

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, August 4, 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 26 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

TARCOOLA TO ALICE SPRINGS RAILWAY

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a short statement before directing a question to the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Transport in another place.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: An article in this morning's *Advertiser* attributes certain statements to the Minister of Transport, as follows:

The construction of the Tarcoola to Alice Springs railway line may be deferred for 10 years. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Virgo) told Mr. Gunn (Lib., Eyre) this in a written reply in the Assembly yesterday. He said he had been told the Federal Government was considering the deferment. However, the information had not been official.

This is an alarming statement, especially if there is any truth in it, which I doubt.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: It is intended to be alarming.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Yes, I think so. The Tarcoola to Alice Springs project is of great importance to South Australia, and the Minister of Transport should surely know officially whether there is to be a deferment of 10 years. For him to make such a statement, more or less guessing about such a deferment appears to be entirely wrong. As recently \$8 000 000 was allocated to enable the project to continue, it appears that the Minister's statement is false. Therefore, I ask the Minister to have this matter clarified as soon as possible.

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

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I direct a question to the same Minister. Is he not aware that the Federal Liberal and Country Party Government procrastinated in much the same manner in regard to the Adelaide to Crystal Brook railway; and is it not also the fact that that railway line is still in jeopardy—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It is in a state of "Fraser federalism" and is never likely to be completed. If honourable members opposite would contain themselves—if I may digress for a moment, Mr. President, you are not keeping very good control of this Chamber; honourable members opposite seem to be able to do as they like—I ask the Minister whether or not the present Federal

Government is adopting exactly the same policy towards the proposed Tarcoola to Alice Springs railway as it adopted towards the Adelaide to Crystal Brook railway, which is still not yet completed.

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

STATE TAXATION

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Has the Minister of Health a reply to a question I recently asked about State taxation?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister is endeavouring to reply.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The figures quoted by the Treasurer on television were Australian Bureau of Statistics figures for State and local government taxation in 1973-74. For all States they are as follows:

	\$
New South Wales	234
Victoria	231
Queensland	177
South Australia	178
Western Australia	180
Tasmania	168

In order to isolate the figures for State Governments, it is necessary to refer to the A.B.S. publication *Public Authority Finance—Taxation* and exclude the items relating to local authorities. The comparison then becomes:

	\$
New South Wales	188
Victoria	184
Queensland	138
South Australia	141
Western Australia	142
Tasmania	125

The comparable statistical publication for 1974-75 is not yet available but officers of the State Treasury Department have since applied the procedures adopted by the statistician to information obtained from the audit reports of each State to produce the following comparison for that year:

	\$
New South Wales	233
Victoria	227
Queensland	155
South Australia	198
Western Australia	184
Tasmania	150

The figures published by the statistician are almost certain to vary somewhat from those calculated by the Treasury, but the differences are not expected to be significant. Since 1974-75, of course, the South Australian Government has abolished the franchise tax on the sale of petroleum products and introduced certain other taxation concessions. These measures would have had the effect of reducing the relative severity of taxation in this State again.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL CENTRE

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I wish to direct a question to the Chief Secretary, representing the Premier, and seek leave to make a brief statement before doing so.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Last Tuesday, the Premier tabled in the House of Assembly the annual report of the Adelaide Festival Centre. That report showed an operating loss for the year ended June 30, 1975, of \$813 688.

The Government grant reduced this to a net loss of \$276 188. In Saturday's *Advertiser*, the Director of the centre, Mr. Anthony Steel, made the rather arrogant statement that we would have to learn to live with the increasing deficit of the centre, forgetting that this Parliament will be the ones to decide whether or not we will live with the growing deficit. Can the Chief Secretary say why the report for the year 1974-75 took 13 months to reach Parliament? Is it possible that poor administration of this sort could be at least part of the reason for the heavy loss? Shall we have to wait a further 12 months for the report for the financial year just ended?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I desire to direct a question to the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Labour and Industry. Can the Minister ascertain the basis on which unemployment figures are now compiled by the appropriate Federal department and to what extent the figures are based on those persons who are registered unemployed? Further, will the Minister find out to what extent the figures are based on those who are in receipt of unemployment benefits? I ask the question because I understand that for many years only about 50 per cent of those persons who are unemployed can qualify for unemployment benefits. Can the Minister ascertain from the appropriate Federal department or departments figures that are more accurate, measured in terms of personal suffering in the community through the lack of job opportunities or possibility of real employment? I ask the question also because of a recent newspaper report based on the fact that it takes about 18 weeks, or nearly six months, for a person who is earnestly and sincerely making every possible endeavour, through both private employment agencies and Government departments, to secure employment. Does not the Minister consider that this is an extremely serious state of affairs and that the present Federal Government should carefully examine its policies and ensure that there are more employment opportunities in the community by lifting that Government's financial restrictions? Does the Minister not think that the statement by a prominent banker in this State, reported this morning, is worthy of examination? The banker deplores the present Federal Government's attitude to wage restrictions, regarding it as one that is not in the best financial and economic interests of the community.

The PRESIDENT: I think there are about 10 questions there.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will try to get 10 replies for the honourable member.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from August 3. Page 341.)

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I support the motion. His Excellency the Governor has stated that, in ordinary circumstances, his recent attendance here will be his last appearance in this Chamber. I remember that, when His Excellency was first appointed, there was much outcry by some sections of the community about his appointment,

but that appointment by the South Australian Government has proved to be a wise one. Sir Mark was the first Australian to be appointed to the office of Governor of this State, and he was the first non-military man chosen for the position. Tradition was broken, and an Australian was chosen on merit. I do not believe that anyone in the community can say that Sir Mark has not been conscientious in his work. He has applied himself to his work with much vigour and he has endeared himself to the people by his outspokenness, his willingness to give a lead, and his ability to associate himself with ordinary people. I wish him peace and happiness in the future.

Part of His Excellency's Speech indicated the Government's intentions for this session. Honourable members opposite know by now that this is a progressive Government under the most capable leadership, and more has been done in its short reign, especially so when one compares what was done by long-ruling Governments of the past, to encourage people to understand Government and to allow them a full voice in their future.

The Opposition voices carping criticism about South Australia's being an over-taxed State, but my colleagues have answered completely those who have criticised the Government on these grounds. No-one likes to be taxed, but we must be taxed so that the Government can supply services that the people demand. Some of those services include water, water storage and the piping of it to those who need a water supply, as well as sewerage facilities. This is probably the most progressive State in relation to sewage disposal because, when the Commonwealth Labor Government was in office, it found it necessary to make huge grants to some Eastern States to enable them to catch up on providing sewerage facilities.

I refer also to hospitals, schools, highways, social services, driver safety, consumer affairs, and to inspectors required to police public health, wage tribunal decisions and safety regulations. Many of our boards and inspectors would be totally unnecessary if everyone was completely honest. However, in our system some people can and do take advantage of every opportunity to cheat and deceive, and to gain an advantage for their own personal profit. Honourable members opposite no doubt accept this as business acumen, and as a sign that the cheat is a smart business man.

The building industry is prone to complaints of this nature, where finance companies and private developers work together to deprive people of their guarantees, and those affected by these manoeuvring companies are usually the young and inexperienced who have put themselves into a lifetime of debt to have what we consider to be every man's right: a house of his own. Honourable members now know why we need to have consumer protection and price control authorities, as well as builders licensing and regulations covering plumbers and electricians. Unfortunately, because of an unscrupulous section of private enterprise, everyone must pay to see that some of their neighbours get a fair go.

Last week, I asked a question regarding the fruit canning industry. As you know, Mr. President, the Minister of Agriculture is absent from the Chamber today, attending a conference on this matter. I have here some press releases that have been issued by Mr. Sinclair, the Australian Minister for Primary Industry, regarding the sums of money that can be found to appease the farming section of the community. I am not saying that that section should not receive this consideration, because in my view some farmers justly deserve it. However, I draw a parallel concerning what is being done for one section with a situation in which others are being unjustly penalised.

Federal spending has been cut on necessitous institutions such as hospitals and schools, as well as on social welfare and highways, the allocation to the last of which was reduced by about \$9 000 000 this year. I refer also to legal aid and the National Employment and Training scheme, which was introduced specifically to assist the unemployed and particularly those who wanted to change their occupation. The aims of that scheme are set out fairly well in the following paragraphs:

1. To alleviate unemployment where it might occur and contribute to overcome skills in short supply.
2. To assist in the long-term restructuring in the work-force.
3. To serve the social and economic needs of the community at large by providing assistance, guidance and remedial training.

The wages of trainees have been cut by between \$10 and \$70 a week. Because they are all receiving \$96 a week, whether they are single or married, it may be questioned whether they all deserve the same type of allowance. Even people with children have had their allowance cut, and trainee numbers have dropped considerably in the last few months. In March, 1975, about 11 600 people enjoyed the benefits of the scheme, while in March of this year (one month after the changes) the figure was 7 400, and it is currently about 7 000. People are being forced off the scheme, while others are not encouraged to join, the overall effects being to deprive the community of sorely needed skills and to waste money already invested on people who left when halfway through training courses. Some of the groups affected are single parents, Aborigines, and the handicapped. We need to spend money in this field equally as much as we need to spend it on the farming community. Hundreds of thousands of unemployed people are living on a mere pittance, yet the Australian Government has refused to fund projects that would aid the community and employ those who want to work. I realise that, in some of the cases I will cite, the producers contribute toward the schemes. The sum of \$540 000 was found for chicken meat research on a \$1 for \$1 basis by the Commonwealth Government, and \$564 000 was found for pig industry research. Regarding forestry taxation concessions, one-third of the amount of calls paid by shareholders on non-redeemable shares in a company carrying on as its principal business afforestation in Australia is rebatable for income tax purposes. Afforestation companies are classified as primary producers for income tax and estate duty purposes, provided the Commissioner of Taxation is satisfied that "forest operations" are being conducted as a business.

For poultry research, \$226 000 was found. Underwriting arrangements for butter and cheese ensure that the producers will receive early payment for their produce.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: It means that you will be able to buy cheese.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: Yes, but money had to be found for the purpose to which I have referred. For wheat research, \$1 700 000 was found, and the vegetable industry has been assisted. The Commonwealth Minister has pointed out the assistance that his Government was able to provide for the people in the agricultural field; for example, the suspension of the meat export charge from March 1; the Government's assumption of responsibility for meat inspection costs; reintroduction of the super-phosphate bounty; continuation of the nitrogenous fertiliser bounty; and new guidelines for farmers seeking welfare benefits. The assistance to the Meat Board to overcome losses on sales to Russia totalled \$1 200 000. For brucellosis and tuberculosis eradication, \$18 500 000 was found,

and \$600 000 was found for carry-on loans to Northern Territory beef producers. I also refer to the re-scheduling of the Government's loan in relation to Nor meat so as to enable the Katherine meatworks to operate; in addition, the freight subsidy programme for beef producers' transport costs in the Northern Territory.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Where did the money for the brucellosis campaign come from? Didn't it come from South Australia's Cattle Compensation Fund?

The Hon. T. M. Casey: No.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: For the dairy research fund, \$873 000 was found. For assistance to the dairying industry in relation to skim milk, the figure was \$300 a tonne. I now refer to a joint statement by the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry, the Hon. Ian Sinclair, M.P., and the Victorian Minister acting in charge of Rural Reconstruction, the Hon. J. Balfour, M.P. Mr. Sinclair and Mr. Balfour made a joint announcement about the progress of the fruitgrowing reconstruction scheme in Victoria. Money is being made available in Victoria, but it is not yet being made available in South Australia on the same scale.

The State Government will amend the Local Government Act to provide measures that will be welcomed by some people and opposed by others. No matter what may be the outcome of these amendments, since the coming into office of the Labor Government it has continually sought to improve the lot of local government and increase expenditure on unemployment relief. Indeed, its spending on unemployment relief through local government has considerably enhanced the responsibilities of local government in providing long-needed amenities to the tax-paying community.

More importantly, it has given the unemployed a chance to maintain their dignity by obtaining jobs and allowing such people to earn a wage, while at the same time doing something for the community in which they live. The Australian Labor Government of 1972-75 was the first Australian Government to recognise the needs of local government, and it was generous in its allocation of Commonwealth funds to that sector. Indeed, many local government areas which had not known the luxury of having a dollar to spare found that with Federal funding, through the Commonwealth Grants Commission and through the unemployment relief scheme, important work could be undertaken and accomplished.

