested that the first-year intake in Australia may drop from 42 000 in 1974 to as low as 32 000 this year. Various suggestions were made about how to encourage or force employers to take more boys, but unfortunately there was little mention of the importance of improving the standard of training if Australia is to advance in this technological age. Apprentices must be provided with the requisite training.

Many businesses which employ tradesmen, especially those on maintenance work only, do not have the facilities in equipment or supervision to train boys competently. If these businesses are persuaded to take apprentices in an attempt to lessen the pool of young unemployed these boys could be left to languish as junior labourers tied by indenture for four years. They will become disgruntled and the system will fall further into disfavour.

Many authorities assert that, unless we increase the present rate of intake of apprentices, we shall not have enough skilled trademen to meet the needs of manufacturing and other trades from 1980 onwards. If this is so, there are the alternatives of bringing skilled migrants into Australia if suitable ones can be found, or to upgrade semi-skilled workers by agreement between employers and unions on an industry or intra-company basis. These alternative sources have been drawn upon extensively in the past and will doubtless be used to some extent in the future. In trades such as welding it has been more common to upgrade, than to train apprentices. However if tradesmen are needed, it is surely better, from a social and employment view point, to train our school leavers.

Population and employment figures in South Australia indicate that it is essential to maintain and, if possible, increase our intake of apprentices, especially in the manufacturing sector. South Australia, as the Premier has pointed out, is apparently the most urban State of the most urban country in the world. At the last census in 1971 for which figures are available South Australia had a population of 1 175 000 of whom 810 000 (or 69 per cent) lived in metropolitan Adelaide. By comparison, Australia had a population of 12 750 000 and of these 8 200 000 (or 64 per cent) lived in capitals or in cities of 100 000 people or more, such as Newcastle and Wollongong. Therefore, South Australia had an urban population 5 per cent higher than the national average.

It appears from the 1971 census that South Australia had 450 000 people working for wages or on their own account. Of these, 113 000 (or 25 per cent) were employed as public servants in Federal or State Government departments or semi-autonomous bodies; 121 000 (or 27 per cent) were engaged in the private manufacturing sector and, according to figures just released, this number has grown to 136 000; 45 000 (or 10 per cent) in South Australia were working on the land or in mining and, of these, about 26 000 were self-employed farmers. Of the rest, 170 000 (or 38 per cent) were working in service industries, in commerce or on their own account in urban activities.

It is essential to maintain the private manufacturing sector in our mixed economy. If it is allowed to wane, the surplus labour will have to be absorbed in the Public Service (which, as the Chairman of the South Australian Public Service Board pointed out so aptly some months ago, must strive continuously to increase efficiency and is not in business to soak up unemployment), left on the dole, which is socially degrading, or taken into service industries, which merely adds to the non-productive community. It has been said that England has become a country of middle men, and Australia must not be allowed to follow suit. There is no scope for sending the surplus labour back to the land because, under existing conditions, it will be difficult to maintain the existing level of employment there.

It follows, then, that, in order to preserve the manufacturing sector, there must be sufficient tradesmen and apprentices to maintain this force. I do not know the ratio of tradesmen to semi-skilled or unskilled labour in manufacturing overall, but I do know that within the metal trades in South Australia, including vehicle building, there are 69 000 employees. About 20 000 of these are tradesmen, and 5 000 are apprentices. This means that for every 14 jobs provided in the metal trades, there are four tradesmen, one apprentice, and nine semi-skilled or unskilled workers. Without the tradesmen, who provide the bulk of the tool-making and maintenance forces, the jobs of the semi-skilled or unskilled workers would not survive. Without the tradesmen to supervise the bulk of the toolmaking and maintenance forces, these jobs (nine of the 14) of the semi-skilled or unskilled workers would gradually be reduced.

A few weeks ago, Mr. Landa, the New South Wales Minister of Labour, announced that his Government would consider introducing three incentives to induce employers in New South Wales to take more apprentices, because in that State the intake dropped from 15 300 in 1974 to about 12 000 this year. Mr. Landa's proposals were, first, to exempt employers who take a full complement of apprentices from the 5 per cent pay-roll tax payable on their wages during the first and second years of indentures. His second proposal was to impose an extra levy of .5 per cent of pay-roll tax on the wages of employers who do not take a full complement. His third proposal was to give preference, in awarding Government contracts, to employers who do take a full complement.

I compliment Mr. Landa for taking some initiative in this matter, but I do not think his proposals are practical or desirable. Admittedly, any reduction in pay-roll tax is to be commended, because it is the most illogical of taxes, especially in times of high unemployment. In effect, it enacts that, if a company is stupid enough to take on more employees, it will be penalised for doing so. Furthermore, Mr. Landa's proposals have no regard for the suitability of the employers' facilities to provide proper training.

Some repetitive industries, like vehicle building and domestic appliances, depend upon semi-skilled or unskilled labour for their production and have a relatively small group of tradesmen on toolmaking and maintenance. In this instance, it should be fairly easy for the employer to take a full complement, even though the breadth of training he can offer may be limited. Other industries, like heavy engineering, which make one-off products, depend upon tradesmen for their production and employ a high ratio of tradesmen to semi-skilled or unskilled labour. They can provide apprentices with broad training, but it may be impossible, because of the type of work, factory space, and supervision required, to take

a full complement. As honourable members may know, the number of apprentices to tradesmen permitted ranges from a ratio of one to three to one to one, in some instances. If Mr. Landa's proposals were adopted, some companies would be laden with extra pay-roll tax purely because of the nature of their industry.

