HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, September 13, 1972

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

QUESTIONS

ELECTRICITY TRUST

Dr. EASTICK: In the absence of the Premier I ask my question of the Minister of Works, who may be able to reply because his portfolio is concerned with the Electricity Trust. Can he say how much of the trust's loss in revenue during the past financial year can be directly attributed to decreased power consumption because of the impact of daylight saving? In the Electricity Trust report tabled in the House yesterday the board revealed a loss of $334,146, the first loss in its operations in 20 years. The trust is quite right in pointing out quickly that this deficit represents only ½ per cent of its gross income, and it was reported to have occurred because of a combination of factors. On page 16 the report states that in addition to cost increases "the summer of 1971-72 was abnormally cool following a wet winter which affected electricity demands for refrigeration, air-conditioning, and water pumping". However, the report did not refer to a second major factor, which was reported in the *Advertiser* on January 26 this year, as follows: "Daylight saving had saved South Australians about $100,000 for electricity, Mr. S. E. Huddleston (Manager, Administration, of the Electricity Trust) said last night."

The press report also states that Mr. Huddleston had said that there was only a small drop in consumption and that the financial loss was only a small part of the trust's annual revenue of about $70,000,000. When considering the figure now, we realize that the $100,000 referred to by Mr. Huddleston a full month before the end of daylight saving represents 30 per cent of the trust's loss for the year. The full loss may well have been considerably higher than the figure to which he referred on January 26. Since it is almost certain that we will have daylight saving during the coming summer (the legislation has not been introduced but the Minister has announced that it will be introduced), it is certain that the trust will face a similar loss in revenue during 1972-73. I should like to know from the Minister what the full loss was last year, so that we can assess the position and be able to discuss the matter. I believe this is particularly important because the Electricity Trust has already indicated that, because of last year's loss, it may have to consider increasing tariffs. Of course, such an increase would affect all South Australians. I need not remind the Minister that not all South Australians want daylight saving, but all South Australians will be called on to make up any losses that result from daylight saving. I suggest that it is grossly unfair that people who do not want daylight saving should have to subsidize a section of people in the community who do want it and who may be prepared to pay increased electricity tariffs to make up for any resultant short-fall in power consumption.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I received this report only on Friday last, and I read it on Tuesday morning before tabling it in the afternoon. I noticed that the report did not refer to daylight saving. I am aware of the newspaper report to which the Leader has referred; I should have thought that daylight saving would be a contributing factor in the relatively small loss made by the trust this financial year. I will check to see why the subject was not referred to. I take it that the Electricity Trust Board may have assumed that daylight saving will continue to operate each year and that it will have to be accepted as a matter of course anyway, something over which the board has no control. The other factors to which the board referred as contributing causes are factors over which it has little control, anyway. If the Leader casts his mind back, I think he will realize the position in which this State was placed initially in making a decision about daylight saving, because we had to have regard to moves made by the other States. If my memory is correct, we were not consulted on the matter before Victoria and New South Wales announced jointly that they would introduce daylight saving. Therefore, if we were to maintain normal business and commerce links with the other States, we had little choice about introducing daylight saving. I think that the real purport of the Leader's question is that, if people who are opposed to daylight saving and who are inconvenienced by it have to pay increased tariffs in order to make up $100,000 or $150,000 (or whatever the sum may be) short-fall in the trust's return, it would seem patently unfair that such people should have to pay to support something that they do not actually want. I point out to the Leader that the former Labor Government

introduced a system whereby people in the metropolitan area now subsidize the tariff rate in country areas. The Leader will know that, since 1965, the policy has been that country tariffs are subsidized to the extent that they are brought within 10 per cent of the rate of metropolitan tariffs.

Mr. Coumbe: That was brought in earlier, as a subsidy.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In fact, a subsidy is paid now by some people to relieve the burden on country people. I imagine that we could almost say that in this instance it should not be considered unfair, therefore, for country people to pay an increased tariff, if that turns out to be the position. I point out to the Leader that, although the board may make recommendations, the Government will decide whether or not tariffs will be increased. Apart from the report, there have been no indications that the board intends to recommend to me that there should be an increase in tariff. On the other hand, certain events that the report says may occur could obviate the need for an increase. I will find out from the board why daylight saving was not referred to as a factor in this case. However, as I have said, I believe that, whether the board was right or wrong, it probably assumed that daylight saving would continue to operate and that it was something over which it had no control.

UNLEY DISTRICT STREETS

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question regarding safety improvements being made along Duthy Street and George Street, Parkside?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Several traffic safety devices were installed along Duthy Street and George Street during 1971 as a result of investigations undertaken by the Road Traffic Board. These included "stop" signs, safety bars, and centre line marking and are shown diagrammatically represented on a plan, which I will make available to the honourable member. The "stop" signs on Young Street, Wattle Street and Fisher Street had been installed previously. This plan also shows the average number of accidents a year at each location that has occurred before and after the installation of these various treatments. The numbers of accidents which have occurred between the intersections along the road is shown at the bottom of this plan. The "before" figures are based on three years accident data and represent a reliable guide. However, the "after" figures are based for the most part on only one year's accidents and, in many cases, only nine to 10 months. It is therefore inadvisable to place excessive reliance on these figures, owing to the chance manner in which accidents happen. At this stage, however, there appears to be a heartening trend indicating that the treatments are having a considerable effect in reducing the number of accidents along this roadway. These locations are being kept under review by the Road Traffic Board and more reliable figures will be available in about 12 months.

SWIMMING POOL DEVICE

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question regarding a swimming pool safety device?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Following the honourable member's question of August 15, he provided me with some additional information, and also his constituent telephoned my office. As a result, arrangements were made for me to inspect this invention. I did this, in company with appropriate technical officers, at a location selected by the honourable member's constituent. Subsequently the constituent discussed the whole matter with one of the electrical engineers present at the inspection. I have been told that this man has been given some practical suggestions on how his device can be improved. He has expressed his appreciation of the assistance given by my officers in this matter.

MODBURY HIGH SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the letting of tenders for an additional toilet block at the Modbury High School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A contract has been let for the erection of a 300-student toilet block and an incinerator enclosure at the Modbury High School. It is expected that these facilities will be available for use at the beginning of the 1973 school year.

MORPHETTVILLE PARK SCHOOL

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked recently about repainting the timber classrooms at the Morphettville Park Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The external surfaces of the four-classroom timber frame block at the Morphettville Park Primary School will be repainted by the end of November, 1972.

STRIP RESTAURANT

Mr. BECKER: Will the Attorney-General say what action the Government intends to take regarding the opening of a strip restaurant in the city at lunchtimes?

Members interjecting:

Mr. Mathwin: Have you been there?

Mr. BECKER: No, I have not. I understand that recently a restaurant opened in James Place, with a floor show, in the form of strip-tease, at 12.15 p.m. and 1.15 p.m. The cost of lunch is $2.50 for oysters and $2.50 for a steak, and customers must pay this amount. The cost of wines, etc., is extra. In view of the establishment of other strip shows in the city in which the performers remove all forms of clothing, I desire to know what action the Government intends to take regarding this restaurant.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I know nothing of the establishment to which the honourable member refers so, not sharing his knowledge of it, I cannot give him a reply at this stage; but I will have the matter investigated.

OPAL LEASES

Mr. GUNN: In the temporary absence of the Premier, who is also Minister of Development and Mines, I ask the Minister of Environment and Conservation whether either his department or the Mines Department has issued mining leases to a company known as Utah Development Company to prospect in mines in the Coober Pedy area. While I was at the opal fields recently, concern was expressed to me that this company had been granted leases close to the opal-mining fields, and it was believed that the people concerned might prevent opal miners from carrying on a legitimate business.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will inquire into the matter. The honourable member first asked whether or not any applications had been lodged for leases on the opal fields, and later on said "near the opal fields".

Mr. Gunn: I understand it's four miles south.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will bear that in mind when inquiring into the matter.

HAIRDRESSERS

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to the question I asked him prior to the show adjournment about the registration of hairdressers?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I have received requests for amendments to be made to the Hairdressers Registration Act, one of the matters concerning the recognition of hairdressers who have been trained in other countries. An amendment to the Act is required to alter the present provision but, because of the amount of important industrial legislation already introduced or proposed to be introduced, it is not intended to introduce any amendments to the Hairdressers Registration Act during the current session. I realize that this matter is important and I will deal with it as soon as possible.

SHARK SALES

Mr. CARNIE: This question is subsequent to a question I asked recently about compensation in connection with shark fishing. Will the Government consider granting loans to fishermen to enable them to replace shark-fishing equipment now redundant as a result of the Victorian ban? The week before last, I asked the Premier whether compensation could be paid to shark fishermen with respect to shark already caught and in storage, and as a supplement to that question I asked about compensation in respect of redundant equipment. The Premier replied:

> As I know of no compensation provisions, I will discuss the matter with my colleague and bring down a report.

Although the Premier has not brought down a report, from the tone of that reply it seems unlikely that compensation will be paid. Therefore, I ask the Minister of Works, in the absence of the Premier, whether the Government will investigate the possibility of granting loans to shark fishermen in these circumstances when money is not available from the normal sources.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will ask the Premier to examine the matter.

POLICE FORCE

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Attorney-General received from the Chief Secretary a reply to the question I asked on August 23 about police cadets and whether the Police Force is at full strength?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The approved establishment of this department is 450 police cadets. On July 31, 1972, the number in training was 361. The difference between the establishment and the number in training is a normal occurrence because of the lack of suitable youths presenting themselves for employment at this time of year. The major cadet intake occurs during the first six months of any year. The strength of the Police Force is based on a programme of gradual expansion, the need for which is determined by assessing foreseeable commitments and likely separations.

This expansion is exemplified by the active strength of 1,971 at June 30, 1971, increasing to 2,063 on June 30, 1972.

FENCING RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport have investigated whose responsibility it is to maintain fencing along Government property? The railway line to Mount Pleasant was closed some years ago and the track taken up. The land is now vested in the Highways Department, although it was formerly under the control of the Railways Department, which accepted the responsibility for the upkeep of the fencing adjacent to the two sides of the land in question. I have received a complaint from a landholder whose property abuts much of this land held by the Highways Department, but the department accepts no responsibility for the cost of repairs to fencing, whereas, when this land was formerly held by the Railways Department, that department met the full cost of maintaining the fencing. As it seems that the Railways Department formerly met this cost, can the same arrangement still apply now that the land is vested in the Highways Department?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to look at this matter. There is something very strange in what the honourable member has said, and I shall be happy to get a report.

CAMDEN SCHOOL

Mr. BECKER: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question concerning the toilets at the Camden Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Prior to the honourable member asking his question, no request for an inspection or upgrading of students' toilet facilities at the Camden Primary School had been received. An urgent investigation will be undertaken immediately and any necessary remedial action taken.

OIL REFINERIES

Mr. SIMMONS: Has the Minister of Works, in the temporary absence of the Premier, a reply to a question I asked on August 15 concerning oil refineries?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Careful consideration has been given to the member's proposition, but it is not practicable at this time to build a second refinery. The oil industry is not geared to handle the crude oil involved and the construction of a refinery using Soviet crude would create the need for a new group of retail service outlets. Economies of scale would be adverse in view of the relatively small South Australian market, which is not satisfied by the existing refinery, and this position would be further complicated by the obligation to process some Australian crude. With reference to E.N.I.T., this Italian monopoly organization has an organized outlet for refined products and processes various crudes, including Arabian as well as Russian.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr. HARRISON: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether there has been any permanent increase in patronage of South Australian public transport as a result of the recent petrol shortage?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes, there has been an increase. The increase that was gained during the petrol shortage was not maintained, nor was it expected to be maintained, but I am pleased to be able to say that the patronage is about 10 per cent greater than it was before the petrol shortage.

PAY-ROLL TAX

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Deputy Premier say whether the Government has considered providing a pay-roll tax concession in respect of an industry that either sets up or maintains its operation outside the metropolitan area? It is reported in the press today that in one of the Eastern States, as part of the Budget introduced last evening, it has been decided to decrease by 1 per cent the pay-roll tax applying to any industry that decentralizes by setting up in country areas. Will the Government consider introducing a similar concession in South Australia, as it would be of considerable advantage in any future discussions concerning the establishment of industry, for instance, at Murray New Town?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: To the best of my knowledge the Government has not considered this matter. However, it has concerned itself with ways and means of attracting industry not only to places such as Murray New Town but also to other country areas of the State. However, it recognizes that, unless the Commonwealth Government plays a more active part in regional development from a financial point of view particularly (although there are other ways it can do this), it will be extremely difficult for the State Government to attract industries into these areas, even with the concessions referred to by the Leader. I do not believe that such a concession would be a real incentive to an industry or sufficient to attract it to the country. Until the Commonwealth. Government zones the nation into

regions that should be developed and is willing to grant tax holidays and things of that nature, we can see no tangible way in which State Governments can give real incentives to industries to establish in country areas. Already this State has done everything it could possibly do, but, because of the Leader's question, I shall be pleased to place the matter before the Premier (as Minister of Development) in order to determine whether it is worth considering.

SMOKING

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Health to the question I asked on August 17 about the co-operation of this Government with the Commonwealth Government in its anti-smoking education campaign?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague states that at the conference of Commonwealth and State Ministers in Sydney on May 2, 1972, it was decided to establish an Advisory Committee for Smoking Education to advise the Commonwealth Minister for Health on the design of a national smoking education campaign. The membership of the committee comprises a representative from each State, a representative from the Australian Council on Smoking and Health, and Commonwealth representation. The States will be expected to distribute the publicity material within their own field programmes on behalf of the Commonwealth, to co-ordinate the efforts of voluntary organizations, and to promote local programmes wherever possible as a result of interest stimulated by the national campaign.

It is intended that money will be made available to the States from the total allocation of $500,000 to enable them to appoint additional staff to their health education units to carry out this work. The Public Health Department will be involved considerably in the programme, and one of its officers represents the State on the above committee. The department will undertake distribution of the prepared literature as part of arranged educational programmes and, for this purpose, will integrate this activity with the functions of its Drug Education Section, augmenting the staff as necessary.

NATIONAL PARKS

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That the regulations (general) under the National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1972, made on June 29, 1972, and laid on the table of this House on July 18, 1972, be disallowed.

It is an unfortunate aspect of introducing regulations into the system of government in this State that it becomes necessary, if one section of these regulations is unsatisfactory, for a member to move to disallow all the regulations. I shall not canvass that point further, but I find it unfortunate to have been instrumental in delaying the other parts of the regulations because I have placed this motion on the Notice Paper. I believe that the best interests of all Parties are not being adequately considered by three parts of these regulations. I refer to the section that deals with birds that are to be placed in the rare group, and I refer to the princess parrot and the scarlet-chested parrot.

I am aware that much information was presented to the Subordinate Legislation Committee earlier, and that these two species are considered by the Avicultural Society in this State and elsewhere in the Commonwealth to be breeding in captivity in numbers large enough to maintain the species. It has also been stated (and I have no reason to disbelieve the statement) that there has been no introduction of wild birds of these species into the aviary-breeding programmes for many years. I suggest that it was not necessary to have taken the decision that has been taken on this matter. South Australian climatic conditions for breeding these birds are extremely favourable and, from the information I have, I believe that a similar position obtains in every State with the possible exception of Tasmania, where climatic conditions make it somewhat difficult for the satisfactory breeding of these two species.

From the information available, it seems that the progress made with the scarlet-chested parrots since they were first bred in captivity in 1932 in South Australia (and this was the first time they had been bred in captivity, and the occasion has been recognized by the presentation of a suitable medal) has been remarkable, and has resulted in their numbers increasing considerably. At present there could be up to 700 pairs of birds held by aviculturists in South Australia for breeding purposes, and their potential breeding capabilities have contributed towards the build-up of this number. It is not unusual for pairs of birds 13 years to 14 years of age to produce young, and in most instances all pairs will double-brood each season, and sometimes beyond this, even though it may be discouraged.

The breeding details can be obtained from the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department, and details were also provided in a letter from the National Parks and Wildlife Service over the signature of Mr. R. G. Lyons dated August 21, 1972. This material was made available to the Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee. From this information we find that the expected number of scarlet-chested parrots in captivity in South Australia at that time was 2,457 birds, which was considerably more than 700 pairs, which was the number stated in the information given to me. It is stated that breeding of the species has been maintained and improved without the use of wild trapped birds for about 30 years, and records indicate that in 1939 a number of these birds were trapped and supplied for the avicultural trade (this supply being legal), but there is no other evidence of a similar supply for that purpose. The scarlet-chested parrots were first sighted in Australia in 1838. There is a wealth of information about where the sightings have been made. The information about these sightings pinpoints the fact that these are nomadic birds that tend to follow seasonal flushes. It has been indicated several times that they will migrate to where spinifex is flowering and seeding well. This has been borne out by several organizations and individuals.

The princess parrot was first bred in captivity in South Australia in 1929. The breeding of this parrot has gradually improved. It is estimated that about 300 pairs are held by aviculturists in South Australia. I am referring to the same source now that I referred to earlier. The Director of National Parks and Wildlife (Mr. R. G. Lyons) says that there are apparently about 1,299 birds in this State. This gives no indication of the numbers held in aviaries in other States. In this case, the birds were first sighted by the Sturt expedition in 1863 at Howell Ponds in Central Australia. Following this, specimens were taken back to England, and they have been bred in captivity over a long time in countries overseas. I point out that the build-up of numbers in captivity over a long time and the inability of the National Parks and Wildlife Service and other organizations to pinpoint specifically at any time the position of naturally occurring groups suggests to me that the placing of these two species in the rare species group, subject to the various restrictions that apply under the regulations and subject to the $10 fee that applies, was unrealistic. This is why I join with many others in believing that these regulations should be changed. Under the heading "Labelling", regulation 56 provides:

(1) Notwithstanding that any other marking may be required under these regulations, any person consigning or conveying or causing to be consigned or conveyed any protected animal or the carcass, skin or egg of a protected animal from his place of business to any other place shall, before consigning or conveying such animal, carcass, skin or egg, securely attach or cause to be securely attached to the sides or top of the receptacle or package containing such animal, carcass, skin or egg, a label not less than 16 cm by 20 cm on which is written in clear legible print—

(*a*) his name and place of business;

(*b*) the number of his permit to keep and sell protected animals;

(*c*) the name and address of the person to whom the animal, carcass, skin or egg is being consigned or conveyed;

(*d*) the number of the consignee's permit to keep and sell protected animals.

(2) Any receptacle or package containing a protected animal or the carcass, skin or egg of a protected animal which is not labelled as aforesaid may with its contents be seized by a Warden.

(3) A person shall not accept for transport or cartage or shipment any protected animal or the carcass, skin or egg of a protected animal unless the said animal, carcass, skin or egg or the receptacle or package containing a protected animal is labelled in accordance with the provisions of this regulation.

The specific point I make is about the requirement that a label shall be not less than 16 cm by 20 cm. I ask where space can be found on a receptacle carrying one small egg or something like that to place a label of that size. I believe it is impracticable and ridiculous to require every parcel to be labelled in that way. That regulation also applies to the despatch of birds by public transport. There is no argument about that. It applies whether the transport is by road, rail or air. It also applies to the conveying of birds locally by the owner from one suburb to another, or from one property to the next. It applies to any transfer, whether it be on public transport or otherwise, and whether it be between breeders living on contiguous properties. It is considered that the transfer of birds and the purchase of birds whenever carried out is adequately covered under regulations 47 (4) and 48 (4). This situation requires that the person making the sale shall enter into a book the details of the sale, and that the purchaser shall also enter into a book the details of the purchase made. I come back again to the fact that the regulations require a person to have a label not smaller than 16 cm by 20 cm attached to any parcel containing the various commodities listed, or parts thereof.

I also refer to the necessity under the new regulations for persons in certain categories to make a report in relation to various species to the keeper of records or to the Director of National Parks and Wildlife or his officer. This is a monthly report to be made available within 14 days of the completion of the preceding month. I believe that it is recognized that, in respect of many of the species of bird, there is, a period during which they will breed. In these circumstances it seems unnecessary to make regular monthly reports, even during the time when there is no movement in breeding numbers. We also find the situation that a person who has one bird of a protected species (and the case cited to me was of a Major Mitchell parrot) is required, under the regulations, to make a monthly report to the appropriate authority that he still has or is maintaining this parrot. Here again we have the situation that the breeding time for this species is a confined period of the year. We also have the situation that few people have the facilities to enter into the breeding of this species.

There are two categories. One is the breeder who has more than one bird, and the other is the pet owner, who has only one bird and is not interested in the breeding aspects. It is demanded of persons holding these species that they make regular monthly reports, and I consider that that requirement is neither necessary nor practicable. The department should consider adopting the legislation or regulations of other States requiring a report annually, quarterly or half-yearly. I appreciate the need for a record of activity, but it is unnecessary to require individuals involved in this interest to make regular monthly reports. On the basis of these aspects, I ask members to urgently consider disallowing these regulations so that the House may consider requirements which are more meaningful and which allow for these deficiencies.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I support in general what the Leader has so ably and thoroughly stated about these regulations. We all agree that some regulations are necessary, but we are getting to the stage where, in trying to combat the wrong that some people are doing, we are inflicting much hardship on people who are acting honestly. In that way, we reduce the quality of life. We are using a sledgehammer when something less could solve the problem that arises when people try to make a profit from trading in rare birds.