I hope that such grants have not suddenly ceased. If they have, I foresee an additional number of unemployed being added to the existing pool. The Fraser Government has promised that the States and local government will receive income from the restructuring of the taxation system. However, the States must first appoint a highly paid and separate grants commission, even though the old system appeared eminently fair. Why the old system could not still operate is beyond me.

The Commonwealth Grants Commission previously recommended funds to local government bodies most in need, and I refer to the allocations in South Australia made through the Lands Department. The new promised federalism appears to be another way of taxing us more heavily than before, because once again we will find ourselves saddled with more boards and directors and more duplication of departments. I cannot be convinced that such duplication is anything but more costly to the taxpayer.

The Fraser Government is shirking its responsibilities. Instead of trying to get us all to work together for the benefit of Australia, it is trying to divide us by pitting

one State against the other, and actually establishing and encouraging State jealousies, which will be to Australia's detriment. It took our forefathers many years to weld the States together as one entity, yet now the Federal Government is trying its hardest to scatter us into parochial parishes. It would be better occupied working for Australia as a whole and trying to improve the quality of life for all.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you still favour the abolition of the State Parliament?

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I have not changed my mind on that matter.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What about local government?

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I have not changed my mind on that matter, either, as I have told the honourable Leader before. The Fraser Government has already shelved its responsibilities in certain areas with the excuse that, if a State wants such amenities, it must provide them. That policy is adopted regardless of the fact that people already are paying high Commonwealth taxes for those amenities.

The Fraser Government has made no mention of reducing taxation in relation to the facilities it is no longer providing, yet, if a State wants to continue to provide such an amenity, it will have to levy additional taxes in order to meet that cost. Amendments to the Local Government Act in the previous session gave local government the power to operate child-care centres. At that time the Federal Government had guaranteed 75 per cent of the funding required for such centres. However, we find that the Fraser Government has recently broken that promise. If the State wants to operate these necessary institutions, it must fund them itself. Surely this is another step back into the dark ages.

Today, we often find that both parents in a family work, as supporting mothers and widows must do to meet their commitments. For these people, such child-care centres are an absolute necessity, as they ensure the best care of children, whose training, health, and welfare programmes are supervised. The need for such centres is proven and, if these centres do not exist on a community basis, then those people most in need of this service must leave their children with whoever will look after them, without being able to ensure that a child is left in the best possible environment.

The Federal Government intends to abolish the Housing Corporation. This will cause a serious blow to the building industry. The corporation provides building finance at low interest for house buyers. With the abolition of this body the only way for house buyers to get bridging finance is from finance companies at a minimum rate of 16 per cent. This costly means of finance is often beyond the means of ordinary people. In referring to the other areas in which the Fraser Government has cut back on funds, I refer to the following recent report in the *Advertiser* under the banner "Liberal M.P. shocks Government with outburst":

The Government's Deputy Whip (Mr. D. M. Cameron) yesterday blasted the Federal Government's policy on assistance to sport as "crazy" and "harmful". In a statement which shocked some Liberal Ministers and is sure to anger the Prime Minister (Mr. Fraser), Mr. Cameron (Lib. Qld.) praised the Labor Government's aid programme. He said it would have been worse for Australian athletics "if the previous Government had lost office earlier".

The report continues:

Mr. Cameron said: "It is hard enough to coach people without being plagued with the constant worry and extra burden of wondering where you are going to raise the fares to send people from one side of the country to the other. It is even worse for international competition." Mr.

Cameron, who has led two Australian karate teams overseas in the past five years, said the Labor Party had been handing out about \$1 000 000 to Australian sporting organisations before "our entry into the chopping events". Actual expenditure for 1975-76 was an increase of \$156 000 on the previous year. But that figure included \$250 000 to the Australian Olympic team. So, in real terms, present expenditure was on the way down and even then most of that money had been paid out by the Labor Party when in Government.

Mr. Cameron said the Government had to spend more and should look at how money was spent during the three years Labor was in power. "It seems crazy that in the 1974-75 financial year, 17 of the Olympic sports were given almost \$400 000 but, because of Government intervention in the year that mattered most, the expenditure programme for those sports was \$20 000 less," he said. It could have been worse if the previous Government had lost office earlier. "That the Prime Minister is interested and concerned is a wonderful sign," Mr. Cameron said. "Previously if Australian sportsmen and sportswomen were unsuccessful overseas nobody even wanted to know they had been competing."

The Prime Minister is going to look at the matter when he comes back from overseas, but will this be yet another broken promise? It was promised that there would be no more continual junketing, but here is another broken promise. How often has Mr. Fraser been overseas since he came to office? I am not suggesting that sporting bodies should receive large sums, but they should receive some consideration, and the Whitlam Government was on the right track.

Dealing with the Federal Government's niggardliness towards aged people, I refer honourable members to an article by Neil Adcock in the *News* of July 27, under the heading "Don't let us care less about our aged people", as follows:

The aged and children are the two most vulnerable and defenceless groups of people among us. If a Government acts to their detriment, or the community forgets them, they are helpless to do anything about it. Unions can strike, pressure groups can lobby, big business can use the power of money and advertising, and the community can be stirred up, held to ransom, or bought off. But who, pray, can force the hand of authority on behalf of the very young and the very old? If we're going to light candles, pray, and protest, let it be over the obscenity of actions and attitudes which threaten the quality of care for the aged, especially the sick and frail aged, now. The threat I'm talking about could come from an insensitive Government, or an uncaring people. Or both. Do you realise that voluntary or charitable nursing homes in Australia may be required to reduce their staffing hours by about 33 or 35 per cent? Less money will be available from the Commonwealth for aged care. At least one home in South Australia has already begun to live within the projected stringencies, and the result is frustration for the staff, insecurity and less personal attention for the patients. Cuts hit aged people in precisely those few things which make life bearable at all—like being walked instead of being confined to a room or a bed for 24 hours a day; having hair washed and brushed; being able to get dressed for a few hours occasionally, and hopefully being rehabilitated to more normal society. They probably will not lack basic medical attention, but they will lose the personal attention that keeps them human.

Seeing patients needing personal attention, and being too busy to give it, eats the heart out of caring members of the nursing staff, and most of them care greatly. Fears that this policy may have been implemented forthwith have been stayed pending the Austin Holmes' report due at the end of September. Meanwhile, charitable homes have to prove that they can effect economies. And they may make urgent submissions. But confidence has already been shaken. Homes managements do not know what the future will hold.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Because of inflation.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: The report continues:

South Australia outstrips other States in the quality of care and number of homes provided, per capita, for our lovely but helpless aged. We're also better organised.

But, if, by community inaction at this moment, a Government is allowed to reduce the level of care given to old people, so much as by one iota, we should hang our heads in shame. We would deserve to go down in history as a heartless generation.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: There has been Government assistance.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: The Government has given increases in some sections, but the gap has widened. Another section of the aged about which we must worry is that which includes those who are able to get out and about and need homes to live in and a community hall in which to function. The subsidy under the previous Labor Government was four to one; now it has been reduced to two to one. Groups in the community had made plans to build units for their members and other people in the towns involved. They were expecting subsidies of four to one; they had drawn up or been interested in plans to cater for these people. Now they have been told not only that the subsidy has been cut from four to one to two to one but also that they may have to wait for three or four years. A similar situation applies to community halls (it may be better to describe them as meeting places for aged people). Those who made a tentative application before they made any progress towards planning now find that they have plans ready but that the subsidies that were to have been allowed previously have now been drastically cut.

Federally, we have a whole list of broken promises, the poor and the under-privileged being unjustly penalised. The privileged are given more privileges and the rich are helped to get richer. From the example set by the present Federal Government, is it any wonder that the voters have become sceptical about the value of politicians? I support the motion.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I, too, support the motion. I congratulate His Excellency on the manner in which he delivered his address to this Parliament. I should like to add my sincere appreciation of the wonderful way in which His Excellency has fulfilled the high and dignified office of a representative of Her Majesty the Queen. Sir Mark has truly been one of our greatest South Australians, and he and Lady Oliphant have fulfilled the roles of Governor and First Lady with great distinction.

Perhaps one of Sir Mark's greatest attributes is the fact that, although he is one of the most learned men we have ever produced in South Australia, he is ever ready to listen, and what a marvellous attribute that is! It is a pity that some of our politicians, on being given a little power, have cost the technique of being able to listen, a lesson, I am sure, they could learn from the Governor.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Of whom are you thinking?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: It could apply to quite a number of people who, not having had power, are given a little power and assume a great deal. Honourable members may draw their own conclusions. To the families of the former members who have passed away since the last session I wish to extend my sympathy and to have my appreciation of their efforts on behalf of this State recorded. Of the three former members, I knew only the late Jim Ferguson in person and I take this opportunity of saying how much that man, in my opinion, did for the State; he was a kindly gentleman with a commonsense approach to the matters placed in his hands.

Early in the Speech, His Excellency referred to the dismal seasonal conditions in the rural sector. Honourable members will note that since then, nearly two months ago,

the soaking rains that His Excellency mentioned have not been forthcoming and the situation has deteriorated markedly.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: That does not apply to all areas of the State.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: True, in the South-East of the State and the lower portions of both the peninsulas the season is quite acceptable, and thank goodness there are some areas that are not devastated by drought. Nevertheless, rains are needed immediately. In most areas I believe they would still be too late to make a great contribution to our income this year. In some areas wheat has been sown, but no crops are resulting. Other areas have remained so dry that at least people have seed wheat left for next year. My point is that much of this State's and this nation's income still revolves around the amount produced by the primary sector. If this is so, every man, woman and child in Australia is affected by the seasonal result.

Over the last 20 years primary products (and these are factual figures) have fluctuated from about 83 per cent of the national export income to as low as 53 per cent during the time when markets for all rural products were so depressed. However, owing to good grain prices and a firming tendency for wool, prices have once again put this portion of our export income at over 70 per cent. Our total export income for the 11 months to May was \$8 562 216 000 and, of the figure, \$6 175 572 000 was from the primary sector. In a breakdown of the figures for primary industry, I exclude mining and forestry, because these are not materially affected by drought. Three major sections of primary industry will be affected. The agricultural, horticultural and viticultural industries form one group, and that group was responsible for 22·52 per cent of the total primary income. The second group, the pastoral group, was responsible for 19·41 per cent, and the third group, the dairying group, was responsible for 2·29 per cent. Those groups make up a total of 44·22 per cent of the primary industry income.

If we consider, as has been predicted, that income from production of these three groups will be at least halved (and those honourable members who have travelled through the countryside in these areas would agree that this could happen, or even could be more drastic), the halving from 44·22 per cent to 22·11 per cent would mean a loss of about \$145 for every man, woman and child in Australia, basing our population on 13 000 000. I have quoted these figures to try to draw attention to the need, quite in contradiction of what the Hon. Mr. Creedon has said this afternoon, for this State Government, the Federal Government, and the nation in general to do what they can to alleviate the present situation.

Some relief could be given almost immediately in several areas. I do not expect the Government to stop the droughts. True, the Premier claimed to have some influence on the big tidal wave, but we do not expect him to do anything to make it rain. Regarding the areas about which I should like to speak, we could think perhaps of the present drought relief scheme that has been proposed to assist producers with stock. On this matter there has been much lip service, and much farcical information has been printed, and many farcical things have been said that, in actual fact, do not relieve the situation. For instance, the payment of 40c a sheep for those sheep eligible for bone mealings sounds a grand gesture until one examines the arrangement and finds that 40c would not pay the freight on the sheep from the drought-affected area.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: They tell me that Samcor would make a good profit on the bone meal, too.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I consider that the production of bone meal should be increased, especially when so much of the ingredient is available. It is farcical for the Minister to claim that the arrangement affords relief, because the 40c would not pay the freight. Moreover, the sheep must weigh 18 kilograms (about 40 lb.) and they must be clean shorn. Shearing cannot be regulated to meet such a scheme as this, and to shear a sheep with half an inch of wool on it would not be a paying proposition.

