LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, October 3, 1973

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

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

At 2.16 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the Council:

As to amendments Nos. 1 *and* 2:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendments.

As to amendment No. 3:

That the Legislative Council do further insist on its amendment and that the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary): I move:

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

The conference was conducted in an amiable manner and, after a fairly short session, was able to arrive at a compromise acceptable to both Houses. Although it was not the shortest conference I have attended, it was fairly short and we were able to consider and resolve all matters. The conference agreed that the Council should not further insist on its amendments Nos. 1 and 2, which sought to introduce into the Prices Act a provision that the declaration of goods to be placed on the declared list should be by way of regulation rather than proclamation. The conference received suggestions from the Premier regarding the discussions on that matter. Some assurances were given regarding an examination of the Prices Act in future to see what could be done about the difficulty the Council saw in relation to the review of prices declarations on an annual basis. After discussing this aspect and looking at the possibilities of perhaps amending the Act to provide for such eventualities, the conference found this would be a most difficult process to encompass. It then investigated further areas of compromise and eventually reached the decision I have reported.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I support the views of the Chief Secretary and I agree that the conference was conducted in a very good spirit. If I may just make some explanation on this matter, when the Bill first came to the Council I looked at the question of being able to amend it to reach the very position the conference reached in its decision. I found that it was impossible to amend the Bill along the lines that were agreed to at the conference. That is why, in my amendment, I went to the question of regulations to get out of my own difficulty. Agreement was reached at the conference that, regarding the annual review, it should apply only to certain parts of the principal Act, namely, those parts concerned with the declaration by proclamation of matters coming under price control in that 12-month period. This is a satisfactory solution because it allows other parts of the principal Act that should have permanence to become permanent. At the conference the Premier undertook to examine this question and to introduce legislation soon to interpret, virtually, the wishes expressed at the conference.

Meanwhile, agreement has been reached that the Council do not further insist on amendments Nos. 1 and 2, dealing with regulations and that, regarding amendment No. 3, that the Council do further insist, which means that the Act will have a life until December 31, 1974. I hope that the legislation to be introduced will divide the principal Act into two separate categories: one dealing with the powers that should be permanent, and the other so that Parliament will have some power regarding checks and balances on the decisions of the Executive.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: As the mover of the amendment, which it is now suggested will be sustained, I support the Chief Secretary's motion and express my pleasure at the result achieved at the conference and my approval of the suggestion that has been reached, namely, the Premier's undertaking, as outlined by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. I express my appreciation also to the Hon. Mr. Potter, who readily agreed to stand in as a nominee for one of the conference managers when I was unable to do so.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I thank the Council managers for the work they carried out yesterday and for reporting the result that has been achieved. I also wish to explain that, during the debate on this Bill, the two amendments (one moved by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and one moved by the Hon. Mr. Dawkins) were far better than the Government's proposal in the Bill. Of the two amendments, I favoured the one moved by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, and voted for it. As I thought that the two amendments were somewhat in conflict with each other, I did not vote for the amendment moved by the Hon. Mr. Dawkins. However, as the managers could not agree on the amendment moved by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, and as the principal agreement was on the Hon. Mr. Dawkin's proposal, I now support it wholeheartedly and commend the Hon. Mr. Dawkins for his initiative in opening the door for the improvement which the measure now provides.

Motion carried.

QUESTIONS

UNDERGROUND WATERS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: On June 14, Executive Council promulgated regulations to control underground waters in the South-East, and some time ago a committee was established to investigate the whole matter of underground water pollution in that area. On August 8, the Minister announced that the Government would be undertaking water pollution control and that a policy had been formulated following a completed detailed study of the present state and trend of water pollution in the South-East. Will the Minister of Agriculture ascertain from his colleague whether, on August 8 when that statement was made, a final report had been made by the committee to the Minister concerned? At a large public meeting held in Millicent on September 13 a motion was passed that the report be tabled in Parliament. Will the Minister also undertake to table in Parliament the report of this committee investigating underground water pollution in the South-East?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the Leader's question to my colleague and bring down a reply later.

PROTECTED BIRDS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Environment and Conservation, a reply to the question I asked on August 28 regarding permits that had been issued for the destruction or trapping of protected birds in this State?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Minister of Environment and Conservation reports that permits to destroy 16 species of protected birds have been issued since

July 3, 1972. Permits to destroy the following number of protected birds were issued during 1972-73:

Emus	3 017
Sulphur-crested cockatoos	261
Black swan	40
Crimson rosella	20
Adelaide rosella	265
Black-tailed native hen	700
Eastern swamp hen	200
Cormorants (various species)	92
White-faced heron	3
Blue heron	3
Magpie	34
Wedge tail eagle	31
Crested pigeons	6
Red-rumped grass parrots	6
Brown hawk	1

The above list relates to the actual allocation for the destruction of birds listed; it is not yet known whether all birds have been destroyed, as many returns required pursuant to the issue of permits have not as yet been received. Many permits are issued for more than one species of protected animal or bird, that is, emus and kangaroos; consequently, the total number of permits issued has not been included. A total of 42 permits to take protected animals from the wild under section 53 (1) (*d*) of the National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1972, was issued and permitted the taking of the following number of protected birds:

Protected ducks (various species)	16
Emu	1
Black swan	6
White-backed magpie	2
Black-tailed native hen	15
Little pied cormorant	4
Little black cormorant	4
Black cormorant	2
Major Mitchell cockatoo	1
Fairy penguin	1

As can be seen, no permits were issued to destroy rare species of animals, and only one permit was issued to take from the wild an injured Major Mitchell cockatoo. This involved a rescue operation.

PETROL

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary, representing the Premier.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My attention has been drawn to the difficult situation in which Mr. Eric Fullston, a storekeeper at the small town of Keyneton, finds himself. I believe this question follows the lines of one asked by the Hon. Mr. Chatterton some time ago. As a result of the Premier's request (and I think this is a fair statement) to the oil companies to reduce the number of their outlets, the small man has unfortunately often been penalized. The gentleman in question conducts the store at Keyneton which, with the petrol outlet that he now has, is a viable proposition; but without that outlet it becomes somewhat doubtful. He has been informed by the oil company concerned that his petrol licence will be revoked within a month. I do not think that life is easy for the country storekeeper, and this sort of loss of revenue will make it much more difficult; not only that, but I understand that in this case this person has the only petrol pump outlet in that district. Will the Chief Secretary take up this matter with the Premier, seeking his intervention with the oil companies in order that they may reconsider the manner in which they are making these reductions?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will take the honourable member's request to my colleague and bring down a reply when it is available.

PINE POSTS

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I have been requested by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, who has been temporarily called out of the Chamber, to ask whether the Minister of Agriculture has a reply to his question of September 25 about pine posts.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Although the Leader referred to "pine posts", I take it he meant sawn droppers and not the conventional round posts, the price of which has been increased by no more than 5 per cent. The Conservator of Forests reports that treated sawn droppers have not been a major item of production until recently. A substantial increase was necessary to make the price comparable with other treated sawn products, having regard to present-day costs of processing.

RIVERLAND FROSTS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: On behalf of the Hon. Mr. Story, I ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he has an answer to a question asked by the honourable member about Riverland frosts. I ask the question on my colleague's behalf because I understand a similar answer will be given today in another place.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: A survey of frost damage conducted by the district horticultural advisers in the weeks following the frosts that occurred in the Riverland areas between September 15 and September 21 has shown that the most severe damage was caused in the Loxton district, with lesser damage in the Renmark and Chaffey, Berri-Barmera and Waikerie-Cadell areas. Negligible damage has been reported from the Barossa and Clare-Watervale areas and no losses have been reported in the South-East. The Victorian Department of Agriculture has reported 1 300 acres (526 ha) of grapes in Sunraysia affected by frost, 400 acres (162 ha) of which has been severely damaged.

I am advised that by far sultanas were the most severely affected variety. Grenache, pedro and currants suffered occasional severe damage, and most other varieties in frost-prone areas were affected to some degree. In areas of severe frost all varieties suffered some damage as at the date of the frost all varieties had reached or passed the vulnerable bud-burst stage. Apricots, particularly the variety story, although at the vulnerable stage have largely escaped damage, possibly owing to tree height offering some degree of protection. A very small amount of damage to clingstone peaches has been reported, but this has been confined to the worst frost pockets. Citrus also appears to have escaped damage, as regards both damage to blossom shoots and fruit of the current Valencia crop. Citrus escaped damage because of the comparatively short duration of frost and the greater solids content rendering them more resistant to freezing injury. As to the financial effects of the frosts, because of their patchy occurrence it appears that loss of income will vary a great deal from grower to grower. Some individual properties suffered almost complete loss, while many were unaffected. I might add that some of the most severely hit vineyards in the Loxton area which were inspected on September 27 were then showing signs of recovery of shoot growth from secondary and dormant buds and from lateral growth on the least damaged new season's shoots. With sultanas, the fruitfulness of these shoots is very poor, and some growers are considering shortening canes and disbudding damaged shoots to ensure the formation of adequate and well placed replacement canes for next season. A field day to discuss this aspect with growers was held at Loxton on September 28.

SHACKS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: My question relates to a subject that has no doubt been drawn to the Minister's attention, the plight of shack owners with beach frontages and river frontages in South Australia. I believe that a shack owners association is now being formed which intends to discuss the matter with the Minister. Will he suspend any further action against shack owners and their licences until the association has discussed the matter with him?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Because I expected a question along those lines, I am able to give the following reply in regard to the matter. In many cases people have read into the Government's actions, and the statement made, more than is in the statement. The fundamental object of the policy is to prevent further development of Crown lands with water frontage pending an investigation of the existing position in order to determine the future use of these areas. All sites licensed for shack site purposes by the department were inspected prior to September 21, 1973, and notices of cancellation of licences over unimproved sites have been issued in accordance with the conditions of the licences. These conditions include: (1) termination on one months notice; (2) buildings to be such that they can be easily removed; and (3) on termination, improvements to be removed within one month. Those conditions are in the licence agreements that the people signed.

Local government authorities have been informed of the proposed investigation and have been requested to take action to prevent further development of those areas where, by arrangement with the Lands Department, councils re-let sites for the construction of shacks. The investigation will also include areas where shacks have been erected on reserved lands where such use is not in accordance with the terms of the reservation. It is unlikely that shacks constructed on areas dedicated for the specific purpose of shack site development will be affected. The Government has appointed a committee comprising representatives from the following departments: (1) Lands Department; (2) Marine and Harbors Department; (3) the Tourist Bureau and the State Planning Office of the Environment and Conservation Department; and (4) the Local Government Office of the Department of the Minister of Transport and Local Government.

The terms of reference are: (1) to define those areas along the sea coast, the banks of the Murray River and its associated lakes from which shacks should be removed; (2) to prepare a programme for the removal of existing shacks; and (3) to consider the provision of alternative sites for holiday home accomodation. The committee is to report to the Minister of Lands not later than June 30, 1974.

No action will be taken to phase out existing shacks until the investigation has been completed and the possibility of providing alternative areas for the establishment of holiday home villages has been studied and the results analysed. It is anticipated that where shacks are to be removed, the phasing out will not commence for some years, except where the present condition of the buildings or the type of construction warrants earlier removal. The inspection of those areas directly under the control of the Lands Department revealed a significant degree of unauthorized occupation both on foreshore areas and on abutting roads which may require earlier attention.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I also have received representations from constituents on Yorke Peninsula who are extremely concerned about this matter; however, some of that concern may have been alleviated by the Minister's reply. Nevertheless, I have been requested to ask the Minister whether he is prepared to listen to further representations from the people on Yorke Peninsula who are, as I have said, very concerned indeed about the announcements that have been made.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes, my door is always open; I never refuse to see anyone who has a point to put to me.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: My question is directed to the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Development and Mines. What method, either mechanical or chemical, will be used to produce caustic soda at the planned petrochemical plant at Redcliffs?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I shall endeavour to get an answer for the honourable member from my colleague.