Since ability to take apprentices differs from company to company, it would be unfair to give preference in Government contracts to those taking a full complement. Furthermore, such a practice assumes that a Government is prepared to pay unnecessarily high prices for its work let out to the private sector, and that is contrary to the interests of taxpayers.

In 1975 and 1976, the number of juniors seeking apprenticeship in Australia has far exceeded the positions available. The reasons are clear—a high level of school leavers, fewer outside jobs available, and an intake which has dropped from 42 000 to 32 000 in two years. The number of new indentures in South Australia has remained relatively stable at just over 3 000, and that is because South Australia did not experience as much of the boom conditions in 1974 and did not have as much of the recession subsequently. Certainly, South Australian conditions have been more stable than those in other States:

The Hon. Anne Levy: Thanks to Dunstan.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: We did not get the boom.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Can you tell us what the metal trades industry is saying privately about Fraser?

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I am talking about apprenticeship training. This situation of over-supply during the past two years, caused by economic uncertainty, is abnormal and, during the decade prior to this, employers in many trades had difficulty in attracting suitable juniors. I do not think the present situation of over-supply available to employers will continue indefinitely, and it is important to examine the defects of the apprenticeship system in Australia at present.

In the first instance, juniors today dislike the thought of being bound to an employer for up to four years, although it must be stressed that until the 1920's many indentures lasted for six years, and only recently have they been reduced generally from five years to four years. Although it is possible for boys to escape from indentureship or for employers to have indentures cancelled, this can be done only after an approach to the Apprentices Commission, and approval is not given lightly.

The second reason why the apprenticeship system is unpopular is that generally there is not sufficient wages margin for skill but, as Australia has about the highest wage structure in the world, it is not economically feasible to correct this situation in the short term, because many industries are already unable to export or resist imports. The unduly high wages extracted by unions on behalf of semi-skilled and unskilled men in the building, transport, and maritime industries have destroyed the margins that existed hitherto.

The third reason for the unpopularity of apprenticeship is that many unions in Australia uphold the principle of equality amongst their members in the wage-fixing area, so that a tradesman just through his apprenticeship receives the same pay as a man with 20 or more years of service. This, to my mind, is ludicrous.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: What about bringing in service payments?

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: That can be done to some extent, but it affects an already high wage structure. I believe it is ludicrous to continue this principle of equal pay, irrespective of experience. It is quite contrary to

the position in Japan where tradesmen start on a low wage but receive an annual increment according to years of service in an industry and, in some cases, it rises 2½ per cent a year for 40 years. The situation applying in Australia deters many people with initiative; it is one reason why many tradesmen leave their trade, even when well experienced, to take some quite different job.

The fourth reason for the unpopularity is the Federal Government's having made available billions of dollars in recent years to expand universities and institutes of further education and to provide free tertiary education. The thought of the good life at a university with minimal discipline, extended holidays, and the chance of a white-collar job after graduation has been much preferable to indentureship work starting at 7.30 in the morning, and a blue-collar job at the end.

The attraction of tertiary education has begun to wane because the community cannot provide enough jobs to suit the qualifications of people graduating. Many employers prefer to appoint young tradesmen with practical experience, rather than graduates, to junior executive positions or as designers, planners, buyers, or salesmen. This adds to the wastage of tradesmen from the shop floor.

The last reason for the unpopularity of apprenticeship is that the higher standard of academic teaching imposed by the trade schools, especially in mathematics, deters some boys, who might make excellent craftsmen in the more manual trades, from seeking apprenticeships. The employers are also to blame in this regard. Whereas some 10 years ago employers were prepared to apprentice boys (I am speaking generally) leaving school at third year level, they are now often seeking boys who have reached fourth and fifth year standard. Certainly, boys with higher secondary school qualifications will cope better academically at trade school, but they are more likely to regard an apprenticeship as a stepping stone to some white-collar job and be lost to industry at shop floor level.

I have mentioned some of the defects of the apprenticeship system in this country and, before suggesting possible changes, I refer briefly to the systems applying in some European countries. I shall confine comparisons to Europe, because our apprenticeship system was derived from the United Kingdom, and most of our tradesmen learnt their trades in the United Kingdom or in continental European countries.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Will the honourable member give way?

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: Yes.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: One problem which has arisen in the apprenticeship area and on which I have received representations is that of the extent of training in factories. I refer to the decreasing diversity of the types of work available to apprentices, which has meant that, although they are getting their theoretical training through the apprenticeship school, they are not getting sufficient practical training. I wonder whether the honourable member has any comment to make on that.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I would have come to that. Of course, this is a problem, and it is one reason why I do not think there is any necessity for four-year apprenticeships. There was such a necessity years ago but, with the skills that are now needed in this consumer-oriented society, with mass production, the range is narrower. Also, employers often do not have the necessary facilities. The vehicle building industry and the com-

petitive domestic appliance industries have some tradesmen, although the breadth of training is somewhat narrow. Also, the boys concerned may not be interested.