Therefore, there are several miscalculations in the scheme, or several examples of kite flying. The people concerned want not lip service but action that will assist them to get through the present crisis. Once again, I refer to the concession on breeding stock sent from a property to agistment, and 50 per cent of the freight will be paid on breeding stock. That really is not any big concession when we consider that few areas in the State are open for agistment. In addition, young stock which probably cannot be marketed profitably and which would perhaps be the best to survive on an agistment scheme have been excluded from this agistment arrangement unless they are of the female gender. Young steers, young wethers and hoggets cannot qualify for this agistment freight subsidy.

I say once again that, although there has been much talk, that will not bring any relief. I can quote instances of sheep already returning from the agistment that was arranged after the fires on Eyre Peninsula. Of course, the people concerned could not estimate the freight cost when the sheep went away, and, in fact, they were not entitled to it until the sheep were returned, and they are now finding that there is a long delay in the provision of this subsidy. There is no point in telling the people of the grand things that the Government will do, if it has no intention of carrying them out effectively.

The land tax return in this State has increased from \$13 000 000 to \$20 000 000 in the past 12 months. Although this burden inflicts anomalies on a small section, it is nevertheless most depressing on those whom it is affecting at present. Of course, under the formula, it will affect the whole rural section of South Australia when the valuations for the whole State have been completed. For the record, I will quote some instances. A property comprising 3 200 acres of rocky hilly grazing land now attracts land tax of \$18 000, but the net income from that property would not be \$18 000. The property could not produce that amount, yet it attracts that land tax burden.

One of the provisions under which land tax is assessed is in regard to the scarcity value of that land. "Scarcity value" is a most unreasonable term, when it is considered that unimproved scrub land in the same area has been sold at \$1 000 an acre to someone who wishes to build a house in that area.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What could he build there?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: He might not build anything other than a house there. Because of this demand by members of the community, which are sick to death of the inner suburbs and want to break out into the country area, people are willing to pay any sum of money for this land. If an assessor comes along and says, "The block next door is valued at \$1 000 an acre," the landholder must pay land tax at that rate. Although his land is not for sale, and the State Planning Authority probably would not permit it to be subdivided, land tax for the property is assessed on this ridiculous schedule.

Many suggestions have been made to the Premier in the hope that he will this session introduce legislation dealing

with land tax. If he does so, it is to be hoped that he will take heed of and accept some of the recommendations that have been made to him. It would be well to note that the proportion of the total value of land on which an enterprise is carried out varies between 45 per cent and 65 per cent for agricultural land. For private dwellings, the figure is about 25 per cent, whereas for commercial premises it is only about 10 per cent. Yet, when one examines the production figure for similar types of land, one sees that the gross income from, for instance, an extractive industry in Croydon is \$1 000 000, the land tax payable on it being \$2 800. On the other hand, in the case of a farm in the Adelaide Hills, with a gross income of \$40 000, expenses of \$20 000, and the need to provide a living for three families (so the sum involved would have to exceed \$20 000), land tax is \$18 000. Yet the capital investment in the land is 65 per cent for farming and only 10 per cent in the case of a commercial undertaking.

If we are to raise \$20 000 000 by land tax, it is high time (and I do not blame this Government entirely for the situation regarding land tax, but the system that it is using at present bears no relationship to honesty or justice), that a more equitable system was evolved. It would not be hard to raise that same \$20 000 000 if the scheme was based on a more even scale. One of the suggestions that have been made is that it should involve a flat rate of taxation based on the assessment value. To my mind, if we are stuck with this iniquitous tax, it should be levied fairly, instead of putting some people completely out of business. I know that this is one of the things that the Premier has said he would consider. The Act allows a person to continue his business without paying the land tax but to let it stand as a debt against the land.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That's wonderful!

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Yes, it is a wonderful thing! It is a great encouragement for families to stay on the land, knowing full well that, by the time father is ready to move on, the accumulated land tax will be so high that there will be nothing left, and, indeed then the land will be completely encumbered.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I wonder how far one could go before they foreclosed.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That's only if it is subdivided.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: It applies to any land tax; it can be left as a debt against the land. If the honourable member thinks that that is any sort of solution to the problem of people being forced off their properties by this iniquitous taxation system, I say to him it is high time that the present Government had a good and honest look at this matter.

I have already referred to the instances of an industry with a \$1 000 000 gross income attracting a \$2 800 payment for land tax, and a farming property with a gross income of \$40 000, from which \$20 000 expenses must be taken and which must support three families, having to pay \$18 000 land tax. I could quote many anomalies. However, what I have already said is sufficient to illustrate the position.

The Hon. Mr. Creedon was vocal about the subsidies being paid to the rural sector. I have already said how it presently produces more than 70 per cent of our national exportable income, and I should like to acquaint the honourable member with some other facts. If he wants to talk about subsidies, he should consider the latest Industries Assistance Commission report, which deals with this matter under the two headings of "Rural Sector" and "Manufacturing Sector".

In the 1974-75 financial year, \$72 000 000 in subsidies was paid to the rural sector and \$186 000 000 to the manufacturing sector. Revenue foregone to the rural sector totalled \$74 000 000 and to the manufacturing sector \$37 000 000. "Other" (which is a vague term) involved \$302 000 000 for the rural sector and \$76 000 000 for the manufacturing sector, the total for the rural sector being \$448 000 000 and for the manufacturing sector \$299 000 000.

The \$448 000 000 for rural assistance includes \$111 000 000 for rural roads and \$51 000 000 for oversea food aid. But who gets the benefit of that? The rural roads are used by everyone in the State and, in many cases, by carriers from other States. Surely, the oversea food aid figure should be regarded as assistance not to the farmers who produce the food but to the recipient country. If those figures are excluded, one sees that the assistance given to the rural sector totals \$286 000 000 and that given to the manufacturing sector \$299 000 000.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Who were the architects of this situation?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I am not sure what you are referring to. Would you like me to give way?

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: I think Black Jack McEwen built up this whole structure.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The Hon. Mr. Whyte is really replying to what the Hon. Mr. Crendon said.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I wanted the Hon. Mr. Crendon to know some of these facts and figures.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Why don't you refer them to Mr. Sinclair before they sack him?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I think he would be more aware of the facts than is the honourable member. I also want to alert the Hon. Mr. Dunford to the facts. The more he publicises them, the better I shall be pleased. I point out that 70 per cent of the exportable income is produced by less than 8 per cent of the population.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: What percentage of the gross domestic product would it be?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I do not have that figure.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: I did not think you would have it, because it would give the lie to your argument.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: It would not. The exportable income has a large bearing on our standard of living. If one relates these figures to overall production, one can develop all sorts of argument. My point is that 70 per cent of our exportable income is surely worth some recognition and assistance, to keep it that way. The latest figures available in connection with the subsidy equivalent for tariffs are given by the Industries Assistance Commission for various industry groups. The sums would probably be greater now. The figures are as follows:

	\$
Food, vegetables and tobacco	303 000 000
Clothing and footwear	266 000 000
Textiles	117 000 000
Wood, wood products and furniture	100 000 000
Paper and paper products	244 000 000
Chemicals, petroleum and coal products	180 000 000
Non-metallic products	72 000 000
Basic metal products	246 000 000
Fabricated metal products	315 000 000
Transport equipment	287 000 000
Other machinery and equipment	348 000 000
Miscellaneous manufacturing	125 000 000
	<hr/> 2 603 000 000

These export taxes are paid by the exporters.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: How did you arrive at the figure of 70 per cent? Does it include mining and forestry?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Yes.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: What is the figure for farm exports?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: They are in three groups. For the agricultural group, it is 22.52 per cent of the total primary industry figure; for the pastoral group, 19.41 per cent; and for the dairying group, 2.29 per cent, making a total of 44.22 per cent.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: It is a declining figure.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: No. It was much lower when markets were more depressed than they are at present. The figure is on the increase again. It has fluctuated between 83 per cent and 53 per cent, and at present it is running at 70 per cent of our exportable income.

His Excellency's Speech referred to the Government's plans in connection with the fishing industry. It was stated that there would be an increase in research and regulatory functions. Of course, the fishermen are worried that there will be many more regulatory functions than there will be research activities. The fishing industry would like assistance in conducting research. Many vessels in the industry are skippered by highly qualified and experienced full-time fishermen. These vessels can travel anywhere in Australian waters, and the fishermen are ready and willing at any time to undertake research. They will take the appropriate officer (and the Minister, if he would like to go) because they are aware of the need for research, and they know the type of research that would be rewarding to the industry.

I wish the Minister would confer more closely with these people, instead of suggesting that there could be greater expenditure on some departmental boat that would probably take a couple of years to equip and come back with the officer's report. The people to whom I have referred could provide the same information in six months, provided they received co-operation and assistance from the Government. I stress that some boats are at present not fully employed, and the fishermen know the fishing grounds.

It is interesting and rewarding to note that after all these years the Eyre Highway will be ready for use in September. The completion of this project has taken a long time and it has been most difficult. It took a long time for Governments to reach agreement about the project and for the work to be undertaken. The project has been so difficult that some of the contractors involved have fallen by the wayside having undertaken work that they could not complete within the limits of their quotes. They became financially embarrassed in their attempts to complete their contracts. Generally, however, this project is a credit to the engineering ability and the road-building supervision of the South Australian Highways Department. I believe that the department is building some of the best highways in Australia, if not in the world. I do not say it does it quickly or economically, but the department builds good highways.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Could it build them more quickly and more economically?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: If it did one, the other would automatically result.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Some of the contractors do not pay their employees the right wages, and go broke.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: What does the honourable member suggest they should be paid?

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: I can tell the honourable member what the contractors do. I can name the contractors who underpay their workers and go bankrupt, still owing money to the Government. Indeed, one of them is still Chairman of the earth-moving section of the Chamber of Commerce.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Let us hope that we do not give such contractors more contracts. Honourable members who have spoken previously made much mention of Monarto. It is high time that the Government accepted the situation surrounding that project, but it will not do that because it promised to establish Monarto. However, it also promised Chowilla as well as a gambling complex at Victor Harbor. The Government has promised many things, but this is a promise that could easily be broken.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: When was a gambling casino promised?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: About the time the Malaysian business men were going to invade South Australia.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: That was a paper promise—not a Government promise.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The promise was attributed to the Premier. Nevertheless, I believe that we are developing the wrong areas of South Australia. Port Pirie could be developed; there is room for much housing that would not result in using choice soil, as has resulted in the metropolitan area. Here we have concrete monstrosities built on the only fertile vegetable-producing land in South Australia. We do not want that to continue, especially if we can save some productive areas for their best use. The way we are heading, we will be supplying the State's vegetables from Port Augusta or Port Pirie. The samphire swamps of Port Pirie would be more suitable for concrete monstrosities than for the development of market gardens that could be more usefully located in the Adelaide Hills.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What about the development of a vegetable-growing industry at Kimba?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I do not know whether the Poldas system could provide sufficient water, but I thank the honourable Leader for his interest.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Cartage costs would be high.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Just as well the Hon. Mr. DeGaris isn't running the country.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The Hon. Mr. Dunford referred to employment prospects, but what work opportunities will be available at Monarto? He suggested that industry will go to Monarto.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Will the honourable member give way?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Yes.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Industry needs transport, and Monarto will be accessible to both road and rail transport, lying, as it does, between two capital cities (Melbourne and Adelaide). It would be close to Adelaide, and industry that might not go to Port Pirie would go to Monarto. Feasibility studies undertaken on the likelihood of industry going to Port Pirie have shown that industry will not go to Port Pirie, so I think there is a greater chance that industry will go to Monarto. I believe the Hon. Mr. Whyte knows that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Port Pirie has probably improved since you left there.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: I hope so.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I am as aware of the feasibility studies that have been undertaken as is the Hon. Mr. Dunford. I point out that, in considering the position of the Monarto work force, the Government even

had to take steps to force some public servants to go there. Some industry is already established at Port Pirie. Certainly, if the harbor were dredged any amount of industry would be willing to locate itself at Port Pirie but, even so, how much less is the possibility of such an industry locating itself at Monarto? There is no way that will happen. Port Pirie has a seaport and a rail link (and I admit Monarto has a rail link).