ESCAPED PRISONERS

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Has the Chief Secretary further details about the committee of inquiry he foreshadowed relating to the prisoners who escaped recently from the Wayville Showgrounds?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I announced recently in the newspaper the appointment of an officer of the Crown Law Department to conduct an inquiry. I have a prepared reply for the Chamber, because I was asked who the officer conducting the inquiry would be and what would be the terms of reference. Mr. L. K. Gordon, Crown Solicitor, was directed as follows:

You are to investigate and report to me upon the following matters concerning the alleged escape from custody at the Wayville Showgrounds on Saturday, September 8, 1973, of three prisoners, namely, Danny Andrew Chapman, John Michael Farnsworth and Noel Russell McDonald, being prisoners detained in the Yatala Labour Prison.

Incidentally, Mr. Gordon is also a special magistrate. The terms of reference are as follows:

(1) What report, or reports, was, or were, given on or before September 8, 1973, by the Classification Committee of the Prisons Department in relation to each of such prisoners?

(2)(*a*) What instructions and orders, if any, were given in relation to the supervision and safe custody at the showgrounds of such prisoners and, if so, by whom?

(*b*) Whose responsibility was it to give any such instructions and orders?

(3) Were such instructions and orders reasonable and appropriate having regard to the circumstances and the purposes of the presence of such prisoners at the showgrounds?

(4) Were such instructions and orders carried out, and, if not, to what extent, and why were they not?

(5) (*a*) Who was in charge of such prisoners at the showgrounds on September 8, 1973?

(*b*) What was the nature and extent of the supervision and control which the person or persons so in charge exercised over such prisoners?

(6) In what area or areas did such prisoners move at the showgrounds during the period from 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. on September 8, 1973?

(7) Was such movement in accordance with all relevant directions and orders?

(8) Any matters of security which you consider to be relevant to the circumstances in which such prisoners escaped.

(9) The nature and accuracy of reports furnished by officers of the Prisons Department after the alleged escape and, if any such report was inaccurate, the circumstances in which such report was made.

NEW MATHEMATICS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I direct two questions to the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Education. First, as the Minister of Agriculture has indicated to me today that he has a reply to the question I directed recently to the Minister of Education regarding any proposed changes in the method of teaching mathematics or new mathematics, will he now give that reply? Secondly, I ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he would be so kind as to inform the Minister of Education that I heard on the radio this morning and read on page 3 of today's *Advertiser* the information I sought in that question; therefore, in the interests of proper Parliamentary procedure, will the Minister of Education please make every effort in future to see that replies are given in the first instance in Parliament rather than in the first instance to the media?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will convey the honourable member's second question to my colleague in another place and see what he has to say about the situation. In reply to the earlier question, I do not know whether this report is different from what appeared in the newspaper, but this is it:

The Education Department noted the reported comments of Professor Potts's talk in Perth. Subsequently a meeting was arranged between officers of the Education Department and university representatives, including Professor Potts, to discuss primary mathematics. At the meeting Professor Potts stated that the report did not, of course, give all that he had said and that he had read from both primary and secondary textbooks in other States as well as South Australia. The university people stated that some terms used in South Australian primary textbooks were not those generally used in .mathematics and that they felt there could be undue emphasis on set work and some aspects of geometry. The meeting decided that primary mathematics should be referred to the next meeting of the Primary Schools Advisory Curriculum Board with a recommendation that a committee should be set up to examine primary mathematics textbooks and the primary mathematics course. It is probable that this committee will be set up within the next few weeks and that the university, as well as secondary and primary schools, will be represented on this committee. In the example given on tables, the grade 2 child referred to would have been unable to give the answer of 9 x 7 even under the previous courses, as such tables were not taught until grade 3.

THIRD UNIVERSITY

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Recently I read in a news article that Monarto was to get the third university in South Australia. The article stated, in part, as follows:

It is understood the State Government has agreed in principle to the university being built at Monarto after having assessed at least three suggested sites.

It further stated:

Backers of this scheme had argued that another city university would create a Paris-style Left Bank atmosphere and open up the southern half of the city. However, the need for permanent employment centres at Monarto, together with pressure from people in the South-East for a tertiary institution, makes the Monarto decision more likely.

Has the Government decided to establish the third university at Monarto and was a site in the South-East itself considered as a part of any submission made for the siting of such a university?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I know of no suggestions made to the Government. They could have been made to specific Ministers, but the matter has not been referred to Cabinet and in those circumstances I am unable to comment on the honourable member's question.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: But you will refer it?

FRUIT CO-OPERATIVES

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: On September 25, I directed a question to the Minister of Agriculture regarding the problems of fruit co-operatives in the Riverland area. Has he a reply?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The first thing the honourable member should acknowledge is that the fruit canneries are co-operatives and as such are owned by the growers; therefore, any assistance given to canneries is, in effect, direct assistance to the growers. The situation in 1971 was that the financial position of both canneries had been seriously prejudiced by trading losses and the proposals then agreed to by the Australian and State Governments were designed to place them on a more secure footing. These proposals provided for the relief to Riverland Cannery and Jon Preserving Co-operative of the burden of long-term debt to the extent respectively of $1 800 000 and $780 000 which was, in round figures, the extent of their indebtedness at that time. The total amount of $2 580 000 was shared equally by the Australian Government and the State Government and took the form of a long-term interest free loan, which freed the co-operatives from future interest and repayment obligations. However, it was considered necessary by the two Governments that this assistance be applied towards strengthening the then very weak position of the co-operatives by ensuring that a proportion of the amounts saved through not having to service loans be applied to the creation of reserves. Accordingly, the following conditions were imposed:

(1) The co-operatives acknowledge that the $2 580 000 of debt continues on the basis that so long as they operate in a manner and to an extent considered by the two Ministers to be reasonable and in the public interest no interest or repayment shall be required for a period of 20 years, and so long thereafter upon such terms of interest and repayment (if any) as the Ministers may determine;

(2) The co-operatives agree that during the period of 20 years they will make a minimum levy of 4 per cent per annum of the amount of the interest-free loans for the purpose of crediting to an amortization reserve. The funds represented by the amount presently credited to such reserves and all subsequent credits thereto shall be retained by the co-operatives for the ordinary purposes of the co-operatives, but shall not be disbursed to members as a distribution of funds or reserves;

(3) If at any time a co-operative should go into liquidation, or should breach these arrangements, the whole of the loans shall be repayable to the State, and half of any amount so recovered shall be paid by the State to the Commonwealth or otherwise dealt with as the Commonwealth Minister may agree with the State Minister.

As to the $383 000 advanced by the Australian Government, this amount was provided by way of a repayable loan to facilitate cash payments to the growers by the canneries in respect of the 1971-72 crop. Since then representation has been made to the Australian Government for this loan to be converted to a grant as compensation for the effects of currency realignments. At this stage, the Australian Government has agreed to defer the payment of the first

instalment of principal and interest while the submission by the industry for compensation is being considered and the State Government is urging the Australian Government to make an early and favourable decision.

TEACHER'S SALARY

The Hon. C. M. HILL: On June 21 last I asked a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Education, regarding an unfortunate mixup in a teacher's salary. A few weeks ago I asked a further question seeking a reply to that question, together with an explanation for the long delay in furnishing a reply. As the Minister of Agriculture has indicated to me today that he has at least some information in regard to that question, can he now give the report from the Minister of Education?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: My colleague in another place has provided the following reply:

The Teachers Salaries Board Award provides that an allowance will be paid to teachers from the first day of January in the year in which they are conferred with relevant university degrees. The present system, which has been in operation for a number of years, is to use university commemoration lists from which are extracted the names of departmental teachers who have been awarded degrees or diplomas. Mr. G. N. Pearce, who is an employee of the Education Department, was wrongly granted a degree allowance because another Mr. Pearce with identical surname and Christian names appeared on the commemoration list. This is the only error of this nature that has occurred since this system has been in operation. As from the beginning of 1974, no new bonded scholarships for students commencing degree courses at the University of Adelaide, Flinders University or the South Australian Institute of Technology will be provided by the Education Department. As tertiary institutions will therefore increasingly be unable to identify certain students as student teachers of the Education Department, it will be inappropriate for the required information to be provided to the department by those institutions.

In future, therefore, to ensure that further errors do not occur, teachers will be required to notify the department in the required form of the awarding of a degree-diploma. It is desirable that, because of taxation rates, payment of the allowance that such award attracts should be made by June 30, as payment is back-dated to January 1 of the year in which such an award is made. Most commemoration ceremonies are held in May and, provided that the teacher produces evidence of the award by then, payment will be effected by June 30. If notification is not received by the end of May, the department may not be able to have the payment processed until the first or subsequent pay in the next financial year. So that teachers may be informed of the required procedure, appropriate notices will be published in the *Education Gazette* early in March and May of each year.

SUBURB NAMES

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: Can the Minister of Lands comment on a newspaper article regarding action taken by the Geographical Names Board?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The proliferation of suburb names in the past caused considerable confusion to people concerned with accurate descriptions of localities, particularly the post office. Some 30 years ago an advisory committee (the Nomenclature Committee) was set up and, in consultation with the post office and councils, it eliminated many names and maintained a degree of control in naming localities. However, the success depended on the voluntary co-operation of all parties concerned, and ultimately the committee considered that the allocation of names should be controlled by specific legislation. Subsequently, a Bill was introduced into Parliament in December, 1969. The Bill followed closely legislation already on the Statute Books of or in preparation by the other States. The Minister of Agriculture, in his second reading explanation, said:

This (the legislation) would prevent a confused situation arising in which land subdividers assigned estate names to comparatively small areas, thus creating a multiplicity of names which can cause confusion in the minds of the public. The Real Estate Institute has co-operated actively with the board in its endeavour to administer the Act effectively and has regularly drawn the attention of its members to the requirements under the legislation. However, numerous breaches continued, particularly in advertising, and since the beginning of this year the board has notified individual agents and developers of every breach brought to its notice and the consequence of continuing to disregard requirements of the Act. It can scarcely be said that the board has acted other than in a generous and considerate manner, and it has actively pursued a three-year programme of education before issuing warning notices. This is contrary to what has been stated in the press, namely, that certain people have been shocked as a result of receiving warning notices from the board. The Act is clear in its intentions: only names officially approved under the provisions of the Act may be used in all circumstances, including advertising. The board has no prosecution pending and will commence proceedings only with the greatest reluctance. Maps showing official names may be inspected at the Central Plan Office, Lands Department, and copies may be purchased.

ENTRANCE QUALIFICATIONS

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply from the Minister of Education to my recent question regarding entrance qualifications to universities and other institutions?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: It is understood that the 19 students described in the *Sunday Mail* as "unqualified" were, in a report that appeared in the *Australian,* described as older students who had not gained Higher School Certificates but who had passed through a series of tests that included Australian scholarship aptitude tests and some interviews. The successes of this group of students would seem to provide some grounds for considering these non-syllabus based questions, together with some interviews, as a sound predictor of university success for this minority group of mature age students. However, the majority of the university intake qualified for entry on the results of the Higher School Certificate examinations. The Special Committee of the Public Examinations Board considered these articles and has been obtaining further information about the use of these tests by other States before making recommendations to the board regarding any changes in the methods of assessing fifth-year students for entry to university. The experiment appears particularly appropriate to the minority group of mature age applicants and possibly to the group of students attending schools where university entrance courses are not available. It is intended to draw the attention of admission boards of all tertiary institutions to this matter.

