

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, September 14, 1971

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

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended June 30, 1971.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTIONS**RETRENCHMENTS**

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask a question of the member for Florey. Will the honourable member explain to the House the charge, which he is reported in the *Advertiser* of September 11 to have made, that there has been collusion in the car industry over the retrenchment of employees by General Motors-Holden's and Chrysler Australia Limited? This bare statement, which is of a very serious nature, is not elaborated on in the newspaper, and I ask the honourable member whether he will explain and elaborate on what he has said and, in particular, whether he really believes there was collusion in the car industry over these most regrettable retrenchments.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Florey does not, of necessity, have to answer the question: I doubt whether it complies with Standing Order 124, which states:

At the time of giving notices of motion, questions may be put to Ministers of the Crown relating to public affairs; and to other members, relating to any Bill, motion, or other public matter connected with the business of the House, in which such members may be concerned.

Mr. WELLS: I am willing to answer it, Mr. Speaker. In my opinion, collusion has occurred between G.M.H. and Chrysler to retrench tradesmen in the motor car industry. I believe this has been done with heartless and callous indifference for the welfare of the people concerned. I do not need to elaborate any further at this stage, but that was the opinion which I stated and which I still hold.

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry explain, first, the present position concerning those skilled workers who were retrenched by G.M.H. and Chrysler in the last two weeks? Secondly, is he aware that among these skilled workers who have been retrenched and forced of necessity to accept a production-line position are migrants who

claim that they were sponsored to Australia by Chrysler as skilled workers? Thirdly, in any negotiations that he has with employers, will the Minister place before them the special case of these migrants, who feel that there has been a breach of contract, albeit unwritten? Since these retrenchments took place I have been approached by various constituents who claim that they are in the position I have outlined. One of them claims that he was interviewed in Australia House by Mr. Warne, of Chrysler Australia Limited; all claim that when they arrived they were met at the airport by a car, which was provided by Chrysler; and all claim that they would not have migrated to Australia if they had realized that within a year or so they would be faced with being down-graded to production positions.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I am aware of the matters raised by the honourable member. This afternoon, at 4.15, I shall be meeting the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council (Mr. Shannon), together with representatives of the motor vehicle union, in order to discuss the situation with them. We are trying to arrange a conference, at which will be present the Premier and I, as well as the Managers of Chrysler and G.M.H.

Mr. HALL: In view of the member for Florey's statement that he believes there is collusion between the two companies in regard to retrenching employees, and in view of the reported statement that the Minister of Labour and Industry had attacked the companies because of the retrenchments, I ask the Premier whether he also believes that there has been collusion between the companies in regard to effecting these retrenchments.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader knows perfectly well that at this stage, while negotiations are proceeding with the Trades and Labor Council and the employers concerned, it would be quite improper for me to make statements of belief that might be provocative towards any of the parties concerned. If the Leader is concerned about getting industrial peace in this State, instead of making some snide political point he will cease asking that sort of question.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry comment on recent statements by the Commonwealth Government regarding present and future rising unemployment in Australia, a matter that vitally affects the future not only of South Australia but of Australia generally?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The press statements appearing in yesterday's *News* and this morning's *Advertiser* show that we cannot always believe statements that we see in the newspapers. Although there have been some misleading interpretations of the Australian employment scene for August, following the release of Commonwealth statistics last night, and although these misinterpretations show South Australia in an unfair light, I cannot say that we have much cause to be optimistic about the future. First, let me deal briefly with the August figures. One report, in a national newspaper this morning, said our unemployment figure had climbed by 511 over the July total; in fact, we had 434 fewer unemployed in August. What had apparently happened was that press reports were based on a column of figures which appear to be the actual numbers of unemployed but which, in fact, are not. In August we had fewer unemployed, more job vacancies and fewer people receiving unemployment benefits. But what will happen in the future? That is where the position starts to look grim. That is an area where the Commonwealth Government is showing its true form, and where employees should beware. The Prime Minister has admitted there could be 100,000 unemployed by January next. Other estimates put the figure at possibly 120,000, or even higher. I am not sure how the Prime Minister arrived at this figure unless, when he was planning his Budget with whoever happened to be Treasurer at that time, he designed this unemployment. It is not unknown for Liberal Governments to create unemployment deliberately.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Millhouse: Who is making inflammatory statements now?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: That is the way Liberal Governments fight inflation—with unemployment. The deflationary impact of that lack-lustre Budget will start to show its effect before many months have passed. I hope that public alarm will force the Commonwealth Government to have second thoughts and to relax its misguided Budget.