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: The rail link is with Western Australia.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: It goes both ways. Monarto is so farcical a project that there is little likelihood of its ever getting under way, and the sooner we concentrate on developing areas such as Port Pirie the better. Of course, there could be a conflict between Government members in this Parliament. After the midnight announcement of new boundaries, we will probably have some clarification of the position. If, for example, the Speaker in another place is able to retain the seat of Pirie (and I believe he can), the likelihood of Port Pirie being further developed is great, especially if the equal numbers in another place are maintained; I think the member for Port Pirie will do much for his town.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Will he get much support from Port Augusta?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I think there is conflict between Port Augusta and Port Pirie. Although I will not enter that controversy, I have seen contracts going to Port Pirie that would normally go to Port Augusta. It appears that one man may be smarter than another.

Finally, I want to say how pleased I was to see the interest shown in the Hon. Mr. DeGaris's piece of poetry, especially when the honourable Leader read it himself. It seemed a different piece of literature from that read by the Hon. Mr. Dunford.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: I read the skulduggery and hypocrisy into it.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Yes, you certainly put them in. I think the Hon. Mr. DeGaris was hoping that his poem might have made the Premier's list for reciting at the zoo.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: That is where the Leader wrote it; I think he was having a zoo night when he wrote it.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I think the Premier would make a better job of reciting it than the Hon. Mr. Dunford did. I want to correct an interjection made by the Hon. Mr. Dunford, because he knows it is not true. I say this just in case some other honourable member may think it is true: I do not own stations. True, I have spent much of my life in the pastoral industry but I do not own any stations in the North, and Jim Dunford would probably know that. I say that to put the record straight. I own a property that would hardly qualify as a station.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: How big is it?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Not very big.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: How big is "not very big"?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I do not have to divulge that. I am willing to tell the honourable member privately.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Is it a large property?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I conclude by saying that I wholeheartedly support the motion.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I, too, support the motion. In doing so I should first like to endorse the remarks made on both sides of the Council regarding the Governor. He

has indeed proved to be a most able holder of that office and has won the admiration and respect of all in our community. It is with regret and affection that we wish him well in his retirement. We can all remember, I am sure, the day when he was first appointed to his position as a representative of the Crown and the loud outcry against him that resulted from one member in particular of the Liberal Party.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Who was that?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I hope all honourable members opposite can remember, and will inform him.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Was it John McLeay?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Yes. I trust that that member of Parliament will have the grace now to admit that he was wrong in his slander of Sir Mark and acknowledge with the rest of us the contribution that Sir Mark has made to the South Australian community during his term of office. I should also wish to mention and stress the fact that Sir Mark was, and is, a most eminent scientist and that his contributions to society in that capacity have been both considerable and extensive. Too often, I fear, our society underestimates the value of scientific endeavour and ignores the scientist in his ivory tower. The men and women who are scientists are among the most highly trained in our community, trained in clear logical thinking, and trained to evaluate evidence and to contribute to the human store of knowledge by their creative activity.

Among scientists will be found the most brilliant minds of the age. They have much to contribute to our society, both within and without their laboratories, if only we will permit them to apply scientific reasoning and method to the problems about us. I am not saying that science has all the answers, necessarily, but in many spheres science can provide us with the objective information on which subjective decisions must be based. I do most strongly hold that the scientific approach is one to be considered in all spheres of our daily activity and that we can all learn from the more scientifically minded.

I should like to make a few comments about the so-called literacy crisis in our schools, mentioned by both the Hon. Mr. Carnie and the Hon. Jessie Cooper. True, surveys such as that by the Australian Council for Educational Research show there are many children whose reading age is below average and who have trouble with simple arithmetic. However, these same surveys show that the vast majority of our children have what is called a "survival level of literacy"—defined as the level needed to cope with the everyday demands of our society. We might note, too, how this survival level has been rising rapidly as our society has become more complex. It used to be considered that the skills of the average eight-year-old would suffice to cope with modern living, but later estimates put the necessary level at that of the 10-year-old, then the 12-year-old; then, finally, the 14-year-old, as society makes more demands on greater skill for coping with modern life.

As reported in the *National Times* of July 26, the Australian Council for Educational Research survey shows that 99 per cent of our 14-year-olds in Australia have this "survival" level of literacy, whereas a similar survey of all the people in the same community showed that only 90 per cent of them achieved this level.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Which survey was that?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The survey of the Australian Council for Educational Research. So much for the claim that literacy rates are falling! I should like to quote a few of the comments in this article from the *National Times*, as follows:

There are revealing differences among the various groups making up the 10 per cent unable to cope with written English at survival level. The main group in difficulty are the older New Australians. Some 60 per cent of New Australians, with no schooling in this country, could not cope with the material—more women than men are in this position. Among younger migrants who have had some schooling here, the illiteracy rate is reduced to about 3 per cent. (According to the Bullock Report, in the United Kingdom, about 3 per cent is par for the course in developed countries.)

Among the Australian and British-born, the older people are also far more likely to be illiterate than the younger. For the over-60's, the illiteracy rate is 12 per cent. It reduces systematically with recency of schooling to 1.6 per cent among those aged 15 to 30. The older illiterates tend to be women, the younger, men. Even if these figures have a certain margin of error, the differences are too striking to be ignored. Leaving aside New Australians with no schooling here, the people schooled in the alleged "golden age" before the depression are 12 times as likely to be illiterate as current 14-year-olds, including migrants. It is a fallacy that we have hordes of young illiterates running about. We have a few, but they are far outnumbered by older illiterates.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: How do you define "literacy"?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: It is the literacy level defined to cope with modern living.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That is rather an odd definition.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: They are talking about the "survival literacy level", by definition.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I do not understand that definition.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I suggest you read the article.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I have; I do not understand what they are talking about. That is why I asked you.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: There is a definition here and it is expanded on in the Australian Council for Educational Research report.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: And the other one was not based on opinion?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: No; the other was based on facts, testing individuals to see what the literacy rate is.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: But I do not understand the definition of "literacy"; neither do you.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I do understand. The definition is:

A "survival" level of literacy has been defined as the level needed to cope with the everyday demands of modern society. This includes the ability to handle data such as classified advertisements for jobs and housing, and application forms.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: But there must be an opinion. You are still basing it on opinion, are you not?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: No, there is a difference. This is a definition and one can do a test to find out what proportion of the population ought to be just passed. With J. P. Young, there was no testing: it was just a matter of asking people whether they believed the situation had changed and that was purely opinion and was not based on any facts. There is a distinction between fact and an opinion. The A.C.E.R. made a test based on facts, using a particular definition of "literacy".

The J. P. Young survey purely asked the opinion of people on whether they thought literacy standards were changing. These people gave an opinion that was not based on any facts whatsoever. A survey of what people think may be of interest, but, if we are determining education policies, surely the facts are of more interest. It is the A.C.E.R. survey that I have been quoting.

It is interesting, too, to note that opinions about declining literacy are not new at all, and such comments can be traced back at least to the turn of the century. About 50 years ago undergraduate "illiteracy" caused alarm at Sydney University, as it does today. Certainly, in the thousands of scripts at the university that I have marked and assessed, there has always been a proportion that show ineptitude with the English language and poor sentence structure, grammar and spelling. However, I doubt that the proportion changed during the many years of my experience.

What is new is that at present the universities are doing something about the causes of the problem, instead of just advocating remedial English courses that could have been just as beneficial half a century ago. It may well be that teachers of senior students in our schools are encountering a larger proportion of students with literacy problems. Previously, such students probably left school at the earliest opportunity, whereas, with greater retention rates, they now stay on at school much longer.

I was appalled, too, by the attack on our education system made by the Hon. Mr. Carnie and the Hon. Mrs. Cooper. They seemed to regard art, music and drama as trivial and unimportant extras that should be treated as extra-curricular activities only: instead, apparently, we should bash the three R's into our children during normal school hours. I know that art, music and drama were neglected in my time at school and I am convinced that my education was the poorer for it.

I rejoice in the fact that my children have more opportunities than I had in these areas and, certainly, I do not begrudge them the better understanding of human experience and emotion that is thus being given to them. For the sake of the children of South Australia, I am indeed pleased that neither the Hon. Mr. Carnie nor the Hon. Mrs. Cooper is ever likely to be Minister of Education, because undoubtedly they would wish to turn the clock back. It has been stated by Opposition members that money alone will not solve the problems in our schools, the implication being that money made available by the Whitlam Government for the education of the children of Australia was ill-spent.

I most strongly deny this and I completely endorse the actions of the South Australian Institute of Teachers and parent organisations in their current attempts to see that the Federal Government does not cut expenditure on education in its forthcoming Budget. I cannot but wonder at the fact that so many of those on the other side of this Chamber have chosen to speak of so-called excess spending in education. Do those honourable members have inside knowledge of cuts that are about to be made? Are they rationalising the inevitable about to be inflicted on the young people of this country, so that the standard of education will again depend on the means of the parent, with equality of opportunity going out the window? It is certainly true that money alone will not result in a good education system but the provision of adequate funds surely is a necessary, if not sufficient, condition for equal educational opportunity.

I will now quote from a document prepared by the staff of a junior primary school in our State, located in an underprivileged area of this city. At this school, a survey showed that numerous problems required consideration. It was found that 30 per cent of the children came from one-parent families, that 11 per cent of the children had speech defects, that 13 per cent of the children had English as their second language only, that 6 per cent were Aboriginal children, and that 17 per cent needed behaviour

modification programmes. Before receiving special help from the Australian Schools Commission, in its innovative grant programme, that school had a staff of six only. Now it has 14 staff members and a whole range of activities aimed not only at the children who are of school age but also at the community from which they come. These include:

1. Pre-school programmes for 4-year-old children.
2. A play group programme for 2-year-old and 3-year-old children whereby mothers attend with their children and learn to develop and inter-act with their children.
3. A family day-care scheme, where the working mother's child is cared for in a family situation and the minding mother is given assistance through the school by a professional adviser on child care.
4. A baby development (parent education) scheme, whereby homes are visited weekly to assist mothers with advice on the needs and development of their children.
5. A toy resource library, where toys are available for children in the playgroup, pre-school, and family day-care programmes, operating on the same basis as a book library with parents helped in selection of suitable toys.
6. A high school programme, whereby students from a nearby high school learn about children's development and needs and spend time at the primary school benefiting the young children and themselves.
7. A mothers and babies health clinic, conducted at the school.
8. A holiday care programme in the Christmas vacation, conducted by mothers and teacher aides.
9. A community club parent activities programme, whereby parents take part in all sorts of activity organised for them at the school. A remarkable percentage of parents attending these activities has been achieved, and the parents gain enjoyment and feel they are important components of the school community.
10. Special help for the Aboriginal children is provided by having adult Aboriginals working as teacher aides in the school.

As well, numerous new activities are being provided for the children at the school, as well as new buildings and facilities, and the pupil attendance has increased dramatically. All these programmes require money, and this has been provided through the Schools Commission. It would be tragic indeed if the innovation grants for such schools were to be discontinued and the opportunities being given to such a disadvantaged community had to cease. I hope that members opposite will do all in their power to see that the present Federal Government continues its responsibilities for programmes such as I have outlined and realises that equal educational opportunities mean far more than the three basic R's, important though they may be.

Whilst I am dealing with the subject of equal opportunities, I should like to comment on some of the extraordinary statements made yesterday by the Hon. Mrs. Cooper. I realise that much of what she said was quoted from correspondence she had received but, as she in no way dissociated herself from the comments made, I could only presume that she endorsed these comments and supported the assumptions on which they were based. If they had not been uttered by a woman, I should class her remarks as some of the most male chauvinistic statements that I have ever heard.

First, I take strong exception to the phrase that implied that feminists and normal women were opposites, that one could be one or the other but not both. A feminist is someone, male or female, who recognises that women have been disadvantaged and discriminated against in our society and furthermore holds that all individuals should be treated as individuals, not classified into stereotypes according to their sex.

People should not be trained to adopt certain roles in society merely on the basis of their sex, but all people, including children, should be given every opportunity to

develop their own individual talents and abilities. Only then can equality of the sexes be achieved, when sex is not regarded as a relevant factor determining the opportunities and activities available to individuals in our society.