I refer to the report of the Australian Tripartite Mission, which inquired into the training of skilled workers in Europe and whose report was published in 1969. The mission visited 17 countries and, although this happened seven years ago, its findings are still current. In its report, the mission states that legislation to provide for new methods of training had been introduced recently or was about to be introduced in most of the countries which it visited. This was necessary because the creation of the European Economic Community had produced a consumer-oriented society. A highly competitive situation had been created in manufacturing industries. Of course, knowing something of the cartels that existed in Europe until 10 years ago, I think it was about time.

This situation required high production efficiency. Much of the work on the shop floor would in future be performed by persons trained in a narrower field of skilled work. That is pertinent to what the Hon. Mr. Sumner has just said. In the past in Europe five years was a normal period of trade training but, because of the narrower scope of work and higher general education of incoming trainees, about three years is the norm in most European countries, and this is likely to be reduced again. Because of changing technology and mass production there is a tendency to give boys a broad training with short crash courses as the need arises in special subjects.

The concept of apprenticing boys as blacksmiths, moulders or boilermakers, in which narrow field they would remain for the rest of their working life if they stayed in the industry, has largely been abolished in Europe but it still prevails in Australia. Trainees begin, for example, in metal working. As they progress, the trade authorities determine in which field they should specialise, recognising however that they still have a general training. In later life, if there is a recession, say, in foundry work, they could switch from moulding to boilermaking or fitting and turning. This is attractive for the worker because he has added security of employment within his trade. It is advantageous to employers, because there is at least a chance for them to employ or to have available a group of people who have a skill and a broad training in a field.

In the United Kingdom, Germany, Norway, Denmark, Austria and Switzerland apprenticeship training still prevails. In France, Italy, Sweden, Yugoslavia, Turkey and Spain full-time training in vocational schools applies. This means that in those six countries apprenticeship, as we know it, has virtually gone. It now involves full-time training in vocational schools.

In the Netherlands, Finland and Norway a mixed system of part training in vocational schools and part on the job is favoured. The Australian mission discovered that in all the European countries the Government, employers and unions were actively involved in the control of trade training. They were co-operating with enthusiasm and the Governments were providing huge sums to subsidise junior and adult training. The vocational schools were well equipped with modern buildings, and the trainees were often provided with free or cheap dormitory accommodation subsidised usually by Governments.

As honourable members know, Australia has a mixed system of training. Boys and their parents and employees sign an indenture agreement upon starting apprenticeship. This normally binds a boy to four years of on-the-job training, but during this time he will be given about 800 hours of academic and practical training at a vocational

school. The system in Australia is very rigid, and some of the changes that took place in Europe up to 10 years ago should, in the interests of all involved, be applied in this country.

The Commonwealth Government has spent huge sums of money each year on education. The sum of \$557 000 000 has been allocated to universities, \$430 000 000 to colleges of advanced education, \$510 000 000 to secondary schools, \$72 000 000 to technical and further education, and \$35 000 000 to national apprenticeship assistance subsidies. I concede that, if the community can provide worthwhile jobs for the numbers of graduates coming from universities and colleges of advanced education, this level of assistance is justified.

At present (and I think only temporarily) many graduates are unable to find jobs of their choosing, and it may be preferable to divert some more of the financial aid for education to vocational schools and trade training. The Federal Government has said that it will concentrate more on technical training. I hope we see some concrete evidence of this in the Budget. The Government encourages employers to take apprentices under the N.A.A.S. scheme by paying to employers between \$16 and \$48 a week on account of apprentices in their first and second year. This is some inducement, but it does not focus upon factory facilities or the quality of training. I believe that changes must be made in Australia to attract suitable boys into industry and, having done that, to train them properly. In this regard, I make some suggestions.

First, the concept of apprenticeship and long-term indentures stems from the tied labour practices of the industrial revolution. I would prefer to change the term to "trainee", as is adopted in parts of Europe. Instead of indentures, I would favour a flexible contract of employment that contained an expression of intention to train and to learn but with a right given to either party to terminate the contract after, say, 90 days or 180 days. It may be that some organisations will still insist on two or three years notice and, if their training is good enough, they may still get the boys. The required period of notice should be negotiable. Few boys know what trade they want to learn when they get to the factory door. The place chosen may be where someone knows somebody. When an employer asks the parent what the boy wants to do, the boy often says, "I do not know, I just want to be an apprentice." I believe that, if the scheme was less rigid without the tie of the four-year period, we would get more boys with initiative as trainees.

Secondly, I favour full-time vocational training for up to one year before practical work on the shop floor is commenced. This scheme applies to bricklayers in South Australia, having been introduced by the Minister of Labour and Industry. They receive 18 weeks full-time trade school training before starting as apprentices. I suggest a similar scheme could be tried in the metal and electrical trades. Under this proposal, a boy would spend, say, 30 weeks full-time training at a vocational school before entering apprenticeship at third-year level, and then spend two years on the job. The boy would start and be paid as a third-year apprentice. He would thus have two years practical training. Some employers have said to me that a period of up to four years' job training is needed to produce a good tradesman, but my answer to them is that Europeans seem able to train adequately in two years or less.