LAND VALUES

The Hon. C. M. HILL: As I understand that criticism is voiced in today's press at the cost of industrial land in the Regency Park area (land being sold by the Government to, I understand, private enterprise), can the Minister of Lands comment on this matter? More importantly, can he inform the Council of the basis of his department's costing of that industrial land prior to its being offered for sale?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The land has been priced and is now available for purchase. In fixing the prices the Land Board had regard to the market value of industrial

land in metropolitan Adelaide, taking into account the superior services provided at Regency Park, which are as follows:

1. Heavy-duty industrial roads throughout the subdivision with easy access to established highways.
2. Industrial-type sewerage and water connections to each section.
3. Underground stormwater drainage connected to each section.
4. Availability of natural gas and three-phase electricity to each section.
5. The situation of the subdivision in proximity to the centre of Adelaide, the rail services available, established intense industrial development, and the adjoining proposed Islington Highway.

Direct comparisons were made with recent vacant land sales at Cavan, Dry Creek, Wingfield, Dudley Park, Ferryden Park, Torrensville, West Lakes and Plympton North, where prices ranged from $8 000 an acre (.405 ha) for unserviced land at Wingfield (which is a noxious trade area) to $35 000 an acre for partly serviced land at North Plympton. Taking into consideration the above aspects, the average price for the general industrial area was fixed at $30 000 an acre. The prices fixed for each section are tempered by the terms of sale where 20 per cent deposit is required with the balance being paid over five years. Regarding todays *Advertiser* article, the sales quoted are for industrial lands which are not as conveniently located and which do not enjoy the same facilities and standards of service as provided for the land at Regency Park. It is further pointed out that the price of $40 000 an acre, quoted for the land at Regency Park, is incorrect. The range is from $29 400 to $32 800 per acre, depending on the location.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: As the Minister has just said that his department (and therefore, presumably, the Government) is offering land for sale at market value, can the Government object to private enterprise offering land for sale at market value?

The Hon. T. M. Casey: What type of land are you talking about?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I am interested to know to which land the honourable member is referring. If he is referring to the Government's expressed policy regarding price control on land for serviced residential blocks for family occupation, I would say that the comparison between what is being done regarding industrial land and what is being done regarding serviced residential blocks may not be considered consistent. However, the Government's expressed policy concerns the control of land for serviced residential blocks to be occupied by families.

SCHOOL DAMAGE

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply from the Minister of Education to my recent question regarding safeguards against damage to school buildings?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Minister of Education reports that the matter of damage to schools has been under examination for some time and is extremely complex. Whereas it is a matter of considerable concern that public funds are required to be expended to make good losses and/or damage caused by vandalism or burglary at schools, the cost of protective devices or security patrols must be weighed against the losses sustained. By their very nature, schools are open institutions which, unlike factories and commercial premises, are difficult to make secure. The installation of protective devices need not necessarily have any significant effect on losses, because of the number of buildings in each location, the impracticability of placing devices in each building, and because extensive damage can take place without a vandal entering a building. This is an Australia-wide problem, and the respective State Education Departments are carrying out various measures on a trial basis, the effectiveness of which will be made known to each other after a period of use. In this State, a committee comprising representatives of the Education, Police and Public Buildings Departments is examining the alternatives available with a view to recommending the appropriate course of action to be taken.

GOVERNMENT OFFICE BUILDING

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Government Office Building (Flinders Street).

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 26. Page 950.)

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): At about the beginning of this century Ralph Hodgson wrote:

Twould ring the bells of heaven,
The wildest peal for years,
If Parson lost his senses
And people came to theirs,
And he and they together
Knelt down with angry prayers
For tamed and shabby tigers
And dancing dogs and bears,
And wretched, blind, pit ponies,
And little hunted hares.

People are more aware today of the sufferings of animals, wild and tame, yet there is a long way to go before the existing laws can be relaxed. In fact, even lawmakers are more educated in the requirements needed to give animals protection and, indeed, to give them the chance to survive. There are still practices in the world that must arouse fury against and shame for mankind; I refer to the live skinning of seals, the forcible feeding of geese, and the chaining of calves from birth in such a position that they can never move. Although these are all oversea practices, here in Australia we have our own forms of cruelty that must be legislated against.

It is easy to view with suspicion the treatment of animals in countries other than our own. It is easy also to ignore or care nothing about our own actions in the matter. I refer to an example in Britain. It is a commonly held, often expressed belief that the French and Spaniards trap and cook the English larks on their migratory flights to and from North Africa. Imagine my shattered equilibrium when I found *tetes d'atouette* on a menu in Southern France. Much later, I discovered that these were veal olives and not a casserole of larks' heads!

In the early days of the institution of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, virtually all vehicles were drawn by horses and bullocks. There were hundreds of thousands of these animals in Australia, and there were innumerable cases of overworking, ill-treatment and lack of attention to suffering animals. This is when the R.S.P.C.A. had its greatest and most arduous work to do. I give all honour to the work of the R.S.P.C.A. today. However, today, with the disappearance of draught animals and with the growth of a much greater community interest in domesticated pets and working animals, more attention has been focussed on dogs, cats and bird life. It is in this

sphere that attempts to make rational and sensible laws are so often clouded by irrational and unbalanced demands.

Honourable members have before them amendments to the Act that are simple, desirable and acceptable to most intelligent people. Briefly, they are aimed at ensuring that chained animals will be released for at least one hour in every 12 hours, and that caged creatures shall be given room to move in a natural manner. We have all been shocked by instances where either of these reasonable requirements has been denied. The Bill increases penalties for existing offences and introduces a much-needed clause regarding the abandonment of animals. The practice of abandoning dogs and cats in the metropolitan area or out in the country is also to be prohibited. If it passes, this provision will reduce not only the needless suffering of some of these creatures but also something that has always been a great nuisance to councils and country landowners. This practice of abandonment, which becomes prevalent at a time when dog licence payments are due, although it is carried out on cats all the year round, is a kind of Australian cruelty of a very strange type.

It is difficult to understand the mentality of any person guilty of this action, but we breed such persons by the hundreds in South Australia. How any family can callously abandon its own animal for the sake of a $1 fee is beyond my comprehension, and it opens wide a field for psychological study. Both country and city people who have vital interests in the matters contained in this Bill have for a long time been pressing the previous Government and this Government to act in this matter. It is strange that it has been forced upon private members to act in order to get these matters ventilated or adjusted. I myself believe that the whole Act should be reviewed in the light of modern conditions and practices. There are many people and societies with a real interest in animal life. They are dissatisfied with the provisions currently on the Statute Book.

Honourable members will have received the letter from the Bird Protection League giving eight points worthy of our consideration. Certainly, there are many sections of the Act that we could study in depth. It is over 20 years since the Act was considered as a whole. I congratulate the author of this Bill and give it my wholehearted support.

The Hon. C. M. HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

LAND COMMISSION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 27. Page 979.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I wonder how those people in South Australia who own or have title to a block of land like the idea of Mr. Dunstan and Mr. Whitlam being the permanent *caveat* on the titles in their possession—because that is exactly what this Bill provides. We have seen over the last fortnight or so much of the pre-conditioning techniques of the Premier armed, as he is, with an army of public relations officers and with press assistance paid for by the taxpayers. We have seen those techniques; we know them from the past and we see them again in relation to this Bill. These pre-conditioning techniques, in my opinion, are being used to divert the attention of the public from certain parts of this Bill.

I wish to quote some of these pre-conditioning techniques to which this Council has become accustomed over the last few years. I refer to a report in the *Advertiser* of September 14 headed "'Drivel' talked on land prices, Dunstan says". As we go on through this matter, we see the Premier attempting, virtually, to challenge or accuse the Legislative Council of all manner of things long before the Bill even entered this Chamber for debate. In last week's *Sunday Mail,* there was the headline "No retreat on land—Dunstan". The article states:

> The State Government has no intention of changing its legislation on land price control. Its Land Commission Bill, which passed through the House of Assembly last Wednesday, is due for debate in the Upper House this week. The Premier, in a statement to the *Sunday Mail* yesterday, accused real estate interests of adopting scare tactics in an attempt to hoodwink the public about land price control legislation. "Their motive is obvious," he said. "They want to prepare the ground so that the reactionaries in the Legislative Council can reject the Bills or water them down to suit the big speculators."

As I have said, in this Chamber we have become accustomed to these techniques and, when the Premier uses his best theatrical talents, the Council is duly warned that the Bill needs close examination. I assure this Chamber and the people of South Australia that this Bill does deserve close examination. I know I speak for every honourable member in this Chamber when I say that any realistic legislation that will assist the people of this State to own their own homes and land will be wholeheartedly supported by every member. It is of concern to every member of this Chamber just as much as it concerns the State Government that land and housing prices have escalated so dramatically over the last few months and made it more difficult for people, especially young people, to own their own homes. But the Premier is trying to lay the blame for this position upon land developers, builders, land agents, landowners, or any other section of the community that he can lay his hands on. He has ruthlessly attacked those people and it is unrealistic and unjust, for some of the blame rests just as strongly on the shoulders of the Government, whether State or Commonwealth.

I refer now to the Planning and Development Act that passed this Chamber in 1967. I well recall the debates in this Chamber and once again the performance of the Premier on the amendments we inserted, because I recall the plea made here that the application of unrealistic administration under the Planning and Development Act could cause a shortage of building blocks for the people and there would be an escalation of prices if the administration of that Act was not realistic.

I recall the warnings given in relation to the Building Act and the Builders Licensing Act. I am not criticizing that legislation, but an unrealistic administration in those areas will be a factor causing an escalation of prices for people in this State. All those measures have contributed to the escalation of prices in South Australia. At the Commonwealth level, the inflationary Commonwealth Budget and the predictable flow-on from that Budget of increased interest rates has also had an effect upon costs of developmental land and housing. So it is unfair for the Government to place all the blame for the present position on the shoulders of certain sections of the community. I know that in relation to land speculation this is a facet being considered, but my point is that it is not the total picture and it is completely wrong that the Government should absolve itself from all blame and throw the blame for this on the shoulders of certain sections of the community.

I agree with the Government that the establishment of a land commission has some merit but I do not agree with the tremendous power given to that commission in this Bill. The emotional appeal of a land commission, coupled

with other political veneers that the Premier has placed upon it, cloaks some aspects of the legislation that seriously challenge the rights of individuals. I said in my opening remarks that every freehold title in South Australia will have a *caveat* implanted upon it in the name of Mr. Dunstan and Mr. Whitlam. In the debates in this Chamber, these aspects of this legislation must be exposed and opposed with vigour. Having said that, I hope that the uncompromising and unfair attitude that the Premier has adopted in this matter does not present an unscalable obstacle to the passage of realistic legislation. In other words, I hope the Premier has not deliberately painted himself into a political corner.

The history of this measure goes back to two policy speeches—that made by the Australian Labor Party at the last State election and that made by Mr. Whitlam at the last Commonwealth election. In the A.L.P. policy speech, in an almost casual reference to the need to control land prices in South Australia, the Premier claims he has a mandate for the provisions of this Bill and other measures that will flow through at a later stage. The Federal A.L.P. policy speech dealt with the establishment of a land commission. This is very flimsy ground for claiming a mandate for the measures at present before the Council. The Premier has clearly indicated that, as far as he is concerned, the Bill shall pass unamended. However, there are matters in this Bill that no responsible member of Parliament could allow to pass without challenge, and I hope to give sound reasons to the Council and to the people of South Australia why this Bill needs amending.