A normal woman, on the other hand, is one who is born with a uterus, a vagina and two ovaries. So, it is perfectly possible to be both a feminist and a normal woman, and many people in our society are both. Feminism is an attribute of a person's mind, an attitude that influences one's behaviour. Womanhood, on the other hand, is a biological or an anatomical description.

By equating an attitude with a certain anatomical structure, the author of the phrase quoted by the Hon. Mrs. Cooper has done precisely what feminists object to: he or she is implying that attitudes and behaviour are primarily determined by anatomy. This ignores the enormous range and variation in talents and abilities, aptitudes, interests, strengths and weaknesses that occur within both sexes: it is treating every member of a sex as being psychologically the same, instead of recognising the tremendous variation which occurs and which is obvious if we treat each person as an individual.

I am not aware of any serious study having shown a great difference in ability between the sexes. True, some scientific investigations have revealed slight differences in mean scores for certain characteristics, girls in some studies having greater verbal facility than boys, whereas boys have greater spatial cognisance than girls.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Any married man would know that.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: That is a sexist remark. But in every case where such differences were detected, the differences between the sexes were very much smaller than the differences within each sex. The coefficients of variation were enormous, which means that it is quite impossible to predict the inherent capabilities of any individual merely from a knowledge of its sex.

Regarding the Sexism in Education Conference to which the Hon. Mrs. Cooper referred, I, too, have read with great interest the report thereof. To suggest that all its participants were Marxist is plainly ridiculous, and I assure the Council that that is just not true. Those who attended the conference were concerned about the sex stereotyping that occurs in our schools, both in the textbooks provided and in the attitudes of teachers and the administration within our schools. These people wish to do something about it.

Numerous studies have been made of the books available to young children and of the attitudes that these portray with regard to the sexes. Time after time the active, energetic characters are male; the passive ones who stay home and do not participate in adventures are female. Adult women in these books never go to work; adult men always do. When a boy and a girl are together involved in some interesting activity, it is the boy who shows greater initiative and daring and protects the girl from danger; it is never the other way around. These models must influence the way that young children see themselves and others, and will help to socialise girls into passive, dependent roles.

Honourable members need not just take my word regarding these matters. A report issued by the Australian Schools Commission in November, 1975, discusses these matters very clearly. The report, entitled "Girls, school and society", should be regarded, I think, as compulsory reading for anyone interested in education, teachers and parents alike.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You mentioned girls relying on boys to take their part, but there could be exceptions to that.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: There are exceptions, but they were indeed rare in the study that was made of children's books. I should like to quote a few passages from this important report in relation to the effect on the attitudes and mental development of girls of the models and expectations that they sense in our schools. Part of the report is as follows:

The effects of teachers' implicit assumptions and expectations on their students have long been recognised as an important factor in schooling. The "Pygmalion effect" reported by Rosenthal is perhaps the best known demonstration of how teachers' beliefs about students can, to a quite dramatic extent, shape the student's educational performance.

That is a reference to an experiment that was carried out in America. A group of teachers was told the names of a small group of children in their classes who were expected, on the basis of a test, to show great improvement in their scholastic attitudes. In fact, these children had been chosen at random and not as a result of a test. At the end of six months, the children were tested to see who had performed better and, lo and behold, it was those children whose names had been given to the teachers. The teachers had expected those children to perform better, and so they did. The report continues:

Other studies undertaken in the United States of America and reviewed by Levy—
not me—

confirm that teachers have different expectations about and behave differently towards girls and boys. Boys are called upon more often than girls as volunteers, are given more teacher time, more skilled work and more individual attention. Girls are expected to be more docile, conforming, obedient and generally domesticated or "good", while originality, self-assertion and "centre stage" activities are more often reserved for boys. Although a similar range of studies has yet to be conducted in Australia, there seems little reason to expect that their findings would be very different.

Later, the report continues:

In one Australian study, Rowell (1971) found a significant relationship between teachers' attitudes and science achievement by girls.

In that study, which I have seen, the results for girls and boys were compared in different science classes, and questionnaires were then given to the teachers of those classes. In every case where the questionnaire revealed that the teachers had no different expectations for the sexes, the girls' performances were as good as those of the boys. However, in every case where the teachers came forward with comments like "Girls cannot do maths", lo and behold in their classes the girls did not do as well as the boys in maths. Another section of the report, which concerns the attitude conveyed in our schools by teachers, is as follows:

Attitudes conveyed in the school by teachers towards family patterns, especially towards working mothers and single parents, have important effects on children. Acceptance of the wide range of family patterns which exists in the Australian community and positive support for working mothers and single parents by schools and teachers are important aspects of bringing schools more into line with the realities of society and of ensuring that children should not be stigmatised when their family structure differs from the assumed "norm" of mother at home, father working and two or three children.

Let us remember that in Australia today one family in eight has no male breadwinner, but a sole female breadwinner. To pretend that this large section of our community does not exist is not to present to our children the facts of our society. The report further states:

Teachers are important models to children growing up. It is from this angle that we see particular cause for concern in the under-representation of females in positions of authority in the education system . . . 57 per cent of all school teachers in Australia in 1974 were female . . . they constituted nearly 68 per cent of primary teachers, including infant teachers, and 45 per cent of secondary ones.

The report also states:

However, the overall picture is still that in all promotion positions, except those which are sex specific positions, females are seriously under-represented in relation to their numbers in the service.

The report continues:

Although it has not positively been demonstrated, we believe that the sexual imbalance of responsibility and power in schools is likely to have a detrimental influence on the students' perceptions of women teachers and perhaps of women in general. That is, women are seen as incapable of decision making, efficient control and top level administration. This is doubly damaging for girls' self-esteem insofar as they may see the older women as projections of themselves in later years and they may also identify with them as women during school time. We are particularly concerned, not with the career prospects of women teachers as such, but with the self-perpetuating nature of low aspirations for women as these are passed on to children who so seldom see high authority held by women . . . It also accustoms both boys and girls to the idea that females occupy subordinate positions.

And so I could go on. However, I am sure that I have quoted enough to show that attitudes in our schools to women and girls are regarded as a serious matter by many concerned people, and that aspirations and talents for up to half our citizens may be stunted by present practices. This is what the "Sexism in Education" conference was all about.

I wish to make one final comment regarding the quotations given yesterday by the Hon. Mrs. Cooper, particularly in connection with the question of presenting children with the truth of our society. Let us look at some facts and figures which give the truth of what is occurring here and now, contrary to many popular myths. Women made up 37 per cent of the Australian work force at March of this year (nearly 37½ per cent in South Australia), though they are far from holding that proportion of positions of responsibility, of course! Even more interesting is the proportion of women of different ages who are now working. The following figures come from the Australian Bureau of Statistics, and they relate to February of this year. Of women aged between 15 years and 19 years, 58 per cent are now in the work force, and many others of course, would still be engaged in full-time education. Of women aged between 20 years and 24 years, 66 per cent are members of the work force. Of women aged between 25 years and 34 years, 48 per cent are members of the work force; this age group includes mothers of young children, nearly half of whom are working.

Of women aged between 35 years and 44 years, 55 per cent are members of the work force (these are mainly mothers of teenage children—a majority of this age group). Of women aged between 45 years and 54 years, 47 per cent are members of the work force. Of women aged between 55 years and 59 years, 32 per cent are members of the work force; these would be women who had ceased their education before the Second World War, when attitudes to the question of women working were very different from those of today. Of all women aged over 15 years, 43 per cent are now working; in South Australia, the figure is nearly 45 per cent. Of course, included in the 55 per cent not in the work force are age pensioners and younger women still engaged full-time in education. The corres-

ponding figure for males is 84 per cent of all those over 15 years being in the work force.

There have been rapid changes in the work patterns of women in our country, changes observable in quite short time spans. The 1971 census, for example, showed women as comprising 32 per cent of the work force, whereas today the figure is 37 per cent. Why are these changes occurring? Some will say that the changes have resulted from economic necessity, and they will leave it at that. To me, this is a bit simplistic, though it is doubtless part of the answer. However, surveys asking women why they work are not necessarily reliable; if "necessity" is considered a socially acceptable reply, some women will tend to give this answer whether or not it is the complete truth.

Part of the answer, I am sure, lies in the demographic changes that have been occurring in our society for a long time, as documented in a recent article by Professor Borrie of the Australian National University in *Search* of July this year. Family size has been falling steadily since late last century. Australian women born between 1842 and 1847 had an average of 6.5 children, but women born between 1862 and 1867 had an average of five children. By 1954, women who had completed their families had an average of 2.43 children, and the birth rate has fallen further since then. In 1974, the net reproduction rate was down to 1.12 (that is, the number of offspring for each individual). This is almost the replacement rate only, or zero population growth.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What effect will those figures have on the plans for Monarto?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Even when the birth rate is equivalent to the replacement rate, the population will continue to grow for 60 years, because of the age structure.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: So, you have 60 years for Monarto.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: It will take 60 years before the population growth ceases, because of the pyramid structure of the age distribution of the population. It is a demographic principle that, where there are many young people, even if they average only one child each when they become adults, in 20 years time there will be more 20-year-olds than there are now, because there are fewer 20-year-olds than there are babies now being born. Therefore, the population will continue to grow for about 60 years after the replacement birth rate is reached.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you believe that Monarto is needed now?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Because our population is growing, we need Monarto.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: At what rate is our population growing?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I do not know. Although I have looked at the Borrie report, I do not carry such figures in my head.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What about the marriage rate?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The number of people marrying now is much greater than it was at any time before the Second World War.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: But what about the age of marriage?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: There are two figures—the age of marriage and the number of people who marry. More people are marrying, and they are marrying younger nowadays. In 1933, only one-third of women aged between 20 years and 24 years were married, yet by 1971 about 64 per cent of women in this age group were married.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The reason why people were older when they married in 1933 was the depression. Generally, people were marrying at a younger age than was the case in that year.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: They were marrying later in 1933 than they are now, but I do not believe it was different from the position in 1911, when the first census was taken.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You have chosen 1933, when marriage was at the oldest age.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Not according to Professor Borrie. It was not much older in 1933 than in the period before 1933. Marriage may have been delayed a little more in the 1930's than it was in the 1920's.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You have chosen 1933 when the age was at its highest.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: It might have been higher than in previous years, but it was not much higher. A most dramatic change occurred after the Second World War in the age of people getting married. It made the post-war period completely different from the rest of the century regarding the marriage age. Of the age group between 30 to 34 in 1933, 77 per cent were married, yet today 92 per cent of this age group are married. Professor Borrie suggests that the post-war baby boom was caused by the younger age of marriage partners and not by an increase in family size.

Today, three-quarters of all births occur to women under the age of 30 years and, with smaller families, this means that an increasing number of women have completed the years of caring for young children at an age when they still have about 30 years of life ahead of them as members of the work force. In other words, it is these demographic changes that mean that more and more women can combine their biological function with the social function of being members of a wider work force in our community, and many women are eagerly seizing what opportunities society allows them.

I refer to the implication of these trends in relation to social policies, such as the provision of child-care facilities. The demand in this area is not yet being fully met, although a beginning was made through the interim Children's Commission established by the Whitlam Government. Unfortunately, the commission was one of the casualties of the change in Commonwealth Government, and I fear that its work may have to wait until another change of Government at the next Commonwealth election. I commend to anyone interested in this topic a recent study by the Research and Planning Division of the South Australian Education Department on the demands for child care in metropolitan Adelaide to help evaluate what is desirable policy for responsible government in this important area.

Finally, I wish to refer to International Women's Year in 1975 and the effect it had on Australian society. I believe its effects were widespread, both in initiating discussion and consideration of the disadvantages suffered by women, and encouraging men and women to do something about these problems and to treat them at other than a trivial level. Tremendous press publicity was given to the \$2 000 000 allocated by the Labor Government for projects to support the aim of International Women's Year, yet little mention was made of the 153 projects that were funded by the grant, and I should like to refer to just a few of these projects as listed in the report of the Australian National Advisory Committee for International Women's

Year. In the field of education, a grant of \$874 was made to St. Michael's Collegiate School, Hobart, and the description of the project is as follows:

A class project was carried out to study Tasmanian women—past and present. The project involved research into church records, old newspapers, family records, etc.; excursions to historical sites; comparative analysis of occupations of school leavers in 1900 and 1975; seminars and talks; displays and preparation of a kit for the use of other schools. This study will help to correct the biased treatment of women in many school texts.