I have many bird lovers in my district and at any meeting in my town of Langhorne Creek the bird-watchers get about five times the number attending other meetings. I am in an area where we have many bird lovers, and some of these people will find it extremely difficult to furnish a monthly return. One person has much vegetation and many natural trees on his property, and he has an aviary so that he may care for birds on the property. Recently he picked up two birds of an extremely rare species and took them with him to care for them. When he asked an inspector what he should do with the birds, the inspector said, "You have to either let them go or give them to me."

This is an extraordinary situation. If what I have said is not correct, the Minister can explain the position. Hordes of inspectors go around the country for various reasons. Many of them are not practical people and sometimes make demands on people beyond their authority. I support the Leader's statement that too much is expected from those who keep birds and are genuinely fond of them, whilst at the same time I agree that we must be practical and have reasonable regulations that do not impose too much difficulty on these people who have birds in aviaries.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to declare the rights and liberties of the people of South Australia; to preserve, protect and render more effectual those rights and liberties; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Since it has become known that I planned to introduce a Bill of Rights, I have been asked several times why I am doing so. My reply has been that the State, the Government, in our day has become so powerful and has concerned itself with so many areas of the life of each of us that the time has come to protect the rights and liberties of the individual of the State by setting them out in Statute form before these rights and liberties are lost. The traditional protection, the rule of law, is, I am afraid, no longer strong enough. A. V. Dicey, in the *Law of the Constitution,* 70 years ago was able to state:

> There is, in the English Constitution, an absence of those declarations or definitions of rights so dear to foreign constitutionalists. Such principles, moreover, as you can discover in the English Constitution are, like all maxims

established by judicial legislation, mere generalizations drawn either from the decisions or dicta of judges or from Statutes which, being passed to meet special grievances, bear a close resemblance to judicial decisions and are, in effect, judgments pronounced by the "High Court of Parliament".

I believe that Dicey could not say that today with this evident satisfaction. This Parliament (and I make no distinction as to the Party in office) on several occasions has passed Bills that infringe the rights and liberties of the citizens. Although we cannot altogether prevent that from happening in the future, at least this Bill provides that we shall have consciously to put those rights and liberties on one side and all will know what we are doing.

Above all today, there is in the community much less respect for the individual and his rights and liberties. There is less toleration of the views of others than there once was. This assertion would be denied by most, but actions speak louder than words. It is easy enough to call to mind actions here in South Australia that have been aimed at forcing a person or people to conform to the wishes (indeed, to the dictates) of others. The climate of the times has changed and what once was accepted and taken for granted now needs to be spelt out if it is to be preserved and kept strong.

Behind all that I have said (and fundamental to it) is a belief in the infinite worth of the individual and, therefore, a need to protect and preserve his rights and liberties so that, within the framework of an ordered community, he may be free to live his life as he wishes. This is the essence of liberalism. Also, we must never forget that rights and liberties also entail responsibilities, as well as obligations, to other people. No-one can properly discharge his responsibilities and obligations without the freedom of action to do so. Rights and liberties, responsibilities and obligations go together. Many have been surprised that these things are not already guaranteed to us by Statute. It is widely assumed that they are, but this is not so.

My aim, therefore, is to strengthen the position of the individual to ensure that every citizen continues to enjoy the rights and liberties which are traditionally ours but which, without the safeguard of a Bill of Rights, could be lost or at least infringed and much reduced. There are plenty of precedents for Bills of Rights. Dicey in the passage I quoted implied this; he was speaking of foreign countries. I remind members of the first Bill of Rights, that of 1689, passed at the time of the accession of William and Mary to the Throne (an Act declaring the rights and liberties of the subject and settling the succession of the Crown). One can go back even further in history to Magna Carta. I next refer to the United States Bill of Rights, being the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, made in 1791. This contained much the same kind of guarantee as I have included in the Bill. I quote two examples. First, article 1 headed "Religious Establishment, Prohibited Freedom of Speech, of the Press, and Right to Petition" states:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Article 8, headed "Excessive Bail or Fines and Cruel Punishment Prohibited", states:

> Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

Even Dicey, with his antipathy to written formal guarantees of rights and liberties, was able to laud the United States Bill of Rights, and he says at page 199:

> Nor let it be supposed that this connection between rights and remedies which depends upon the spirit of law pervading English institutions is inconsistent with the existence of a written constitution, or even with the existence of constitutional declarations of rights. The Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of the separate States are embodied in written or printed documents, and contain declarations of rights. But the statesmen of America have shown unrivalled skill in providing means for giving legal security to the rights declared by American Constitutions. The rule of law is as marked a feature of the United States as of England.

We come now to the twentieth century (to our own time) and to recent declarations of the rights of men and women, declarations both international and national. I refer to the Eighteenth Report of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, 1968, entitled *The United Nations and Human Rights,* and in the introductory chapter on page 1 we find this:

> It was during one of the darkest hours of the war—

that is, the Second World War—

> when the Axis powers achieved almost complete control of the European continent, that President Roosevelt provided in his "Four Freedoms"—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want and freedom from fear—a rallying cry for all those suffering from the ravages of war and totalitarianism. After another disaster, the Pearl Harbour attack, the Allied Governments agreed in Washington

on the "Declaration by United Nations" which named as the basic goal of victory the preservation of "human rights and justice in their own lands as well as in other lands".

Then on page 2, under the heading "The Charter of the United Nations", it states:

> In the preamble to the Charter, the peoples of the United Nations have reaffirmed their "faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small," and their determination "to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom". Article 1 of the Charter lists among the main purposes of the United Nations the achievement of international co-operation "in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion". Similarly, in accordance with article 55 of the Charter, the United Nations has the duty to promote "universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion".

As a first step towards the implementation of the ideas embodied in the Charter, the United Nations, in 1948, adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. I do not suppose that there is one member who does not support that declaration; certainly the Government does, as the Premier said in reply to my question on notice on July 20, 1971. I have relied on the declaration, both directly and indirectly through the Canadian Bill, in the drafting of this Bill. Some of the articles are not easily put into a form that can be enforced by law. Indeed, it has been found impossible to do so, but many of them can be drafted (and have been drafted) in statutory form. I will refer to some when explaining the detail of the Bill. Others, such as articles 22 and 25, I have regretfully had to omit. As I hoped to be able to put these two articles into the Bill, I will refer to them briefly now, because I am sure all members will agree that it is desirable, if possible, to guarantee these rights by Statute, but it is really not possible to do this. Article 22 provides:

> Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through natural effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality.

Article 25 provides in the first part:

> Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.

I quote briefly parts of the preamble which set out the reasons why the declaration was proclaimed and which served equally well to reinforce the reasons I have already given for introducing the Bill. I quote only two of the paragraphs, as follows:

> Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world;
>
> Whereas the peoples of the United Nations have in the Charter reaffirmed their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women and have determined to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom;

Finally, I refer to the Canadian Bill of Rights of 1960, the long title of which is "An Act for the Recognition and Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms" and on which this Bill has been based. I have a copy with me and, of course, it is available in the library, and I hope members will look at it.

I turn now to the Bill itself, and I hope that the duplicated copies have been distributed to members. I regret that there was not time to have it printed ready for introduction this afternoon. The Bill, after the long title which has been read out, begins with a preamble. It is not a long preamble, but I have thought it wise to include a preamble, setting out briefly the reasons why this Bill has passed, as I hope it will be passed. The Bill provides:

> Whereas it appears to the Parliament of this State assembled just and proper that certain of the rights and liberties that should be enjoyed by the people of the State be expressed and set out in written form:
>
> And whereas it appears desirable to the said Parliament that those rights and liberties as so expressed and set out should be preserved and protected lest they should in any manner or by any means be abridged or abrogated.

I hope that summarizes the reasons I have given in my explanation. Clause 1 of the Bill is the short title. Clause 2 provides that the Bill shall come into operation on January 1, 1973. I preferred to put a certain date rather than to leave it to proclamation because, as I am a member in Opposition, the matter would then be beyond my control and the control of members of my Party and, if we provide for a certain date, the Bill will, by force, come into operation on that date. It is necessary to have a date fixed some time in

advance so that it is certain which Acts of the South Australian Parliament are antecedent laws of the State, and the definition appearing in clause 3 is necessary to provide a division, for reasons I will explain, between antecedent laws of the State and laws that are passed in the future. I hope that the date of January 1, 1973, will be a day on which no other Act of this Parliament will come into operation so that there will be certainty on this point.

Clause 3, the interpretation clause, contains the definition of antecedent laws of the State: that is, laws which come into force or which have been in force before the day on which the Act came into operation. It also includes regulations made thereunder. The law of the State, which is a separate definition, is any law passed on or after the day on which this Act comes into operation. This is the significant part of the definition (at the end of clause 3):

> . . . on and from the expiration of the period of two years next following the day on which this Act came into operation, includes every antecedent law of the State.

This is to allow us as Parliamentarians, the Government and the Public Service two years to look through the Statutes of this State to see in what respect those Statutes now contravene the provisions of the Bill of Rights so that we will have an opportunity to scrutinize, amend or confirm those infringements, should such action be thought desirable. As a result of our Statute law, it is necessary to have such a period, and I hope that a two-year period will be long enough. It should be long enough, in all conscience.

Clause 4 contains the declaration of rights and liberties of the people of this State. Several subclauses set out various fundamental rights that I hope to preserve and strengthen. I shall go through them and give the source from which each subclause has been drawn. The first is the right of the individual to life and the security of the person and that comes from the Canadian Bill of Rights. The second, concerning the right of adult persons to take part in the Government of the State, comes from article 21 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The third, concerning the right to receive without improper discrimination equal protection of the law, comes from article 7 of the declaration. The fourth, concerning the right to effective remedy at law, comes from article 8 of the declaration and is a clear direction to the courts to find a remedy, or to formulate a remedy if none can be found, in the law as it stands at the time. The fifth, concerning freedom of thought and conscience, is drawn from article 19 of the declaration. The sixth, concerning the right to freedom of religion and the right to change religions, is drawn from article 18. When I have been asked what is the position regarding Scientology under this clause, I have replied that I do not believe that scientology is a religion. However, if those who espouse those ideas can convince a court that that philosophy forms the basis of a religion, they would be entitled to the protection of this clause. Although I do not believe they can do it, they are entitled to the protection given by this clause if they can.

The seventh subclause concerns the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and the right to belong to an association formed for any legal purpose including the right not to be compelled to belong to an association, and is a paraphrase of article 20 of the declaration. The eighth, concerning the right to equal pay, is based on article 23. The final right, set out in clause 4, concerns the right to receive information, and I have added the words, after taking them out once, "from a free press". This clause therefore reads in the Bill I introduce today, as follows:

> The right to receive information from a free press.

That is based on the German basic law. My hesitation concerning this subclause was over the phrase "from a free press". I considered that that phrase might have been restrictive and might have been applied only to newspapers, thereby excluding radio and television. Although I am not entirely satisfied with it, even now, I believe that this phrase is so well known and accepted that it would be interpreted to cover those areas which I intend it should: that is, all the media by which people are informed of current events and the opinions of people in the news. Clause 5, which concerns the construction of the law, is based closely on section 20 of the Canadian Bill of Rights. I draw the attention of members to the preamble at the beginning of that clause, as follows:

> Every law of the State shall, unless it is expressly declared by an Act of this Parliament that it shall operate and have effect notwithstanding the Bill of Rights, 1972, be so construed.

As I have earlier said, it is not possible to bind Parliament absolutely to avoid any infringement of these rights. Indeed, I do not believe that is practicable. There will be occasions when it will be necessary for good reason to infringe some of these rights, but at least by

the way in which this clause is drawn it will be necessary for us to do it consciously. This Bill draws attention to the fact that we are overriding what I hope we would all regard as fundamental rights and freedoms of people. We and others outside this place will be able to judge whether what we are doing is wise or unwise. The placita in clause 5 deals with arbitrary detention, imprisonment, and the imposition or authorization of cruel or unusual punishment. One of the articles in the United States Bill of Rights is much the same and has been used in argument before the United States Supreme Court recently concerning capital punishment.

The Hon. L. J. King: It was upheld?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was, and it was decisively in favour of the Supreme Court's decision to declare capital punishment unlawful.

The Hon. L. J. King: If that decision is right, that will give capital punishment only two years in South Australia under your Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I point out, and as the Attorney-General well knows, that that decision would be certainly persuasive on our courts, but it would not bind our courts. I am willing to stand up to that. Clause 5 (c) deals with the rights of a person who has been arrested to communicate with and retain counsel, and so on, and it preserves the remedy of *habeas corpus* (that you have the body, is the translation of those words), one of the fundamentals in the present law. The Habeas Corpus Act, which was introduced in 1679, is the source of that fundamental right of a person to be brought before the court speedily should he be arrested, so that the court may judge whether or not he has been rightfully detained, and so on. I shall not quote all the paragraphs, but (*i*), which does not appear in the Canadian Bill, provides:

> Require any person to hold real or personal property of any specified kind as a prerequisite for exercising his right to vote at an election for either House of Parliament.

As was pointed out in the *Advertiser* a few days ago, that is contrary to some of the provisions in the present Constitution of this State dealing with the limited franchise of the Legislative Council. In effect, I am giving two years for us to clean up this situation, but I hope that we will resolve the problem well before then.

The Hon. L. J. King: What meaning do you give the words "of any specified kind"?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think that would include holding in fee simple, leasehold, or any other form of tenure of land.

The Hon. L. J. King: Would it preclude a requirement that you hold property of a certain value, irrespective?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should think that it did: I intended it to do that, and if it does not perhaps we should look for another form of words that puts it beyond doubt. I hope it is beyond doubt, but if there is any doubt it should be amended. I refer to paragraph (*m*), which states:

> Provide for a search of any premises or place except as is ordered by a person holding judicial office.

Clause 5, in conjunction with clause 4, sets out (and I hope protects and reinforces) the freedoms which we either enjoy or should enjoy in this State. The other clauses are of a more technical nature, although I hope that members will not find the clauses that I have dealt with so far to be technical. Clause 6 deals with severability: in other words, if, because of the provisions of this Bill (if it becomes law), the provisions of other Acts of Parliament are struck down as being contrary to it, the remaining provisions which are not so struck down will be severed from those which are bad and will remain in full force and effect. A similar provision is contained in the Acts Interpretation Act.

Clause 7 makes it clear that this Bill is in addition to (supplements, if such supplementation is appropriate or is the case) any right or liberty which we may now have. It does not derogate from any right or liberty we now have but supplements such a right or liberty. Clause 8 is aimed at ensuring that we do not inadvertently trespass on any matter which is within the province of the Commonwealth Constitution. The provisions of this Act shall be construed as extending only to matters coming within the legislative authority of the Parliament of this State and will be construed to exclude any other. Clause 9 is an entrenching clause, and is in a similar form to that contained in the South Australian Constitution dealing with the Houses of Parliament. It provides that the Bill of Rights, once passed, shall not be amended unless that amendment is passed by both Houses of Parliament and submitted to a referendum of the people of this State. In other words, it entrenches it in the law of South Australia, and I believe that these things should

be so entrenched. So far as we are able, I believe that we should provide that these things should not be altered simply by a subsequent Act of this Parliament.

As a rule I am not in favour of referenda: the only exception I make to that opposition to referenda is in the case of a Constitutional alteration such as required under the Commonwealth Constitution, or that which we accepted under the State Constitution, or for such fundamental matters as those contained in this Bill. Clause 10 is probably not necessary because it is obvious, but I have spelled out that this Act will bind the Crown. I do not pretend that the drafting of the Bill has been easy: it has not. I am grateful for the advice I have received from Professor Castles, of the Adelaide University Law School, and others. I hope I am entitled to assume that we all support the principles embodied in it, but certainly in Committee I shall be glad of constructive suggestions for amendments of the clauses or subclauses, or of additions to them. Nor do I say for a moment that the mere passing of the Bill of Rights will secure for all time the rights and freedoms set out: it will not. That is a continuing task.

The price of liberty is eternal vigilance, but it is something which we at this time can do to affirm our faith in these things and to protect and strengthen them. To say, as some will, that it is not necessary to enshrine them in the Statute law of this State, because we already enjoy them, is most unwise. Of course, one could argue from such an assertion (dangerous though I believe the assertion to be) that there can be no harm in putting into statutory form what we already have and enjoy. That is true, but not wholly true. There are examples here and now of their infringement, and I have referred to some of them. That this is so, and that there is any hesitation about the acceptance of any of them, is the measure of the imperfection of our democracy. In South Australia citizens should be enjoying, all these rights and liberties: that we are not is confirmation of the need for a Bill of Rights.

The Hon. L. J. KING secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (COMMERCIAL VEHICLES)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It brings the law in South Australia relating to speeds of commercial vehicles on open roads to some comparison with the allowable speeds in other States. At present, the allowable speeds in South Australia are the most restrictive in Australia, and, apart from this inconvenience, the present allowable speeds are, in the opinion of many, a road hazard. Under the present provision commercial motor vehicles exceeding 13 tons are restricted to 30 m.p.h. A significant consideration in road safety as it applies to the drivers of commercial vehicles is that relating to time spent in driving at any period or in completing one trip. Continued driving at relatively slow speeds has a hypnotic effect, which will at some time or another have been experienced by ail drivers on a long journey, and this soporific effect constitutes a very real road hazard. I can vouch for this, having driven for a short time at night in one of these vehicles.

The likelihood of a driver's being affected by the hypnotic effect of low-speed driving on the open road increases markedly with the time of driving. Although it has been suggested that there should be some limitation of hours of driving to overcome this hazard, a more realistic and effective way of removing the hazard is the proposed increase in the speed limit of commercial vehicles to 50 m.p.h. Of course, this will reduce the time necessary to complete a journey, and will significantly reduce the likelihood of accident-causing driver fatigue. Many transport drivers are concerned that, because of the unrealistic speed limits in South Australia, they are accumulating demerit points, their livelihood being threatened if their licences are suspended. Indeed, there is also an added danger to road safety, because experienced drivers, charged under the existing speed limits and losing their licences under the points demerit scheme, are being replaced by drivers who do not have similar experience and knowledge of the road.

Clause 1 of the Bill is formal. Clause 2 repeals section 53 of the principal Act, and re-enacts a new section, which imposes a speed limit of 50 m.p.h. on commercial vehicles on the open road. The position in other States, I understand, is as follows: N.S.W., 50 m.p.h.; Queensland, 60 m.p.h.; and Western Australia: under 3 tons, 60 m.p.h.; 3 to 7 tons, 50 m.p.h.; and over 7 tons, 40 m.p.h. Victoria, I am informed, has recently lifted the speed limit to 50 m.p.h., or is about to do so.

I believe that legislation increasing speed limits for motor vehicles should be considered in relation to the braking capabilities of such

vehicles. This Bill, as it has been received from the other place, is not complete in this regard. Additional clauses relating to braking requirements will complete the proposed measures. I intend to take the necessary steps later to bring these clauses before the House. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO secured the adjournment of the debate.

MEADOWS ZONING REGULATIONS

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I move:

That the Metropolitan Development Plan, District Council of Meadows planning regulations—zoning, made under the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1971, on July 6, 1972, and laid on the table of this House on July 18, 1972, be disallowed.

In moving this motion, I am fully aware of the problems that will face the Meadows council, and the board of management of Minda Home Incorporated especially, if the motion is carried. All members are aware of the concern about the zoning regulations of the Mitcham and Meadows councils, particularly as they affect the Craigburn property. I believe I should deal with the problems being faced by the councils in this area, and that I should state the reason why the Minda Home board would prefer these regulations to be passed as they are now constituted. In the original 1962 development plan, this area was classified for special uses. This gave the opportunity for the land to' be used as a racecourse or golf course, but the real reason why it was classified for special use was to' cover the case of an institution, namely, Minda Home. As it was classified in this way to cover the case of this institution, it would perhaps be wrong to argue that the intention in that plan was to leave the area classified for special uses.

I intend to interpret this classification as relating to institutional use; it would be wrong to argue in any other way. I believe that the attitude in the community now is, and will be in future, that we must preserve as much open space as we can as close to urban areas as possible. The area to which I have referred is unique, since it includes part of Sturt Creek catchment area. We all realize that part of this area is presently reserved in relation to the Sturt Gorge and the Sturt catchment dam (the flood dam). I should like to examine the position of the board of Minda Home if this area were classified as open space, rather than as a residential area as proposed in the suggested zoning regulations. Immediately the area is classified as an open-space area, and future development is prevented, the board will lose much equity in the property, and its potential to borrow money on the property will be reduced.