My third suggestion is that in Australia boys should be trained in broader fields than they are trained in at present. For example, a trainee should be encouraged to qualify as

a metal tradesman rather than as a boilermaker, fitter, turner, blacksmith or moulder. Thereafter, he could be given a short crash course in a specific trade and, presumably, he would be compensated for obtaining special qualifications.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Do away with demarcation and do the whole sweep of qualifications?

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: Yes, the whole sweep. As we saw, in the moulding industry when there was a workers recession, tradesmen had to go out of the trade and work in, say, a delicatessen. That is silly, when in some other metal areas there was a shortage of tradesmen, and unions agreed to the upgrading of certain workers. As in Europe, the intake of the schools should be controlled and influenced by the unions, the employers, and the Government. In Europe, this practice is followed, and if it was adopted here it would give tradesmen more job security and provide a wider pool of labour for industry.

In conclusion, I point out that I have not dealt with the problem of trade training for adults. That is not because I am against such schemes, but I am more concerned that we should provide a sound basis for training school leavers. If my third suggestion is adopted, adults with qualifications would be given training during their working lives. I have pleasure in supporting the motion for adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I rise to support the motion. In thanking His Excellency for his Speech opening this session of Parliament, I join with other honourable members in expressing regret that Sir Mark has forecast his resignation later this year. South Australians have been extremely fortunate in having such a distinguished man appointed to be the first South Australian-born Governor of this State. Sir Mark was the product of Adelaide University and other universities. He was a student at Adelaide University when it was recognised as having outstanding schools in medicine, engineering and pure science. Sir Mark has given not only to British people but to the people of the whole world brilliant service in the fields of pure physics and atomic physics, and in the war-time development of radar. Later, he gave service to the Australian National University's development in the field of physics. Sir Mark also has shown a brilliant and inquiring mind into life and philosophy generally, and it is in these fields that he has in recent years won the respect and admiration of the people and the State. Sir Mark always has had great sympathy with common humanity and he never ceases to try to improve man's social welfare.

I join with other honourable members who have expressed their regret at the passing of James Ferguson, William MacGillivray and Horace Hogben. The first two distinguished gentlemen bear names famous in Scottish clan history and the third was a leading figure in the work of the Presbyterian Church, so it may truly be said that this is another instance of the wellknown fact that the Scots as a race have always been willing to give freely of their time and the fruits of their experience in the service of State and country. I extend my sympathy to their relatives, especially to Mrs. Ferguson, who is so well known to many of us.

Turning to the Governor's Speech itself, I will refer to several items. The first deals with the Bill to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. The Speech states:

In order to reduce the number of wage-fixing tribunals, it is proposed that the Public Service Arbitration Act be repealed and that jurisdiction to make awards in respect of public servants be vested in the Industrial Commission in the same way as for any other workers.

To me, this is a move in the right direction. For too long members of the public have seen wage rates for both Federal and State public servants set by tribunals which work quite separately from those courts setting wage rates for general commerce. I do not believe that there should be the present notable gap between the methods used for assessing conditions and wages of public servants and the methods used for other groups in the community. Regarding paragraph 8 of the Speech, which refers to hobby farms, I note that the Government proposes to interfere with regard to more legislation in this sphere. It is to be hoped that the Government will not proceed to make more and more legislative restrictions, without first observing carefully the diverse and contradictory reports and recommendations that have been made on this matter in recent months.

Paragraph 9, which refers to the Government's aim to extend the scope of secondary education, states:

As part of its policy two special music schools were successfully established at Brighton and Marryatville High Schools in 1976 and additional special interest centres are planned for 1977, including one school for languages. Over the past few years my Government has given increasing attention to the place of the performing arts in its education policy.

That is very laudable and I do not think anyone could deny the benefit but, in the light of various recent statements in connection with education and employment, there is another side to the question. Appreciation of the arts must not swamp the curriculum.

I am constantly being approached by educationists and parents who are extremely worried about the techniques employed in our education system. I refer to children being taught and brought up without discipline or without being held to worthwhile objectives or without being forced to acquire any particular basic skill (in short, children being allowed to drift along aimlessly), all in support of the proposition that they should be allowed complete self-determination without first being given basic knowledge and philosophies as a guide. I repeat that the public is becoming worried and dissatisfied with our educational aims, and the records of the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations are now revealing the outcome of this lack of policy; namely, the vast number of young people registered as unemployed, young people who have acquired no basic skills during their school years.

According to His Excellency's Speech, a world authority in theatre-in-education was brought to Adelaide by the Education Department to work with 20 of our local drama teachers, but in the *Sunday Mail* appeared a report that the Flinders University drama centre would not take any new students for a year, because of the acute shortage of jobs for actors.

Hillcrest and other vital hospitals are chronically short of staff. The authorities complain that they cannot get people of sufficient educational background to fill the needs of these institutions. I believe that there is far too much emphasis on what so many theorists in education call "the arts" although they really mean spectator arts rather than participatory or creative arts. The arts, of all the disciplines, I humbly submit, is the most demanding. No musician, no artist, no actor will deny that. I suggest that a great deal of time is wasted in teaching children very limited, elemental forms of music and art which are virtually valueless to them in their lives.