Another project involved the grant of \$1 790 to the Federation of Italian Migrant Workers and their families, and the description of that grant is as follows:

F.I.L.E.F. sought a grant to produce a special issue of *Nuovo Paese* dealing specifically with the problems of migrant women, which it was intended would initiate a series of projects covering the lives of migrant women within the home, the work force, and their status in society generally.

Another grant of \$2 000 was made to Jumbunna in Victoria, and the description of the grant is as follows:

Jumbunna is a non-political, non-sectarian and non-profit-making group of women in executive positions. It was formed to arrange meetings, lectures, seminars, etc., as a means of self-improvement for its members.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Is that a sexist organisation?

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: It is not sexist in its aims at all. The description of the use of the grant continues:

The group conducted a seminar in October entitled "Women—Breakthrough into Management", and received a grant towards the cost of bringing Ms R. Loring, Associate Dean, University of California, to give the keynote address.

Another grant of \$15 736 was made to the city of Collingwood, in Victoria, and the grant description is as follows:

Funds were sought for a community-based project initiated by the city of Collingwood, which aims to enable women to work towards an exhibition of women's craftwork.

A further grant of \$2 000 was made to Ione Fett of New South Wales, and the description of the grant is as follows:

Ione Fett has undertaken a study of medical graduates in Australia focusing on the differential patterns of medical work between men and women over the last fifty years. Funds were provided to cover printing costs in order to make this study widely available to libraries.

A grant of \$10 000 was made to the South Australian Correctional Services Department, and the grant description provides:

Little research has been undertaken in the area of female crime and sentencing techniques; this lack of study has to an extent been determined by the comparatively small number of women prisoners. The Correctional Services Department received a grant to study female crime and sentencing techniques. The study would cover social, medical and psychological factors of female criminality as well as the range and extent of sentences used by the courts, and the nature of current treatment facilities available for female offenders.

The Darwin Women's Centre received a grant of \$16 563, the grant description being as follows:

As a result of Cyclone Tracy, the Darwin Women's Centre Committee requested assistance to establish a centre for women in Darwin. The Department of the Northern Territory made a house available to the group for this purpose. The centre provided health and crisis counselling services, as well as a relaxed meeting place for the many women living in very cramped temporary accommodation. A community worker assisted women to make best use of existing community services, to develop self-help and support groups, and to ensure that they were able to express their needs in reconstruction planning.

I have referred to only a small sample of the many projects funded by the \$2 000 000 grant related to International Women's Year. All honourable members would agree that these are worthwhile projects and that the \$2 000 000 granted achieved much value for money. I believe that

the Whitlam Government deserves much greater praise than it has received anywhere in the press for its initiative in sponsoring such an imaginative programme.

Further, I note that there was no public outcry at the Fraser Government's allocating nearly the same sum, that is, \$1 800 000, for the celebration this year of the American bi-centenary. I wish the Americans well in their celebrations of the 200th Anniversary of their violent over-throw—

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: It was the Declaration of Independence that we celebrated.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I am sure the Americans are celebrating the 200 years since the violent over-throw of their colonial government. I fail to see what this celebration has to do with the Australian Government, unless we are becoming completely subservient to the United States of America. For a Government committed to eliminating so-called waste and extravagance, such as adequate care in nursing homes for the aged, this expenditure of \$1 800 000 appears to be unnecessary and unjustified. The lack of public criticism that has occurred is perhaps an interesting commentary on the double standards of much of our press. I support the motion.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I, too, support the motion. I wish to thank His Excellency for his Speech and the distinguished manner in which he has represented Her Majesty during his term of office. I wish him and Lady Oliphant a happy retirement. Although he is to retire, I am sure we have not heard the last of Sir Mark Oliphant, and I hope he will continue to make statements to which I shall look forward from time to time. I wish to take the opportunity of reaffirming my allegiance to Her Majesty. Speaking, as I do, towards the end of this debate, I intend to emulate honourable members on this side of the Council and speak on a few specific items with a view to offering some comments which I hope will be constructive and which may be of some assistance to the Government. I do not intend to follow the example of most honourable members opposite in this debate. Almost the whole speech of most members opposite comprised either an attack on the Liberal Party or a blowing of the Australian Labor Party's own trumpet. I realise that honourable members opposite who have spoken in this debate are back-bench members. Nevertheless, one would have thought they would try to speak constructively.

The Hon. Anne Levy: I did.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Perhaps that criticism does not apply to the honourable member, but it does apply to most honourable members opposite. They might have elaborated on certain aspects of Government policy or discussed in a little detail some Government project being carried on for the alleged welfare of this State. One honourable member opposite, the Hon. Mr. Foster, is still to speak in this debate, and I trust that he will speak constructively and not indulge in tub-thumping or denigration of the Opposition.

The first topic to which I intend to refer is compulsory acquisition. I acknowledge, of course, that it is sometimes necessary to acquire land compulsorily in the public interest, but I am alarmed at the oppressive manner in which this Government has often carried out compulsory acquisition. One example was the Flinders Medical Centre access road acquisition. It was simply announced in the press that this road was to be built. No notices of intention to acquire were issued, so that the landowners had no access to any court proceedings. There were cases where landowners wished to sell their houses and go to other States because they had been moved there in the course of their employment. They were informed by land agents

that they could not expect reasonable prices for their properties, because of the news that they were to be compulsorily acquired.

These people were placed at a great disadvantage. There were no formal acquisition proceedings; they had no access to the courts; they could not get value on the open market; and they were completely at the mercy of the Government. If the Government announces a plan that would involve compulsory acquisition in any area, it should be prepared, on request, to issue a notice of intention to acquire and, on request, to acquire immediately on reasonable terms. There were other cases in regard to the Flinders Medical Centre access road where the owners were not required to move, for reasons such as those I have given, but where, when they became aware of the fact that their properties were to be acquired, they understandably lost interest in their houses and wanted to have their properties acquired on reasonable terms.

Again, they were completely at the mercy of the Government. Some of them had to plead for the service of a notice of intention to acquire. Shortly after the press publicity, they received circular letters, but no formal notice of intention to acquire. In compulsory acquisition cases, the owner is at a disadvantage. The acquiring authority often seems to take delight in acquiring the land at the lowest possible price, even an unfair price. The owner is hesitant to run the risk of going to court. The acquiring authority operates from a position of considerable strength, and it seems to me that this position of strength is often abused.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: That is good emotive stuff but it is not true, is it?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: It is true. Many people have come to us stating these facts.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: What is the percentage?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I do not know the percentage.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: It doesn't mean anything then; it's off the top of your head.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I have formed a committee to inquire into this matter.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: You have formed an opinion without any evidence.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I think I could speak about this. I have not merely formed an opinion. I have formed a committee, which has sat on a number of occasions and has heard much evidence; it is still sitting and will hear more evidence. The fact that land has to be acquired is regrettable. When that happens, the Government should make the process as painless as possible and should be concerned not to use its position of power but should be prepared to negotiate and pay a fair price. The next matter to which I wish to refer is State taxation. Much has been said about this issue already.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: And more will be said.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Yes.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: More will be said about the Fraser Government's policy.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: No, I am talking about State taxation.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: The increase in State taxation is due to Federal policy.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am speaking about State taxation, which is due to the State Government policies.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: What about the Fraser Government?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Federal Government's policies will be known when the Federal Budget is introduced, and I may have something to say on that subject then. At this stage I propose to talk about what we know about.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Don't guess.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am not guessing; I am using figures given me by the Parliamentary Library Research Service.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: As long as you put the blame in the right place.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am not fixing the blame. I propose to talk about State taxation, about which we do know something; I do not intend to talk about the taxation policies of the Federal Government, which will be stated in the Federal Budget. When that time comes, I may have something to say about them. The most interesting figures are the comparisons of the annual increase in per capita rates of States' taxation with the annual increase in average weekly earnings in New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. I take these States simply because they are the two largest Eastern States, and South Australia. This is really the significant figure. The concern of the individual is not merely or mainly the amount of tax he has to pay: it is the amount of tax in relation to the resources he has out of which to pay the tax.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That's right.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Are you saying that South Australians earn less than people in New South Wales do?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: No. If the honourable member will listen to what I have to say, he will learn. Until 1974-75 the margin between the annual increase in the South Australian capital rate of State taxation and the annual increase in the average weekly earnings was less in South Australia than it was in New South Wales and Victoria. However, in 1974-75 (the latest year for which I could obtain figures) this situation changed dramatically. In that year the figures are as follows (and I will mention each State and give the figures for the margins by which the annual increase in the per capita rate of State taxation exceeded the annual increase in average weekly earnings): In New South Wales, in that year, it was 8.15; in Victoria, it was 7.51; and, in South Australia, it was 11.67.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That is a significant figure, isn't it?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Yes. I should add (because this matter has been raised before, properly, by the Hon. Mr. Sumner) that in these figures the necessary adjustment has been made to allow for the fact that payroll tax is levied against Government departments only in this State. Thus, South Australia has nothing to be proud of in its recent record of State taxation.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Nothing to be ashamed of, either.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am not so sure about that.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You are not sure, but we are.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am sure. If you think that this State has nothing to be ashamed of, we have different ideas. I am surprised that the Minister would think those figures showed something to be proud of.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: You have to relate this to the services given in this State.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I take the honourable member's point, but I am talking about State taxation, which is what other honourable members have spoken

of in this debate. Various figures have been quoted, but my first point is that, wherever South Australia stands in State taxation compared with other States, it is necessary that the State taxation system be equitable, and the responsibility for making it equitable rests fairly and squarely on the Government. It is the Government that imposes the taxation, and it has the responsibility of seeing that it is at all times fairly imposed. The problem in this State is capital taxation, particularly land tax and succession duties.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What is your problem with succession duties?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: If the honourable member will listen, I will get to it. It seems to be the practice of the Hon. Mr. Sumner, particularly this session, that, as soon as a member on this side of the Chamber mentions a matter, he interjects and asks, "What about so and so?" In most cases, he would find out if he would only listen.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Sometimes you say you will refer to something later, but you never get around to it.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: If, at the end of my speech, the Chief Secretary says that I have not got to the subject of succession duties, I will challenge him on that. Capital taxes were first imposed in South Australia in the 1870's. At that time, land was not just the main source of wealth—it was the wealth. Today, we have a more equalitarian society, and it is a necessary corollary of this that the tax burden should be more equally spread. In the land tax field there have been some quite ridiculous anomalies about which the Government so far has done nothing. On June 9, the Minister of Lands, in answer to a question from the Hon. Mr. Foster, tried to lay the blame for the manifest inequities in the land tax system solely on speculation. The responsibility rests with the Government. The combination of the effects of inflation, exacerbated by the previous Federal Government, and the savagely regressive tax scale have brought about the problem. There was nothing wrong with the scale years ago, when it hit only the wealthy, but today, because of inflation, properties that are quite modest are in the higher tax brackets because of their monetary values.

The Government has not changed the scale, but the point is that a long time ago it should have changed the scale to allow for the higher monetary values. It is just as culpable for a Government to allow itself to profit unnecessarily at the expense of a taxpayer because of increasing values as it is for it to impose unjust taxation in the first place. There has been talk about changing the rates. If the Government does introduce legislation to reduce the rates, I shall look at the rates with much interest.