The board is eligible to receive from the Commonwealth Government a subsidy of $2 for $1. Each time we devalue this property, we reduce the opportunity of Minda Home to expand in other areas. If the present property is worth, say, $4,000,000 when classified as a residential area, it would be worth possibly only $2,000,000 when reclassified, so' that we would have taken away from Minda Home the potential to raise $6,000,000. This fact must be considered. However, I believe that people who live in the Hills and who are in the low and average income groups must be considered. If the council loses the return from ratable property, it will lose revenue and these people will be affected. Over the years, the Government has acquired much land in the Meadows council area, that council having lost a considerable sum in rates as well as the potential to earn a much greater sum. I will give an example of the areas of land presently owned by the Government in the Meadows council area. The long-standing non-ratable land in the Meadows council area is in the following wards: Happy Valley, 1,320 acres; Clarendon, 651 acres; Kangarilla, 1,620 acres; Meadows, 1,052 acres; Ashbourne, 4,414 acres; Echunga, 5,639 acres; Battunga, 12 acres; and Macclesfield, three acres; total, 14,713 acres. No rates are collected in respect of that land. At present values, the loss to the Government in rates for that land is $33,130, mainly to protect city water supplies or a Government venture such as the Woods and Forests Department, which competes against private enterprise and receives many concessions in not having to pay other taxes.

Regarding the total area in the Meadows council district involved in lost rates, we have, in addition to the 14,713 acres in long-standing non-ratable areas, Government properties that normally would be within other council areas. They are establishments such as the police station and the Commonwealth Government's Post Office, and the area involved in this, amounts to 70 acres. Then we have land that has been acquired in recent times by the Engineering and Water Supply Department.. The Happy Valley reservoir area is 288} acres and 3,937 acres is to be acquired for the proposed Clarendon reservoir.

A total of 19,000 acres in the Meadows council district comprises land owned by the Government as waterworks properties, properties that have been declared for some time, and the general properties, such as a post office and a police station. In addition to that non-ratable land in the Meadows council area, there is the Cox National Park comprising 1,180 acres, the Kyeema Wild Life Reserve of 800 acres, and Mount Magnificent National Park, comprising 233 acres. The total rates lost annually amount to about $46,000.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Don't you want open-space areas?

Mr. EVANS: Yes, but I also point out that the people in that council area pay a much higher rate to maintain these open spaces than they should be required to pay. They would not need anywhere near that amount of open space for their recreation requirements. Those areas are there mainly to give the city people an opportunity to get away from the rat race, and I do not think anyone would deny the city people that opportunity. The only value to the local community is that they can spend some recreation time in the area, but they live in an environment where their properties are larger and they have not the same desire or need to get away from the rat race as have people living in the plains area. I do not deny that the areas do benefit local people, but the local people bear the whole burden. Most of the people in this State live within the Adelaide Plains area, and the majority should be willing to contribute to the cost of maintaining these recreation areas.

The Minister should also know that, because of the large areas of open space in the Meadows council area, noxious weeds are prevalent and the open-space areas tend to harbour the weeds. In many cases, the open-space areas abut primary-producing property on which the owner always is striving to obtain a living in the present economic conditions, at the same time being restricted in his economic growth by a lack of activity by the Government departments in keeping noxious weeds and vermin out of the properties. People in these areas have had to put up with this for many years. The position is getting worse, not better, except that in Belair National Park there has been a real attempt to control noxious weeds.

If the Government (and, by the Government, I mean the people of the State) cannot accept the responsibility of reimbursing or subsidizing to offset the loss of rate revenue to the people of the Meadows council area, surely we must give the people of the area the opportunity to develop properties wherever they can. If not, eventually we will make the area a place for only the wealthy to live and we will rate the average man and the poor man out of the area. I do not consider that it is the right of only the rich people to live in the Hills area: everyone in the community who wishes to live there should have the opportunity to do so, subject to the controls regarding subdivision, particularly in the catchment area.

The other problem that the people of the area have in relation to open-space areas is that of fire protection. There is a distinct burden on the community and the council to protect not only property owned by local people but also property owned by city people. The fire risk in a national park or recreation area is greater because people light campfires or throw lighted matches on the ground and leave immediately a fire starts, leaving the problem for someone else to attend to. I do not consider that they do this deliberately in most cases: it is an unconscious action, because people are not really conscious of the danger of using any type of fire in the Hills or the bushland area during the hotter parts of summer.

To return to the particular area of concern, namely, Craigburn, which comprises about 500 acres on the Meadows council side of Sturt Creek, the Minister has said that Craigburn board is willing to leave about 40 per cent of the area as open space if there is a proposal for subdivision, although I understand that the board has also said that it has no plans for subdivision in that area. If there is an offer to leave 40 per cent, the zoning plan should show the part that will be left, so that any person who acquires a property in the area in future will know whether his house is likely to face an open area or a housing development. It is important to define the area clearly.

We should not pass regulations haphazardly saying, "It does not matter. At some time in future we will select the 40 per cent." Even if there is a backing down regarding the 40 per cent, 12½ per cent still must be left, in terms of the Planning and Development Act, and at least that area should be defined clearly. In the past, councils have accepted responsibility and have stated what section they desire left. That power has been given to the council in recent years, but the position is not satisfactory for those people who are concerned about protecting their environment.

For that reason, I believe that there is justification for rejecting these zoning regulations and for considering a supplementary plan showing exactly where the areas of open space are to be. Having presented to the House a petition signed by more than 6,000 people, I wish to read from part of the letter submitted to me at the time in support of the petition, as follows:

With special reference to Craigburn, it is inconceivable that this magnificent open area of such beauty and tranquillity should become yet another housing development.

I do not think that is completely accurate, because it has not been stated that the property will, in fact, become a housing development. The present board has stated that it does not intend to subdivide, but we all know that boards change, if for no other reason than, say, the death of one of their members, and new members may have a different attitude to this property. The letter continues:

With the grandeur of the Sturt Gorge before you and the open fields around, it is hard to believe one is only 10 miles from the centre of urban Adelaide and it surely forms a much needed retreat from the urban sprawl and bustle. In the 1962 plan, Craigburn was designated "special uses" to be set aside as part of a buffer zone south of the city consisting of the Sturt Gorge below Flagstaff Hill, Craigburn, the hills face zone in Coromandel Valley and then to Belair National Park.

The special uses determined in respect of Craigburn were based on the idea that it should be used as an institution. The letter continues:

This concept of a buffer strip separating zones of urban development is good and we feel it should be implemented as authorized in the 1967 Planning and Development Act. We understand that Craigburn is owned by Minda Home Incorporated which runs it as a dairy and mixed farm and in this way serves as a very useful rehabilitation scheme for some of its residents, as well as providing needed agricultural produce. The Board of Minda Home Incorporated has publicly stated that it wishes to keep operating Craigburn as a farm and does not wish it to be subdivided. It is therefore in its interests also to see the area zoned "special uses" and kept as open space.

The statement that it is in the interests of Minda Home Incorporated that special uses should be made of the property is true but this may not be the case in the long term, if we think in terms of the property's monetary value and its viability in the future. The letter continues:

Notwithstanding, it would seem that Minda Home Incorporated is substantially supported by public funds, both in the form of direct grants from the State Government and with assistance from the Commonwealth Government.

The Mitcham council has helped the organization, too. The letter continues:

We feel, therefore, that it does have some responsibility to the public about the future designation of this land, and the selling of Craigburn or sections of it for subdivision is not an appropriate way to show its gratitude to the people who have helped it in the past. If in the future Minda Home Incorporated fell into financial difficulty I am sure the public would again be willing to assist it in its wonderful work.

I suppose that is fair comment: the public may be willing to contribute, but I am not sure that it would be the public generally that raised the biggest objection to the area's being zoned as it is now zoned. A certain section of people may help financially. Finally, the letter states:

In conclusion we would like to say that many petitions in recent years have shown that the public are interested in responsible planning and development, in proper land usage, in the retention of open-space buffer and recreational zones, in the preservation of the natural beauty of their surroundings, and it is up to the Parliamentarians of today to see that this is carried out. Craigburn at present is a beautiful unique large open tract of land. We must ensure that it is kept so for future generations to enjoy.

I agree that, if possible, we must ensure that the area is retained for future generations to enjoy but its aesthetic value can be enjoyed only while the area is being used as it is at present. The public cannot have picnics in the area, conduct a race meeting or ride motor cycles, etc.; use of the property is really restricted to a dairying operation carried out by Minda Home Incorporated. Although I do not object to that, I have received many letters from people stating that they wish to see the area used for other purposes, for example, as a national park. However, I point out that those associated with national parks know how certain members of the public tend to abuse the various facilities that are provided at no cost.

Other people suggest that Craigburn should be used only by conservationists, who could visit the area and study the fauna and flora there, as well as making geological studies along the Sturt Gorge. There are many ideas about how the property should be used and no doubt, despite whatever use is made of it in future, some people will be offended. I appreciate the work of the councillors who have submitted the plans relating to this property, and I know that they have received

co-operation from the State Planning Authority, which has agreed to the plans. This matter has been considered by Cabinet, as well as by the Subordinate Legislation Committee, on which both Parties are represented. However, the final decision must rest with Parliament, and I am strongly convinced that we can do no harm by disallowing the regulations and taking a second look at the matter.

If part of Craigburn is to be used for residential purposes, where services are available for any proposed subdivision, let us clearly define which area is to be so used. A small part of Craigburn is situated in the Meadows council area. I hope that the majority of members in this House will support the motion so that negotiations between the council, the State Planning Authority and other interested groups can proceed and so that a satisfactory solution can be found to this difficult problem.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

DAMAGES

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, where damage is done or theft committed by inmates of Government institutions who have escaped custody, the Government should meet all direct and indirect costs and damages incurred by the property owner in having his property restored where he is not covered by insurance.

I wish to refer specifically to one case, even though many cases can be quoted, as all members would be aware of occasions when inmates have escaped from legal custody and have committed offences against persons as well as property. Personal injury is covered by an Act already in force, and it is now time we looked at the matter of protection of property owned by individuals and affected by unscrupulous actions of persons who have escaped from legal custody.

Mr. COUMBE: I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Orders of the Day (Other Business) to be postponed until after Notices of Motion (Other Business) have been disposed of.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There not being sufficient numbers, the motion lapses.

Mr. EVANS: I refer to the situation which occurred when three inmates from Brookway Home broke out from a camp at Heathfield earlier this year, on February 8. On the following morning these escapees broke into a local community hall. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted: debate adjourned.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (ELECTORAL)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 30. Page 1114.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): This Bill is most important and amends the Constitution Act of this State. The Leader, when speaking on this Bill last week, set out the principles of the Bill clearly and dealt with the functions of Upper Houses throughout the free world and with other relevant historical matter. I do not intend to canvass that area now, because the Leader has adequately done so. He also quoted extensively from speeches and documents from all over the world supporting the importance of Upper Houses and the Parliamentary bicameral system. I, too, have always believed in the importance of this system, and I will continue to espouse that view as long as I am a member of this House.

The Government has announced that it intends to introduce a Bill to widen the franchise applying to the election of members of the Legislative Council, and we can guess how that measure will proceed. This Bill now under consideration is in some ways complementary to the Government's foreshadowed measure and, as I have always been interested in this important principle and realize the need to update the boundaries applying in respect of the Legislative Council (which were not altered when the boundaries applying to the House of Assembly were altered), I support the Bill.

On August 30, the reaction of the Premier in replying to the Leader was predictable, and we all expected to hear what we heard. The Premier's speech was filled with venom towards the Legislative Council and he certainly displayed the Australian Labor Party's openly stated platform to abolish the Legislative Council. This matter has been the Premier's *bete noir:* he looks on the Legislative Council as a reactionary force that will oppose any legislation that he favours. Yet, when we study the record of many Bills that have been passed by the Upper House, we see that the Legislative Council has a fine record in this respect. In the last Parliamentary session we saw the Legislative Council often amending Bills that came from this House in an incorrect form. The Legislative Council amended such Bills so that they became more workable than they were when introduced. I recall in that session the Government making numerous mistakes in introducing many Bills. Some Bills had to be held up and one Bill even had to be withdrawn and redrafted. This is one way the Legislative

Council helps the people of South Australia to obtain better and more carefully considered legislation.

Mr. Langley: Did it ever amend any of your Bills from this House?

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, it did. The member for Unley can be satisfied on that score, and it only shows the impartiality of the Legislative Council in that regard.

Members interjecting:

Mr. COUMBE: I recall not only during the term of the Hall Government but also during the Playford Government that the Legislative Council often amended legislation introduced by Liberal Governments. I believe that this discloses that the Legislative Council is willing to consider, review, and amend when necessary any legislation that, in its opinion, needs improving. This is one of the fundamental purposes of the Legislative Council in this State, and a true role of Upper Houses throughout the free world. This Bill deals with boundaries of the Council and the method of electing councillors. The boundaries were not altered in 1968 when the House of Assembly boundaries were altered. One of the Bill's features concerns the number of councillors. In most Upper Houses the proportion of members is two members of the Lower House to one of the Upper House, and the Senate is a good example of this.

Before the recent Constitution alterations there were 39 House of Assembly members and 20 members of the Legislative Council. We now have 47 members of this House, and it is intended to alter the number of Legislative Council members to 24. The number of members of the Senate was increased some years ago when the number of members of the House of Representatives was increased. Another feature is the introduction for the first time of a proportional representation system of voting for the Legislative Council. I have heard many discussions on this question, a system that was introduced into the Commonwealth Senate by a great Labor leader, Dr. Evatt. Obviously, there is a precedent for proportional representation, but Dr. Evatt had a chequered career, and I understand that at one time he thought he ran the United Nations Organization himself. When speaking about the franchise for the Upper House, I have commented on voluntary enrolment and voting, and I understand that the Government will introduce a Bill dealing with franchise for the Upper House so that a person on the roll for the House of Assembly is likely to be on the roll for the Legislative Council.

However, I believe that most people of this State do not want the Legislative Council to be a mirror image of the House of Assembly or even a pale reflection of it, because it is in the House of Assembly that Governments are made or unmade, that financial measures have the greatest responsibility, and that the two major Party machines operate. At present we have no Independent members, although at one time there were 10 or more. This Bill proposes that a proportional voting system should be introduced, with voluntary enrolment and voting, and suggests a novel and new system be introduced concerning the Legislative Council boundaries. I admit that an alteration to these boundaries is long overdue. Instead of adopting the system assumed by the Commonwealth Government of the whole State being one district (as in the Senate), members of the Upper House are to be elected on a two-boundary system, the districts being city and country.

At present, an imbalance exists between city and country with seats and representatives. Central Nos. 1 and 2 Districts represent, more or less, the metropolitan area, but the Southern and Midland Districts infringe on what is now the metropolitan area, because the boundaries were not altered by the 1968 Constitution amendment. We should consider the boundaries that were drawn up by the Electoral Commission for the existing expanded metropolitan area. This area would be one district and everything outside that area would be the other district. Opponents of this legislation indicated that this would seem to be unfair, but it would correct the present imbalance. Also, it would overcome an important aspect that is often overlooked by members who represent either city or close metropolitan districts, that is, the long distances to be travelled by those who represent country areas at present. I cite the member for Frome and the member for Eyre as two examples, because these districts cover almost one-third of the State.

Mr. Gunn: They cover 86 per cent of the State.

Mr. Venning: That doesn't leave much for anyone else.

Mr. COUMBE: The problems of these House of Assembly members in trying to contact the residents of their districts are obvious, and there are also difficulties in electors contacting their elected representatives. However, I realize that this proposal is not approved of by Government members. I put it to members

calmly and seriously that this Bill deserves deep consideration and that it should not be brushed off in the way indicated by the Premier when he spoke in the debate and by other members opposite by way of interjection. I point out that the provisions in the Bill could allow us to set up a realistic method of operating the Upper House effectively, and I say that irrespective of Party. The members for Stuart and Whyalla represent districts in the area to which I have been referring, the Minister of Labour and Industry representing another district in that area. People in those districts would possibly have a greater say in selecting members under the proposed system than they have now, especially as the franchise is likely to be widened. This Bill provides a simple system of boundaries, much simpler than the system for the whole State used in relation to the Commonwealth Senate. The Senate system is cumbersome. I can remember at elections having to consider a how-to-vote card dealing with 13 to 15 candidates.

Mr. Clark: Wouldn't you get that under this system?

Mr. COUMBE: No, I do not think so.

Mr. Clark: Will you limit the numbers?

Mr. COUMBE: No. For a start, under this system the State will be divided into two districts.

Mr. Clark: You would get two lots instead of one.

Mr. COUMBE: There would be much smaller numbers. Members would be able to canvass the districts much more easily than Senate members can do now. During the last few years, perhaps using the American system as an example, the Senate has taken a new role with its Select Committee system. I have lost count of the number of these Select Committees operating at present. It may well be that the Legislative Council could consider such a system for itself. I believe that the franchise should be widened and that anyone entitled to vote for this House should be entitled to vote for the other place, but I think that there should be voluntary enrolment and voting.

I point out to honourable members that the proportional representation system of voting (and I am not referring to the peculiar system used in Tasmania) was first introduced in Australia by a Labor Leader, Dr. Evatt. The present boundaries of the Legislative Council districts are long overdue for consideration. If this Bill were passed, with other legislation that the Government has introduced, we would have something that we could really work with. This Bill provides an entirely new means of representation in the Legislative Council. I invite members to study the Bill, especially the schedules, which are most important. By way of interjection, members have referred to an imbalance and to a gerrymander, but such situations will not apply under this Bill. Ihave the impression that members opposite have merely scanned the Bill and decided to throw it out, first, because it has come from another place, and secondly, because it has come from the Liberal and Country League.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: That's right.

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister confirms what I have said.

Mr. Venning: I wouldn't place much importance on what he says.

Mr. COUMBE: As he is the only Minister present, I take it that he is the official spokesman for the Labor Party at present. I support the Bill.

Mr. JENNINGS (Ross Smith): As a consequence of my long, deep, and serious consideration of the Bill, I oppose it. If I had the opportunity, I would vote out of existence the Legislative Council. The member for Torrens has said that many members on this side believe in abolishing the Legislative Council, and I am proud to say that I am one of those members. The honourable member said that the present Legislative Council was very good because it passed without obstruction much legislation that went to it from this House. True, not many Bills are rejected by the Legislative Council. However, it is more interesting if we look at the quality of the Bills that are not passed by the Upper House. What is important is that all the Bills that mean a lot to the people of South Australia are invariably rejected by the Legislative Council, whereas those things that are purely administrative are allowed to continue. The provisions relating to adult franchise, voluntary voting, and voting for the two Houses on separate days were supposed to be a compromise and the instrument of joining up the warring factions in the Liberal and Country League. That is what the big conference at Glenelg was supposed to achieve, but the factions are still fighting. The Leader of the Liberal Movement is still saying that much ballot rigging is taking place. He wants electoral officers to control ballots at his Party conferences.

Mr. Mathwin: That has nothing to do with the dial-a-bus system.

Mr. JENNINGS: It has nothing to do with this Bill either, but it has much to do with the reasons behind this Bill, which was supposed to be the result of a compromise between the two Parties (I think I can refer to them as two Parties, because that is what they are these days). Members of these factions do not trust each other. The compromise arrived at by the Glenelg meeting will not make any difference at all to the warring factions in that Party.

Mr. Hopgood: The Leader said he was very much satisfied with the result.

Mr. JENNINGS: They were both satisfied then, but that satisfaction lasted for only two days.

Mr. Hopgood: Do you think they are too easily pleased?

Mr. JENNINGS: No, I think they tried to fool us. When we discuss the bicameral system, some people usually tell us that that system has always existed everywhere else and that there is something about it according to the natural law, or something of this kind. The Leader of the Opposition referred to Canada and the Provincial Parliaments in that country, but he did not say that only one Province, Quebec, now has an Upper House in its Provincial Parliament and he also did not say that Quebec is in the process of abolishing that Upper House. It is interesting to find out whether statements are true and, further, to find out who makes them.

Mr. Clark: Do you want to quote Sir Collier Cudmore?

Mr. JENNINGS: No, I would not quote him, even if he was right. I wish to quote from a paper delivered by the Hon. D. E. Nicholson, a member of the Legislative Assembly in Queensland. The subject of his paper is *The Doubtful Advantage of the Upper House in State Legislatures,* and he states:

What are the advantages of an Upper House in a Legislature? From the point of view of those who see nothing but good in a second Chamber, it would probably be argued that the Upper House acts as a House of Review; eases the pressure of work on the Lower House; is a "brake" on hasty legislation coming from the first Chamber; and, in the case of a Federal Legislature, is able to safeguard the interests of the component States of the Federation. Whilst conceding that there may be merit in the inclusion of an Upper House in a Federal Parliament, let us look at the practical application of these functions as they apply under certain circumstances to a second Chamber in State Legislatures.

In the case of nominated second Chambers, everything runs smoothly while the same political Parties are in control of both Houses, but what is the position when, after a change of Government at an election for the Lower House, the new Ministry finds itself confronted with its Upper House packed with the nominees of the defeated Ministry—and particularly if the politically-opposed majority in the Upper House sets itself out to be deliberately obstructive to legislation originating in the Lower House?