In fact, "the arts" is an empty clap-trap expression meaning very little and if our young people emerge from their study of drama with no background knowledge of

Shakespeare or Christopher Marlowe, if they know concrete music yet cannot understand the composers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, let alone the magnificent composers of the twentieth century, Shostakovich, Khachaturian, and Messiaen (to name only three of the greats), or if they are children who are taken in by so-called modern art yet will never know the beauty of the French impressionists or the glory of Romanesque architecture, I think our children are the victims of a gigantic confidence trick.

I regret that I can find in His Excellency's Speech no mention of the teaching of fundamental technologies. We are constantly being reminded that we are living in an age of more and more mechanisation, more and more automatic machinery which is supposed to be giving us greater production, with the employment of fewer people. This is occurring not only in factories but also in commercial offices, where machines are in some degree taking over the work of clerks. As a result, we are hearing almost every day from the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations that the demand for skilled personnel is high and unfulfilled and that the number of unskilled out-of-work people is growing. Yet regrettably I see no mention in the Speech of the requirement for training in fundamental technologies, training in the basic mechanical skills.

It must be obvious to all South Australians that artisans in sufficient numbers are not being trained, nor are our secondary schools turning out sufficient people with the fundamental requirements for further training in these areas. Surely the basic reason for secondary education (in fact, for all education) is to prepare people for a happy and useful life. I think it was the Hon. Mr. Carnie who quoted the words of the former Vice-Chancellor of Monash University on this and other problems of education. I intend now to quote in greater detail Dr. Matheson's talk to the seventh annual general meeting of the Graduate Careers Council in November last year. Dr. Matheson said:

It seems to me that the assumptions on which universities have been based, and which have guided development all the way through, are either no longer valid or are becoming less valid every day. We have proceeded on the assumptions that the high schools would deliver to the universities students with a certain kind of preparation upon which the universities could rely; that selection processes could be based on an assessment of the achievement of the students at the end of high school; and that those selection processes, although doubtless of limited validity, were at least adequate to permit universities to pick out the brightest students, and to rank in a more or less defensible way the middle order of students. Having made that selection, the universities could plan their courses with certain assumptions of previous preparation in mind. This, I now recognise, is a totally old-fashioned and outdated concept. The longer universities cling to it, the more disastrous the results will be, not because of what is happening in universities but because of what is happening in schools. The hard facts of life are that the high school system is becoming less and less able, and, what is perhaps more significant, less and less willing to perform such a function. State Departments of Education are no longer aiming to produce students who are literate and numerate. This may be a realistic way of organising secondary education in the modern world, but the consequences for the tertiary education system have not been considered seriously . . .

I think we are in deep trouble of a different kind because we have not thought out properly the overall function of the tertiary educational system. At present, there is confusion about the relative role of the colleges and the universities. As I see it, the colleges are proceeding too much in the direction of becoming another set of universities. About 15 years ago in Britain, a number of senior technical colleges became colleges of advanced technology. They were to be elite colleges producing, along with the technical faculties of the universities, the key people in British technology. They prepared their

students for the diploma of technology, administered by an external surveillance system. This system operated for about a decade, until one day the Government of the day decreed that they would become universities. I believe that the people taking this decision had not seriously considered whether there was any difference between a college and a university, and if so, what its nature was, and whether any damage to this conceptual difference would be done simply by changing the label overnight. The result has been that the educational facilities for technologists in Britain far exceed the requirement, probably by a factor of two. Many hundreds of millions of pounds have been wasted that could have been more usefully spent.

I am depressed to see that Australia is tracking down the same route, and that the distinction between colleges and universities, underlined in the Martin Committee Report of 1964, has been ignored. That in itself would perhaps not be too serious. But what is quite certain is that the next layer down the educational system is being grossly under-supplied. You can get a young graduate engineer only too easily, but you cannot find a decent draftsman anywhere. The training of skilled technicians is an area which is being very seriously neglected in the Australian system.

Following that, I suggest that honourable members read today's *Advertiser*, because there is a report in it of a survey undertaken by John P. Young on this issue. Education policy is a worry to parents all over Australia. I remind the Government that parents are not stupid, and most parents have their children's well-being, including their educational training, much at heart.

Recently, I received a letter from a person who sought to draw my attention to a statement by Mr. Whitlam which appeared in the *Advertiser* on June 14, 1976. Mr. Whitlam is reported as saying that he did not think the public would believe that any of the programmes the Labor Party initiated were wasteful. The writer of the letter stated:

The fact is that many people do think this. In my opinion, conferences to further Marxist-orientated educational policies are not only wasteful but harmful.

As all honourable members know, educational conferences and seminars, official and unofficial, take place, and often the reports of their findings are discussed at school level. As I said earlier, parents are not stupid, and sections of one report of a Seminar on Sexism in Education held at Wattle Park College of Advanced Education in November, 1975, has been sent to me with comments on those sections. I make clear that in referring to this information I am not referring to any departmental policy but, rather, to the activity of a typical pressure group. I refer to this report emanating from the conference to which I have referred. Several points are interesting because of the reaction of parents. The report states:

Concern was expressed in particular that most materials in use in schools are sexist and that non-sexist and counter-sexist materials are desperately needed.

The comments of the parents concerned were:

Why? Surely materials must be sexist if they are to reflect truth, that is, express the differences (and our consciousness of those differences) which exist between the sexes.