I come now to the question of succession duties, and I understand that today the Premier announced that it was the policy of the Government, following the policy of our own Party, that duty on successions between spouses was to be abolished.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It was your Party that introduced it in the first place.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I do not know who was in office in 1870.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: No, but you have been in office since. If it was the policy of your Party, you could have abolished it between 1968 and 1970, but you did not do a blessed thing.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Chief Secretary pokes his nose in when it suits him, but he has not listened to my speech. What I was saying and what he would have

gathered if he had listened, instead of reading a newspaper, was that it was inflation, which was brought about largely by the Federal Whitlam Government—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: And still maintained by the Fraser Government.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: It is certainly because of inflation that the phenomenon of which I have been speaking came about, and that phenomenon was that the rates, which operated very well while the Playford Government—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: There were periods of inflation when Playford was in office.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: In the period of the Playford Government, there was nothing like the continuing galloping inflation that there is now.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You know that that's not right.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The problem at present is that properties that are quite modest are, because of inflation and the higher monetary values, taxed at an extremely high rate. In the past, properties taxed at that rate were the properties of the wealthy, and the wealthy should be taxed heavily, but now it is the modest working man who is being taxed heavily. As every honourable member knows, some time ago it was announced officially in the press and in the media by our Party that our policy was to abolish succession duties on successions between spouses. I am pleased that the Premier has followed the lead of our Leader (Dr. Tonkin) and has decided to do what is in our policy.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You were a step behind again. You could have done it in 1968.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I do not wish to carry on with this dialogue. The problem did not exist in 1968.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Your policy was not there in 1968, either.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: In the field of succession duties, the taxpayer is faced with the same problem as that to which I referred, before this long interruption, in regard to land tax. Modest possessions are taxed at a higher rate because of the high values now attributed to them. In regard to succession duties, there has been no suggestion that I am aware of (and I do not think this was in the Premier's announcement) that the Government intends to review the rates. They should be reviewed radically and indexed to guard against inflation. The final question to which I refer is the question of Monarto.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You, too?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Yes, me, too.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I thought your Party was dead against it.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: It is against anything progressive.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I oppose the establishment of Monarto at this time. The only justification for Monarto is the need to save Adelaide from over-population. The population of the city of Adelaide by the year 2000 is now placed at a very much lower figure than it was at the time that Monarto was conceived. The Premier, about a year ago, said:

The population of this State is now forecast to be about 1 492 000, a figure of 122 400 greater than the most likely population projected in the Borrie report, but well below the earlier projections made in the 1960's in an era of higher birth rates and higher net migration from overseas. That same estimate showed that by the year 2000 the population of the Adelaide statistical division, which includes Monarto, would be 1 128 000. I understand that the latest departmental estimates for Adelaide by the year 2000 are 1 100 000 to 1 250 000. I suggest that these

figures are well within the optimum population for Adelaide which has been spoken of as being about 1 300 000.

There seemed to be a need for a satellite city when the project was conceived in the 1960's. A population of 1 600 000 for Adelaide and Monarto by the year 2000 was discussed at one time. Monarto is not a true exercise in decentralisation. It was a "save Adelaide" exercise, which seemed, on the original figures, to have some merit but which now appears to be an expensive and unnecessary exercise.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: But those figures could change.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: They are the figures on which the Government has operated. They came from departmental sources.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: But they could change.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Yes. I should say that these figures were obtained from the Library Research Service through the Economic Research Unit, on which the Premier's Department relies. So, I am relying on the same statistics.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Let us have a look at the situation regarding migration.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I do not intend to do that at present. I am rather distressed to have to look at the Minister when he interjects, but I suppose I must put up with that.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You have been reading your speech ever since you started, so you haven't looked at anyone.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I have been looking at the Minister.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Under Standing Orders, you are not allowed to read your speech.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Moreover, Monarto does not have a reasonable assurance of an industrial base and, therefore, is doomed to failure. The report of Mr. I. A. Wardle, the member for Murray in another place, on his overseas study tour on new cities reveals that in no case had a new city been successful without having an industrial base at the time of foundation, although in some cases cities had survived after the original industrial base had failed. The Government would be wise not to proceed with the construction of Monarto at present but instead to introduce across-the-board incentives to true decentralisation in the way in which it has been done in Victoria and which has been advocated for some time in South Australia by the Party of which I am a member.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: For how long?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Leader of the Opposition in another place made a press release to this effect last December.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That's some time ago.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Yes. About 12 months ago, I asked in the Council whether the Government would consider across-the-board incentives to decentralisation along the Victorian lines, and I specified what they were. The answer was "No": the incentives would be given only to Monarto, the iron triangle and the green triangle. I support the motion.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1971-1974. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I have introduced this Bill because there is an urgent need to amend some of the provisions of the Workmen's Compensation Act. I believe that my proposals overcome the obvious defects that exist at present. In two areas they provide further benefits to an injured workman. In another area, they enable the court to apportion liability where a workman sustains injury in the service of two or more employers. This will help to minimise a serious social problem.

At present, the last employer of a person may be held liable for all his injuries, as a result of which some employers are now reluctant to engage a workman with a known physical defect or with a bad record of injuries. If the employer knew that, in the event of an injury being sustained, he would not necessarily be liable for the total compensation payment, he would more readily engage a partly incapacitated man.

The present practice of calculating compensation according to average weekly earnings over the previous 12 months will be changed. Instead, a workman would receive 100 per cent of his basic earnings for normal hours worked at the time of injury. This would include over-award and service payments, but would exclude overtime and certain special allowances. There is also provision to vary his compensation because of quarterly indexation, etc.

Under these proposals a workman in South Australia would be compensated at least as generously as under the Acts of the other mainland States or under make-up agreements within the Federal metal trades. The benefits would be better than those introduced by Ordinance in the Australian Capital Territory in 1975 and accepted by Federal Parliament during the Whitlam Administration. They also exceed the 85 per cent of average weekly earnings proposed in 1974 by the National Committee of Inquiry into Compensation and Rehabilitation. It will be recalled that the Chairman of this committee was Mr. Justice Woodhouse of the New Zealand Court of Appeal, who took part in a similar inquiry in New Zealand in 1967. He was brought to Australia by the Whitlam Government because of his expertise in this subject.

Under the present legislation, an employee, who has worked substantial overtime in months past but is not doing so now, can receive more money by being at home than at work. I could quote many examples but will confine myself to the case of a construction employee who received \$224 a week during a prolonged period on compensation but would have dropped to \$175 if he returned to work. There is no reason to suspect that this man concocted his injury, but the case was widely talked about on the shop floor. Because of poor legislation, this man became the subject of ridicule and envy amongst his workmates.

A great many working people have spoken of the need to change this part of the Act. This is not surprising, because I know from experience as a manager of factories during the past 20 years that the great majority of workmen in South Australia are conscientious and, above all, honest. Both sides of this Parliament also recognise the need to change, and I refer particularly to a statement by the Premier on June 18 last. He said:

The Government is seeking to ensure that a person on workmen's compensation will not receive more while he is away from work than he would if back on the job. We are very conscious of the cost to employers of workmen's compensation.

I refer also to a statement by the Minister of Labour and Industry when presenting in another place the second reading explanation of an amending Bill on February 11 last, which was subsequently withdrawn. He said:

The Government is concerned at the increase in the number of workmen's compensation claims that have been made since this Act came into operation in 1971. Although in the last four financial years the number of wage and salary earners in the State increased by just over 10 per cent from 408 000 to 449 000 the number of workmen's compensation claims increased by 50 per cent from 56 000 to 84 000.

I said when beginning this second reading speech that there is urgent need to amend this Act. I remind honourable members that in July, 1975, the Governor when opening Parliament said that the Government would introduce measures to revise the Act. Eight months later the long awaited Bill was introduced in the other place but, to the dismay of the public, it did little to correct anomalies. After the second reading speech, the Bill was withdrawn without debate.

The Governor, in his Speech on June 8, made no reference to workmen's compensation, but the Premier and the Minister of Labour and Industry stated subsequently that some legislation would be introduced during this session, although they did not say when this would happen or what facets of the Act would be changed. Therefore, I think it is appropriate to introduce my Bill at this early stage of the session.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3, which amends section 8 (1a), is consequential upon the amendment of section 51 by clause 6. Clause 4 amends section 9 (2b) and (2e). Clause 4 (a) is of a drafting nature. Clause 4 (b) enlarges compensable journeys to cover a journey to obtain a medical certificate in connection with an injury, not only for which a workman has received compensation, as in the existing Act, but also for which he is entitled to receive or is seeking compensation in connection with any such injury. The additional cover proposed in this Bill is of significance to a workman in a decentralised area like Whyalla who may have to make a lengthy journey to Adelaide to seek special medical attention.

Clause 5 inserts section 32 (a). Under section 32 of the existing Act, an employer is bound to disclose his medical reports to a workman at any time before or during proceedings. This clause inserts a corresponding obligation upon a workman in any proceedings under the Act, but not prior to proceedings.

Clause 6 amends section 51. In the existing legislation, where total or partial incapacity results from the injury, the amount of compensation shall be a weekly amount during the incapacity equal to the average weekly earnings during the period of 12 months immediately preceding the incapacity, or some lesser period if the workman has not been employed for so long a time. Clause 6 provides that an incapacitated workman would receive his current weekly earnings. This, as defined, would include his award wage, over-award and service payments, plus any leading hand, first-aid, tool, and qualification allowances.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Disability allowances?

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: No. I will mention disability shortly. If a workman is employed on incentive work, he would receive in lieu of incentive benefits 10 per cent of his award and over-award payments. I have selected 10 per cent because some awards provide that, if an incentive scheme is introduced, it should be possible for an average workman to earn at least 10 per cent above his award rate. Weekly earnings as defined under clause 6 would exclude overtime and bonuses as well as shift, industry, disability, weekend and public holiday penalty, district, travelling, living, clothing and meal allowances. Disability is intended to cover allowances for dirt, danger, weather, confined spaces, heat, height, wet conditions, cold rooms, call back, camping, etc. Clause 6 (d)

provides that the changes to the weekly rate of compensation shall not operate retrospectively.

To give comparisons with other States, I point out that under the existing Victorian Act an adult workman receives a minimum of \$70 a week rising to a maximum of \$107, depending upon the number of his dependants. However, the Government has announced that it intends to introduce amending legislation, and a committee of inquiry is preparing recommendations. Meanwhile, a workman in Victoria employed under the Federal Metal Trades Award does receive, as a result of an agreement between employers and unions, make-up pay whilst on compensation. This brings his benefit to a level equal to his award rate plus over-award payments. Make-up pay does not apply when an injury is suffered during the first two weeks of employment, nor does it apply during the first two working days of any incapacity. Furthermore, the maximum period of make-up pay for any one injury is 39 weeks. Make-up pay agreements apply in Victoria in some other Federal awards, in addition to metal trades.

Under the New South Wales legislation, a single adult receives as compensation \$64 a week plus \$14 for a wife or *de facto* and \$10 for each child between three and 16 years and up to 21 years in a student. However, there are make-up agreements under the Federal Metal Trades Award and other awards. In the metal trades the make-up is to normal pay, which is defined as the award rate for 40 hours plus over-awards and, if a workman is employed under an incentive scheme, these are averaged over the three months prior to incapacity.

In Western Australia a workman is entitled to receive the ordinary wage including any over-award payment that he would have received for ordinary hours worked. However, because of confusion regarding interpretation of the term "ordinary wage", an amendment was passed in November, 1975, which specified that it included over-award payments but excluded bonus or incentive payments, weekend or public holiday, penalty and other special allowances.

In Queensland a workman receives his average pay over the previous 12 months or his present award rate, whichever is the lower. If he is not covered by an award his rate will be based on the rate in the South-East Queensland Fitter and Turners Award or his average pay, whichever is the lower.

In the Australian Capital Territory, under an Ordinance of 1975 which was accepted by Federal Parliament, a workman receives full pay for normal hours excluding overtime for the first six months of injury. After six months the benefit reduces to \$67.68 a week for a single adult plus \$17.81 for a spouse and \$8.31 for each child. Provision is made for these amounts to be varied owing to indexation.

In Tasmania a workman receives average weekly earnings similar to the benefits applying at present in South Australia. However, I understand that the Labor Government in that State is, like the Government here, concerned with the high level of claims and has set up a committee of inquiry to recommend modifications.

Honourable members will note that the benefits proposed in clause 6 conform closely to the amended Western Australian legislation and to what employees under certain Federal awards are now receiving in Victoria and New South Wales.

Clause 7 inserts a new section 51 (a). It introduces a new scheme whereby the Industrial Court will have the power to apportion liability between employers where a workman sustained injuries whilst in the service of two or more employers. At present the last employer may be held liable for the total injury and, as I mentioned earlier

in my speech, this amendment would help to minimise a serious social problem, namely, the reluctance of an employer because of full liability to engage a new workman with a known physical defect.