In *Second Chambers in Theory and Practice,* by Lees-Smith, it is stated that the main function of a second Chamber is that of thwarting the Lower House when, and only when, it is legislating contrary to the desires of the people. If a second Chamber becomes subject to the Party system, it interferes unfairly with the Party to which it is opposed, whilst it ceases to function when its own Party is in office, with the result that it increases instead of diminishes the misrepresentation of the public will. But Party is a necessary and inevitable institution of democratic government on a large scale and the problem, therefore, of creating a representative second Chamber which will be outside its control is, by the nature of the conditions, insoluble. This leads to the fundamental conclusion that a second Chamber is an unsuitable instrument for ensuring that a Lower House will keep in touch with public opinion, and attempts to use it for this purpose should be abandoned.

Mr. Nicholson was talking about a nominated Upper House. However, the same applies even if the Upper House is elected. This would not be nearly so bad if it was elected democratically, but this rarely applies in South Australia. Mr. Nicholson's paper continues:

The same writer, in referring to a statement that the argument for a second Chamber has for years been based upon the claim that, properly constituted, it is an ally and not an opponent of the public will, quotes the observation: "If it becomes a mere instrument of Party warfare, never refusing passage to vital measures from the Lower House when its own Party is in office and taking every opportunity to obstruct the measures of the opposing Party, it will increase instead of correct any distortion of the public will."

Mr. Speaker Nicholson, a Country Party Speaker, then quotes a famous British Labor Member of Parliament (Mr. Gordon Walker) and states:

In an article appearing in a book by S. D. Bailey, Mr. Gordon Walker, M.P., sees a second Chamber as "a natural device in a Federation in which it can discharge the function of representing and protecting the interests of the member States that make up the Federation", but in dealing with weaknesses of second Chambers he states: "Far from desiring a system of checks and balances, Parliamentary government presupposes the concentration and continuous transmission of authority throughout the State. The whole idea is that there should always be a Cabinet capable of exercising through Parliament the

sovereignty of the State. This is essentially a democratic idea designed to ensure that the will of the people shall prevail quickly and completely. A country that wants Parliamentary government and the Cabinet system cannot tolerate deadlocks between the various organs of the Constitution that might make effective government impossible.

It is because the concentration of authority is natural to Parliamentary democracy that, wherever it is practised, power has tended to vest itself in the Lower House, which is the one directly formed by and responsible to the people. It is therefore difficult to find a place for a second Chamber, whose whole purpose is delay, in a Parliamentary democracy which by its nature abhors delay and deadlock."

Mr. Mathwin: That's why they all refused to join—Attlee, Brown, and all those people!

Mr. JENNINGS: I think the honourable member is talking about things that he knows little about. These men (Attlee, Brown and plenty of others) have gone into the Upper House, which is virtually a debating House, and nothing more or less.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Powerless!

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes.

Mr. Coumbe: Some of the best debates in the world have been held in the House of Lords.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, and I have been privileged to hear some of them, but that House cannot do anything at all in a constitutional and administrative way. It can, however, give advice, and that is what men like Lord Attlee and Lord Brown and (let us admit) Conservative and Liberal Lords do. Instead of these men being thrown out completely after they have for years been in the House of Commons, they go into the House of Lords to give advice to the Government.

Mr. Mathwin: Winston Churchill refused to do it.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, because he wanted to stay in the House of Commons all his life, and he did nothing in that House for years before he died: he was just allowed to remain there and for years was never opposed.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Read statements from the bloke who refutes those arguments!

Mr. JENNINGS: The member for Kavel can do that. I am quoting the remarks of a man who is on his home ground, and whose submission continues:

Almost half a century has now passed since Queensland adopted a one-House Legislature and that this has apparently not militated against the good government and welfare of the State and its citizens is reflected in the fact that no serious attempt has been made to restore the Upper House during this period.

No Government in nearly 50 years has tried to restore the Upper House in Queensland, even though there have been all sorts of Government, and for a long time now there has been a Country Party and Liberal Party coalition.

Mr. Payne: Even Bjelke doesn't want it.

Mr. JENNINGS: Of course he does not; he knows how useless it is, and it would be an obstruction. The submission continues:

It would appear that there is merit in the arguments advanced against an Upper House that a second Chamber—

(*a*) usually tends to be conservative—

I certainly have not noticed that in South Australia!

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Would you say it is not progressive enough to be described as being conservative?

Mr. JENNINGS: Its members are troglodytes. Continuing to refer to the argument against an Upper House, the submission states that a second Chamber is "in a position to impede reform and obstruct progressive measures" and further states that a second Chamber—

(*b*) makes for delay in the passage of legislation which could have serious consequences in a case where the national interest requires that a measure should be passed into law as quickly as possible;

(*c*) is an additional burden on the public revenue which cannot be justified in view of the lack of public interest normally shown in the proceedings of a second Chamber.

Don't we know that in this State! Few people in the whole community of South Australia know who are their Legislative Council members, and those who do know could not care less.

Mr. Goldsworthy: How many of your constituents know you represent them?

Mr. JENNINGS: All of them.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Would it be 2 per cent?

Mr. JENNINGS: I guarantee that not 1 per cent would know one of the four Legislative Councillors who represent my area. The submission continues:

I feel that first of all I must state that I do not put it forward in any provocative way. I do so mainly to bring forward what I hope will be, particularly from the Presidents of the Upper Chambers, a very unbiased opinion. I think it is most appropriate that the final paper of our yesterday's session should deal with some of the problems associated with the Upper and Lower Chambers. It is very

evident that there are problems and frustrations. It was because of the frustrations occasioned by the Upper House that Queensland abolished its Legislative Council in 1922 and it is interesting to note that since that time there has been no move to re-establish an Upper Chamber there. The State has progressed very well—

I do not agree with Mr. Speaker Nicholson, of course, in that respect, but he says that the State is still getting on well, and he continues:

I admit that in common with all other Parliaments the Party machine controls many of the actions of the Legislative Council of our State.

I am afraid that I have gone a little too far: I am quoting now the gentleman who did not support Mr. Speaker Nicholson, so I will leave it there.

Mr. Coumbe: Do you want to withdraw that statement?

Mr. JENNINGS: No, I did not go so far that it is necessary to expunge these words from *Hansard,* as long as members realize that I was quoting someone else. In New Zealand, a Conservative Government abolished the Upper House; it was not a Labor Government and, as far as I know, there has been no indication that New Zealand will restore the Upper House or that the people in that country want it restored. As far as I can see, there is no indication anywhere that a unicameral system cannot do its work just as well as can a bicameral system. We have here another bad attempt to gerrymander the system through an Upper House. The member for Torrens referred to numbers, but if this legislation is passed we will have more members representing fewer people in the metropolitan area. This is absurd and it is a reimposition of a gerrymander of the type current when Sir Thomas Playford was in office. That gerrymander kept him in office for many years and now we are asked to superimpose over that this idiotic system of elections for the Upper and Lower Houses on separate days.

Mr. Gunn: What about in Tasmania? Have you ever lived there?

Mr. JENNINGS: Ever since Mr. Menzies was frightened and held a Senate election separate from that of the House of Representatives we have had separate polling days for each House.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: And what a waste of money.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, and it has been happening ever since.

Mr. Gunn: You should be the last Party to talk about wasting money.

Mr. JENNINGS: Now the conservative section of the Liberal Party, which does not believe in accepting money other than to keep itself in power, wants to have a separate day for Upper House elections. We have enough elections now in Australia. If our Government decides to hold a referendum to find out what people want on an important matter, we are told that we are wasting money, but the Liberal Party is prepared to do that regularly once every three years just to secure its position of power in the Upper House. Fortunately, it can do nothing about the situation in this House, and members on this side will be in power for as long as most of us will want to live. However, all the good we can do in this House can be undone at any time by an Upper House that is one of the most powerful Upper Houses in the British Commonwealth, if it is not the most powerful. I have put to the House information that will enable members to vote sensibly on this matter, but I am not confident, even though I am usually a sanguine type of person, that I have converted the member for Eyre. Nevertheless, there are sufficient intelligent members in this House to follow the lead I have now given them.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): Mr. Speaker—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Here comes the great democrat.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am glad to get the approbation of the Minister of Education because it always heartens me. We have today heard one of the better speeches from the member for Ross Smith, because at least on this occasion he has read from something which I think has an official status, the reports of Parliamentary proceedings and conferences that were held some time ago on Parliamentary practice. The honourable member gave a lengthy reading of material which he had dug up and which he considered would be pertinent to the debate. I should now like to refer to some of the points he made, although I do not believe they will stand up to much scrutiny.

The member for Ross Smith said that he had given serious consideration to the Bill and that, as a result of that serious consideration, he believed that the Upper House should be voted out of existence. Members on this side have known for some time that it is part of the Labor Party platform to abolish the Upper House and the honourable member's view is not the result of any immediate serious reflection but merely a straight-out quotation from his Party's platform. Nevertheless there

is no division of opinion whatsoever in my Party concerning the usefulness of the Upper House as a House of Review.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I say, without any qualification whatsoever, that there is to my knowledge no person in the Liberal and Country League who wishes to abolish the Upper House.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Further, this is the view shared by the majority of people in this State despite the deliberate attempts of the Labor Party to confuse the South Australian public regarding the Upper House franchise, the people elected to that House, and the proper function of that House. Despite this deliberate attempt to confuse the public, I am convinced that the South Australian public believes that the Upper House is a House worth keeping. The member for Ross Smith, in replying to the statement that the Legislative Council had rejected only a small percentage of the legislation of this House, says that the Upper House rejected only legislation of real consequence. As the Legislative Council refused to pass only five of the Bills passed by the House of Assembly last session, the honourable member is really saying that 145 of the 150 Bills passed by this House last session are of no consequence to the citizens of this State: he is saying that all the consumer legislation, taxation measures and other legislation that vitally affects the day-to-day life of the people are of no consequence.

Mr. Jennings: Many of those Bills were amended.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. They were happily accepted by the Labor Party as improvements to the original legislation. When conferences between the Houses were required, many of the amendments were accepted as necessary improvements without any argument taking place. Only on rare occasions were long conferences held (I remember only one or two), so that the honourable member's point is especially weak when he says that only Bills of consequence were rejected. In effect, he is saying that 95 per cent of the Labor Party policy is of little consequence: that the Bills rejected by the L.C. were the only Bills of serious consequence. However, they were matters about which the public of this State had serious reservations. Those Bills concerned local government franchise and related matters, in respect of which the Labor Party claimed a mandate.

I do not believe the public examines every detail of a policy speech; they merely make an overall assessment of it. If an assessment was made of the Bills rejected by the Legislative Council, one would probably find that those Bills did not have the support of the majority of the South Australian public. The point he makes, that the rest of the legislation is inconsequential, is ridiculous. He says that we believe the Upper House exists because it is a natural law. I do not know where he got that from: we think it should exist as a matter of common sense. It is a matter of comparing the situation where Upper Houses are in existence with the places where they are not, and concluding whether or not they are useful. The member for Ross Smith says that they are not useful. However, the vast majority of democracies around the world have concluded that they are useful and have retained them for that reason. If the honourable member casts his net fairly wide to substantiate that point, and takes the global scene into account, he will find that his comments will not stand up for long in relation to most democratic countries around the world.

The honourable member went on to refer at some length (and this occupied the major part of his speech) to the comments of the Speaker of the Queensland Parliament (Hon. D. E. Nicholson), who said that power had tended to vest itself in the Lower House; this is as a result of the experience in Queensland, and he sees this as a good thing. I do not know at first hand, or even by repute, what qualifications that gentleman has to advance that point of view. Those views are certainly not held widely by many people who have studied the results of the one-House system in Queensland and, indeed, around the world. I should like to quote the comments of a senior lecturer from the University of Queensland who spoke on the effect of the one-House system. The following comments appear in a book entitled *The Government of the Australian States,* which can be found in the Parliamentary Library:

> The long dominance of a single organized political Party further contributed to the decline of the Assembly—

he is referring particularly to the Queensland Assembly—

> by transferring public interest from Parliament to the Party. Long before polling day it was obvious that no change in the Government was likely. Hence what the Parliamentary Labor Party decided in caucus inevitably became the law of the State. However closely fought the proposal may have been in caucus, the Party

voted solidly in the House. Once introduced into the Assembly, the Bill marched irresistibly through all stages, and no Government Bill was ever defeated and very few were even laid aside. Nor was there much hope of any amendment by the Assembly. The Opposition frequently attempted to achieve some changes, but in general without any serious hope, though a very few successes were achieved. It is not surprising that in such circumstances the standard of debate should deteriorate.

He is one authority of some standing who considers that the single House in Queensland contributed to the deterioration of Parliamentary procedures and to the deterioration of decision-making in regard to the laws of the State. I share that point of view. A single Chamber, constituted in this way, leads to a deterioration of the democratic process. I should like again to refer briefly to what John Stuart Mill said at the end of the last century. Although the following has often been quoted, I consider it to be relevant:

> A majority in a single Assembly, when it has assumed a permanent character—

this is what it assumed in Queensland and what it would assume here if the Upper House was abolished—

> when composed of the same persons habitually acting together, and always assured of victory in their own House—easily becomes despotic and overweening, if released from the necessity of considering whether its acts will be concurred in by another constituent authority. The same reason which induced the Romans to have two consuls makes it desirable there should be two Chambers; that neither of them may be exposed to the corrupting influence of undivided power, even for the space of a single year.

In this case, it would of course be for the term of the Parliament. This tends to reinforce the view of the Queensland authority from whom I quoted—that with a single Chamber there is a deterioration not only in Parliamentary process but in the ability of the public to influence legislation once it has been introduced into the Parliament. I have heard it said that the long period during which the Labor Party occupied the Government benches in Queensland was a period of considerable stagnation in that State's life. Queensland is endowed fairly considerably with natural resources. What I will now say is, of course, a political comment and not necessarily intended to advance my argument. However, it indicates what can happen if a State has only a single Chamber.

Mr. Clark: This Bill doesn't actually propose that.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: No, but I am replying to the point made by the member for Ross Smith, half of whose speech was taken up by arguments regarding the abolition of the Upper House. Sir Thomas Playford said in Queensland, when that State was considering imposing water restrictions in Brisbane, "What about all the streams running down to the sea a few miles south?", in reply to which someone said, "It is uphill to Brisbane." That illustrates the type of thinking that evolved in a long period of stagnant Government in Queensland.

The last point made by the member for Ross Smith was that the provision of a separate election day would ensure the election of certain persons to the Upper House. In advancing that argument, the honourable member obviously has no confidence in the citizens of South Australia in regard to being given the responsibility of deciding whether or not they want to vote. That is what it amounts to. At present, voting for the Upper House is voluntary. However, when people are herded to the polls compulsorily to vote for the Lower House, it would, to all intents and purposes, amount to compulsory voting for the Upper House if its members were elected on the same day as those of the Lower House. Of course, one does not have to vote for the Lower House: one can merely put a cross on the voting paper. Therefore, all this Bill does is provide for a voluntary vote for the Upper House.

Mr. Mathwin: There is nothing sinister in that.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is so, and there is nothing sinister in voluntary voting for any Chamber. If we had confidence in the citizens of this State, we would not force compulsory voting on them. If the people have something to gain by voting, they will vote. The Liberal Party has confidence in the citizens of this State. This is an area in which we can extend the democratic principle and give people the choice. The Labor Party, on the other hand, believes that the people should be herded to the polls. This is a matter on which the people should be given a choice whether or not to vote. Obviously, the Labor Party is frightened of voluntary voting. I have no doubt that, if South Australia blazes the trail in relation to this democratic principle, other States will follow suit and, indeed, that the Commonwealth Government will seriously consider the principle of voluntary voting, because opinions change as people's views of rights, responsibilities and privileges change. Often they do not change rapidly but, as they do, the matter should be re-examined. When

this happens, the arguments that were advanced when compulsory voting was introduced will be repeated. Perhaps in the light of public opinion and the views of the majority of citizens we might have a more democratic stance in voluntary voting. My Party unanimously agrees with this, and I think probably the majority of British migrants would share this view, having seen both systems in operation. I mentioned earlier points in the policy of the Liberal and Country League, the Party that sits on this side of the House.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You could have fooled me!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I think perhaps the Minister had better instruct the member for Ross Smith before he starts chiding me. I have been dealing with the points raised by the member for Ross Smith, and I do not think I have taken as long to deal with them as he took to make them. He did not really get on to the details of the Bill.

One of the first provisions is that the Legislative Council should be a House of 24 members. It is proposed that membership of the Upper House should be, as nearly as can be reasonably maintained, half that of the House of Assembly, and this is not without considerable precedent. I refer to the situation that obtains in the case of the Commonwealth Senate and its relationship to the House of Representatives. Although the sphere of responsibility is somewhat different, both the Commonwealth Parliament and the South Australian Parliament are dealing with legislative matters very much on the same basis. The spheres of responsibility vary, as does the scope of responsibility. There is, indeed, no tangible difference between the legislative function as a deliberative assembly of the Commonwealth Parliament and that of the State.

It is written into the Constitution Act that there shall be a nexus between the representation in the Upper House and that in the Lower House. We find many points of marked similarity if we compare the Commonwealth Constitution in relation to the Senate with the Constitution of our own Legislative Council. That is not surprising.

Mr. Simmons: The deadlock provisions?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: There are no deadlock provisions in this Bill, but we will come back to that. A former Clerk of the Legislative Council (Mr. E. G. Blackmore, C.M.G.) had much to do with the drafting of the Commonwealth Constitution. He was the first Clerk of the Senate. I repeat that there are many points of similarity between the Constitution of the Senate and that of the Legislative Council.

Mr. Clark: Like the franchise?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will get around to the franchise. If the Government passes this Bill and if it cares to insert full franchise provisions, South Australia would have a situation which would almost mirror the situation in the Commonwealth Senate. I will advance that argument later.

Mr. Clark: Two and a half to one in each district. Don't give us that!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If members will bear with me I will deal with that specific point later in my remarks. The Bill provides that the Upper House in this State shall approximate as nearly as possible half the numbers in the Lower House. I will quote from *Australian Senate Practice,* by J. R. Odgers, Clerk of the Senate, as follows:

> The Constitution empowers Parliament to increase the size of Parliament if it thinks fit, but lays down certain conditions which must be observed. The most important of these conditions is the rule, set out in section 24, that the number of members of the House of Representatives must always be "as nearly as practicable" twice the number of Senators. This is known as the 2 to 1 ratio.

Members will no doubt recall that an attempt was made, when the last redistribution in the Commonwealth sphere was being considered, to break this nexus. It is interesting to note the result of the referendum on the matter and to see what the citizens of Australia thought about keeping the membership of the Senate to about half the size of that of the House of Representatives. Overall, 40 per cent favoured breaking the nexus or allowing a disparity, and 59 per cent opposed it. In South Australia the vote was almost two to one; 33 per cent favoured breaking the nexus and 65 per cent believed that the Senate should remain at half the size of the House of Representatives.

The Senate is constituted very much along the lines of the Legislative Council. The vast majority of people in South Australia were happy to keep the Senate at half the strength of the House of Representatives. The Bill seeks to apply that principle in South Australia, and I believe this would have general approval, if properly put to the people of this State. Unfortunately, the sort of propaganda advanced by the Government, in this case the spokesmen being the Premier and others, about the Legislative Council has caused the public to be thoroughly confused about that place. If the facts were put coherently, fairly, and

impartially, we would probably find the same degree of support for the representation of the Upper House being about half that of the deliberative Assembly.

This will lead up to a point raised by interjection. We come to the question of how this Bill proposes to divide up the State. Why not divide the State into two electoral regions? The Commonwealth is divided into regions called States, but I do not know the degree of arbitrariness or the logical basis for the original division.

Mr. Hopgood: There wasn't any.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Obviously, there is no logical division on the basis of population. The country has developed so that each State has its own Government, and the States are logical units within the Commonwealth. It must be conceded that each State has its own peculiar interests. We hear much nonsense spoken about representing interests and people, but they cannot be divided. We have regional groups that we call States, each with its own peculiar interests and its own machinery for Government. One does not have to look far to find the most logical division, if we think in terms of representation of regions in South Australia. The Bill proposes that there should be a metropolitan area, which is defined in all legislation, and a non-metropolitan area or rural area. What more sensible division could one obtain? This division would be completely similar to the divisions within the Commonwealth. These areas should be represented in the House of Review exactly as the States are represented in the Senate. Non-metropolitan areas have problems and interests relating specifically to that locality, and there are problems and interests specifically relating to the metropolitan area, in the same way as the States of the Commonwealth have these differences. If we are to consider what would be the most logical grouping of people in the State, this would be the most logical division.

Mr. Clark: So that you get the result you want!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will refer to that—

Mr. Clark: That was just an accident!

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It was the result of a scheme.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It was not. I should like to quote what the Premier said in his speech in this debate, as follows:

> The principles with which the Labor Party is imbued in electoral matters have always been clear: they are that every citizen within the State should have an equal right with every other citizen to an effective say in the Governments that affect his life.