The Hon. Anne Levy: That is not what "sexism" means.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: This is a quote from parents' comments on the information contained in the report. It is what they believe sexism is. If the honourable member listens, she will see the point they are making. The report then states:

The major recommendation of the conference was that, (b) an incorporated body be formed and known as the Sexism in Education Action Project.

The parents state:

Formed and now in the hands of extreme thinkers.

The report states:

There is a disproportionately low number of women holding or applying for senior positions in schools and in administration. This perpetuates a career structure that reflects numerous inequalities between the sexes (i.e. secondary subject choice, career choice, academic qualifications, study leave, promotion opportunities, leadership models, career interruption and stereotyped role expectations in schools).

The parents state:

1. This promise could more accurately use the underlined word "differences", but emotion-charged "inequalities" is preferred.

2. It overlooks the element of choice.

3. What statistics tend to prove factual inequality in matters listed within brackets for a woman who chose to seek them? Are any available?

The report states:

Unless this structure, which limits human potential and effectively uses only half the available talent, is transformed . . .

The parents state:

This statement is a falsity. Indeed not all of the remaining half is available. Some of the remaining half wish to stay at home.

The report states:

Women seldom consider promotion for the following reasons:

- a. the obvious absence of women in similar positions;
- b. the failure of senior officers, principals and principal education officers to offer them positive encouragement for promotion, unlike that already offered to men.

The parents state:

These reasons carry no weight as there is no documented evidence.

The report states:

. . . assessment panels and Public Service Board selection committees are invariably male.

The parents state:

Can S.E.A.P. prove their innuendo of discrimination?

The section of the report dealing with recommendations is as follows:

The conference recommends that all teachers, but particularly females, are fully informed of the conditions and regulations governing promotion, at regional meetings convened by a co-ordinator of women's affairs. At least 50 per cent of senior liaison officers appointed be women and that the existing imbalance be rectified as soon as possible.

The parents comment:

Is not this sexual discrimination? Why not "all teachers being informed by printed form"?

Then, regarding the second part of the recommendation, that is, concerning the 50 per cent, the parents make the following observation:

Basis should be talent and ability to do the job only.

A further recommendation of the conference states:

A co-ordinator of women's affairs be appointed at super-intendent level or above.

The parents commented:

Her terms of reference should be stated.

The conference makes the following recommendation:

A women's adviser who is a committed feminist sit on all curriculum planning committees.

The parents comment:

Why? To state that she has to be "a committed feminist" instead of a normal woman qualified for the job reflects discrimination.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Is a committed feminist not a normal woman?

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: She may be or she may not be.

The Hon. Anne Levy: What is your definition of a normal woman?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The same as yours.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: These are the comments of the parents. This is what they think. They do not want a committed feminist in such a position. Regarding teacher training, the general recommendation is as follows:

The areas of personal relationships and sexual behaviour, of occupational choice and of sex roles are largely excluded from the overt curriculum, leaving the influence of the hidden messages conveyed in school and society to work unexamined and unchallenged.

The parents state:

Except by parents, Sunday school teachers, relatives, neighbours, sporting clubs, social groups and peers. What does the Education Department think it is supposed to be towards children?

Regarding teacher training, the following statement is also made:

Modifications of sex roles are among the most profound changes going on in society.

The parents state:

We the parents want documented examples to substantiate this, please.

The last words handwritten on the copy of the report I received are as follows:

Can the spending of large sums of money on conferences such as this be justified?

The comments made on the report are interesting, because they reflect what people in the community think, and I am glad that this information has been sent to me. The critics of this report state:

If schools exist for children and their development, what good did a conference which resulted in such a report really do the children in our schools? What special expertise did the members of conference have in that the report they compiled should be regarded as authoritative? Was it just that teachers who were prepared to leave their schools for a week voiced opinions? Those who were not, did not. This group defined sexism as organising people according to sex and sexual behaviour and attributing various behaviour, personality and status traits to people on the basis of sex.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Instead of talent!

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: The parents are anxious that appointments should be made on the basis of talent. It is not non-sexist to appoint a woman who is a dedicated feminist and nothing else. Again, this is entirely the view of these parents, and I am merely informing the Government of that view.

I received a telephone call only a week or so ago from a mother very shocked that her child, in a school west of Adelaide, had received a lesson on witchcraft and black magic. This was particularly horrifying to her. As she said, "No time is given to religious instruction but all the time in the world to this rubbish." Parents are not stupid.

Another complaint I have received from an educationist on the lack of trained pre-school teachers, with results which could be very dangerous. This report I saw in the *Advertiser* in June. She referred me to a study made in metropolitan Brisbane by Phyllis Scott—"Personality Development in Children of Working Mothers, a study of pre-school children" (Ph.D Thesis, Department of Psychology, University of Queensland). As my correspondent says:

If this thesis is sound, then it is even positively harmful for this study tested the effect of three, four and five year olds being separated from their mothers for more than six hours a day in group care. The results showed a significant effect on the aspects of personality relating to self-development and mental health, namely less security, more concern for self, less concern for others.

The report in the *Advertiser* has stated there are about 1 500 untrained pre-school teachers. There is something here that could well be looked at by our education authorities.