SNIPER SEASON

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether any decision has yet been made with regard to a snipe season in the South-East?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will raise with my colleague the matter of the snipe season in the South-East. Also, I will see whether any decision has been made regarding the sniping season in this place.

RAILWAY LAUNDRY

Mr. CUMBE: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport give information about the laundry at the Adelaide railway station? He is aware that this extensive laundry, which handles much work not only for the South Australian Railways but also occasionally for the Commonwealth Railways, has burned down and is out of action. I should like the Minister to say what plans are in hand to replace this building and have the laundry functioning again, because its absence is creating great inconvenience at the station as well as possibly causing the State a loss of revenue or an additional expense. What plans has the Government to replace the old laundry?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am slightly at a loss to understand what inconvenience is being caused. However, the situation is as the honourable member has stated it. Regrettably, several weeks ago the laundry was reduced virtually to ashes. In view of other impinging factors associated with the matter, no steps have been taken to re-establish the laundry. As the honourable member probably knows, the area on which the laundry stood, together with the area where the tarpaulin shop and bakery stand, will be required for the proposed cultural complex. Impinging on this is the reorganization of that area of the Adelaide railway station to cater for the entry of the standard gauge line into the station. In addition, when the standard gauge line comes to the station, the northern carriage sheds (and I am sure the honourable member knows where these are located) may have to be altered. In view of all these factors, until final designs and plans have been determined, it is impossible to say where the laundry can be re-established. However, when these problems have been solved, what should happen to the laundry will be considered.

DINGO BAITING

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation have investigated the allegation that the Lands Department's method of using poison to control the dingo menace is wiping out many other species of our carnivorous wild life, and will he give the House a full report of the investigation? A report in today's *Advertiser*, headed "Dingo Bait 'threat' to wild life", states that Mr. Lang, a director of a tourist company, has alleged that until recently there has been an abundance of wild life in certain areas to which he travelled with tourists, particularly the Flinders Ranges, Coopers Creek, Innamincka, Marree, and the Birdsville Track. Although Mr. Lang is reported to have said that he has no proof

that 1080 is responsible for the lack of wild life in that area now, I consider that the matter should be investigated and, accordingly, I ask whether the Minister will obtain a report, and also whether he can give the House any information now on the matter.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I did see the report in the press this morning and I have taken the matter up with the Minister of Lands. I hope to be able to give the honourable member a reply tomorrow.

PARAFIELD GARDENS JUNCTION

Mr. GROTH: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Chief Secretary to my question of August 18 regarding control of traffic at a road junction at Parafield Gardens?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague states that officers of the Police Department have thoroughly investigated the question of police manually controlling traffic at the Port Wakefield and Salisbury Highway junction on racing and trotting days, and they consider that traffic conditions at this location, including those on the occasions referred to, do not warrant manual police control.

LYELL McEWIN HOSPITAL

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Chief Secretary, a reply to my question about the provision of additional beds at the Lyell McEwin Hospital?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Minister has told me that the present stage reached in the proposal to provide 25 extra beds at Lyell McEwin Hospital is that funds have been approved, working drawings are in the course of preparation, subcontracts for mechanical work (that is, air-conditioning, etc.) will be advertised in mid-November, and tenders for the main building contract will be called in December this year. The work is expected to be completed and the additional beds available in about March, 1973.