Mr. Payne: You quarrel with that, don't you?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We do not. He went on to say that the Labor Party believed in one vote one value, but if we extend the argument about the principles that imbued the thinking of the Labor Party in the Commonwealth sphere, we find that the South, Australian representation in the Senate is equal to that of New South Wales, and that gives us a ratio of five to one.

Mr. Clark: Who said that was right?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: When the question of Senate representation was raised during a television programme, the Premier did not say anything to indicate that the Labor Party was not happy with South Australia's representation in that House (the Premier can correct me if I am wrong). I do not believe that most South Australians would be unhappy with our representation, either.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will have to link his remarks with this Bill, which deals with the Legislative Council.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Premier said that under this Bill the representation would be 2½ to 1, and I am saying that in the Commonwealth sphere it is 5 to 1 in our favour.

Mr. Clark: And you think that is right?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If members opposite believe that South Australia should not have equal representation in the Senate with the other States, they should say so. However, I believe that the principle of equal representation in the Senate is good. If South Australia is to have any sort of voice in the Commonwealth Parliament, it is eminently sensible that the Senate should be constituted as it is. I do not believe that the Premier would say that there should be one vote one value in Senate elections, because that would sell the State down the drain. Government members ask, "Why should the votes of country people carry more weight than the votes of city people?" In reply, I ask those members, "Why should people in South Australia have five times the voting power of people in New South Wales?"

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am not going to allow the debate to continue along the lines of Senate representation unless it is linked with the Bill under consideration, dealing with the Legislative Council.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am trying to make a comparison between the Upper House in this State and the Commonwealth Upper House. The powers of the Senate are almost identical with the powers of our Legislative Council. Some people would like to strip our Upper House of all its power; they would like to make it a mere extension of the Lower House, without any distinctive character. The following is a quotation from *Australian Senate Practice.*

Except as to money Bills, the Senate has equal power with the House of Representatives in respect of all proposed laws.

The Senate can initiate and amend legislation, as can our Legislative Council. Further, there are Ministers in the Senate and the provisions for money Bills are similar to those applying in our Legislative Council. The article in *Australian Senate Practice* continues:

The Senate's powers in regard to money Bills are subject to certain restrictions and are dealt with in detail in Chapter XVI, at p. 261. Briefly, the Senate cannot:

(*a*) originate a taxing Bill or an appropriation Bill;

(*b*) amend a taxing Bill or a Bill appropriating revenue or moneys for the ordinary annual services of government; or

(*c*) amend any Bill so as to increase any proposed charge or burden on the people.

I do not hear people complaining about the way in which the Senate operates. And, if they were given a fair account of the way in which the Legislative Council operates, I do not think they would complain about the Legislative Council either. The Bill divides the State into two regions and seeks to implement a voting system similar to that applying in Senate elections. The Bill seeks to provide for an Upper House where the balance of representation is different from that in the Lower House, and it gives small groups a possibility of representation. In the Senate, minority Parties get representation proportionate to their votes. This Bill seeks to implement a thoroughly democratic principle on the basis of proportional representation; in this respect its provisions are similar to those applying to Senate elections. Why does the Premier not publicly blast the Senate? Why does he not say that South Australia is wrongly represented in the Senate? Where are the champions of democracy when the question of our Senate representation is raised? Let us remember that in Senate elections South Australians have five times the voting power of New South Wales people.

Of course, I believe that the provisions for Senate elections are sensible, and this Bill seeks to make the Legislative Council districts and voting system very similar to those applying in Senate elections. The nonsense about one vote one value cannot be sustained. The big talking point used to be the percentage of votes, but if we decide to divide the State into regions there is not likely to be the same type of connection between the percentage of the votes and the number of members elected. For example, the Labor Party may get 90 per cent of the vote in the Port Adelaide area, while the Liberal and Country League may win easily in another area. And, of course, some seats are uncontested. So, any relationship between the percentage of the vote and the number of members returned can easily be changed. Once we establish a system of electoral districts we must forget the old arguments about the percentage of votes and the number of seats. The only circumstance in which it is sensible to talk about such matters is when the whole State is one district and we use the proportional representation system. The Labor Party will not have a bar of that system, and I do not think it is desirable. If we are to have a member representing and being responsible for a district, the Bill provides the best way of doing this. The Labor Party talks about one vote one value. In this connection, it should turn its attention to the Commonwealth Senate which, in terms of its argument, is far less democratic than is the Upper House in South Australia.

Members opposite say that country interests must not be allowed to dictate to urban interests. However, because this House is predominantly made up of members representing metropolitan districts, nothing that is proposed by the other place can pass here without the consent of those metropolitan members, but the reverse is not true. If the major metropolitan representation decided on a course of action, there would be nothing that the country people could do about it, so that they are effectively disfranchised. What we should consider is a means of giving each region of interest the possibility to advance a point of view with some hope of having that point recognized. Rural interests cannot bring any legislation into this Parliament that can become law, unless this House gives its sanction. It is senseless to talk about one vote one value unless we take the whole State as a district. Members opposite should look at this Bill honestly. If they believe that the Commonwealth system works satisfactorily, that the

Senate performs a useful function, and that it has a fair basis of representation, they must concede that the provisions of this Bill are fair and just. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. WELLS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADVERTISING

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Becker:

That, in the opinion of this House, all Government and semi-government advertising should be placed with Australian and preferably South Australian owned and controlled advertising agencies.

(Continued from August 30. Page 1117.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): This motion—

Mr. Gunn: It's right and proper.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member is not careful, I will deal with his Party's advertising. This motion followed a series of questions asked by the honourable member for Hanson. First, the honourable member asked whether it was true that all Government advertising for the South Australian Government was handled by the oversea firm of Hansen Rubensohn McCann Erickson Proprietary Limited. The answer is that Hansen Rubensohn McCann Erickson handles the following Government departments and utilities: Woods and Forests Department; Municipal Tramways Trust; State Government Insurance Commission; State Electoral Department; Department of the Premier and of Development; and the Government Tourist Bureau. The advertising expenditure through that agency by these departments in the last three calendar years is as follows: 1970, $34,058; 1971, $160,052; and 1972 (to July 31), $90,338. The preponderance of South Australian Government advertising is handled by Australian-owned agencies operating in Adelaide. These are as follows:

Department	Agency	Estimated Budget $
Railways Department	Aldwych Advertising	25,000
Electricity Trust . . . . (two agencies)	NAS/Macnamara and Taylor O'Brien	35,000
Gas Company	NAS/Macnamara	130,000
Housing Trust	NAS/Macnamara	30,000
Lotteries Commission	Birrell Kaine	150,000

In addition, if we add the account of the Savings Bank of South Australia that is handled by George Patterson Proprietary Limited, a subsidiary of the Bates Agency of the U.S.A., the total is $330,000, as against about $180,000 with the Hansen company.

Then the honourable member asked what were the terms and conditions of the advertising contract. The South Australian Government is not contracted to Hansen Rubensohn McCann Erickson Proprietary Limited. The agency's agreement is subject to three months notice to be given by either party. This arrangement is much more liberal towards the Government than are the terms enjoyed by agencies employed by the honourable member's Party in New South Wales, or at least I presume it is his Party. We take the view that the distribution of advertising work is equitable in South Australia.

The honourable member said that he believed that the action of this Government and of the Labor Party in not supporting the local advertising industry had been responsible for the difficulties encountered by locally owned and controlled advertising agencies and ancillary industries. In the figures so far tendered it has been clearly demonstrated that this Government has spread its advertising work most equitably amongst five Australian-owned agencies and two agencies with international connections. With regard to ancillary industries (and this term is assumed to comprise printers, process engravers, stereotypers, photographic studios, and other production suppliers), they will continue to receive the same volume of field supply work, regardless of which agency or agencies order this work.

Moneys committed for Government advertising purposes are moneys of the South Australian taxpayers. We provide for healthy competition between the advertising agencies in South Australia. The honourable member then said that, when it came to spending the taxpayers' money in this State, the Government allowed it to go into foreign hands. We have found that there are advantages in having an agency that has international connections. In a moment I will deal with the nature of that agency and its ownership. However, there is

clear evidence of the benefit to the State in having international facilities and training available to the Government. For instance, the London office of the McCann Erickson international network has, at minimum cost, recently rendered advice to South Australian Government House in London, concerning the redesign of its premises and its displays aimed at attracting immigration and tourism into South Australia. The agency has also recently briefed its South-East Asian offices to provide on-the-spot advice for our Government in planning to attract business interests to South Australia, in association with the South Australian Government agencies we have appointed in the area.

The honourable member went on to say that he had no argument with Hansen Rubensohn McCann Erickson but argued on the principle involved in this issue. He said that the fact that the Government had awarded Government departmental advertising to this firm, which is the Labor Party's advertising agent, indicated that something untoward was going on and that this firm, because of the present situation, had perhaps received what he would call the golden handshake. I am surprised to think that the honourable member believes that, because, after he had moved this motion, he must have been somewhat embarrassed to see the public statement that the Prime Minister of this country had made a series of approaches to the Hansen company to do the electoral work of the Liberal Party nationally.

Mr. McAnaney: You have only the newspaper to support what you say.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Prime Minister personally approached Mr. Rubensohn.

Mr. Becker: It couldn't be true.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is true, and the honourable member must know that it is true. Let him ask Mr. McMahon about it. The Commonwealth Liberal Government evidently agrees with this, because it retains the services of Hansen Rubensohn McCann Erickson for work of national importance, to which members opposite have subscribed so readily. The Director-General of Recruiting has used this firm for many years. The same agency is retained in New South Wales for the advertising work of utilities and boards controlled by the Liberal Government of that State: it is retained not because of a golden handshake but because its contribution and work have proved to be highly effective in loan raising and other projects of considerable importance.

I turn now to just what happens with this agency and with other agencies in Liberal-governed States, because, presumably, the honourable member is expressing the point of view of his Party.

Mr. Jennings: Which Party?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Whichever Party he belongs to. The honourable member has suggested that there is something wrong in our having obtained work which we gave to Hansen Rubensohn McCann Erickson as an overall programme within the Government, thus getting from that company a benefit from having one company handling a number of accounts. I have previously detailed the benefits the Government gets, such as free services, as a result. However, this is not something new in Australia. When the present New South Wales Government took office it transferred to the Liberal Party's advertising agency, Masius Wynne-Williams (New South Wales) Proprietary Limited, the advertising accounts of the State Lotteries Department, the Premier's Department and the Health Department, which accounts had hitherto been serviced by Hansen Rubensohn McCann Erickson.

I turn now to some facts about Hansen Rubensohn McCann Erickson and its ownership structure, which has been attacked by the honourable member on behalf of a little group of agencies called AUSTAC. Hansen Rubensohn McCann Erickson began business as a wholly-Australian owned agency in Sydney in 1928. Its founder, Mr. Sim Rubensohn, continues to lead the company today as its Chairman. Its organization is Australian in policy setting, management structure, staffing and character. In a total staffing complement of 229 people employed in Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide, Perth and Brisbane, there are only two persons of foreign nationality (both media executives, one American and one Malaysian). The merger of the Hansen Rubensohn agency with the United States-owned McCann Erickson Incorporated was negotiated by Mr. Rubensohn in 1959. This was no rapacious takeover. Although the company became a subsidiary of an international company, at the same time the Australian executive took shares in the international company. They directly share in the ownership of the Australian company, and the Australian employment in that company is as much wholly Australian as it was before the merger.

It has been suggested that what is happening as a result of the Government's awarding these

contracts to Hansen Rubensohn McCann Erickson is that we are transferring to that company's shareholders taxpayers' money from South Australia. Let us see, in fact, how much is going to the United States shareholders. In the last financial year (December 31, 1971) the agency's Adelaide office contributed, before tax, the magnificent profit of $5,252! This year, the company is making a loss, to June 30, of $4,294. So the magnificent sums that have been provided by the South Australian taxpayers, are in fact going to South Australian, employment of South Australian people.

I turn now to what is happening to counterparts in other States. The Liberal Party of Australia, to which I believe the honourable member has some affiliation, has been serviced for many years (and is still serviced) by Masius Wynne-Williams (New South Wales) Proprietary Limited, which is the wholly-owned subsidiary of a British company of the same name. The account of the Australian Country Party (I do not know what connection the Liberal Party has with that Party; perhaps certain sections of it are getting a little closer to the Country Party, but they are associated federally) is serviced in this country by the United States-owned Leo Burnett Company, a wholly-owned subsidiary of that company in the U.S.A.

The account of the Democratic Labor Party, which is even serviced by subscriptions from supporters of the honourable member, is served by John Clemenger Proprietary Limited, which was formerly a wholly Australian-owned agency in which the American agency B.B.D.O. has now acquired a 35 per cent shareholding. So it will be interesting to see what Mr. Posa has to say on this topic. It is paradoxical, to say the least, that the major political Parties of Australia, beleagured by the incessant claims of AUSTAC to win exclusive appointment for Government business, have nevertheless chosen to retain the services of advertising agencies that are either wholly or substantially owned by oversea interests. The reason is obvious: these are basically service companies, and the agencies are able to draw on internationally achieved techniques in advertising which are very important in modem advertising terms. Indeed, the result of the merger of Hansen Rubensohn with McCann Erickson has meant that many Australian executives have, at the expense of the American company, been trained in the U.S.A, in the latest advertising techniques. That produces beneficial results not only to the Government but also to the Australian Labor Party.

In New South Wales, by decision of the Liberal Government, the advertising accounts of at least three departments, namely, Lotteries, Premier's and Health, are handled by Masius Wynne-Williams Proprietary Limited, a British-owned agency. The account of the Milk Board is handled by an American-owned agency, Leo Burnett. The accounts of the Sydney County Council, the State Electricity Commission, the Egg Board, and the Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board, are handled by Hansen Rubensohn McCann Erickson.

Mr. Evans: How much did this report cost us?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Not a cent.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It's cost you something, though.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Let us come a little closer to home and see what the position with advertising contracts is in Victoria, under a Liberal Party Government. The State Electricity Commission account is handled by George Patterson (Bates, U.S.A.); the Milk Board by Compton (U.S.A.); the Road Safety Council by USP-Needham (U.S.A.); the Gas and Fuel Corporation by Clemenger (35 per cent U.S.A.); the State Savings Bank by Hayes Publicity (Australian); the Board of Works by USP-Needham (U.S.A.); the Victorian Tourist Bureau by Foote, Cone, Belding (U.S.A.); and the Country Fire Authority by Clem Taylor O'Brien (Australian). Regarding the list of agencies and departments in Victoria, far more of them are handled by agencies that are subsidiaries of American-owned companies than is the case in South Australia.

Mr. Becker: What's that got to do with South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: You're always talking about South Australia, when you do not want to hear about the other States. Now, let us consider what has happened when members opposite have been in office. Under Liberal Governments in South Australia the position was substantially similar to the present position regarding the spread of agency work between locally-owned companies and foreign-owned companies.

The position is also similar in Queensland, where the account of the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau is serviced by George Patterson (Bates, U.S.A.), who also handles part of the account of the Department of Industrial Development. Queensland agencies handle the work for "Queensland-Made", the State Railway Department, and the State

Government Insurance Office. The work for those departments is handled by Campbell Advertising. The work for the Health Department, the State Electricity Commission, and the nurses recruiting campaign is done by Le Grand Advertising (Australia). Each of the three States that have Liberal Governments has a record of employing agencies that are not members of AUSTAC.

Mr. Clark: Perhaps they handle the Liberal Movement's advertising.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not think they do. Certainly, it has not been the case generally that the Liberal Party has used members of AUSTAC exclusively in Australia. The member for Hanson has been led to move this motion by a hope that we would not reply to it or without investigating the matter that he has submitted. In fact, it has been the experience of Governments that there are real advantages in drawing on oversea information and techniques.

Quite clearly, on the figures I have given, we are not paying huge sums towards the profits of shareholders in United States companies. Australian executives are employed, and the overheads of these companies run to 92 per cent, mainly in wages. The nature of the mergers with oversea companies has been such that Australian agencies can draw on the resources of their American and British agencies and on the development of advertising techniques, which is vital. Not all Australian agencies can do this and, because of this, we do not always get from Australian agents the latest and best of advertising techniques. In the distribution of our contracts, the work has been distributed broadly.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

POLICE REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

[Sitting suspended from 5.57 *to* 7.30 *p.m.}*

METHODIST CHURCH (S.A.) PROPERTY TRUST BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to constitute the Methodist Church (S.A.) Property Trust, to define its powers, authorities, duties and functions, to make provision for and in relation to the vesting in the Methodist Church (S.A.) Property Trust of land held for and on behalf of the Methodist Church in South Australia, to repeal the South Australian Wesleyan Methodists Act, 1887, and the Methodist Union Act, 1900, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its main purpose is to replace the individual trustee system of holding Methodist Church property in this State with the property trust to be created by this legislation. At present most real estate owned by the church is held by various bodies of individual trustees. The object of the Bill, therefore, is merely to replace these bodies of individual trustees with the body corporate, the Methodist Church (S.A.) Property Trust. It is generally agreed that the present system is outmoded and cumbersome. The vesting of title in a body corporate will greatly facilitate the management of church property and dealings with church property. The Bill also provides that the corporate body be authorized to administer a general fund of money received from bodies within the church and private persons.

The Bill has been approved by the South Australian Methodist Conference of the Methodist Church and by the General Conference of the Methodist Church of Australasia and follows the pattern of a Bill passed by the Victorian Parliament in 1970. Each of the other State Conferences of the Methodist Church in Australia has adopted legislation which transfers the real property of the church to a body corporate. The preamble to the Bill is explanatory. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 repeals former Acts. Clause 3 contains definitions necessary for the interpretation of the Bill. Clause 4 establishes the corporate body to be known as the Methodist Church (S.A.) Property Trust. Clause 5 deals with the appointment of the members of the trust. Clause 6 provides for the appointment of a Chairman. Clause 7 establishes a quorum.

Clause 8 details conditions under which an appointment to the trust shall become vacant. Clause 9 enables continuing members to act notwithstanding vacancies. Clause 10 appoints the Connexional Secretary as Secretary of the trust. Clause 11 authorizes the use of the common seal. Clause 12 provides for instruments to be executed under the common seal. Clause 13 empowers the trust to appoint an agent or attorney. Clauses 14 and 15 enable all property held upon trusts of the model deed to be vested in the corporate body. Clauses 16 and 17 enable the trust to receive and hold moneys on behalf of the general fund, other departments and institutions.

Clause 18 exempts certain properties from the operation of the Act. Clause 19 provides for property to vest in the trust subject to certain conditions.

Clause 20 provides that all land devised given or granted to the church shall take effect as if the trust was named as beneficiary. Clauses 21 and 22 enable the trust to hold and manage property on behalf of the church. Clause 23 enables the trust to make regulations with the approval of the General Conference of the church. Clause 24 provides for the enforcement by the trust of rights which arose in respect of property before that property vested in the trust. Clause 25 protects persons from any liability of loss or misapplication of trust funds and stipulates safeguards. Clause 26 provides that persons dealing with the trust are not required to inquire whether the exercise of the power of the trust is unauthorized, irregular or improper.

Clause 27 protects the rights of any person under any action which may have been commenced prior to the passing of this Act. Clause 28 indemnifies persons exercising powers or carrying out duties in relationship to trust property. Clause 29 authorizes the trust to institute legal proceedings. Clause 30 enables the Registrar-General to register all property vested in the trust. Clauses 31 and 32 enable the trust to allow church land to be used by other denominations except land held under provisions expressly forbidding such use. Clause 33 grants the Annual Conference of the church to delegate its power and authority to its standing committee. This Bill is in the nature of a hybrid Bill and will be referred for consideration to a Select Committee of this House.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I do not wish to take up the time of the House unnecessarily. I support the Bill which, being a hybrid Bill, will require the appointment of a Select Committee. It will be in the interests of the Methodist Church's domestic affairs to have this Bill approved by the House so that all its property will come under the body corporate. With the changing times, there is a demand among various Christian church groups to share properties; the Bill will assist the Methodist Church in that regard, and other bodies will be able to use property owned by this church. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of the Hon. L. J. King, and Messrs. Clark, Ferguson, Hopgood, and Wardle; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on October 3.

FOOTWEAR REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Footwear Regulation Act, 1969. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It stems from a recommendation of the Ministers of Labour of all States of the Commonwealth who are each responsible for the administration of the Acts of the States relating to the branding of footwear. The main amendment is to require the brand to disclose the material used in the uppers of footwear in those cases where the upper is made of leather or of a material that resembles leather. Also, if the quarter-linings of footwear are made of leather or of a material that resembles leather, it will be necessary for those linings to be described. These amendments are primarily designed as a consumer protection measure.