The Bill is the brainchild of Mr. Dunstan and Mr. Whitlam. The Commonwealth Government, with a pocketful of the taxpayers' money, is trying to buy its way into the position of controlling the States in connection with matters of land tenure; that opinion is borne out by a Queen's Counsel's opinion, which I obtained. The Western Australian Labor Government was, in the first place, to be the guinea pig in connection with the introduction of this type of legislation. If one looks at the history of the legislation in Western Australia, one sees signs that the Labor Government there is getting the jitters in connection with Commonwealth demands for legislation at the State level. In Western Australia the Bill has passed the House of Assembly, but the Government has not proceeded with the legislation in the Legislative Council.

In Tasmania a similar position appears to be developing. The responsible Minister in Tasmania asked for an urgent meeting to be called last Friday of the responsible Ministers in the States to examine the demands that the Commonwealth Government is making in regard to land commission legislation. The Tasmanian Bill has not been proceeded with at present. So, with two Labor Governments standing in the sidelines and not moving and with one State Minister calling for an Australia-wide conference of Ministers to consider the States' approach to the Commonwealth's demands, in this State the Bill has been forced through the House of Assembly during a 5 a.m. sitting and pushed through to this Council. This Council now has the opportunity to amend the Bill, which will in some ways become the pattern for the rest of Australia.

So, the Legislative Council in this State is the guinea pig for the whole of Australia in connection with this fundamental change in our whole approach to land tenure. It is up to the Council to try to fashion out of this Bill an acceptable pattern for the operation of a land commission which may well set the pattern for the whole of Australia. We have to begin that task with the background of the Premier's uncompromising and arrogant attitude. One may ask the Chief Secretary, "What happened at the conference last Friday which was called by a Minister in the Labor Government in Tasmania? What decisions were made by the responsible State Ministers at that conference? Were they completely satisfied with the Commonwealth Government's approach?" Surely this Council, being the first Upper House in Australia to make a judgment on this new concept, should be entitled to that information before the legislation passes this Council and goes on the Statute Book. Is this Council to be deliberately kept in the dark? The Premier appears to wish to force the Council to make a hasty decision. South Australia appears to be the odd man out, as far as the States are concerned, in connection with the Commonwealth's demand.

Of course, other matters could be examined in a similar way. The Commonwealth Government has set up a commission to inquire into the whole question of land tenure, but this Bill is being introduced before we can have the benefit of the commission's examination of the matter. The Bill is already in this Council and decisions have already been made by some Ministers at State level in relation to the Commonwealth's proposals for an Australia-wide system of land commissions. Also, statements have been made in relation to land tenure before the commission dealing with that matter has reported to the people of Australia.

I should now like to examine the question of leasehold tenure, as opposed to the traditional system that has prevailed in South Australia. I say with some pride that every outside observer has agreed that the freehold tenure system that we have in this State is probably the best in the world; that concept, with which we have lived for so long, is now under threat as a result of this Bill. The Government's decision to introduce this Bill indicates to me no more than a long-term objective of the policy of the Labor Party in Australia—public ownership of land. Under that policy the individual becomes no longer the owner of his land: he becomes dependent on the State for shelter, losing his independence, which home ownership and land ownership provide. The argument used in favour of leasehold is that it will reduce the cost of housing, but I challenge that argument and I ask all honourable members to examine the position existing in the Australian Capital Territory, where leasehold tenure has existed for a long time. Experience has shown that in the Australian Capital Territory it is not the type of land tenure that determines property prices but rather the rate at which serviced land can be made available.

Any examination of leasehold tenure in the Australian Capital Territory will show that the people who are advantaged under that system are the wealthy: it is not the young person requiring a block of land to build on who appreciates the leasehold system. Let me give an illustration of how interference of Government in a leasehold system can provide a situation where only the wealthy can be involved. Members may have information about what is happening in the Northern Territory, where a leasehold title is given for a block of land where the Government decides there will be only one caravan park or only one shopping area or only one motel. A lease will be issued for auction on the understanding that it is the only lease that will be given in the area for one of the purposes I have referred to. The lease is put up for auction, and the only people who can buy it are the wealthy; in these circumstances, no encouragement is given to the individual who wants to start in a small way, build up a business, and provide a service. This is one outcome of the leasehold system, under which the Government can attach provisions

to a lease stating that the lease can be used only for a certain purpose.

The freehold system meets the traditional desire of a majority of South Australians for home-ownership, and the force of this desire should not be overlooked by the Government in seeking to impose leasehold tenure, which is the stated intention of the South Australian Government. South Australia gave birth to the Torrens title system, and is a State where freehold ownership has traditionally represented the culmination of the average family's aim. The advantages of freehold tenure are the maximum certainty for the purchaser and the financier, as opposed to the potential uncertainty created by a Government lease, where one party to a contract can vary the conditions of that contract at any time during the term of the lease. Freehold property is accepted by financiers as security for loans either for the purpose of purchasing a dwelling or for other needs, such as borrowing for a family business or to enable offspring to establish a home.

Freehold property financing is likely to retain its high priority with lenders, so that the great proportion of available funds will be directed to freehold areas in preference to leasehold, unless the leases are in perpetuity or of a sufficiently long term. Thus, the borrowing costs of construction for a house on leasehold land could be higher, and the availability of sufficient finance for this purpose could be lower. I have already indicated that the Canberra experience does not prove the point that leasehold land is in any way advantageous to the smaller person in the community who is seeking to own his own house.

Another important question relating to freehold title is the equity established by the individual for himself and his heirs. A house is often the only substantial asset that many people acquire in a lifetime. A freehold property for many represents the main, and probably the only, real hedge against inflation. Such an asset is of importance to a widow who is possibly left to rear children. The security that home ownership brings to retired people and pensioners provides, at that stage of life, relatively low-cost shelter and leaves diminished income available to meet the needs of living in a situation that is compounded by continuing inflation. The financial advantage to a Government in a freehold title system (and therefore to the taxpayer, of course), in selling rather than leasing land in new cities and existing centres, is one of overriding importance.

Freehold titles also give people the incentive to maintain and improve properties. This point is demonstrated when one compares the situation under the lease system, where lessees can be indifferent to the upkeep of a house. The relative simplicity of the administration under the existing Torrens title system, by comparison with the administration of large-scale areas, must be considered. In its recent submission to the Land Tenure Commission, the Department of the Capital Territory predicted that substantial administrative machinery and costs would be involved with the extension of lease systems into the States.

By those remarks one can well judge that I look with a rather jaundiced eye at any decision made at a political level to change the title system from a predominantly freehold one to any system where the commission can buy huge tracts of land and issue titles under leasehold tenure. The Bill before us is so broad and so vague in the scope of its acquisition powers that it will bring substantial uncertainty into land dealings, and complete uncertainty to anyone at present owning his own land or his own house, or those people who aspire in the future to own their own house and land. The Bill contains no protective provisions whatever as far as the individual is concerned; his private home can be taken and he could have to wait two or three years to receive compensation. Each honourable member in this Chamber would have had experience of the Government's acquiring property. Often the experience is not happy for the person whose property is being acquired.

Major industry cannot be expected to build or obtain land with the intention of building if it believes that it could be seriously embarrassed by any arbitrary decision made by the Minister, who will have power to step in and take over that land. People involved in industry could spend much money in planning for industrial expansion only to find that the expansion is frustrated by the arbitrary decision made by one man, the Minister, in charge of this legislation.

Retailers in the commercial world could also have problems when planning expansion because there is no guarantee that land held for expansion will not be taken under the terms of this Bill. The land does not have to be taken for a specific purpose, but could be taken to prevent expansion taking place. I concede that the Government should obtain land for urban development, but the powers the Minister wishes to assume in this legislation are not, in my view, a fair solution to anyone in the community.

The Fijian Constitution, in approaching this problem, gives a person whose land is to be acquired an opportunity to challenge the decision on the ground of fairness. The Bill before us contains no right of appeal whatever. I believe an appeal should at least be provided on the ground of whether the acquisition is fair or unfair. Even with the limited powers of acquisition that exist under present legislation there has been, in this State, unfair acquisition: I make that statement knowing that it is correct. It is unfair acquisition when a landholder is placed deliberately in the worst possible bargaining position by an overbearing Government.

I can remember when the Hon. Mr. Chatterton and the Hon. Mr. Creedon made their maiden speeches in this Council and spoke about the problems of the small man. I made the point then, and I make it again today, that under this Bill the small man has absolutely no protection at all. The Minister, with his arbitrary power over the commission, can decide that a certain function will be carried out by the commission, and there is absolutely no right of appeal. In the whole question of land acquisition we have seen the small people in the community badly treated as a result of the power of Government to acquire property; and to acquire it not necessarily for the purposes for which the Government requires it.

I believe that all honourable members appreciate that it is difficult to attract industry to South Australia because of the geographical situation here. One of the most important aspects of attracting industry to this State must surely be the whole question of security of tenure. I suggest that the Bill before us should be amended so that if any person has a unit of land in one ownership, which is intended to be developed as one project, that land cannot be taken by the commission. Unless something of this sort is done, industrialists, retailers, and small commercial people who have made purchases of land for future expansion have absolutely no protection whatever against any arbitrary decision the Minister may make. If one looks at court decisions, one finds that the courts have often spoken of what they term a planning unit. The High Court has used some tests in relation to the definition of such a unit. I believe the legislation should contain the definition of a planning unit, and if that unit is being held for future expansion of an industry or commercial activity it should

be exempt from the power of the commission to assume that title.

If the Government says it is concerned about speculation, that also could be covered. Where no development takes place on a planning unit for a certain time acquisition could proceed. Going back to the example of Fiji, the Government there must prove that the land is the best that can be taken for the purpose required; in other words, there must be a purpose, the purpose must be stated, and the land being taken must be the best available for the purpose. This Bill allows the assumption virtually by the commission of any title in South Australia and there is absolutely no need to state a purpose for that acquisition. That is an arbitrary power no Government and no Minister should have over the people of this State. There is no restriction in the Bill on reasons for acquisition. I shall quote briefly from the Planning and Development Act, section 63 (2) of which reads as follows:

The Authority may, with the approval of the Minister, either by agreement or compulsorily, acquire or take land for the purposes of developing it and making it suitable for any purpose for which the land is proposed to be, or is, reserved, or is to be used, preserved or developed under any authorized development plan or planning regulation made under this Act.

That is an extremely wide power, and if the objectives of the Commonwealth cannot be achieved under it I do not know why we need expand the powers so much in this Bill. I shall compare section 63 (2) with clause 12 of the Bill to illustrate the point I have been trying to make. In the Act we see power for the Government to acquire or take land for the purpose of developing it under any authorized development plan or planning regulation, but let me read clause 12 (1) to the Council, dealing with the functions of the commission:

The functions of the Commission are as follows:

(*a*) to acquire land for present or future urban expansion or development, for the establishment of new urban areas, or for other public purposes;

That means nothing at all. Under the acquisition provisions of the Planning and Development Act it must be for a specific purpose, and one will find this in practically every acquisition Act in the free world. The Government has the power of acquisition, but it must be for a specific purpose.

I know that the present Government has extended its power and acquired land for road-widening purposes and taken that land, and I believe (in my opinion, anyway) that that land was not taken specifically for road-widening purposes, but for another purpose altogether, a private matter. The function of the commission under clause 12 (1) is to acquire land for present or future urban expansion or development, and for other public purposes. Other functions are as follows:

(*b*) to manage and develop or re-develop the land so acquired;

(*c*) from time to time, as prevailing circumstances require, to make available such of its land as the Commission considers necessary or expedient for the orderly establishment, expansion or development of urban areas, or for other public purposes;

(*d*) to promote integration and economy in the development of land for urban purposes;

(*e*) to provide, or arrange for the provision of, services and amenities for the use or benefit of the present or future community in new urban areas;

Surely that is wide enough for anyone, with the use of the words "for other purposes". What does that mean? How is it defined? It could be nothing. Then we come to clause 12 (1) (*f*):

(*f*) to perform such other functions—

(i) as may be necessary or incidental to the foregoing; or

(ii) as may be assigned to the Commission by the Minister.