HILLCREST HOSPITAL

Mr. WELLS: Has the Attorney-General received from the Chief Secretary a reply to my question of August 18 regarding provision of a bus for the Hillcrest Hospital?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague states that the present bus used at Hillcrest Hospital is a Toyota 22-passenger micro-bus and was purchased in December, 1965, using funds raised by voluntary organizations together with a 50 per cent subsidy paid by the Government. Following the purchase of the bus, the staff establishment at Hillcrest Hospital was increased to provide for the employment of

a bus driver. The bus has been used extensively since that time on week days, and at weekends on some occasions, to transport patients on outings to the hills, beaches, other places of interest, and on visits to church guilds and similar outside organizations. It has also been used for annual trips to the Royal Show and to transport patients to the annual holiday camp at Aldinga Beach. At the present time the bus is in constant use during the week. In September, 1970, it was found necessary to seek approval for approximately \$500 to be spent on repairs to this bus. A complete overhaul and engine reconditioning were subsequently carried out by the Government Motor Garage. In addition, all seats have recently been re-upholstered and the bus is now considered to be in good serviceable condition. To ensure that all wards have an equal opportunity to take part in bus outings, a list is submitted weekly to the Lay Superintendent, showing which wards participated and the number of patients going on each trip. These lists show that on many occasions the bus leaves without its full complement of passengers and this can be attributed to several reasons. In the first instance it is not possible to predict with any certainty which patients will be able to take part, because of the nature of their illness. In some cases, the patients change their minds at the last moment. Whilst it may be possible for patients in different wards to go out together, great care must be taken in the selection of patients. Since its purchase, the bus has proved to be a big asset to Hillcrest Hospital and full value has been derived from it. Experience has shown, however, that some improvements such as reclining seats, air-conditioning, toilets, and a driver compartment would considerably improve the conditions for both the driver and his passengers. With this in mind, investigations are currently being conducted at Hillcrest Hospital by a committee, which was set up in 1970 for the purposes of deciding how surplus funds from the Hillcrest Hospital Canteen may best be spent. It is understood that a 32-passenger bus with provision for air-conditioning and other facilities is contemplated.

CAVAN WEIGHBRIDGE

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of August 26 about the Cavan weighbridge?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The problems associated with the weighing of southbound trucks at the Cavan traffic station are appreciated by Highways Department officers and,

for these reasons, inspectors have been instructed that they are not to weigh south-bound traffic during peak periods and that at all times they are to use discretion to ensure that they minimize the dangers to truck drivers. Plans and specifications have been drawn up and tenders will shortly be called for the manufacture and installation of two new weigh-bridges at sites on each carriageway of the duplicated section of Main Road No. 6, Port Wakefield Road, at Parafield Gardens. When these are installed, the Cavan weighbridge will be abandoned.

MODBURY HIGH SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education obtain an up-to-date report on the condition of the school administration block at the Modbury High School that has cracked substantially? Also, can he say whether it is intended to restore this building soon? I have raised this matter from time to time with former Ministers of Education as well as with the present Minister. I was previously told that observations over a considerable time were necessary to gauge the effect of seasonal changes on the soil and on the building. The Public Buildings Department expected to receive a report from the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization that would give the results of investigations to date. The danger factor has been brought to my attention and it is obvious, even from my observation, that the building is still moving slightly, and concern exists that this might cause one of the plate-glass windows to break.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

PARINGA PARK SCHOOL

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister of Education has now indicated to me that he has a reply to my recent question about the Paringa Park Primary School. I should be pleased if he would now give that reply.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I correct the honourable member: I indicated that I had a reply some time ago to a question the honourable member had asked some time previously about this school. The lease for the land owned by the Education Department for the proposed new Paringa Park school has been terminated and the Engineering and Water Supply Department has vacated the property.