The other amendments are minor ones: first, to provide that heel tips and caps should be excluded from the definition of "sole"; and, secondly, to permit any shoes with an all-leather sole that have heels of wood, metal or plastic to be branded as having an "all-leather sole" (this is at present permissible only in respect of ladies' shoes). These amendments are found to be necessary owing to the changing designs of footwear. Since it is the desire of the participating Governments, and also clearly in the interests of the trade generally, that the proposed amendments to the relevant State Acts should be as uniform as possible, this Bill is in substantially the same form as a measure that has recently been enacted in Victoria.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure will come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. It is proposed that this be a uniform date in all States. To ensure that the industry will have sufficient formal notice of the proposed requirements, it is at present intended that the date will be January 1, 1974, provided the legislation of all States is enacted before the middle of next year. Clause 3 amends section 4 of the principal Act by inserting technical definitions of "quarter lining" and "upper" in relation

to shoes, and by amending the definition of "sole" to exclude materials comprised in heel tips and caps from the definition of materials comprised in the sole of shoes.

Clause 4 amends section 5 of the principal Act and spells out specific labelling requirements for "soles", "uppers" and "quarter linings" in relation to shoes and in general is intended to ensure that, so far as is practicable, there will be a clear statement as to the materials used in each part of the shoe. In addition this clause also provides that wood, plastic or metal, if used in heels, will not of itself preclude the description of "all-leather sole" being applied to soles otherwise consisting of leather. This clause also repeals subsection (2) of section 5 of the principal Act which has now become redundant.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Highways Act, 1926-1972. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill is intended to deal with two matters. First, it sets out an additional power in the Commissioner of Highways in relation to structural alterations to buildings and land subject to acquisition. Secondly, it provides for an amendment to the principal Act, the Highways Act, 1926-1972, consequential upon the decision, given legislative effect in a recent amendment to the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1971, that will, subject to Ministerial approval, permit certain motor omnibuses, including those of the Metropolitan Tramways Trust, to be used on roads notwithstanding that they do not comply with the requirements of subsection (1) of section 144 of the Road Traffic Act, which relates to maximum axle weights. Honourable members may recall that an amendment of this nature was foreshadowed on the introduction of the amendment to the Road Traffic Act. The amendment proposed in this regard is to increase the contribution payable by the Municipal Tramways Trust towards the maintenance of roads.

Clauses 1 and 2 of the Bill are formal. Clause 3 amends section 27b of the principal Act. This section deals with the acquisition of land by the Commissioner of Highways for the purposes of the widening of roads. The amendments proposed by this clause are to strike out subsections (6) and (7) and re-enact them in a somewhat extended form. This is effected by paragraph (*a*) of this clause. Proposed new subsection (6) at paragraph (*a*) repeats in almost identical words portion of old subsection (6) of section 27a of the principal Act. Proposed new paragraph (6) of this subsection provides that the enhancement of the value of the land subject to acquisition by reason of any alterations, additions or repairs to any building, fence, structure, well, dam or water supply will not be taken into account for the purposes of determining compensation unless those alterations, additions or repairs have been carried out with the consent of the Commissioner.

Proposed new subsection (7) re-enacts the remaining provisions of old subsection (6) and in addition provides that it will lie upon the person claiming compensation for alterations, additions or repairs to prove that they were carried out with the consent of the Commissioner. Proposed new subsection (8a) to be inserted by paragraph (*b*) of this clause sets out the powers of the Commissioner to give his consent to alterations, additions or repairs under this section and also gives the power to the Commissioner to make the consent subject to certain conditions. Clause 4 increases the contributions payable by the Municipal Tramways Trust towards the cost of the maintenance and lighting of certain roads from .5c for every kilometre travelled by the trust's omnibuses to .95c for every kilometre so travelled. This increase in contribution is intended to be some recompense to the Commissioner for the additional wear and tear of roads arising from the use of the heavier buses.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 12. Page 1249.)

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the Budget, as it is called in this State, because members in Opposition really have no choice but to support it. There is no possible opportunity to defeat the Budget, but nevertheless there are some features in this one which are by no means unsatisfactory. I refer briefly, in the first instance, to Treasury officers in South Australia. I have heard it said on more than one occasion (and I have no reason to doubt it) that Treasury officers in South Australia (and I refer to those in the Public Service; I am not referring to the politicians) are second to none in the Commonwealth.

I believe we have most efficient officers in the Treasury as well as in the Auditor-General's Department.

I refer, too, to the impending retirement (I think in December next) of Mr. Seaman, who has been a most efficient officer. I also mention Mr. Jeffery, who has recently retired as Auditor-General. Fitting reference has been made to Mr. Jeffery by the Leader and other speakers and the new Auditor-General mentioned him in the preamble to the current Auditor-General's Report. I will read this brief reference:

> Special mention must be made of the services to the State of Mr. G. H. P. Jeffery, C.M.G., A.U.A., F.A.S.A., who retired on June 5, 1972, after filling the office of Auditor-General with distinction for almost 13 years. In that position, and in earlier appointments in the Public Service, he won wide esteem for his knowledge, drive and efficiency.

I commend and support those remarks. We have been fortunate indeed in our officers in the Treasury and in the Auditor-General's Department and I know those who succeeded Mr. Jeffery and Mr. Seaman (Mr. Byrne and Mr. Carey) will follow this tradition of the high standard we have enjoyed in the past. Treasury officers have a fairly large hand in the preparation of the accounts of the State. We now have those accounts under consideration. On reading the Financial Statement one can recognize not only the material supplied by Treasury officers but also the political overtones that have been superimposed on that material. This year I thought that such overtones were a little more obvious than they were in the past; they bear the unmistakable stamp of the Treasurer. The Treasurer's phraseology, which has become familiar through his public pronouncements, crops up again and again in this document. I shall quote the following sentence as an example of the political comments that have been superimposed on the factual material in the Financial Statement:

> When this Government took office in 1970, South Australia had for many years been behind most of the Australian States in its provisions of social services . . .

Frankly, I do not believe that statement. I have heard the Treasurer, when he was seeking office, quote statistics on a per capita basis in connection with the amount spent on hospitals and education. However, if one considers the cost of living in other States, one realizes that in the period referred to South Australians were better off in the fields of education and social services. When Sir Thomas Playford was Treasurer, South Australia's cost of living was considerably less than that in other States. When the Treasurer quotes per capita figures he is using a completely fallacious argument. So, I do not accept the assertion in my quote from the Financial Statement. Actually, for many years South Australia's provision of many services was superior to that in other Australian States. Members were recently invited to attend the opening of extensions to the sheltered workshops at Bedford Industries. People from many countries attended that opening, and they paid a tribute to the fact that no similar type of establishment in the world could compare with that at Bedford Industries. This indicates the sort of work that was done in the social field for many years under Liberal Administrations.

We believe that it is fallacious to expect Governments to take over entirely all sorts of charitable and rehabilitative work; it is far better for people of charitable instinct to do something for their fellow citizens. We believe that a scheme whereby the Government helps such people is far better than a system under which people have to shelve their natural sympathy and expect the Government to do all the work. We believe that, if people expect the Government to do everything in these fields, their initiative and charitable instincts are killed. At Bedford Industries, where a tremendous amount is done by people who are charitably disposed to those less fortunate than themselves, Governments have done their part over the years to see that necessary help is given.

Claims have been made that Liberal Administrations have spent less on education than has been spent in other States. However, when I visited other States to inspect high schools, particularly in Victoria (one of the standard States), I found that South Australian schools were superior in respect of physical surroundings, conditions of work, science laboratories and sporting facilities. I believe that I had fairly good grounds for comparison. So, I refute the Treasurer's political statement; he has often tried to mislead the public with that kind of statement.

Mr. Crimes: Of course, you are not making political statements!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am speaking about the Budget. I would like to see the cost structure in this State kept as it used to be. The Minister of Education said that the percentage increase this year in the education allocation was not as great as it was last year, because inflation had been controlled.

He said that last year the big increase in the education allocation resulted from inflationary trends. In making those remarks the Minister was paying a backhanded compliment to the Commonwealth Government; at least it curbed inflation during the relevant period. It is difficult to line up the levels of taxation in the different States. For example, poker machines exist in New South Wales, but they do not exist in South Australia, and I hope we never have them here. Nevertheless, they provide much revenue for the Government in New South Wales. So, it is difficult to find a real basis of comparison. In justifying the level of taxation, the Treasurer said that, if we did not keep our level of provision of services up to that of the standard States, we could not expect to receive favourable consideration from the Grants Commission. I find the following statement of the Treasurer somewhat contradictory :

> In short, if we wish to achieve Revenue Budget results no worse than the standard—

here, the Treasurer is referring to the standard States of New South Wales and Victoria—

> then we must ensure that our levels of services and expenditures, and our efforts in taxation and charges are, on an overall balance, comparable with the standard.

I find the Treasurer's next sentence strange; it is as follows:

> South Australia may expect to achieve a similar Budget result to the standard—

in other words, we can achieve a Budget result similar to that of New South Wales and Victoria—

> if it has better than standard services coupled with greater than standard taxation.

He is saying that if we want the same Budget result we have to tax more heavily and provide better services. However, in the next sentence he says:

> It may achieve a similar Budget result with below standard taxation only if it is prepared to hold services to a lower level also.

I should have thought that it was implicit in his first statement that, if we imposed taxation at the same level as it is imposed in the other States and provided services at the level of the other States, we could expect, as a result of our application to the Grants Commission, to finish up on the same level as the other States with regard to budgetary provisions. However, in the next sentence the Treasurer says that we must do better, so I find these references strangely contradictory.

As previous speakers have said, there are no spectacular increases in taxation in this Budget, and one would hardly expect them. In view of the financial contributions made by the Commonwealth Government, not only in its normal grants, which have been increased by the escalation factor, but also in the supplementary grants, the public would have been more than alarmed if spectacular taxation increases had been included in this Budget. Many people will find unpalatable the increase proposed in water charges. The Treasurer states:

> For 1972-73, that effort is continuing in a more modest way, with the major increases in charges being limited to water and sewer rates and fees for the services of the Registrar-General.

This is one area in which we should make every effort to keep charges to a minimum. My Party believes in private ownership. In this connection, we believe we should do everything we can to encourage young people to own their own houses. From time to time, the Treasurer has referred to cottage development and so on in, I have thought, rather derisive terms. Nevertheless, the basic unit in society is the family, and the most congenial and satisfactory surroundings in which a young married couple can make their home is in a house of their own. It has become increasingly difficult for young people to get a start in owning their own houses. Increases in water charges and so on are making it even more difficult.

I reiterate that in the Sydney metropolis the cost of houses is almost double the cost here, so it must be virtually impossible for young couples in their 20's to purchase and maintain a house. I hope that we do not get to that situation in South Australia as a result of escalation not only in real estate and building prices but also in the charges we levy on people who wish to own their own houses. My Party opposes the Socialist doctrine that the State should own and control as much as it can. We believe in private ownership and private enterprise, and this applies right down to private house ownership. This increase in water charges will hit house owners, especially young people who are trying to establish and maintain a house. It is no wonder that we are approaching the stage in this community where a family needs two incomes. It seems deplorable to me that the days when a husband could support his family and have a reasonable prospect of owning his own house are fast diminishing. I believe that a major reason for this is that Governments have attempted to do things for people that people could reasonably do themselves. This process has been greatly accelerated by the activities of Labor Governments

in this country. Labor Parties attempt to buy votes by promising that they will provide services and amenities. They try to sell the idea that someone else will pay for these things. All that this achieves is a redistribution of money. The idea that someone else will pay is completely fallacious. The question that must be considered is the areas in which people are most capable and competent to spend their own money. We must find out in what areas Governments do this more satisfactorily. Obviously in some fields Governments must take the major share of activities. However, in other cases people can spend their money more efficiently than Governments can do it for them.

This is the basic difference between our approach and the Labor Party's approach to many of these issues. Those of the Socialist bent believe that Governments can control not only finance but also whole areas of people's lives better than the people can do it themselves. I find this view completely objectionable. The Treasurer seems to promote the idea that the wealthy will pick up the tab. The statistical fact is that the bulk of taxation has to be raised from the average citizen. I will not quote figures from the Bureau of Census and Statistics, as I have previously done. If the Government wants to hand out more in the way of amenities it is the average citizen who has to pay.

The Treasurer states that he has had the unpalatable job of increasing pay-roll tax from 2½ per cent to 3½ per cent. We remember the clamour from this Treasurer and other Treasurers that the Commonwealth should give the States a growth tax. Now that it has been given and the Treasurer is charged with the responsibility of raising a bit of tax, he says that he has had to make the unpalatable decision to increase the tax from 2½ per cent to 3½ per cent. The difficult situation in this country is that the Commonwealth Government has the major task of raising taxation, whilst State Governments spend the money. If the Commonwealth Government is of a different political complexion from the State Government, the State Government has a ready-made whipping boy, and doesn't this Government give him a hiding! Everything is the fault of the Commonwealth Government, which has the responsibility to provide a whole range of public utilities.

The Minister of Roads and Transport has jumped on the band waggon. He wants the Commonwealth Government to do the work on the Eyre Highway. The Railways Department is going broke, so the Commonwealth should step in. The Commonwealth is expected to contribute to education, and so on. Because the State Government wants to spend more, the Commonwealth is expected to give a bigger hand-out in every sphere. Here we have a division of responsibility, with the major taxing authority divorced from the major spending authorities. This Government loses no opportunity to castigate the Commonwealth Government and, in the light of this Budget, I think it does this unfairly. The sums made available, especially since Mr. McMahon has been Prime Minister, are vastly in excess, on a percentage basis, of anything that has been provided in the history of the State. That has been particularly noticeable during the last year.

I heard Sir Robert Askin say that he believes that the present Commonwealth Treasurer and the Prime Minister have shown outstanding ability in understanding the needs of the States and in trying to accommodate them. However, I look forward to the day when I will hear the Treasurer of South Australia and the Minister of Roads and Transport pay fair and due acknowledgment to the Commonwealth Government's effort in trying to help the States overcome their budgetary difficulties. One of the major problems is the escalation in salaries and wages and the inflationary trend, which the Minister of Education said he is thankful has been halted to some extent. Over 52 per cent of the increase is absorbed by increases in salaries and wages; this is a continuing problem with which the Treasury must come to grips. However, there must be a limit, without changing the pattern of life of the citizens of the State, to the level of State taxes and charges that can be levied on our citizens.

One of the areas in which there has been a particularly spectacular increase in taxes in the past 10 years is in the area of stamp duties. This is borne out clearly in Appendix IV, which is a list of increases in the 10-year period in various fields. However, it is in stamp duties that the most spectacular increase has occurred. It has been a particularly steep increase, as we well know, from last year's Budget—by far the steepest of any increase. Anyone who has purchased a new or second-hand car and who has been faced with the piece tacked on top of the bill for the transfer of the secondhand vehicle or on the price of the new vehicle is only too well aware of what has happened regarding stamp duty on vehicles. In 1962 the revenue from stamp

duties was $4,897,000, but is has leapt to $22,532,000; this is more than a four-fold increase in 10 years, and the biggest jump by far has occurred in the latter years.

Anyone who has bought land or who has transferred property has seen tagged on the bottom of the bill the amount of the Government stamp duty. He will realize that this is the biggest single charge levied on the transaction. If one has a piece of land surveyed and pays the fees in connection with the transfer, by far the biggest slug in the transaction is the stamp duty paid to the Government. We are trying to encourage people to own their own house and to take an interest in it; yet this is the kind of charge that makes it difficult for people to own property. I am not talking about large properties but of having some stake in the country; but this impost makes it more difficult for people to get a property. This is a fundamental difference in approach taken by my Party and taken by the Labor Party.

I mentioned earlier the spectacular increases in water and sewerage charges over the last 10 years, and this makes it difficult for people who try to own some property or their own home. Education consumes by far the largest slice of any State Budget. The Victorian Budget has increased significantly the spending on education. Despite the halt in inflation referred to by the Minister of Education and the fact that it accounted for a lower percentage increase in expenditure on education in South Australia, Victoria has provided a greater increase in expenditure on education.

Mr. Crimes: How mean it must have been in the past!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I refer the honourable member to the report in this morning's *Advertiser.* I do not intend to criticize the *Advertiser,* which has been a responsible newspaper for many years. I have no reason to doubt the figures quoted in this morning's *Advertiser.* The figures quoted of money spent on education in Victoria, and the increase in South Australia this year, despite what the Minister of Education has said about the Commonwealth Government curbing inflation, show that there has been a significant increase in Victoria. At last, the Government has decided to give the $6 book allowance which it promised to complete the school book payment and which it promised at the last elections. I think that both Parties made the same statement about an increase in the book allowance. The Labor Party said that it would increase it by $6, but it has taken the Government until now to increase that allowance for secondary students.

One other item in the Education Department lines is that the Government has accepted responsibility for the transport of handicapped children. I had the pleasure of introducing a private member's motion dealing with this matter during the last session.

Dr. Eastick: You might have activated it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Opposition can justly take credit for that move. I introduced the motion, which had the support of the member for Elizabeth, who made an excellent speech and who was with me in spirit. In addition, many other Government members said that they were in favour of the Government's accepting responsibility for the transport of handicapped children to and from school.

Mr. Mathwin: I supported it, too.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Opposition unanimously supported it but, when it came to the vote, Government members' support was somewhat illusory. I am glad to see that, after a short time, the Government has accepted this responsibility and that provision is made for it in the Budget. The provision of this transport does not require much money, and it is peanuts compared to some of the expenditure on which the Government was embarking. I think the parents paid half the cost of the transport, so the extra amount required to transport handicapped children to suitable schools is only small. I think the Opposition can take credit for this, but I commend the Government for having the good sense to move within a short time.

No doubt the Opposition will initiate other good ideas and, although the Government may not be disposed to accept them and give credit where it is due, the Government will take up those ideas, introduce them quietly, and then claim the credit for them. Aid for independent schools is being increased. The Labor Party policy and outlook differ from those of the Liberal and Country League on this matter, but I will not canvass that again at length, having mentioned it in the Loan Estimates debate.

We cannot escape the fact that the effort made by the South Australian Government regarding aid for independent schools, even in the most generous allocation, has lagged considerably behind the efforts in other States. The largest donation to the most needy school in this State, according to the needs basis,

until this Budget was introduced had been $34 a head. Schools that the committee considers to be less needy receive less than that amount. This position compares with per capita grants of $50 in New South Wales, $40 in Victoria, and $45 in Queensland. Western Australia and Tasmania are the only States where the allocation is somewhat lower than the $34 in South Australia, although they are not significantly lower.

The other States accept that the per capita system of making grants to independent schools is by far the fairest system. Of course, needs can be inflated. This sort of scheme encourages schools to show areas of need so that it can attract greater subsidies from Governments to satisfy those needs. Schools can be opened on a shaky financial basis and, having considerable need, can apply for assistance. The Minister of Education used to make derisive remarks about the wealthy independent schools, but I have noted with interest that the final recommendation of the needs committee is that grants be made to such schools as Saint Peters, Prince Alfred, Rostrevor, and Wilderness. They are the schools that the present Minister has described as being wealthy schools.

All educational institutions, whether State or Commonwealth, face considerable difficulties, mainly because of the increase in salaries and the cost of equipment. These costs are increasing astronomically, and the room for an independent school to manoeuvre is limited. Governments, with a whole range of provisions, can adjust allocations from department to department, but a similar option is not open to an independent school, which operates in a narrow sphere and must either swim or sink. All schools face a crisis. Even the current costs of running so-called wealthy schools have become almost unmanageable, although these schools can raise money, including loans.

Even the schools that the Minister describes as being wealthy have qualified for assistance under the needs system. Our view and, I think, the view of most people is that the fairest and best way to give assistance is on a per capita basis. In that way people do not tend to inflate their needs. This view is held by the Independent Schools Association in South Australia and in other States.

The amount available under welfare services is increased, and this is one part of the Budget with which I agree wholeheartedly. I am speaking not of the whole range of provisions but only of provision made for such people as deserted wives. I have found that many cases of hardship exist in this area. It is a sorry reflection on society to see a reference to the dramatic increase in the number of deserted wives and other people for whom the State is called upon to make provision. Although we have so-called permissive legislation, we should view this matter with caution, because any forces and tendencies that break down the family (and I have mentioned this matter in relation to housing) are matters that we should consider closely in our legislation.

My experience is that this breaking down is an increasing trend, and Governments are being called on to make provision for these people. The amount provided in the Budget is not tremendous when we consider the whole Budget, but provision is made for the Minister of Community Welfare to be able to give this assistance. I hope that the money will not be spent like other Government money is spent by people running around the country and empire building. Some people take the view that getting on the Government payroll and building an empire makes them all the more important. I hope that this money will be spent on people in need, as it should be spent. Governments are being called on to make this sort of provision because of the breakdown of the family and society.

The second largest provision in the Budget is for the public debt. When I was looking through the appendices I was struck by the amount of money that we must provide to service debts, and I noticed that much money had been raised overseas, in countries such as Switzerland, the Netherlands, the United States of America, and the United Kingdom. Most of these loans are payable in Australia and fortunately will be converted to long-term loans here, but the interest rates are not insignificant. That charge on the Budget caused me some concern. In a prosperous country such as Australia is now (although it was not when some of the loans were negotiated), with the balance of payments that we enjoy at present, that is a significant charge on the Budget.