Then, turning to page 6 of the Bill, we see the following words:

In the performance of its functions under this Act, the Commission may, notwithstanding any enactment or law to the contrary—

In other words, the commission is outside the Planning and Development Act; it can thumb its nose at that Act. Once again, all the powers are outlined. Going back to clause 6, one sees the constitution of the committee. The commission shall comprise three members appointed by the Governor, two appointed by the Premier after consultation with the Prime Minister, and one being a person nominated by the Prime Minister after consultation with the Premier. Take your partners for a circular waltz! The Bill gives the Minister and the Prime Minister complete and absolute power to tell the commission or to assign to the commission such other functions as they think may be necessary, and the functions of the commission are listed, notwithstanding any enactment or law to the contrary. That power, I believe, is completely unnecessary. In my opinion, the Planning and Development Act contains sufficient powers and restraints to see that the objectives of the Commonwealth views on land commission operation in this State can be fulfilled under this principle without placing every freehold title in South Australia virtually at the whim of a Minister.

I shall comment briefly on other matters contained in the Bill. I have dealt with most matters, but I must re-emphasize that, under clause 12, the decision of the commission to acquire land compulsorily is not subject to any right of appeal or challenge in any court of law unless it can be shown that it went beyond the powers which are so widely expressed in this Bill. The powers conferred upon the commission by the Bill would enable it to acquire compulsorily any private home anywhere in South Australia, not necessarily for any specific purpose. The powers conferred on the commission would empower it compulsorily to acquire any shop. If, for example, there should be an argument under another Act of Parliament between the Government and an individual, the commission could step in and compulsorily acquire that land and there would be no right of appeal to a court of law. Such is the breadth and width of the power that the commission could step in and publicly acquire a piece of land, yet there is no right of appeal, whereas under another piece of legislation there would be that right. The result is that no landholder can have any sense of security with this Bill in its extremely wide form, and the carrying out of any development, which is a common feature today, would become extremely risky.

Summing up, any realistic measures that the Government may wish to adopt to encourage house ownership in South Australia, to provide long-term and short-term cheap finance to young people to own their own home, and to house people in a proper manner will be supported by the Council, but I am concerned at the Premier's extremely arrogant attitude in regard to this Bill: on at least two occasions he has said that he will not accept any change to this concept. As I have already pointed out, it is not only the Council that will be concerned with this legislation, but other Australian Labor Party Governments are concerned and have expressed concern about the legislation now before us. I know that the statements which have been made by the Premier probably had overtones of playing politics. It is fun and games to accuse

the Council of all manner of things, particularly before honourable members have had a chance to debate the Bill. Any assessment of the Bill, made by any individual South Australian in reading the extremely wide powers which the commission has and which is under the control of a Minister and probably a second Prime Minister, can only cause alarm to all those who presently own their own home or land or who hope to do so. I believe that the Bill requires amending to make it more realistic and more in line with the aspirations of South Australians. If that is the case, I assure the Premier that he will not be criticized by the Council if he assumes a less arrogant attitude. On the other hand, if the Premier wants to remain the odd man out in Australia in seeking total powers over every freehold title in the State, he must expect the Council to defend the rights of the individual against such an unwarranted and unnecessary concept.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 27. Page 984.)

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): I must, as other honourable members have done in this debate, refer to the extraordinary increase in State taxation that has taken place during the last three years. It is just as desirable for Governments to live within a reasonable income as it is for private businesses and individuals. The proposition that a State Government may promise to spend moneys wildly in excess of what it knows it is likely to receive from the Commonwealth Government and from normal sources of income and, without regard to the consequences, make up for its lack of frugality by large percentage increases in State taxation is to be deprecated. South Australia is having great difficulty in keeping its present industries, let alone attracting new ones, and this is one of the first fruits of this irresponsibly lavish use of money. At a time when most Australians are making a genuine effort to beat inflation, the State Government is increasing its tax income to a far greater degree than inflation or wages are currently increasing. And for what purpose?

Is it to manufacture new goods and products with which to beat inflation? Not a bit of it: it is to extend and staff a series of non-productive theoretical committees and departments. Let us look at these figures once again. In 1970-71, State taxation, according to the Auditor-General's Report, totalled just over $58 000 000. We are presented here with an estimate for 1973-74 of over $137 000 000, representing, as honourable members have already said, a 134 per cent increase on the 1970-71 figure, and there is a 19 per cent increase in this year's estimates over last year's. No State can stand this kind of taxation and still thrive. The increase in wages tax alone is an imposition that will draw much money out of the productive sphere of goods and services and will dissipate it on excessively over-staffed and under-productive departments.

Regarding salary expenditure, this appears to be an area for a Government inquiry, namely, into the general justice and suitability of the highest salaries being paid to public servants. Many of these salaries seem to have got out of proportion not only in comparison with those being paid in private business but, indeed, with other salaries paid within the Public Service. A cluster of salaries exists in the higher echelons that is not rational, and the public probably does not realize how many of these high salaries go on to the State's wages bill. In recent times, we have had the appointment of a Director of Environment, who receives a salary of $18 694, and a Director of Industrial Design at the same salary. I might add that the Director of Planning, who is senior in time of appointment, receives a lower salary, namely, $17 878. We have a Director of Transport, at a salary of $21 856; and in the Premier's Department we have a Secretary on $15 991 but also a Director on $20 224. We have the new Ombudsman position, carrying a salary of $20 200.

All these salaries compare surprisingly with the salaries of the Public Trustee and the Under Secretary, who have important positions, on $15 991; whereas the Commissioner of Police (surely the most arduous position of all) is on $19 700, or over $2 000 less than the Director of Transport. Clearly, there is room for a reassessment of values. I interpolate here and say that this kind of lavish treatment does not extend to all members of the Public Service, certainly not to the staff of Parliament House. I do not wish to embarrass any member of our loyal and hard-working staff by making wide references to their salaries. However, I draw honourable member's attention to the fact that, despite the flurry of jobs attracting annual salaries of $20 000, with the exception of our chief librarian, the whole of the library staff in Parliament House has to share the princely sum of $22 975, and that sum, I have discovered in my research, is not the actual salaries figure but includes overtime, which was payable for the first time in the 1972-73 financial year, as well as the typist's annual increment. The chief librarian is, as is clear for all to see, receiving an annual salary of only $9 365, despite his high qualifications. Honourable members will not underestimate the background of skill and knowledge required to keep up with members' constant needs for accurate information on so many matters in widely diverse fields.

I notice under the heading "Premier's Department, Miscellaneous" (a most fascinating section) that an advance of $40 000 and a grant of $450 000 are to be made to the Adelaide Festival Theatre Trust. This may be peanuts in the art world today, judging by the Commonwealth Government's extravaganza, but I for one wish to know for what this cool half a million dollars is being granted. If it is for the promotion of art work by comparatively unknown artists, I trust that the Government will insist that some effort will be made to obtain quality. From my own observations, the trust does not seem to be advised by a very experienced committee or, if it is experienced, it certainly seems cynical. Heaven preserve us from any more poached egg canvasses and from any additional intestinal writhings in stainless steel.

Under the same section one can see that $90 000 is allocated to the Monarto steering committee. Despite the apparent lack of rationality in the decision to attempt the building of a new city in a place that is ill-favoured by nature, with little rainfall and no beauty, and a place to which no commercial person wants to go, presumably this is a reasonable amount for the purpose involved. However, the big questions that this estimate does not answer, as far as I can see, are: to whom has the State been committed for research and planning in this area, what contracts are being signed for such services, and under what financial terms are they being signed? I refer, of course, to the announcement, apparently made with the Premier's blessing, in last Saturday's *Advertiser* to the effect that a wellknown firm of planning consultants has received a long-term engagement for the purposes to which I have referred.

Also, a second firm of consultants, with headquarters apparently in Europe, has been engaged in some capacity.

If this was a genuine announcement of a contract, it is clear that Parliament is entitled to know the precise nature of this commitment by the State. I hope that the Minister representing the Premier will inform the Council what contracts have been let in the matter referred to in the press and the precise nature and value of the financial commitment. I should also like the Minister to elucidate two mysteries (at any rate they are mysteries to me) appearing in the same section of the Estimates. The first is an advance of $90 000, the same amount as is allocated to the Monarto steering committee, to the Design and Craft Industries Authority. I should like to know when and for what purpose this authority was set up. The second mystery is the $15 140 subsidy in respect of residential development. What could this possibly mean?

Most honourable members who have spoken in this debate have expressed dismay at the continuing and ever-growing loss incurred by the South Australian Railways. Train services around the world are being used more and more today. Without doubt, they are being supported financially largely by the carriage of passengers in addition to those heavy goods for which they are so well adapted. The primary requirements of public acceptance of train services are speed, cleanliness and punctuality. In South Australia, regrettably, a combination of these three things is rarely offered to the public. Those responsible for our rail services must realize that today they are competing with the pleasant, highly organized airways and tourist bus services. There seems to be a general attitude in the South Australian Railways Department (an attitude that has persisted for many years) that people, especially passengers, are a nuisance to a railway system, and that a railway system exists primarily to carry heavy goods. The propositions that advanced bookings should be easily come by or that meals should be provided on trains at convenient hours are foreign to our railways administration.

The Hon. Mr. Chatterton has stated in this debate, in an oblique sort of way, that railways all over the world run at a loss. Referring to the Hon. Mr. Hill, the honourable member said:

> At least he admitted that railways throughout Australia—

he could have said "throughout the world"—

> are losing money.

I do not know that, and I doubt whether there are many countries in the world where railways administrations lose money on such a colossal basis as we do and, moreover, at such an escalating rate. In a few short years this has become a disaster. I know that comparisons of railway services in Europe with those in South Australia are laughable. I have travelled on many railways in Britain and Europe, from the international express to the modest rapide, which belies its name and thereby confounds the innocent traveller. They all had one thing in common: they were full, and on all of them I found amenities unknown in Australia. On the British and French railways, for example, high standard meals are accepted as the normal accompaniment of a journey. British Railways' crisp baked potatoes are quite famous, and, I found, lived up to their reputation. As for France, I had my best blanquette de veau and a delicious camembert on a train between Calais and Paris. The comment that no railway runs economically is easily disposed of by an examination of the results of the Commonwealth Railways services that criss-cross South Australia. The truth of the matter is that for far too long the hierarchy of the South Australian Railways has been composed of engineers and not of commercial trade promoters. Not since the long-time lamented Mr. Webb, who revitalized the South Australian Railways system, have we had a first-class commercial promotion of the desirable features of the system. I support the Bill.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON (Southern): I refer first to the Royal Adelaide Hospital's dental department. It is fair to say that the Government's record in relation to dental treatment, particularly in the field of school dental units, is excellent, and there is no argument that progress has been greater recently than it has in the past. Nevertheless, that does not mean that everything in the garden is rosy.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: On the right track, though.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Yes, along that line. I express concern at the situation that appears to exist in relation to waiting lists for treatment of patients in this department. This concern was redoubled when I heard recently that it was a widely commented on fact that about 1 000 people had been added to the waiting list for dentures in the last six months. I wish to cite two cases. The first concerns a person who has been on the waiting list since 1967, and in that period of six years has received no notification of impending treatment. If the waiting list for dentures extends back that far and persons after 1967 are not yet treated, and if the waiting list has had a consistent growth rate, it will now consist of about 12 000 people. This is a scandalous situation, and urgent attention is needed to correct it.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But surely a person on the waiting list would follow up his position?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I should imagine it would be normal for a person to be notified of his position on the waiting list; there should be no need for him to inquire whether he had moved further up the list, because in many cases these people come from country areas and a long trip is involved.