I now come to paragraph 14 of the Governor's Speech, dealing with the acquisition of land. I want to give a strong warning here that Governments in other States have run into trouble when their departments for development have purchased too much land too far ahead of requirements. The result of tying up land and of using it is a shortage of land for commercial and housing purposes in the metropolitan vicinity. This, then, means that the price of land available to the general public is forced up to unreal heights and continues to skyrocket year by year. The Western Australian Government had this problem around Perth some years ago, as did the Government of New South Wales on the north side of Sydney Harbor. In both cases, land had to be released. In paragraph 16 of the Governor's Speech appears this sentence:

The State Planning Authority is continuing its land acquisition programme for further open spaces in the metropolitan area and also in some country areas.

Reference has been made frequently over the past few years to the necessity for flexibility in planning laws and regulations. This sounds marvellous. It implies that unforeseen problems (that is, unforeseen to date) will be dealt with easily and with the minimum of flap. Regrettably, the outcome of this attitude seems to have been that interlocking planning authorities have so much arbitrary power and are all being so flexible that it often takes months, even years, for the average person to be able to proceed with his proposal or even to get permission to proceed. The warning can never be given too frequently that, where flexibility means arbitrary decision making amongst our rulers, no person can know his rights and nobody can obtain a quick answer to any question. So the community feels hamstrung and frustrated. I turn now to paragraph 18, which states:

My Government is continuing to give effect to its intention to maintain and improve the public transport system within the State—

Nobody can deny that that is a fair proposition. I may say, to coin a phrase, that public transport has a long way to go. The first sentence of the paragraph continues: in order to provide an alternative to the use of the private car, and achieve a better balance between public and private means of transport.

What, please, is a balance in this respect? Presumably, it means all public and no private. Later the paragraph states:

At the present time a review is being conducted of the longer-term transport needs of the north-eastern segment of the Adelaide metropolitan area.

The Transport Department is very strong on reviews. It usually means that the subject of the review will not have to be included in this year's Budget.

As my penultimate point, I wish to mention the Government's fiscal policy, which seems to be for heavier and heavier State taxation. Other honourable members have spoken fully on this growing evil, but I want to mention once more the cruellest tax of all, one that is quite unjustifiable—the death duties levelled at husband and wife. As I have said before, succession duties are a relic of old-style socialism which believed in the necessity for breaking up blocks of assets into numerous small parcels for the better sharing of wealth and opportunities, a belief that has over the past century proved a false and damaging economic policy.

When, however, death strikes one of a married couple, succession duty is a cruel extra burden on the remaining

partner. Wherever that marriage has been a partnership, both people contributing in work and saving, surely that estate should remain intact until the death of both partners, for which in most cases the hungry Government has only a short time to wait. Where, as in a recent publicised case, the wife has worked side by side with her husband in building up a business, with the death of the husband the wife virtually loses everything, her husband and her livelihood.

Many reforms are necessary in the area of succession duties, but none more urgent than the abolition of succession duties between husband and wife.

Finally, I wish to return to my theme of education and give the final word to His Excellency. On January 23 of this year, His Excellency Sir Mark Oliphant delivered an address on universities to the Australian University Graduate Conference at Flinders University. May I just quote a couple of paragraphs that are very applicable:

At the present time, all universities of the western world suffer from the combined effects of inflation and a fixed, or even declining income. The years since World War II have seen a dramatic increase in both the incomes and the numbers of universities. An ever increasing proportion of the population has demanded tertiary education and fees for such studies have been abolished. The proportion of students entering courses and dropping out before completion has increased greatly. A minority of students appears to enrol at a university less to pursue serious studies than to engage in strange kinds of anarchy designed to disrupt rather than encourage scholarship. In this, they are aided by a few members of the academic staff. Students taking professional courses, such as medicine, engineering and law, and those doing the natural sciences, are seldom, if ever, to be found in such activist groups. They are too busy!

There is a growing questioning of the value to society of compulsory education beyond about 14 years of age. Many young people cannot cope with secondary education, and some who scrape through to matriculation gain little as drop-outs from university courses. It is claimed sometimes, that by keeping the young at school, they do not enter an over-crowded labour market, or become out-of-work drifters. However, they do leave the education system eventually, and if their training has not fitted them for the jobs which are available, they are apt to end up as disillusioned and unemployable, trained for a career which no longer exists. Unemployment among university graduates is increasing—

as honourable members would have seen from the report only yesterday—

even among those who were encouraged by the authorities to train as teachers of subjects in which sufficient staff had been difficult to obtain. Because of shortage of funds, it has become necessary to curtail some research projects in universities, and hence to reduce postgraduate training in some fields. This may not be altogether bad if it results in more careful scrutiny of research activities which, in some cases, are neither interesting nor creative, but exercises designed to lead to a thesis and a higher degree—

such as a nephew of mine, who was engaged in an exercise counting cats with different coloured eyes! His Excellency continued:

In all universities with which I have been associated, there are to be found what Sir Henry Tizard called "perpetual students and fellowship holders". They seek scholarships, fellowships or research assistantships, wherever they are to be found, working earnestly but without inspiration at one thing after another, often shamelessly used by ambitious academics to do the dull jobs for them. Such folk, usually women, can find themselves stranded, without job or further prospects in the present economic climate. There are in the academic world a number of men who have climbed to success, or even to Nobel prizes, on the shoulders of such people, and who, when the going gets tough, discard without hesitation those they have encouraged previously to be their slaves.