For the first time in 20 years the Electricity Trust has not made a profit. This has already been mentioned, and it is a pity that the Government saw fit to impose a surcharge on the trust in its last Budget simply because the trust has been successful. However, it seems to be part of the Government's thinking that, if any undertaking is successful, it must be got at. Is there anything wrong with being profitable? If this attitude were applied to the whole financial sphere, not only would businesses go broke but also it would not be long before the whole country became broke.

Another matter of considerable concern to the Government is the increase in the railway deficit. This year the deficit is about $5,000,000 greater: the total is about $20,000,000. The Government should be concerned that, in a State the size of South Australia, the Railways Department loses $20,000,000. I hope the Government's solution will not be to squeeze people off the roads and increase country transport costs in an endeavour to lessen this loss. The Government has much to be thankful for in this Budget, but it has no one to be more thankful to than the Commonwealth Government. The Prime Minister and the Comonwealth Treasurer have done an outstanding job in difficult financial circumstances, and I pay a tribute to the outstanding generosity of the Commonwealth Government in that situation. Indeed, I am sure that the public will be aware of this contribution at the next Commonwealth elections. I support the second reading.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I rise in this House, which is electric with interest, although few people will be interested to hear or read what I say. I wonder about the usefulness of this Budget debate at this time, at 8.35 p.m., when, although the hour is not late, most people will be wondering what is the next television programme or what is happening at a local community meeting and are not concerned about what is being said in this debate. I am sure that all people have an opinion on the philosophy of the Government or that of the Opposition; they recognize there are two Parties in this House that are philosophically opposed on how to govern this State.

Mr. Payne: Do you mean the two Parties on your side?

Mr. HALL: The honourable member, who is one of the 27 Government members, is one of the four members opposite willing to listen to the debate.

Mr. Venning: That is—

Mr. HALL: I have behind me my staunch supporter, the member for Rocky River. I congratulate the member for Kavel on his contribution to this debate. Although the Minister for Roads and Transport can turn his back on the debate and on the Budget he is one of the architects of the Government's policy: that the Government is supreme, and the public should come second to the Government's future in this State. However, these matters are unimportant in the general context of this debate. The whole Budget area of initiative is much less than we as Parliamentarians believe. The Auditor-General's Report came to this House far too late to assist members in this debate, but the report shows how inflated the Government's view is of administrative responsibility in South Australia, because, while the Budget shows a revenue of about $500,000,000, many of these millions of dollars now being considered involve housekeeping only. What initiative is there for alteration in areas such as the deficit of the Railways Department, and waterworks and sewerage undertakings in South Australia. The Auditor-General's report reveals that, of the $456,000,000 involved in last year's Budget, only $272,000,000 was involved in the expenditure of moneys from Consolidated Revenue obtained through the various avenues of the Government—from the Commonwealth Government, State taxation or territorial resources. How much of our Budget deliberations are concerned with the housekeeping figures for various Government departments? Our view is inflated in monetary terms and we would be much better off to separate these items and consider Budgets where we have true initiative to alter Government action.

Mr. McAnaney: That is what I say.

Mr. HALL: I am pleased that I am now a disciple of the member for Heysen. It would be better if these organizations were run as business organizations and showed their deficiencies as such, receiving Government subsidies as business undertakings, rather than being falsely brought into the consideration of the Budget. We know that the Railways Department will add to its losses year by year until the Government takes action to improve the department's efficiency. We know it is time that the Government reviewed the efficiency of the Railways Department, even though it will have to continue to subsidize the department. However, why should the department not be operated as a business concern and receive a direct payment from the State Government as a subsidy to it, which would be better than the present system? The report goes on to show the areas of deficit in Government administration. The Engineering and Water Supply Department had an overall deficit last year of $3,330,000. Irrigation activities showed a deficit of more than $1,000,000, South-Eastern drainage showed a deficit of nearly $1,000,000, and the Marine and Harbors Department, for the first time in some years, is showing a deficit of sizable proportions, as did the Railways Department, the South Australian Housing Trust with its rental operations and the Municipal Tramways Trust. It would be a much better situation

if this House debated issues where real initiative could be brought into the debate rather than concentrating on housekeeping issues. We should face the real issues. Although the Government wants to go to the polls with a hand-out Budget—

Mr. Curren: What about the Commonwealth Budget?

Mr. Payne: There is nothing—

Mr. HALL: The Premier's Budget is reported in the press under a banner heading "Premier's Budget is for the Needy", but the money has been provided by another Government. By acting in this way, the Government has written down the ability of the South Australian Administration to be a really effective force regarding alteration and reform.

Mr. Burdon: It's a bit like one of your Budgets.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mrs. Byrne): Order!

Mr. HALL: I know that the member for Mount Gambier is concerned about the fact that his Government is, in reality, a Conservative Government, which has refused to introduce reforms that it could have introduced. It has, as a Labor Party Administration, talked about reform for some years but it has refused to alter the basic areas in which the Government is involved and which affect the Budget. The Government keeps talking but does nothing, and it rests mainly on the decisions of previous Governments. I have heard this session much debate about conservation, the recycling of products, and the environment, etc., but in all these matters the Government rests on the work of the previous Government. Its expenditure on education rests on the report of a committee initiated by the previous Government; its policy on water supply, whether it concerns a dam or water filtration for Adelaide, rests on the decisions of previous Governments; and the project involving the construction of the Adelaide Festival Theatre on the Torrens bank is the result of decisions of a previous Government.

Mr. McAnaney: And paid for by the Commonwealth Government!

Mr. HALL: Where does this Government rely on its own decisions? Here, we find the Government parading before the next election and relying on decisions made by a Government of a reverse complexion.

Mr. Curren: Do you mean stationary or moving?

Mr. HALL: The member for Chaffey had better have his say, because he has few weeks left in this House. We do not know how long the session will last. Perhaps the lone Minister of Roads and Transport can tell him how many weeks he has left. He knows that he has until March, or whenever it is that there will be a double or single dissolution of this Parliament. With the majority that this Government has momentarily, it is time that it showed a brave face, instead of the cowardly face that it shows and instead of hiding behind the figures in this Budget, consisting largely of sums provided by the Commonwealth Government. It is time that the Government stopped running to the public to curry favour in the way that it is trying to do by this Budget. We know that the Government can point to obvious expenditures and say, "Look how good we have been; vote for us." This. Budget is noted for its omissions.

At this stage, the Government is doing little else than acting as an agent for the Commonwealth Government and disbursing millions of dollars provided by that Government. It is of little use for this Government to ignore the challenges that it should be meeting, when it has the majority that it has in this House. With a majority here of seven members, what excuse does the Government have for failing to meet these challenges? I refer here to the housing situation in this State, a matter that is covered in the Auditor-General's Report and in the Budget document. Here, we find a reference to the first real loss incurred in respect of rental accommodation in South Australia. What is the purpose of the Housing Trust?

Mr. Curren: To build houses for the needy.

Mr. HALL: I agree for once with the member for Chaffey: the trust's purpose is to build houses for those who need them and for those who find difficulty in obtaining them through their own capital and savings or through having to move from place to place to perform services required by their employers. The trust exists also in order to provide houses for deserted wives, families on low incomes, and those suffering illness. Although this is why the Housing Trust is needed, why has the Government refused to introduce reform in this area, which is crying out for reform? Why is the Housing Trust allowed to go on functioning in this way? Why should people be allowed to receive subsidies in respect of Housing Trust houses that are in demand when those subsidies are not needed? This Government has failed to recognize the difficulties inherent in this area.

Mr. Curren: As you did!

Mr. HALL: It has failed to ensure that a proper charge is made in respect of those people occupying Housing Trust houses who

can afford to pay a proper charge. The basis of the trust's existence is to help the needy; let us not misrepresent the situation. I find, from previous political experience, that few Governments have been willing to deal with this problem. I know that, when in office, we dealt with it in relation to houses occupied by public servants, and we reached an amicable agreement with the Public Service Association whereby rents would be automatically graded in respect of public servants occupying Government houses. Action clearly needs to be taken in regard to Housing Trust rental houses. All members know of instances in which a family, in most cases in real need, occupies a Housing Trust rental house at a rental well below the commercial value applying generally in the community but often, over the years, that family's circumstances change tremendously, sometimes to such an extent that the family concerned can afford to pay the full economic rental, yet it does not do so.

Obviously, a new approach is needed regarding Housing Trust administration in respect of this situation. First, I suggest that the rental value of a house should be determined on the basis of the present capital value of that house, and the rental of every Housing Trust rental property should be based on today's economic value. Then, according to the means of the person who occupies the house in question, the rental should be reduced. In these circumstances no-one would rent a Housing Trust house at a reduced or subsidized rental when it was not justified, and the full rental value of a house would always be the basic value. I in no way wish to inhibit the use of these houses by those who need them.

In fact, the system I have suggested would help the needy and would result in removing from rental houses those who do not need a subsidy, substituting for them those people who every member knows should have a house of this sort but who cannot at present be accommodated because there are not sufficient houses. This is an immense challenge facing the Government. I think all of us on this side have heard rumblings about Government interference in the activities of the Housing Trust, but we have not heard of any substantial move made in this area of social need, which is crying out for change. That is a challenge that this Government has not met in a full three years in office with a seven-member majority. It is a direct reflection on the lack of courage of the Government.

I come now to another area of omission. We know that the Government, in apportioning these millions of dollars it has been very fortunate in obtaining from the Commonwealth, has put that money to use where it believes most votes are available. What has it done in relation to the depressed rural economy? In reply to demands from this side, the Treasurer has said consistently that he cannot abolish rural land tax. He gives as his reason that he does not have enough money, to begin with, and, secondly, that it may in some way affect the amount of the Grants Commission allocations to South Australia. Yet this Budget denies the very logic he uses to support his arguments. Because he has been able to spread so many millions of dollars he has shown his capacity, with Commonwealth funds, to attend to a wide general section in South Australia, but he has left out of his attentions the rural community.

The larger States, which provide the standard on which the Grants Commission operates to allocate finances to the under-privileged States, have themselves abolished rural land tax, yet in South Australia we still have a Government which insists on taking $1,000,000 annually out of the rural community. In the face of this Budget it has no justification for the continuation of what, by Australian standards, is straight-out extortion from a community that cannot afford to bear it.

Mr. Payne: Don't people pay land tax in the city?

Mr. HALL: The honourable member cannot discredit the basis of the argument by saying something which is not relevant. Perhaps he would care to read the *Financial Review* of August 17 last, in which he would be able to study a proposal to establish a special bank for the rural community. In that article he will find references to the rural debt in Australia and to the problems of the rural community, isolated in its inability to pass on its charges to its customers. He will find there every reason to catch up with the other States of Australia in attending to this important matter. So the Treasurer, in disbursing an extra $50,000,000-odd, is unable to dispense to a rural community the justice given it by every other State in Australia, a justice which is dispensed by other Labor Governments in Australia but which this Government is unable or unwilling to bestow.

One could go through the Estimates line by line, giving an opinion on how the money should be disbursed. We would have difficulty,

however, in arriving at areas where the Government is able to change its mind from year to year. The Auditor-General makes comments in relation to the water supply of South Australia and also to the vote for education in this State. Those sums are expected to increase annually to keep pace with inflation and to provide for the increasing numbers in the community. One knows these figures must increase to sums commensurate with what is available. Those are not areas which give room for change in policy. This Government, more and more, in common with other State Governments, is becoming an administering authority for the Commonwealth. What we look for, however, is efficiency of operation, and in this I suppose it is rather too early to point to the obvious failures of the Government.

I repeat that the Government has shown little initiative: in most substantive matters it exists on decisions of the previous Government. I find it rather dismaying when I look at what is supposed to be Government achievement in South Australia since 1970. One could only add up these figures and say the Government has been most fortunate. The Budget is not one so much of disproportionate expenditure of the sum presented to it as one of omission, of inability to grasp the problems facing the Government. I have mentioned two this evening and one could find many more. I am extremely disappointed that the Government, with a majority of seven, should rest on the decisions of the Government before it which had no majority in this House. It is a reflection on the present Government that it has failed to live up to its promise that it would move into areas of reform. If anything can be said about this Government in the area of Labor politics, it is simply that it is extremely conservative.

Mr. BROWN (Whyalla): I do not think Government members or members of the previous Liberal Government would deny for one moment that any State Budget is obviously reliant on Commonwealth finances.

Mr. Gunn: This Government has been very well treated.

Mr. BROWN: Members opposite are obviously going to rush in and attack me on Commonwealth finances. I will deal later with the attitude of the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Gunn: That will be interesting to hear but it will not be very enlightening.

Mr. BROWN: I am sure the member for Eyre will find it interesting. Over the years of the present Liberal Government in Canberra, the State Liberal Governments in Victoria and New South Wales, the Country Party Government in Queensland, and the previous Liberal Governments in Western Australia, Tasmania, and South Australia have all, at one time or another, condemned the attitude of the Commonwealth Government regarding provision of finance for the States. There is no point in saying that is not so, because we have only to look at some of the statements made over the years by Sir Henry Bolte. From time to time he has had a go at the Commonwealth Government about its attitude to State finances. The member for Kavel spoke at length about the State Government's facing up to its responsibilities in the transport of handicapped children, and said that at last this Government had faced its responsibilities in that field. Later, I shall deal with the question of mentally retarded children and show how the Commonwealth Government has faced up to the question of educating these children. I am very pleased the State Government has honoured its responsibilities in the transport of these children. It is most important, and I agree with the member for Kavel that it is something of which we can be proud. That statement applies to members of the Opposition as well as to the Government, because the Opposition has supported this action.

The member for Gouger raved on about private enterprise. He implied that private enterprise should be allowed to run with a subsidy from the ratepayer, the ordinary man in the street, who must subsidize such organizations as the Railways Department, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and the Electricity Trust. What happened to private enterprise in connection with the m.v. *Troubridge*? How stupid it is to talk about private enterprise taking over necessary services on a subsidized basis from the ordinary people in the street! It is obvious from the speeches made during this debate that the Treasurer's Financial Statement will go down in history as the finest document ever presented in this House. Members opposite have not condemned it; they would not be justified in doing so. The Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. Clark: Which one?

Mr. BROWN: I mean the genuine Leader, not the Leader within the Opposition. The genuine Leader of the Opposition said that the Commonwealth Government had been responsible in its approach to the needs of the State. What a short memory the Leader has! I

remember a long debate in this House on the question of the wine excise, and I also remember the debate concerning the taxes that the Commonwealth Government imposed on electrical goods and motor vehicles. Let us not kid ourselves about the attitude of the Commonwealth Government to the States. This State has continually pressed the Commonwealth Government for additional finance. In the Financial Statement the Treasurer said:

> The last two years have seen a number of important changes in the extent and kind of general purpose financial assistance given by the Commonwealth to all the States. Following strong submissions by all States in 1969 and early 1970, the Commonwealth agreed to a major review of the financial assistance arrangements and, at the Premiers' Conference of June, 1970, offered a new deal which provided for an increase in the base grants, an improvement in the annual betterment factor, a grant towards debt services on a specified portion of existing State debt eventually to be taken over, and a grant determined in lieu of interest-bearing loans . . .

The new deal that the Treasurer referred to was brought about by pressure from all States. Later in his Financial Statement the Treasurer said:

> At the Premiers' Conference in June, 1971, the States made it clear that the problems in prospect in 1971-72 were greater than they had actually experienced in 1970-71, and the Commonwealth, convinced by the urgency of the case—

let us bear in mind that the Commonwealth Government had to be convinced by the urgency of the case—

> agreed to further improvements to the States' share of financial resources ... As members may recall, the fact that these arrangements were still inadequate to meet minimum needs was shown up clearly by the unanimous decision of the States, before leaving the conference table, to increase the pay-roll tax rate from 2½ per cent to 3½ per cent immediately on the transfer to the States taking effect.

On reading those passages, one can only conclude that in the period referred to the Commonwealth Government was under continual pressure to provide finance, yet Opposition members have repeatedly said that the Commonwealth Government did a marvellous job! The Commonwealth Government provided increased finance for education, but it did that only after continual approaches by the State Governments. Of course, even under the new arrangements for financing education, the Commonwealth Government is still favouring the rich schools instead of catering for all sections of the community.

I refer now to finance for advanced education, particularly the Whyalla proposal. Once again, the Commonwealth Government has failed miserably to provide adequate finance for decentralization of industry; it gives only lip service to decentralization. I hope that, as a result of pressure from the States and as a result of the great victory that the Labor Party will have in the coming Commonwealth elections, there will be a significant improvement in finance for advanced education. For a long time I have been associated with one of the greatest examples of decentralization of industry. As a result, I know that we must have finance not only for decentralization of industry but also for the things that go with industry, and there is no question that advanced education is one of those things. One of the big problems associated with decentralization of industry is that people sometimes have to leave a country town because the town does not have the facilities for advanced education that their children need.

Mr. Allen: That applies to all districts.

Mr. BROWN: Yes, but it applies particularly in the district to which I have referred. I realize that, in places such as Peterborough, there would be a need for these facilities, but the need is much greater in areas where there are more people and where greater decentralization has taken place. Over the years, I have tried to obtain progress in this field, and I must admit that some progress has been made, but I am concerned that greater progress has been delayed because of the unavailability of finance from the Commonwealth Government. I say genuinely and sincerely that I will continue to work for additional finance from the State and Commonwealth Governments, especially from the Commonwealth Government, for advanced education and education generally. I am pleased to see that a further grant is provided for the Kindergarten Union of South Australia (Inc.). Whyalla has two or three kindergartens, one of which is a major kindergarten. This field of education is growing.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: If we had the same standard as the Australian Capital Territory has (and that is paid for by the Commonwealth Government), we'd be doing very well.

Mr. BROWN: That is the point I am getting at. If the Commonwealth Government shovelled as much money into Whyalla and other areas of the State as it shovels into the A.C.T., we would be doing very well. Unfortunately, some parents do not believe in sending their children to kindergartens. If more

parents believed in this form of education, it would grow, so that Governments generally would be forced to face up to their responsibility in this field: that applies particularly to the Commonwealth Government. However, I find that some parents do not believe in pre-school education for their children. I hope that this position will change. Although members opposite do not like the word "compulsion", it may be that in future we will provide for compulsory pre-school education, as this may be the only means of making Governments accept their responsibility in this field.

The member for Kavel referred to the education of mentally handicapped children. I am proud of the school in Whyalla for mentally retarded children. I am especially proud of the teacher in Whyalla, for she has great knowledge of the art of teaching these children. It is gratifying to see her and her assistants at work, and to see the advancements that have been made in this field of education. The member for Kavel said that the Government had at last faced up to its responsibility and was paying for the transport of these children to their schools. I point out that the school in Whyalla costs this Government $25,000 a year, and that the Commonwealth Government does not pay 1c by way of subsidy.

Mr. Goldsworthy: If you're not going to let them do anything we might as well abolish State Governments.

Mr. BROWN: It is all very well to say that. I believe that this form of education is most necessary. In the past, we have not faced up to this question.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That's not the point. Going on what you are saying, we might as well shut up the Education Department and transfer it to Canberra.

Mr. BROWN: No. I believe that the Commonwealth has at least as much responsibility in these fields as the State has.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Transfer half the department there, then.

Mr. BROWN: The honourable member keeps on harping about this, but let us consider the matter further. The Commonwealth Government does not pay any subsidy with regard to the education of mentally handicapped children. However, if a hostel is built to provide temporary accommodation for children, the Commonwealth Government will subsidize it. Why should subsidies be provided in this area, and not in other areas?

Mr. Goldsworthy: On your argument, why doesn't it subsidize the building of high schools?

Mr. Venning: You're just trying to knock the Commonwealth.

Mr. BROWN: No, I am not.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You want to transfer more responsibility to the Commonwealth.

Mr. BROWN: No, but it seems to me that the Commonwealth has a lopsided attitude with regard to the teaching of mentally handicapped children. Having been associated with the education of these children, I am pleased to say that advances have been made. Several children who have been educated in these schools have later been employed in the community. This is a wonderful achievement that I hope will be continued. Again, unfortunately, because education of these children is not compulsory, parents may send a child to the school for six months and then take it away. Such a child will not be seen at the school again until maybe a year afterwards. This does not do much good for the child's education.

The Government is spending a record sum on education. During the last year or 18 months a new open-unit classroom has been opened at the Whyalla Primary School; in fact, it was one of the first such classrooms in the State. I was pleased to see this classroom opened. An assembly hall has been built at the Whyalla High School. Ironically, a hall was promised by the former Premier (the member for Gouger), but unfortunately he did not get around to providing it. A new canteen has been provided at the Hincks Avenue Primary School, and a new classroom at the Nicholson Avenue Primary School. Moreover, a new primary school has been built at Long Street. Next year, there will be a new high school at Whyalla Stuart.