Another case leads me to suspect that patients are not notified when their turn for appointment reaches the top of the list. Two people in the same suburb have had their names on the waiting list for dentures, one since 1969 and the other since 1970. Recently, the person waiting since 1970 complained about the waiting period and he received treatment. The 1969 person is still awaiting treatment. I have reason to believe also that there is a large backlog of people awaiting treatment for cavities and that backlog of patients is increasing, not decreasing. This situation of what appears to be an appalling backlog of patients awaiting dentures cannot be allowed to continue, or we can quite logically be called a dental disaster State. I seek information from the Minister on the following points: (1) By what method are patients notified when their names reach the top of the waiting list for dentures? (2) How many people are on the waiting list? (3) What number of people are on the waiting list for dentures who have been waiting for each year from 1965 onwards, giving these figures for each separate year? (4) How many names are being added to the waiting list for dentures or repairs for the last six months? (5) How many people were fitted with dentures or repairs for the last six months? (6) How many people were put on the waiting list for dental treatment for the last six months? (7) How many people were treated in the same period? (8) What is being done to cut down on the growth of the waiting list to catch up the backlog?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You will have to wait for 12 months if you want all those answers.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I hope not: I hope the information will be readily available.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You hope! You don't know what it entails.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I wish now to give an indication of two methods of pulling down the growth rate if it is outstripping treatment. First, the obvious solution would be to appoint extra dental staff. Secondly, a preventive dental care scheme could be introduced on a widespread scale. The former faces one major difficulty—attracting staff. I have looked at the salary range and find that a graduate entering this department is offered a salary of $7 500, rising to $9 000 after a period of five years. The same graduate can expect to earn a salary of $10 000 in private practice. The specialist dentist is offered a top salary of $12 500. He can earn $20 000 to $30 000 in private practice, so it is obvious that salaries and promotional opportunities are not sufficient to encourage suitable staff and something must be done to correct this situation.

In Western Australia, caravans similar to the school dental clinics operate in country towns and provide promotional opportunities; a similar system could be introduced here to provide treatment in those areas of the State at present without dental care. The most important field of neglect and potential care for these problems lies in preventive dentistry. I quote briefly from a booklet entitled *Preventive Dentistry for the Dental Practitioner,* by Mr. W. Sims, of the Department of Pathology, Royal Dental Hospital, London:

In spite of the substantial literary output on the subject of preventive dentistry in recent years, attempts by the public health authorities to control dental diseases by preventive methods have been on a wholly inadequate scale and the minimal efforts of practitioners in this regard have made no impact on the problem whatsoever. Although dentists frequently express their concern at the widespread occurrence of dental disease and testify their faith in preventive measures, they hardly ever make any attempt to prevent caries occurring in their patients and often ignore periodontal disease until irreparable damage has been done. The current attitude of the professions seems to be one of shock at hearing the tenets of preventive dentistry doubted and astonishment at seeing them practised.

That the average dental practitioner does not practise preventive dentistry is deplorable but understandable. He is unlikely to have received any practical instruction in the art at his dental school, he serves a public wretchedly apathetic with regard to its dental health, he is remunerated almost exclusively on the basis of restorative and surgical procedures carried out and he is faced with an overwhelming demand for these services. These excuses for the present attitude of dental practitioners are, of course, failings of the dental profession itself and are the direct result of its reluctance to deal with dental disease by any other method than treating established lesions. This preoccupation with repairing the ravages of dental disease would be tolerable if dental caries and periodontal disease were unavoidable pestilences, like influenza for example, but they are not; both diseases are the outcome of ignorance and neglect and are almost entirely preventable. That a profession, staffed by university graduates, should elect to spend its time performing endless, repetitive, mechanical procedures to deal with diseases due entirely to personal negligence, and which it is within its power to prevent, is one of the sadder anachronisms of our times. Conversion to the philosophy of prevention involves nothing less than a revolutionary reorientation of the thoughts and attitudes of every dentist.

I define preventive dentistry as the art of keeping healthy mouths healthy. It is thus concerned only with patients whose dentition is in its original naturally healthy state and those in which all dental lesions and abnormalities have been treated. Because we are regarded as repairers of dental disease rather than promoters of dental health, few patients in the former category seek our services, and with regard to the latter group, it must be stressed that it is axiomatic to the preventive approach that all treatment is carried out to the highest possible standards. The true practitioner of preventive dentistry, having rendered a patient dentally fit, will hold himself primarily responsible for any carious lesions, or deteriorations in periodontal health, which may subsequently occur.

I am sure many dentists will not agree with those views, that they do not take any interest, but it appears that a number of dentists do not carry this out, perhaps because of the pressure on them for the repair of lesions that already exist.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: When was that article written?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: In 1968. There seems to have arisen a misconception that, provided fluoride is added to water, lack of care does not matter. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You should be up to date. You should find out what they are doing in Britain now.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Fluoride provides a healthy base to commence care of teeth. However, it is a well-known fact that, after the age of 30, periodontal gum disease is a more important factor than decay in tooth loss. If the former Chief Secretary believes that sufficient work is being done in the field of preventive dentistry in South Australia at the moment, I think he is not quite up with the facts.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: He did not say that; he said that the article was a little out of date.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I referred to that article because much of it relates to the present position in South Australia.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I understood you to say that the article came from England. It is completely out of date.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: There is an obvious and growing need for properly trained dental hygienists who could work under the supervision of and in co-operation with dentists in the Royal Adelaide Hospital's dental department, school dental units, or in private practice.

The Hon. V. G. Springett: Don't they do it now?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Not as I understand the position. The present situation has been created by a lack of care in this field in the past. The cause does not lie only with the present Government.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Labor Governments made more progress in the last 10 years than Liberal Governments made in the previous 30 years.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: If the honourable member had listened, he would realize that I said that earlier.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: But you are now criticising Labor Governments.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is the task of the Opposition. These dental hygienists perform the important task of instructing patients in the proper care and maintenance of their teeth and gums to prevent, where possible, recurrence of problems. If this is done, trained dentists are relieved of the need to carry out that work. There is a report by an Australian surgeon, Captain Martin, in an international magazine which claims that one properly-trained dental hygienist can prevent five times the number of cavities that a dentist can treat in any given period. This is an astounding figure and indicates the urgent need for such people to be trained and appointed without delay. The Armed Forces introduced dental hygienists in 1965, and they are appointed on the basis of one dental hygienist to three dentists. The time has come, in view of the backlog that exists and in view of what is building up, for the Government to set up a training scheme for dental hygienists as a matter of urgency. I do not believe that the cost would be too great, and certainly the reduction in the cost of treatment would go a long way toward financing any such scheme. Certainly we might be able

to stop fooling people by putting their names on what appears to be a never-ending waiting list. I hope the Minister of Health will obtain replies to the questions I have posed.

I appreciate the reply given to me today on behalf of the Minister of Education in relation to the implied acceptance of a proposal I made about students attending schools where university entrance courses were not available; I suggested that wider criteria be used for the acceptance of such students into various tertiary courses. I trust that the Minister's approach to the admission boards of tertiary institutions will be successful.

I turn now to another problem that I have referred to previously. I believe that a small move is being made to solve the problem, but it needs urgent attention; I am referring to the primary school free book scheme. It is now common knowledge that, in any group of children of the same chronological age, there will be a wide range of ability in all subject areas. Publicity has been given recently to the problems faced by secondary schoolteachers when students come to them at the chronological age of 12 years but with reading ages as low as eight years or nine years. This is not a situation which suddenly arises at first-year secondary level; it is already in existence, of course, when the child is at primary school. The question arises, "What has the primary school done about it?" If the school has carried out the policy of free textbooks, such children have been given in grade 7 "Reading on, Red Book 1", "Radiant Reader Book V" and, as from 1974, "Readers Digest Advanced Reading Skill Builder", all of which may be suitable for average readers, but none of which is at all suitable for the 11-year-old child with a reading age of seven years or eight years. Why not, then, use a grade 3 reader for the backward grade 7 child? The reasons are that he has probably read it before and that it contains stories that may interest an eight-year-old child but certainly will not interest most 11-year-old children. In other words, the child's ability to understand the subject is ahead of his reading ability. Thus, by adhering strictly to the free book scheme as it exists at present, schools are unable to cater effectively for any but the average child.

The reply given to my earlier question stated, in part, that the reason for maintaining the bulk supply scheme with a restricted choice was that "the economic gain far outweighed the possible educational gain of freedom of choice". This is a gross over-simplification. For many children, the present scheme has no educational value at all. At present there is only one way in which a school can provide for the basic educational needs of such children, and that is to ask parents to provide money for materials which ought to have been supplied under the free book scheme. I emphasize that these are not optional extras; for many children they are basic educational requirements. For example, such requirements may be reading books with a low reading age and high interest age and in sufficient variety to enable a child to use a book or a kit which captures his interest and thus allows learning to take place. Similar arguments can be made out for widening the choice in other areas. There are, for example, many attractive and interesting mathematics texts and individualized kits which may well be of far more value to some children than either of the two texts prescribed. Further, there are spelling kits that aim at catering more effectively for the varying needs and abilities of the children than do those listed on the free book order.

The ideal solution to the problem is to institute a scheme similar to that now in use in the secondary schools, whereby a grant of $x a child is made either to the school or to the parent. The Government ought to be willing to spend as much on primary schoolchildren as it is spending on secondary students. The argument based on economic gain in favour of bulk buying is valid only if the children do not suffer educationally in the process. If it is thought to be unwise to introduce such a scheme immediately, perhaps as an intermediary measure the list of books available could be considerably lengthened to include materials that will cater more effectively for the wide range of abilities among children at every grade level in every subject. This measure would ensure, to some extent at least, that the advantage of bulk buying would be retained.

I turn now to the sum allocated to the South Australian Railways from Government resources to finance the railways deficit. It is alarming to find that, for every person who boards a train at a country station, there is a loss of $16.40; for every interstate passenger there is a loss of $7.51; for every metropolitan passenger there is a loss of 44c; and for every ton mile of freight carried there is a loss of 89c. For every $1 earned by the railways, the department is involved in $1 in labour costs alone. This situation cannot go on. The Government should look carefully at the comprehensive report that has been issued on the South Australian Railways; the following is a paragraph from that report:

> It was not within the terms of reference of this inquiry to recommend what the role and objectives of the Railways should be or the physical form of the system necessary to achieve them. However, we are very strongly of the opinion that, in fairness to the management of the South Australian Railways (in whatever form it may exist in future), the Government should define, as precisely as possible, what role it wishes the Railways to play and set financial and other limits within which the Railways must function. Only then can the organization be expected to function effectively; only then can the Government be sure that the State is getting an appropriate service.

I am sure that, if all the recommendations on the railways were put into effect, the loss would be considerably reduced and money would be available for the important activities that I referred to earlier. I support the Bill.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): In rising to speak to this Bill I indicate my great concern at escalating costs and charges and the burden that bears on the public as a result. The Railways Department's deficit has been referred to by almost every member who has spoken to the Bill. I believe they have every reason to do so, because the deficit has more than doubled in the past three years. The increased expenditure of the Hospitals Department is an increase of 2⅓ times the amount spent in 1970. I do not wish to criticize the Government in a negative manner about these increases because I realize that hospital services must be maintained. However, I would not consider honourable members (those supporting the Government, as well as Opposition members) to be responsible men, if they were not concerned about current inflationary trends.