Clause 7 (3) will enable two or more insurers who covered an employer at different times to have their respective contributions determined by the court. This would overcome the delays which occur at present when a workman has had a continuing or series of injuries, and different insurers dispute liability.

Clause 8 amends section 52 (a) and inserts an additional reason for an employer to give notice to discontinue compensation payments, namely, the failure of a workman to present a continuity of medical certificates. New subsection (3) provides that, where a workman issues an application challenging his employer's right to discontinue weekly payments at the expiration of the period of notice, the weekly payments to the workman shall be suspended from the expiry date, pending a proper determination of the merits of the claim if the employer can demonstrate to the court that he genuinely disputes his liability. The court must hear summarily any such dispute. The period of the notice remains at 21 days.

Clause 9 repeals sections 54, 60, 61, 62 and 63. The repeal of section 54 which should be considered with the amendment of section 68 by clause 14, means that an injured workman will no longer receive certain preferential treatment compared with a person at work. At present he receives whilst absent on compensation average weekly earnings, as well as payment for public holidays and credit for annual leave and long service leave. This means that he is at present entitled to double pay on public holidays. The repeal of sections 60 to 63 inclusive is consequential upon the amendment of section 51 by clause 6.

Section 62 provides that where a workman is engaged in two or more jobs concurrently with different employers his earnings shall be aggregated for the purpose of computing "average weekly earnings". The employer for whom he is working at the time of injury shall be liable to compensate him for the loss of earnings in two or more jobs. By repealing this section the workman will in future receive compensation for only one full-time job.

It is undesirable at a time of high unemployment to condone the practice of more than one job. The safety factor should also be considered because an employee working long hours is more prone to injure himself or his fellow employees. Under section 51 as amended by clause 6 the injured workman with two or more jobs would receive the wages for ordinary hours which constitute a week's work in the employment in which he was engaged when injured. Suppose, for example, that he works full-time as a welder during the day for Smith and part-time at night as a barman for Jones. If he is injured during the day he receives as compensation average earnings as defined previously for that one job. On the other hand, if he is injured at night he would receive average earnings on the basis that he was working full-time for Jones. This provision applies only to the workman with two or more jobs and not, of course, to a workman with only one part-time job.

Clause 10 repeals and replaces section 64 and is consequential upon the amendment of section 51 by clause 6. It deals with a workman under 21 or an indentured apprentice who is injured and whose injury, whether total or partial, is permanent. As in the present Act he will for purposes of compensation be treated as if he had reached 21.

Clause 11 amends section 65. It provides that the right to have an absence on compensation counted as service

for the purposes of sick leave and annual leave shall be qualified in the following ways: first, the absence on compensation to be counted as service shall be limited to a maximum of 12 months; and, secondly, the right to obtain payment for such service shall not vest in the workman until he returns to work, ceases employment or dies, whichever first occurs.

This clause also removes the existing provision that absence on compensation must be temporary before that absence can be counted as service. This is of benefit to the permanently incapacitated worker who is not temporarily absent and cannot accrue service under the present legislation. This amendment would overcome the situation of a workman, who, say, after three years on compensation, takes an additional 12 weeks annual leave on pay before returning to work. However, a workman can accumulate leave for up to 12 months whilst on compensation to enable him to have the funds to pay for a holiday with his family after recovering from injury.

Clause 12 repeals and replaces section 66. It is related to clause 11 and caters for Federal and other State awards in respect of which South Australia has no legislative competence.

Clause 13 amends section 67. It inserts a requirement that the existing obligation upon an employer to provide suitable employment to a partially incapacitated workman or, failing that, to make weekly payments at the rate as for total incapacity will not arise unless and until the workman has given to the employer a notice in the prescribed form that he is fit for suitable employment. This covers the present anomalous position where a workman may be fit for light work but has not advised his employer of this fact. The employer is liable to pay full compensation for failing to provide light work, even though he is ignorant of the true facts.

Clause 14 amends section 68. It provides in new subsection (1) that, subject to the provisions in section 30 and clause 11, amending section 65, if during an absence on compensation a workman receives, say, payment for public holidays, annual leave, long service leave, Christmas or profit-sharing bonus, his weekly payments of compensation shall be reduced accordingly. However, an injured workman who has retired and received a pension will not have the amount of pension deducted from his compensation benefits.

Clause 15 amends section 71. It provides the machinery for an adjustment from time to time of the weekly rate of compensation to reflect, first, the past or present condition of the workman; secondly, any variation due to indexation, etc., in award, over-award or the other items included in weekly earnings by the definition inserted by clause 6. The adjustments can be made by agreement of the parties or, failing agreement, upon application to the court. Clause 16 removes the word "accident" in section 88 which was left in by mistake when the concept of injury by accident was removed in 1965. Clause 17 ensures that the amendments effected by this Bill shall not be given retrospective operation.

May I say, in conclusion, that until recent years compensation payments were inadequate and many workmen suffered hardship when injured because of insufficient benefits to maintain their families. However, the community does not want an injured man to receive more pay at home than at work. This and other anomalies have crept into the present legislation and must be corrected. Workmen's compensation is a complex subject, and the proposed amendments are designed to be fair to all parties. I hope

that the Government will recognise the merits of the Bill and that any reasonable suggestions by it will be treated with respect.

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

WATER RESOURCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 28. Page 240.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): As the Hon. John Burdett explained in introducing the Bill to this Chamber, its one design is to give some real power to the appeal tribunal mentioned in the principal Act, which allows to be granted or refused by the Minister a licence to draw water from wells in certain proclaimed areas in South Australia. The granting or refusal of a licence by the Minister is on the advice of an advisory committee. There exists in the principal Act an appeal to a tribunal against a Ministerial decision in relation to the granting or refusal of a licence, but the appeal tribunal, if it finds against the Minister's decision, cannot enforce the acceptance of its decision. In other words, if the appeal tribunal differs from a decision of the Minister, the Minister can ignore the determination of the appeal tribunal.

Therefore, I believe the contention of the Hon. John Burdett is correct that, if the principal Act provides for an appeal against a Ministerial decision, the decision of the appeal tribunal should bind the Minister; or, on the other hand, there should be an abolition of the appeal provision.

What is the use of having an appeal tribunal if it has no power to enforce decisions? We all accept the fact in this State that we should pursue as strongly as possible, and even ruthlessly, policies to ensure that there is no destruction of a renewable resource—our underground waters. I was somewhat appalled when I heard the Minister of Works say on television in the last week or two that recent research had shown that the resource under the Adelaide Plains was greater than at first anticipated. That is good news, but the Minister stated that there would be no reduction in the present drawing of water from the underground basins in that area. He went on to say that, with the present usage, the basin had a life expectancy (or words to that effect) of about 30 years. I consider that to be a disturbing statement, because if, on existing evidence and existing usage, that basin has only 30 years of life expectancy, we should be restricting the use of that underground water still further, because no-one can justify the destruction of an underground basin such as that.

If one considers American history on this matter, one sees that right throughout America, in the over-exploited underground basins, the resources have been completely ruined, maybe for 1 000, or 2 000 or 10 000 years, and the people are not entitled to do that sort of thing. If I have correctly understood the information given by the Minister, such a policy can only be roundly condemned. We are entitled to draw only at the annual recharge rate from underground basins, no more.

In allocating this resource, the Minister, I agree, has a difficult task. No-one knows more than I the difficulty involved in this, because I, as Minister, was the first to recognise this problem and the first to start rating the use of underground water in that area. It is an extremely difficult task but one from which we should not move away. We should face the facts clearly and, if a resource can be used and maintained indefinitely, that is the usage that we should allocate from that basin.

We must follow a policy of conservation of these natural resources. If we handle them carefully, they will be a continuing resource, but they can be destroyed absolutely if we over-exploit them. The Minister has a difficult task in allocating these licences and his decision must be either final or subject to an appeal on certain grounds. If the decision is subject to an appeal, that should be an appeal which, if upheld, commits the Minister. If it does not commit him, the whole tribunal should be abolished because it would be a waste of everyone's time and money.

I am surprised that the Government, on this particular Bill, is seeking a further adjournment of the debate. The Whip told me that the Government was doing that, but I considered that this Bill was important and that I should speak on it. The measure has been before the Council for a week and it is simple, not complex. It deals with one simple amendment regarding provisions in connection with an appeal against a Ministerial decision, and I remind honourable members of the number of times that we have been bombarded by the Government with about 10 or 12 complex Bills and have been expected next day to present our case to this Council, without having had any of the resources that are at the Government's disposal. I am disappointed that so far Government members have not seen fit to speak to the Bill, although it has been before us for a week. Perhaps the Hon. Mr. Dunford, instead of parading his knowledge in the South-East, could have been examining the legislation and commenting on it.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: We must get around the electorate.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: More than that: I think the honourable member must get around the Government's opinion. That is the point. One must also bear in mind that the Government may not yet have given its instructions. I suppose that, on those instructions, no member on the Government's side is allowed to speak until the master determines. I support the Bill and hope that the Government will consider it as soon as possible or release back-bench members from their pledge to Government policy and allow them to do their homework and present their views on legislation.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I did not intend to speak in the debate on this Bill. I support it, because I consider that it is necessary.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The whip is cracking.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The Minister of Health normally was a rabble rouser when he was on the back bench, and since he has been on the front bench he seems to have got a sense of dignity. However, he also seems to have lost that in the past week, and I am sorry about that. I support the measure because it is a simple one, as the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has said, and it amends section 64 of the principal Act by striking out subsection (4) and inserting new subsection (4) and (5). New subsection (5) provides that the Minister shall comply with any direction given by the tribunal under new subsection (4). I consider that that is a necessary procedure in the circumstances because, as I stated yesterday in the Address in Reply debate, I am extremely concerned about the situation, particularly in regard to the underground basin in the Northern Adelaide Plains.

I am particularly concerned, even though the Minister now says that the supply has a life of 30 years, and I suspect that the Government now thinks, "This will be built up in the next 10 or 20 years and, therefore, there will be no need to put in an expensive irrigation scheme." The Government thinks that it will get off the hook in that way. If it does, it will be using up valuable irrigation land that

should be reserved in the same way as the land adjacent to Gepps Cross abattoirs was reserved for a specific purpose.

As the Minister of Works, in his recent press statement and in his statement in another place, indicated that the draw from the basin was almost three times the recharge, it is extremely important that the control of that draw from the basin be carefully observed. In that case, I consider that the tribunal, as the Hon. Mr. Burdett has indicated by the provisions made in this Bill, should be in a position to have the final decision. The Minister should not be able to make any decision that might put him in an awkward position.

I consider that the situation is serious. It has been stated in a report that the life of the basin is 30 years. If we are going to run that basin down in 30 years, this Parliament and this Government will be condemned in future. As the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has said, we owe it to the future to preserve the basin and, in that case, I consider that the amending legislation proposed by the Hon. Mr. Burdett is amply justified. I support the second reading.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

FRUIT AND PLANT PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 29. Page 301.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I rise to support this Bill, which was introduced in the Council by the Minister of Agriculture last Thursday. I have had an opportunity since then to discuss the Bill with representatives of the fruitgrowing and market gardening industry and, as far as I can ascertain, they have no objections to it. As the Minister said in his second reading explanation, which was printed in *Hansard* but which he did not read—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That was with the Council's permission.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: That is so.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Well, don't try to imply that the Council was against it. If you want to object, do so, and we'll know where we stand.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I know where the Minister stands and sits. He should not get so upset. He is losing that little bit of dignity that he gained for a little while. The Bill amends the Fruit and Plant Protection Act in two respects.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You shouldn't—

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I think it would be a good idea if the Minister listened to what I was saying. As the Minister said in his second reading explanation, the Bill provides for a simplified and more expeditious procedure in the event of an outbreak of pests or disease affecting fruit or vegetables. The only thing it does is to provide that the necessary action may be taken by a notice given by the Minister in the *Government Gazette* rather than by proclamation. Although members of the industry have not been approached or consulted about the matter by the Government, they have shown no objections to it since the Bill was drawn to their attention. I therefore support the Bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.38 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 10, at 2.15 p.m.