I now turn to welfare services, the allocation for which increased from $8,509,946 last year to $11,301,571 this year, and I am pleased to see this increase. I do not know how other members fare regarding social welfare in their areas, but, in the industrial area I represent, I find it one of the biggest problems. Page 146 of the Auditor-General's Report for 1972 shows that there has been an increase of 463, or 30 per cent, in the number of deserted wives over the figure for last year; an increase of 193, or 70 per cent, in the number of unmarried mothers; and an increase of 2,564, or 82 per cent, in the number of unemployed (and this is not the making of this Government). There has been an increase of 96, or 16 per cent, in the number of sickness

cases over the figure for last year. I think these figures more than bear out the fact that social welfare is ever-increasing and becoming a serious problem in the community.

I sometimes wonder what causes wives to be deserted, and whether in many cases it may be due to the failure of the husband to face up to his financial responsibilities or whether the couple married too early in life and found that the husband's income was not what he thought it would be. The latter would make it difficult for him to budget satisfactorily. Unmarried mothers are also a serious financial problem in my area; perhaps youngsters today are emotionally forward but otherwise very backward. The Commonwealth Government has failed dismally in assisting the unemployed in this country. I wonder whether some people may be working too much overtime. Perhaps the husband has two jobs.

Mr. Mathwin: He might have two wives!

Mr. BROWN: Possibly. Perhaps the wife works and perhaps they may have married too young or relied too heavily on hire purchase.

Mr. Becker: Not too much taxes?

Mr. BROWN: That may be so, too. If all these things are added up, I believe that it is one of the major problems in our community and, whether or not we like it, it is causing considerable financial hardship. It is one of the major reasons why a State Government must budget more for social services than perhaps it would have done some years ago. Whether we can solve this problem and plan our destiny better in the future, one can only guess. These problems in our community will have to be arrested if our financial commitments are to be reduced to any considerable extent. I am pleased that the festival hall is nearing completion.

Mr. Keneally: Are you interested in culture?

Mr. BROWN: As I am a great believer in the performing arts, I am looking forward to the completion of the hall, which I hope will attract first-class entertainment to the city, because places such as Whyalla, Port Pirie, Port Augusta, Mount Gambier and other areas of the State will benefit if the hall lives up to expectations.

I am pleased to see that we are continuing our spending on housing and welcome the fact that the Housing Trust is to build elderly citizens' cottage-type dwellings. As elderly citizens grow older (even though they own their own houses), there is a tendency for them to live together in a small housing project.

Mr. Mathwin: They'll be terrace houses like the Pommie houses?

Mr. BROWN: They would probably remind the member for Glenelg of some of the houses back in Coronation Street. They will be attractive and there will be a planned beautification programme sponsored by the trust. Even though the houses might remind the member for Glenelg of some of the houses in the United Kingdom, the beautification programme will not remind him of "back home". We had to wait until the Labor Government came to office in this State to get altered designs for the houses.

Mr. Mathwin: We get many migrants here, and they may not appreciate that.

Mr. BROWN: The honourable member may be correct and I appreciate his interjection more than he thinks, because I have found that migrants do not like flats or high-density living. On the other hand, in 18 months in my district, private builders have intensified the building of flats, and these flats have been occupied. Some people want to live in flats and, if this is solving a problem, we ought to build them. The Government, before coming to office, promised to spend as much as it could in the areas where expenditure was most needed, and the three Budgets that the Government has brought down have done that. Further, when we are returned to office next year and bring down the Budget for next financial year, that Budget will continue to do as the previous Budgets have done.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): Madam Acting Deputy Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to this Bill when you are in the Chair. You adorn it most magnificently. Unfortunately, however, it is a pity that more members are not in the Chamber: I think we would be struggling to form a cricket team at present. I place on record the valued service to the State given by the Under-Treasurer (Mr. Gilbert Seaman), who will retire at the end of this year. Similarly, I acknowledge the service to the State of Mr. Jeffery, who retired from the position of Auditor-General on July 5. Mr. Jeffery's reports and comments were of immense value to Parliament. Not all his suggestions were accepted by the Government's of the day, but, as the officer of Parliament supervising Government expenditure, he carried out his duties in a most exemplary way. I wish Mr. Jeffery well and hope that he has a long retirement. I also compliment our new Auditor-General on submitting his first report to Parliament.

In considering the Budget, the Opposition is mindful of the fact that this document is phase 1 of what we call a model Socialist State. Mr. Whitlam, the Leader of the Labor Party in the Commonwealth Parliament, said in South Australia some years ago that if Labor was successful in gaining office in the Commonwealth Parliament and Don Dunstan was Premier of South Australia, South Australia would become the model Socialist State of Australia. In my opinion, this Budget is phase 1 of that master plan. However, we know that the Labor Party will not be successful at the Commonwealth elections, and the Premier must go it alone. He is trying to achieve his objective at the expense of wage and salary workers and with the generosity of the Commonwealth Government.

Let us consider the amounts of money received from the Commonwealth Government in the past two years and the amount of extra taxation that the State Government has raised. The model Socialist State is committed to giving huge social benefits at the expense of the so-called middle class: the so-called upper class (or the minority) is so structured that it can survive the extra tax burden more easily than can workers on fixed wages or salary.

Any worker who depends on the present arbitration system for a regular wage or salary increase when his award expires is at a disadvantage, particularly when inflation is high and Governments can tax him before he receives adjustments to earnings. The pensioners are a classic example of this and, with superannuated people on fixed incomes, are the greatest sufferers. This Government is killing enthusiasm for social retirement and is forcing people to spend their money so as to reduce their savings.

In the past 12 months savings bank deposits have increased to a higher level than ever before, reflecting a lack of confidence by the people in the present economic situation throughout the whole of Australia. This is a tragedy, because in each State it is reflected through the general economy. It is a situation that we should not experience at present in a country such as this. In the period that we are going through in Australia's history, we should be expanding at a rate that has not been known previously. If we do not overcome successfully the problems of the high cost of living and of the low productivity level, the country will fall behind.

We all like to think that we are contributing something towards creating a more affluent society. It is time we did that, and here the responsibility falls on the State Government. This Government is charged with the responsibility of ensuring full employment in the State. Regardless of how difficult that may seem and of what the influences may be outside the State, the State Government must do all in its power to ensure full employment. Earlier this year the Commonwealth Government gave additional funds to the State for the specific purpose of trying to create a greater work programme to increase employment but, unfortunately, this scheme failed.

Therefore, if we have a financial structure that is taxing the workers at the level at which they are being taxed now, we are taking this money out of the community and putting it into only one area, namely, the State coffers. The State Government must try to re-inject the money where it can do the most good. Unfortunately, we must prop up organizations such as the South Australian Railways. In this financial year we will have to provide $22,500,000 towards the railway deficit. This amount is about 20 per cent of the amount of money raised in State taxation, and it is a great pity that we must do this, because that amount of money could be used to build many houses and provide many benefits.

A short time ago the member for Whyalla spoke about such people as deserted wives and unmarried mothers. These people need as much encouragement and assistance as we can give them. We know that it is easy for a woman to have an abortion, but I admire the unmarried mothers who work and battle on to try to raise their family in the community. Strange though it may seem, I consider that it is the State Government's responsibility to help these people.

In explaining the Bill, the Treasurer pointed out many difficulties and gave the history of Commonwealth grants and additional handouts to the States. He pointed out future possibilities, our future cost structure and how we should plan for this. However, it comes back to a matter I have previously raised: the Budget is a plan for the financial affairs of the State for the next 12 months but, by the time it is delivered to Parliament, 2½ months has elapsed. Further, increases to wages and salaries and to the overall cost structure cannot be predicted, and therefore extremely high provision in areas must be made. I suggest that Estimates be made for a six-month period and that the Treasurer come back with a supplementary Budget. Indeed, this could have been

the situation had this year not been an election year in South Australia but, because we are coming into an election period, the State has budgeted for a deficit of $7,500,000 in the hope that it will be able to cover all contingencies. I believe that Parliament should receive in-depth quarterly reports showing what has happened in the previous quarter and forecasting what could happen in the coming quarter. Industry can do that, and I cannot see why the State cannot. It should be accepted that both State and Commonwealth Governments have supplementary Budgets every six months to adjust to changes in forecasts. Unfortunately, we never see State Governments reducing their own taxation: once a tax is imposed, it is there to stay. Although there has been a reduction in rural land tax, I should like to see it completely abolished.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You are saying you can't do it.

Mr. BECKER: I am not saying that: I am saying it is not done. State taxes are hard to prune and the only way that the burden on taxpayers in this State can be lifted is for the general efficiency of spending by the Government to be improved. This Budget does not state what figure remains outstanding to contractors for work uncompleted at June 30, 1972. Although we know how much money is owing to the Government, we do not know how much the Government owes for the supply of goods and services at that date. We do not know whether the Government pays its accounts on 30 days, 60 days or 90 days.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What has this to do with the Budget?

Mr. BECKER: We do not know to what the Government has committed to the State over the next 10 years. A change in Government could find a bankrupt Treasury and any financial commitments that a new Government might wish to undertake might have to be foregone. During the life of this Government State taxation has increased in comparison with the 1970-71 figure by $2,290,855. In 1971-72 the amount of money taken from the people of South Australia was a record $33,531,882. In this Budget the Government expects State taxation to return an additional $15,505,000. In this two-year period the State will take from the public purse $49,036,882. However, that amount cannot be taken from the public and put into the State coffers without having some effect. That is the extent to which this Government has gone in taxing the workers of this State, the people they say they represent and the people who put the Government there.

The Auditor-General reports that the cash in hand at June 30, 1972, was $46,779,417, $4,790,791 less than the year before. In other words, there has been a general run-down of the cash in the State Treasury. Such money is generally invested in the short-term money market to cover basic interest costs. However, during the past year the State was forced to borrow $20,000,000 and that has added to the State's interest bill.

In the past financial year we have had a deficit operation of $1,066,000 while receipts from taxation and Commonwealth grants and charges to the Public Service were increased by 18 per cent. As I have earlier mentioned, the amount due and unpaid at June 30, 1972 in Consolidated Revenue was $13,088,000, an increase of $1,353,000. I will be watching to see whether the Government makes a concerted effort to collect this amount outstanding. Although this figure represents to the public only a small percentage of the overall Budget, it is still a large sum in terms of the State's finances. Indeed, I can imagine what the Government could do if it had that $13,000,000 to spend now.

The public debt increased during the past financial year by $77,383,234 to a record high of $1,333,720,225. This, based on the State population of 1,184,600 as at December 31, 1971, is equivalent to $1,389 a head of population, representing an increase of $49 a head over the previous financial year. It is interesting to note that during the last financial year the average rate of interest concerning this debt was increased by .30 per cent; in other words, the borrowings were increased from 5.05 per cent in 1970-71 to 5.35 per cent in 1971-72. As a matter of interest, the average rate 10 years ago (1962-63) was 4.425 per cent. Many of the new loans raised by the State were, regrettably, at the rate of 7 per cent, some being about 6.8 per cent. The average interest rate is down to 5.35 per cent and, provided inflation can be checked, it would virtually pay the State to pay off the loans incurring a higher interest rate, leaving those loans incurring the lower interest rate.

It is interesting to note how the total public debt is made up and the areas of borrowing. Of the sum of $1,333,720,225, the amount of $1,293,252,555 is repayable in Australia; $26,283,400 is repayable in the United Kingdom; $10,765,735 is repayable in the United States; $1,324,420 is repayable in Canada;

$1,402,347 is repayable in Switzerland; and $691,768 is repayable in the Netherlands. Of course, these loans are arranged by the Commonwealth Government, but it indicates the colossal sum that is needed to finance a State such as ours, as well as indicating the colossal amount of capital required for State undertakings. One can imagine that, if an effort were made to reduce the public debt, our interest payments would also be reduced, perhaps providing a greater sum for private enterprise to develop this country.

I think this is probably one of the reasons why we have looked to oversea countries during the past decade for capital: to develop our resources. However, the simple fact is that the States have accumulated these huge public debts. It is disappointing to note that $109,474,000 has been paid to the South Australian Railways from Consolidated Revenue towards that department's deficits and special leave payments. This year, $22,500,000 has been provided, but the question is where will this end. Just how long can we continue to have this enormous drain on public funds? An advertisement appeared in the *News* on Monday, August 21, stating:

Why on earth should you go back to the temper-testing, noisy horn-honking, uneconomical, air-polluting, time-wasting city rush hour traffic? Use your brain . . . take a train . . .

When I saw that, I said, "Rather than use your brain and take a train, you need your head read!" The report states, by way of an example, that if a person caught a train from Oaklands, the five-day weekly ticket would cost $1.87, and it would take 22 minutes to reach Adelaide; there would be no station parking, no wear and tear on the car, and no expense involved in petrol, oil or tyres. The total weekly cost would be $1.87 to travel to Adelaide from Oaklands by train. However, according to the advertisement, if a person drove his car from Oaklands to Adelaide, the weekly cost of petrol would be $2.50; parking at the service station would cost $2.50; the journey would take 35 minutes; and oil, tyres and wear and tear would cost $1, the total cost being $6 a week. For seven years I travelled from Oaklands to the city by train and put up with being pushed, shoved, kicked, and trodden on, as well as suffering from the effects of dirt and dust. My neighbour and I got sick and tired of this, so five of us clubbed together and travelled to and from work by car.

The South Australian Railways cannot compete with that set-up. Each one of us took it in turn to take his car and was picked up at the front door (if I was taking my car, I would pick up my neighbours at their front door), and we would be delivered to a point within a short distance of our employment, having travelled in a car in comfort. In addition, the time that we left work for home was flexible, as we did not have to run to catch a train, to be ordered about by someone in a uniform, as well as being subjected to the elements on the way to and from the station. We were taken home to the front door and, with five using a car, the cost was reduced to $1.20 a week, compared to the present train fare of $1.87 a week. The rail service cannot compare with the convenience and comfort that we enjoyed.

Therefore, if the railways wishes to attract passengers, it will have to make its facilities more comfortable, and it will have to create better public relations between the public and its employees; it will also have to reduce fares to such a level that it will not prove economical for a person to take a car or, indeed, for a team of people to take a car to the city. Until this can be done, people will never be attracted back to the railways. As I have said, for seven years I put up with travelling on the train, as did my wife, who had to struggle with a pram on to a train, while others just watched.

Personally, I believe that the train guards and conductors are helpful but, unfortunately, there are the few who, because they are in uniform and may be in charge of a train, believe that the passengers are nothing but peasants. It is time that the South Australian Railways embarked on a greater public relations drive and provided some training or made some effort to make passengers feel welcome on the trains.

The classic example is the service received on the Glenelg tram. I will have nothing said against the Glenelg tram, nor against the drivers and conductors, who seem to know everyone, giving a friendly "Hullo" and being only too willing to help the passengers. Over the past two years the Glenelg tram service has improved considerably. We can be proud of the Glenelg trams and the service provided, but the men who work on those trams are proud to work on them and, because of this, are giving valuable public service. They accept and welcome their passengers. During the recent petrol strike, when they carried more passengers than ever before, they went about their duties in a manner suggesting that this

was a challenge to bring the people back to the trams, and I hope they have been able to increase the patronage.

It is pleasing to note that the Municipal Tramways Trust is continuing its programme of refurbishing the trams. I understand the cost of refurbishing a tram is about $8,000, so it is not a task to be completed within a short time. However, there is something about the tram of which we can all be proud. The only thing lacking is that perhaps consideration could be given to naming the trams. Ships have names, and trains have names. It is a wonder the trust has not considered naming the trams. After all, we have wonderful people who have served the State and I could not think of anything finer that a tram named after Sir Thomas Playford in honour of his service to South Australia. There are many other well-known South Australians who, I am. sure, would not mind having a tram named after them.

It was disappointing to see in the report of the Electricity Trust of South Australia, presented yesterday afternoon, that for the first time in 20 years the trust had sustained a loss of $334,146. It was foreshadowed that there could be an increase in tariffs. The last increase in tariffs was just over 18 months ago, an increase of about 3 per cent. However, it did not work out at 3 per cent in some areas; many of my constituents complained. I hope the trust can manage to avoid this increase. I shall quote from the report in relation to natural gas, and I believe this is most important. The Chairman said:

During the course of the year several discussions were held with the producers with a view to negotiating the purchase of additional gas for future use. No agreement has yet been reached. The trust holds the firm view that it should not be expected to pay more for additional gas than the price recently agreed by the producers for the possible sale of large quantities of gas to New South Wales. The gas is produced in South Australia and was discovered as a result of exploration licences granted by the South Australian Government. The public of South Australia could be expected to react strongly to any proposal that the trust should pay a price for gas which would in effect be a subsidy by electricity consumers in this State to gas users in New South Wales.

I hope those remarks will be noted by the Government and that every endeavour will be made to help the trust obtain the South Australian gas at a price that will not be subsidizing gas consumers in New South Wales.

Mr. Langley: Isn't our electricity the cheapest in Australia?

Mr. BECKER: I do not know. The honourable member is the electrician in the House. I am disappointed by the news that David Shearer Limited has finally met with financial difficulty and that the State has had to provide money to cover the guarantees given to help this company in the past. In his Financial Statement the Treasurer said:

Members will be aware that an offer has been made by Horwood Bagshaw Limited to the shareholders of David Shearer Limited which would enable the industry to be continued and even expanded at Mannum. Having regard to the fact that the Government would be obliged to meet large payments under its guarantee were David Shearer Limited to be placed in receivership, we have decided to offer to find much the same sum providing this will ensure that the industry is continued at Mannum.

We have been informed that a Bill will be brought down to provide for this. One other company, for which the Government was also guarantor, met with financial difficulties during the year, and these two companies together cost the State $1,650,000. The first company was at Port Pirie. I was always sceptical about it since it first started. It had a very glowing prospectus; the idea was good, but there was never sufficient working capital in the business. Unfortunately, Port Pirie has lost an industry and the State will have to bear a certain amount of cost in relation to the guarantee.

In the case of David Shearer Limited, the alarming point is featured in the financial pages of the *News* of this afternoon. A meeting was held today. The report states:

The future of David Shearer Ltd., Mannum-based agricultural implement maker, is doubtful following a meeting of the company's unsecured creditors held in Adelaide today. A poll failed to approve a proposal by Horwood Bagshaw Ltd. to acquire the company and pay unsecured creditors 20c in the $1 in respect of the company's debt. The voting was 117 for the proposal (representing $133,000 of debt) to 157 against (representing $485,000).

Mr. Bonnin, who addressed the meeting, said that the only way in which the creditors could receive payment, in his opinion, would be for the Government to write off the company's debts, so that the creditors could receive about 20c in the dollar. Mr. Denton, representing Horwood Bagshaw Limited, said that the company would probably purchase some of David Shearer's assets, including land, buildings and plant. However, it would not be able to purchase other assets, such as goodwill and patents. I hope that, no matter what happens in the final outcome, the people at present employed by David Shearer Limited will have

employment opportunities and that every encouragement will be given by the State to keep this industry at Mannum.

Looking back over the history of David Shearer Limited, I consider that Mannum was fortunate to have had the business develop as it did. Had it not been for the Second World War, David Shearer would never have expanded in such a way. Had it not been for the extremely sound financial assistance and advice received from time to time, particularly after the Second World War when the company was able to swing straight back into the production of agricultural machinery, the business could have closed down. Over the past 10 or 15 years the company has been fighting virtually a losing battle. It is a shame that the company will have to go into liquidation.

I wish to sound a warning about the credit card system that Australian banks may introduce. I hope that the Government will watch this matter carefully. The system was introduced in America some years ago and, in the first few years of its operation, American banks lost about $1,000,000,000 as a result of fraud associated with credit cards. There are traps in the credit card system, but I know that Australian banks are carrying out careful research into the matter.

Mr. Langley: Being a banker, you should know.

Mr. BECKER: If the honourable member had been listening, he would have heard me say that American banks had lost large sums in the early stages of the system. I should not like to see that kind of thing happen in Australia. Actually, I believe that most Australians will not accept the system; the retailers are certainly against it, for very good reasons. The credit card system establishes, through computers, a confidential file on each person holding a credit card. In this way, a person's movements, spending and habits can be followed, and his private affairs are no longer confidential. This breaks down the essence of Australian society as we have known it.

Some friends of mine have just returned from Munich, where they watched the Olympic Games. Unfortunately, they did not book for the games in advance, and they were astounded that the only tickets available had to be bought through the black market at $80 a day for each person. Had they wanted to watch all the events, it would have cost them $3,000. During their visit to Munich they were surprised at the tension in the city, the general lawlessness, the attitude of the people, and the breaking down of society. They gained the same impressions during their travels throughout Europe.

This Budget is providing for a welfare State, but with it may come the breaking down of our social structure. Anyone who has visited the United Kingdom in the last 12 months (and the member for Glenelg will agree with me here) will say that Australia is a wonderful place; what we have that no other country has is a way of life that we should preserve. I hope that this Budget will do exactly that. I hope it helps those who most need help, and I hope it is not designed to encourage those who do not want to work to persist in that attitude. Further, I hope it does not encourage those who have no respect for law and order and those who have no respect for other people's property to persist in those attitudes. The moment the State provides the means to break down our system the whole social structure will fall, and we will have a tense society. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. BURDON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.15 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 14, at 2 p.m.