It is not my intention at this stage to go over the speeches made by my colleagues, although I do agree with many of the well emphasized remarks they made. Some of the points raised included extra charges that the Government imposed before it introduced the Budget, so that the Budget would not look as bad as it really was.

I do intend to answer some things that have been said and criticisms that have been made (not very effectively in my view) of my colleagues' well reasoned arguments. The Hon. Mr. Creedon, when speaking to this Bill, referred to statements I made some time ago regarding sewerage, when I said that the amount made available for sewerage in

another Bill was much less over the last two years for Gawler. In fact, the amount available would not have been much more in effect than one-quarter of what was available two years ago. The Hon. Mr. Creedon said (page 958 of *Hansard*):

A few weeks ago the Hon. Mr. Dawkins referred to sewerage in Gawler. He has been a member of this Council for 11 years and has asked three questions on this matter.

I congratulate him on having the time to look through *Hansard* for the last 11 years to find out that I have asked three questions about sewerage in Gawler. Of course, he has not had the time to go through *Hansard* and take out the number of times I have mentioned sewerage in general debate, the Address in Reply debate, the Loan Estimates or in the Budget, when one can refer to general matters. I am also certain that he could not know how many times I have taken up this matter privately with the Minister of the day. Mr. Creedon went on to say:

The Hon. Mr. Dawkins said that sewerage had been under way in Gawler for eight years. That statement is incorrect, because work on the system did not commence until 1968, in the term of office of the Labor Government.

That would have been at the end of the Labor Government's term. He then said:

The Hon. Mr. Dawkins, who made other misleading statements, has lived in the area all his life and should know better.

I suggest to the Hon. Mr. Creedon that if I have made other misleading statements he should give chapter and verse, because it is all very well to say that honourable members make misleading statements and should know better: he should be able to back up statements with facts. Relating to sewerage, the Hon. Mr. Creedon said:

The Hon. Mr. Dawkins said that sewerage had been under way in Gawler for eight years.

That, of course, is incorrect, because if one examines page 565 of *Hansard* one will see that I said:

I remember hearing not so long ago a prominent member of the Australian Labor Party saying, "We are still waiting for sewerage in Gawler." I remind the A.L.P. that it is over eight years since it had the chance to reverse that trend.

That is what I said, "It is over eight years since it had the chance to reverse that trend." The fact is that it took three years after assuming office, to get started. The Hon. Mr. Creedon made that plain himself, because he said that the Labor Government did not do it until 1968. The Minister of Agriculture kindly and unintentionally interjected, saying:

You realize that South Australia is the best sewered State in the Commonwealth.

I said I was aware of that. Of course, that was the situation in 1965 when the Playford Government went out of office, and it was largely because of the efforts of the Playford Government that, although sewerage had not got to Gawler at that stage, the State was (as the Minister of Agriculture so correctly interjected) the best sewered State in the Commonwealth. So much for the accuracy—or lack of it—of the Hon. Mr. Creedon.

I refer now to local government. I may reiterate some of the things I have said previously; however, I make no apology because in my view the situation in local government is not good. I said previously in this Chamber that I have looked at the whole district of Midland, as it was, and saw the satisfactory situation that existed when the department was supervised by the Hon. Mr. Hill. I went to practically every local government area in my district and found that the district clerks had as much work as they could handle and as much money as they could manage. Their main concern then was to see whether all the money provided could be used before the end of the financial year. Today, the situation is vastly different because most local government areas are crying out for money, because they have been cut back and are now prepared to consider the possibility of direct grants from the Commonwealth. However, some local government authorities have now had second thoughts. They gain this impression at a convention they attended last month. Local government authorities were prepared to consider becoming regional areas and, in effect, losing the term "local" out of "local government". I believe that the present Royal Commission investigating local government boundaries will have to make some variations because, after all, it is 41 years since boundaries were altered. However, I do not support large regions which will have to go cap in hand to the Commonwealth Government only to be told what they should or should not do with the money they receive from the Commonwealth. That is the situation that will obtain if the Prime Minister is allowed to have his way not only with local government but also in the field of education.

The Hon. Mr. Creedon stated that education had been run down but was now improving: I contest that statement. When I went to a function in the Mid North some years ago with the Hon. Mr. Loveday (then Minister of Education and a sincere member of Parliament who did as good a job as he could in the circumstances), I heard him say that the population explosion of children in this State when compared with other States was larger by far. The Education Department had been under the supervision of the Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson until a few months before that function and the Hon. Mr. Loveday said the department had done a splendid job in coping with the population explosion in the education field in South Australia. This nonsense about education being run down but now being improved does not get my support, although I do agree education is being improved because we are spending more money on it. I know, as I believe every other honourable member will agree, that we are still using old buildings. I have mentioned in this Chamber a number of buildings overdue for replacement, and other members could do likewise. However, there has been no alternative because of the very explosion to which the Hon. Mr. Loveday referred. Yorketown High School is a school I have mentioned in this Chamber just about as often as my friend, the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill, used to mention the Hackham crossing.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Did I use to mention the Hackham crossing!

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I believe that problem has been overcome; I am hoping my problem will be overcome, too.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: But they didn't accept my suggestion.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: On August 23, nearly six weeks ago, I asked a question of the Minister of Education regarding Yorketown High School. I said this:

My question refers to the projected construction of a new high school at Yorketown. Some two months ago I asked a question of the Minister on this matter. At that time tenders had been called for the new school, and the Minister kindly informed me what would happen in due course, for which I thank him. However, I have had it put to me by constituents in that area that they are concerned that no tender has been accepted, and they are wondering whether the Minister is still considering tenders, whether he intends to accept one of them or whether tenders will be called again. The reason for this further question is, of course, the great urgency for this facility and the considerable time lapse which has occurred in constructing this high school, with consequent great concern of the people in that area. Can the Minister say whether tenders

are still being considered or, if not, when they will be called again?

The Hon. Mr. Casey very kindly said that he would refer the question to his colleague and bring down a reply in due course. I might say that that question was a further one, but it was in no way provocative because people in the area had received information on the grapevine that the project had gone dead. As it had "gone dead" so many times previously, they were most concerned. I have not had any information that would convince me to the contrary, because it is almost six weeks since I asked the question and I still have not received an answer. I mentioned it privately to the Minister of Education, and last week to the Minister of Agriculture, but I still have not received an answer. I am not attaching any blame to the Ministers, but the department should be able to supply information more quickly than that. In making these comments about education I hope I have dispelled the idea that, under a Liberal and Country League Government, education was run down. However, I commend this Government for what it is doing for education. I do not agree by any means with all that the Hon. Hugh Hudson does, but by and large he has done a competent job as Minister of Education. I hope I shall always be fair and give credit where it is due. Honourable members will realize that, and they know if I have any criticism to make I will do so.

I must make one or two comments about the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Chatterton. He mentioned the railways. I believe that the Railways Department, to some considerable extent, has contributed to its own problems by its inefficiency and even in some cases lack of courtesy and anxiety to help in past years. Speaking from the viewpoint of primary producers, there was a time not many years ago when primary producers were almost completely dependent on the railway system. They had to take pot luck. They got their superphosphate when it suited the railways to bring it and their stock was sent when it suited the railways to send it. If the railway system took two days to get stock to a place that could be reached in 10 hours in a truck, it took two days and they had to put up with it. When the opportunity arose, primary producers decided to move their goods by road rather than by rail, so the department largely had only itself to blame; some of the problems it faces at the present time are due to the department itself.

The Hon. Mr. Chatterton made his comments in speaking about the railways and in criticizing the Hon. Mr. Hill who, when he was Minister, actually reduced the railway deficit in one year and, in a period of over two years when he was Minister, the deficit was only marginally increased overall; in other words, it was contained in that period of more than two years. Since the Hon. Mr. Hill has been sitting on the opposite side of the Chamber the railways deficit has more than doubled.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: The Hon. Mr. Chatterton said something about the Commonwealth Government, too.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I am coming to that; I have one or two comments about it. He also criticized the dial-a-bus episode and the fact that the Hon. Mr. Hill had mentioned it. I believe the dial-a-bus episode was an exercise in irresponsibility. It was a waste of money in the same way as the visit of Dr. Breuning was largely a waste of money. However, I do not altogether blame the Minister of Transport (Hon. G. T. Virgo), because I believe the dial-a-bus episode particularly, and also Dr. Breuning's visit, were pipe-dreams of the Premier, and I believe the Premier is largely to blame for the waste of money on the dial-a-bus scheme.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You are a long way off the mark.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I often appreciate the honourable member's comments. As I said two or three months ago, I have great respect for the honourable gentleman, although we may have a verbal "set-to" at any time at all.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Why don't you look after the old fellow?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I will, and the Chief Secretary can look after him, too. I suggest with great respect that, now he is on the back bench, the Hon. Mr. Shard should resist the temptation to make second reading speeches sitting down. I look forward to hearing the honourable gentleman having his say in due course. What the Hon. Mr. Chatterton said about the railways was as follows:

> There are, however, much deeper questions about the railway deficit that were totally ignored. Contrast the attitude of the previous Commonwealth Government to air transport. It was prepared to spend hundreds of millions of dollars on airports and aircraft while railways were neglected. It is hardly surprising that air transport is a glamour industry, whereas railways struggle with outdated plant and equipment.

I have never heard such nonsense in all my life. I remember, probably when the Hon. Mr. Chatterton was in England, that quite a few things were done by the Commonwealth for the railways. It is not many years since the line from Melbourne to Albury was standardized, nor is it very long since travel from Sydney to Perth on one gauge became a reality. It is not so long since the whole of the system in the South-East was constructed as broad gauge after having been narrow gauge for many years; that was a result of the help of the Commonwealth Government. Only the other day, it seems, a new railway was constructed from Port Augusta to Whyalla. If the honourable gentleman likes to take the trouble (as he will soon be a member for the whole State) to go to Coober Pedy, he will see that the Commonwealth Government at the present time (and this was being planned long before the present Government came into office) is surveying a new line which will go into action in due course between Tarcoola and Alice Springs. To say that the Commonwealth has done nothing for the railway system in South Australia is a lot of poppycock. In talking about airways, the honourable gentleman said:

> Air travel is a very elitist form of transport catering for very few people in the community . . .

To my knowledge, about 2 500 000 people travel by domestic lines in Australia every year. A considerable number of other people travel by charter aircraft, and many Australian people travel by oversea airlines. It is nonsense to suggest that over 2 500 000 Australians are elitists. If the previous Commonwealth Government spent money on the airlines system, it created one of the best systems in the world. A certain percentage of the fare paid by every air traveller goes to the Department of Civil Aviation to provide the necessary facilities. I believe that our two-airline domestic system is one of the best systems in the world. If the honourable member's Party had had its way, we would have only Trans-Australian Airlines and, without competition, there would be the same kind of inefficiency we are complaining about now in the Australian railways.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: The previous Commonwealth Government wanted to give T.A.A. away and keep Ansett.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: No; it did not. If the previous Government had sold T.A.A. to private enterprise it would have insisted that T.A.A. and Ansett be on equal terms, and the likelihood of either one's failing would be remote. The two-airline system was set up by a Liberal

and Country Party Government but, now that the Labor Government is in power, does it intend to change the system? Some of its supporters would change it, but the Labor Government will not change it because it is working too well.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Who created T.A.A. initially?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: It was created by the Chifley Government.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: What kind of Government was that?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: If the Minister's Party had had its way it would have had only T.A.A., and the Minister was not a member of that Party then.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The Hon. Mr. DeGaris was.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: But only for a short time. In any case, I believe that the comments which have been made by Government members about the railways and the airlines are so far off the beam that it is almost pathetic.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Your comments, do you mean?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: No, the Minister's comments from time to time. In conclusion, I reiterate my very great concern at the escalating costs and charges which, I am sure, must concern every honourable member, whether or not he is a Government supporter. I support the Bill.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary): I do not intend to give a lengthy reply to the various points honourable members have made. As is customary, replies to questions that have been asked in the debate will be made available to honourable members. However, some honourable members may wish to repeat their questions so that the replies will be recorded in *Hansard.* I thank honourable members for the way in which they have dealt with the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 8 passed.