He quotes an oath that Benjamin Franklin imposed on all aspiring members of his club in Philadelphia, as follows:

I swear diligently to seek the truth and, having found it, impart it to others.

Sir Mark, continued:

This is the solemn duty of the enquiring, uncommitted mind, the true academic mind, whether in the university or elsewhere. It is an approach singularly lacking in many teachers in universities, whose minds are far from open, and it is almost entirely absent in even the graduate's approach to politics.

In the past, I have always believed that the key to a world where hunger, poverty, violence and war no longer drove men and women to senseless inhumanity and intolerance lay in more and better education. When I see the greatest, most highly educated peoples in the world engaged in a continually escalating and brutalising arms race, enabling, through the international trade in arms, the emerging nations to engage in terrible, death-dealing strife, I have serious doubts. Education is as impotent as Christianity to bring peace to the world—rather it encourages selfishness, greed, violence, intolerance, and lack of self-discipline or social discipline.

I support the motion.

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

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health):

I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

It makes a number of miscellaneous amendments to the principal Act. First, it alters the membership of the Medical Board by providing for the appointment, in addition to the present members, of a nominee of Flinders University of South Australia and of a legal practitioner nominated by the Attorney-General. With the establishment of a medical school at Flinders University, it is obviously desirable that the university should have the right to nominate a member of the board in the same way as the Adelaide University has. Because the board is from time to time confronted with problems of legal complexity, for example, in cases involving disciplinary proceedings against medical practitioners, the membership of the board is widened by the inclusion of an experienced legal practitioner who will assist it to dispose of these matters in a manner that is procedurally correct.

The Bill also contains amendments that modify the present requirements under which an applicant for registration or provisional registration is required as a matter of course to attend before the board or a member of the board. Because more than 450 medical practitioners register annually with the board, it has become a physical impossibility to have the registrants presented to the board. The Bill therefore contains provisions that enable the board to call an applicant before it, but do not require the board to follow this course automatically. The Bill contains an amendment doing away with the present privilege of continuous registration. Before 1966, a medical practitioner who registered in South Australia could pay \$10.50 and be granted continuous registration. No annual practising fee existed before that time.

By the Medical Practitioners Act Amendment Act, 1966, an annual practising fee was introduced. However, under the 1966 amendments practitioners who were registered at that time could retain the benefit of continuous registration. At present, this means that about 50 per cent of the medical

practitioners on the medical register have continuous registration without payment of an annual fee, which means that the sole revenue of the Medical Board is derived from medical practitioners registered after the commencement of the 1966 amendments. The expenses of the board are not covered by present revenue. The Bill will remove the present anomaly and will have the effect of requiring about 1 600 medical practitioners to pay an annual practising fee which will increase the annual revenue of the board by about \$14 000, which will go a long way towards making the Medical Board self-sufficient in revenue.

Clause 1 is formal. Clauses 2 to 6 deal with the appointment of the new members of the board. Clause 7 makes a drafting amendment to the principal Act. Clauses 8 and 10 abolish the requirement for the board or a member of the board to interview, as a matter of course, applicants for registration under the Medical Practitioners Act. Clause 9 does away with the privilege of continuous registration for medical practitioners registered before the enactment of the 1966 amendments.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

DISTRICT COUNCIL OF LACEPEDE (VESTING OF LAND) BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill vests certain land, within the district of the District Council of Lacepede, in that council. The land in question is occupied by a residence that in the past was used by the local doctor. However, recently the council purchased for the local doctor a new residence. The land on which the doctor's old house stands was impressed with a trust that was intended to ensure its perpetual use as a residence for a doctor. The original trustees are now dead and the council in question is anxious to avoid the costs of a somewhat expensive and complex application to the Supreme Court to set aside the trust. Accordingly, at the council's request this measure is now proposed.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 sets out certain definitions necessary for the purposes of the measure, of which the

most important is the definition of "the land". Clause 3 vests the land in the council for an estate in fee simple free of all trusts. Clause 4 is a consequential and machinery provision, and clause 5 enables the council to deal with the land so vested in it in all respects as if it was its own property. The grant of this power is consistent with the fact that the council has already purchased another residence for a doctor. This Bill is a hybrid Bill and will, in the ordinary course of events, be referred to a Select Committee of this Council.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I have been associated with this Bill for some time. It is sad that such a long period has elapsed between the time that the original approach was made to the Attorney-General perhaps three or four years ago and the introduction of the Bill. The facts are as set out in the second reading explanation. In order to attract a doctor to the Lacepede District Council area, an agreement was reached between the local people to build for him a house, on the title of which was a caveat. In the time that has elapsed since the house was built, all those involved in the original transfer either have passed on or cannot be traced.

The house is no longer suitable for use as a doctor's residence and for a number of years has been left unoccupied, as a result of which it has deteriorated rapidly. It is reasonable that the council should now vest it in the Lacepede District Council, because it has built another house for the medical practitioner.

I support the second reading, but am sorry that the matter has been so long coming before the Council, thereby causing the continued deterioration of an asset in the Lacepede District Council area.

Bill read a second time, and referred to a Select Committee consisting of the Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, R. C. DeGaris, J. E. Dunford, R. A. Geddes, and C. J. Sumner; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on September 9.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.34 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, August 4, at 2.15 p.m.