Schedule.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I appreciate the Chief Secretary's saying that replies to questions will be forthcoming. However, I cannot help mentioning the Railways Department line, because I think that every Opposition member has raised the question of the railways. I take it that the Chief Secretary does not have a short statement of the Government's plan to tackle this problem, about which much concern was expressed during the debate?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary): I do not have a specific reply for the honourable member. However, undoubtedly he will pursue this matter, perhaps during Question Time, to obtain the appropriate reply.

Schedule passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

UNDERGROUND WATERS PRESERVATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 27. Page 986.)

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT (Southern): I support the Bill. I am sure that all honourable members would agree that particularly in South Australia the preservation of such water supplies as we have is vital, and it is equally vital to preserve our water supplies from contamination and pollution. It is particularly important in the South-East, because its principal water supplies are underground and the people are living above them.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Not at the moment.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: No. Perhaps the people are living in the water supply now, and that makes it even worse. The South-East, which constitutes only about 15 per cent of the State's area, is the only region in the State that has a reliable rainfall, namely, between 19in. (482.6 mm) and 30in. (762 mm) annually. The risk of pollution is obviously high, because normally, at any rate, the people live on top of the water supply, and this makes the question of anti-pollution and anti-contamination measures vitally important. The Engineering and Water Supply Department, to which department the control of underground waters will be transferred under the terms of the Bill, has published a booklet entitled *South-East of South Australia Water Pollution Control,* which outlines some measures the department intends taking. The booklet also underlines the dilemma we are in, particularly in the South-East, in that on the one hand we must conserve our water supply and keep it free from pollution, whereas on the other hand throughout the world (and in South Australia, not the least) we are faced with the need to produce more food than ever before in order to cater for our increasing population. In areas like the South-East, which is a large food producer with much animal husbandry, this poses a dilemma. On the one hand, we have to produce more food; on the other hand, the production of more food by animal husbandry creates a greater risk of pollution. The booklet outlines some of the measures it is intended to take. We are told, for instance, on intensive animal husbandry, that it is not intended to restrict existing animal husbandry (piggeries, and so on), but it states:

> The disposal of wastes from existing intensive animal husbandry operations to surface and underground waters will be phased out by December 31, 1977.

With regard to dairies, we are told the following:

> The establishment of new dairies and the continuance of existing dairies is not opposed provided that milking sheds and holding yards are located at approved sites and that manure and liquid wastes are not disposed of, or drain naturally to surface waters, sinkholes or underground depressions.

With regard to industrial wastes, we are told that the discharge of effluent, and so on, either directly or indirectly, to surface waters or underground waters is to be phased out by December 31, 1977. I acknowledge that desperate problems require desperate remedies and that radical controls are necessary in order to cope with this kind of problem but, for that very reason, it is essential that co-operation be engendered with the public and that the public, and particularly the people living in the area and their Parliamentary representatives, be given the maximum amount of information. That is a request I now make to the Government: that it take every measure to see that the public is really encouraged to co-operate and that the public is given all available information.

I acknowledge that this booklet is a step in the right direction. It sets out to give some information and it gives addresses at which further information may be obtained, but it is very general in its terms. I understand that the information that can be obtained from the addresses given is also very general in its terms. It also appears that the report of the committee that has been set up, which has been referred to earlier in this debate, the Committee on Water Pollution Control in the South-East, has not yet been brought down; it has not been tabled, and is not available to the public. It seems to me that the booklet must be lacking to some extent in proper background and proper knowledge because that report has not yet been brought down. The people in the area in question in the South-East are most apprehensive about what the controls will be. This was shown at a public meeting held at Millicent on September 13, the resolution passed at that meeting being that the

report of the committee be tabled in Parliament. It is essential that the controls, which I acknowledge must be introduced, be non-bureaucratic and non-technical in their formulation and interpretation. People in the area are genuinely apprehensive about how these controls will affect them and, the sooner those fears are allayed by information and the promise of co-operation, the better.

There is one aspect of the Bill about which I am not happy. I suggest that this Act, which the Bill seeks to amend, was better controlled and administered by the Mines Department than it will be by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The Mines Department has a long and good history of acting in a regulatory capacity, in regulating various things. The Engineering and Water Supply Department does many other things as well. For one thing, it is a revenue-raising department. Heaven forbid we should ever be faced with the prospect that people in the South-East with numerous bores on their properties will be charged considerable fees to obtain permits to maintain their bores. In supporting this Bill, I urge the Government to see that this report is obtained as soon as possible, that it is tabled in Parliament, that it is made available to the public (and particularly the public in the South-East of South Australia) and that in every way the Government in imposing these radical controls that it must impose seeks to co-operate with the public concerned and gives all possible information. I support the Bill.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON (Southern): This matter has concerned me for several years—not so much the control of pollution (because that is something relatively recent) as underground water in the South-East. It is encouraging that people in Government circles, including the previous Government, at long last are seeing this as a valuable resource, because for years there has been a very poor attitude towards water in the South-East. In particular, I refer to the system of drainage that has been constructed there, which perhaps is not at present contributing but certainly in the future will contribute to the unnecessary loss of water from the underground system. I have expressed concern for many years that, when this system was constructed, no regard was had to its effect on agriculture or on the underground water system.

I have one comment on the Bill itself. I should like to have seen a Bill specifically relating to the South-East, because that is a unique underground water resource. It has several divisions in it, running from the top down to the marshland, and no doubt it would have been easier to draw up a separate Bill, but that is a matter for the Parliamentary Counsel and the Government. I urge the Government to consider drawing together all the bodies now concerned with water in the South-East, including the South-Eastern Drainage Board, the Underground Waters Preservation Committee, and any other committee associated with water, into one body so that, whenever water supply is being discussed, the whole water problem in the South-East can be considered, and not merely sections of it. In the past, if there had been a much broader look at the general water situation, much of the drainage would not have been carried out and many of the mistakes made would not have been made.

In days and years to come, we shall find that much of this system will have to be reconstructed to ensure that water does not run away at the time of the year when it should be going into the underground water system and that wherever possible it is preserved. I am always surprised that, at a time when pastures have their lowest growth, the water is allowed to run out to the sea and that, at times of the greatest pasture growth, underground water runs into the drains, which leads to plants being deprived of an element vital to plant growth—water. I consider it is necessary to make a fuss over this to get some changes in the regulations, because it is creating some feeling in the district against the department. I am certain that the department's attitude will help overcome any feeling that may have arisen in the past because of the rather wide aspects covering all stock bores and domestic bores in the South-East. I am certain that, if the department had discussed the matter with the local people and with honourable members representing the district, there would not have been the amount of dissatisfaction that arose. As the Hon. Mr. Burdett has said, the people live on top of their water supply in that area, but I believe that at present there is over-emphasis on stock pollution, not in relation to concentrated activities such as dairying and fattening units but in relation to ordinary stock grazing and pastures.

I assure the Hon. Mr. Burdett that at present the water is sitting on the surface and, if it is to be polluted at any time, it will be polluted now. The greatest problem exists around townships, dairies, and the concentrated forms of production; in connection with those areas I support what the Government is doing to control pollution. There is no doubt that something had to be done. I know of instances where people are unnecessarily introducing harmful products into the underground water system, and I give full credit to the Government for taking steps to stop those practices. It is just unfortunate that it has gone a little too far. I shall give the Government full support in its efforts to restore the confidence that the people had in the department. I agree with the Hon. Mr. Burdett that it is necessary, in order that people know what is going on and can assess what the department is doing, that they be given whatever information is available. I understand from a message I received this afternoon that the Government has agreed to make available to a local committee quite a bit of the study on pollution; that is a step in the right direction, because it is difficult to assess the value of measures if full information is not available. While it is very nice to receive a blue pamphlet with a most attractive cover, that pamphlet does not give all the information that is necessary if one is to make a full assessment. The pamphlet is a public relations document which says that further information can be obtained elsewhere. I do not see how it can do any harm for the Government to make full information available. Some primary producers may, without being under the pressure of extreme measures, do something about their problems if the Government gives them full information.

I support the Bill and trust that the Government will give an assurance that, wherever possible, the information sought by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and the Hon. Mr. Burdett will be made available not only now but also in the future. I hope the Government will not attempt to restrict the use of water by people grazing stock; those people have been there for many years, and I believe they have a prior right to be able to use the 1 per cent of the water supply that it is said is necessary for stock water. Water levels will not be reduced by such usage; that has been shown in other parts of the world where underground water has been used. I support the Government's restrictions on the use of irrigation water. In some areas problems have already risen through over-usage of irrigation water; for example, salt has been introduced into the underground water basin. There has been a lowering of the water levels in some areas of high usage; this is alarming

in areas with high production rates. It would be a pity to spoil the water supply situation for the sake of a few more acres. I support the Bill.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I thank those honourable members who have contributed to the debate on this important Bill. Political animosity is inappropriate in connection with this Bill, particularly when one realizes that the most precious commodity in the world is water. If this planet were devoid of water, man would be in trouble for the rest of his time here. This Bill is only the beginning of a series of Bills that will culminate in water resources legislation, which is long overdue. This State is the driest State in the driest continent in the world. I was surprised that most of the debate centred on the South-East. Of course, the South-East is only a small part of the State; the central and northern parts of the State are important, too. In the northern part of the State we have the difficult problem of artesian water. In south-western Queensland, with which I am familiar, the output of some of the bores has decreased over the years. When one sees those bores one wonders for how long they will continue to pour out tremendous volumes of water every hour of every day. So, we must look at the State as a whole and not confine our attention to the South-East, important though it may be. I shall reply to the Leader's questions when clause 9 is dealt with in the Committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Regulations."

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): During the second reading debate the Leader of the Opposition raised a question on this clause. In reply I point out that in the Act, as it presently stands, the power to, in effect, exempt wells is circumscribed in two particulars. First, it is limited to a total exemption from the provisions of this Act and, secondly, it is limited to wells only of "prescribed depth" (wells of more than this depth cannot be made the subject of an exemption, and the only exemption that can be granted is a total one); thus, even though a good case could be made for a partial exemption from the Act, such a partial exemption could not, in the terms of the present legislation, be granted. In the Government's view, this form of exemption is unnecessarily restrictive, and the substance of the amendment proposed by this clause is to permit far greater flexibility in granting exemptions. Wells may be exempted by reference to any one of a number of characteristics of which the most obvious one is "use", that is, wells used for certain purposes may be exempted from all or any of the provisions of the Act. This, of course, does not exhaust the classification that may be adopted; it could relate to types of well, sources of water, physical location or any other characteristic, and, as has already been mentioned, the exemption relating to such wells can be from the whole Act or any part of it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I thank the Minister for that explanation. I assumed that was the intention of this clause. The explanation also relates to clause 4, which, I believe, is a safeguard clause relating to what may be done by regulation under clause 9. I assume that the Government intends to bring down regulations to replace those at present before the Committee.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The answer is "Yes".

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.28 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, October 4, at 2.15 p.m.