MIGRANT HOSTEL

Mr. CLARK: Has the Premier a reply to my question of September 1 about the Smithfield hostel?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Advice was received from the Commonwealth Department of Labour and National Service by letter dated July 28, 1971, that the Smithfield hostel would close at the end of July. The letter indicated that the decision was taken as a result of a review of hostel accommodation throughout Australia, the need for which arose partly from the Commonwealth Government's reduction in the immigration programme for 1971-72. After receiving this advice, I asked the General Manager of the Housing Trust to inquire whether the area could be obtained for use by the State Government. The General Manager has been in touch with the Department of Interior, but is still awaiting a reply.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether his attention has been drawn to the comment of the Auditor-General in his report which has been tabled today and in which he states:

Very little road construction is carried out by contract and it would be desirable for more major projects to be done by private contractors to test the efficiency of the department as reflected in costs.

Has the Minister seen that comment and, if he has, will he follow the Auditor-General's recommendation, because he knows the policy that was followed by the previous Government?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have not seen the report, which was put on my desk a few moments ago as it was put on the desk of the honourable member. I have not had a chance to peruse it, but I will. Concerning the second point, I am fully aware that, if the former Government had had its way, it would have sacked the whole of the Public Service and done everything by private contract.

Mr. Millhouse: That is absurd.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: However, there are grave dangers in doing work by private contract. In fact, I draw the attention of the honourable member to an instance that was referred to me during the weekend, in which it was alleged that a contractor had been underpaying his staff by about \$50 a week. The Government does not desire to have work done under these conditions or to have the result of the investigation into this incident occur in any other instance. The result in this case was that, when about half of these employees joined the union, the contractor sacked them immediately.

PRICE CONTROL

Mr. SLATER: Has the Premier a reply to my question of September 2 about certain commodities which are under price control but which are sold above the normal price

fixed for such commodities at sporting features and at the Royal Show?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The maximum approved price for meat pies and pasties sold for consumption off the premises is 13c. However, for many years an additional 1c has been approved for events such as the Royal Adelaide Show and certain sporting fixtures where additional costs are incurred in respect of penalty rates of pay, heavy lease or rental charges for stalls, etc. Sauce is an extra for which an additional 2c is normally charged and is not subject to price control.

MINNIPA RESEARCH CENTRE

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Works obtain an assurance from the Minister of Agriculture that the Minnipa Research Centre will not be closed when the new farm college is built at Cleve? Recently, a report of the Committee of Inquiry into Agricultural Education, Research and Extension in South Australia recommended that a farm college be built at Cleve, and everyone was pleased about this recommendation. However, the committee also recommended that the research centre at Minnipa be closed. A report appearing in the *Tribune*, an Eyre Peninsula newspaper, shows that this matter has caused concern to constituents in my district, and an early reply to my question would be appreciated by them.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will discuss the matter with my colleague, but I point out that these recommendations have not been considered by the Government and no decision has been made on this matter.

PORT LINCOLN HOUSING

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Premier a reply to my question of August 31 about Housing Trust houses being constructed in Port Lincoln?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Rental-grant houses have been built in country towns with funds obtained under the Country Housing Act. As finance accumulates in this account, more houses are erected. Currently there are insufficient funds available to build further houses, but I expect that shortly the trust should be in a position to erect further houses under this scheme, and Port Lincoln will certainly be one of the towns considered. The trust is aware of the general demand for rental accommodation in Port Lincoln and has a steady programme there at present. The trust also knows that there is a demand from families who would qualify for rental-grant housing, but this, of course, also exists in other country townships.

TELEVISION ADVERTISING

Mr. CRIMES: Will the Attorney-General investigate the possibility of obtaining the withdrawal of an advertisement for Whitmont shirts that is being shown on commercial television? The advertisement is based on the depiction of senseless brutal violence during which reference is made to the various shirt fashions worn by the combatants. Censorship authorities generally concede the depiction of violence when it is a valid and integral part of a theme, but there is no such justification for violence in the television advertisement to which I have referred.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not know the advertisement referred to, but I will have inquiries made.

EUDUNDA SCHOOLHOUSE

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Education say when I will receive a reply to a question I asked on August 18 (nearly a month ago) about the painting of the Eudunda schoolhouse? The Minister will recall that I asked him how long ago the Eudunda schoolhouse had been painted, and I suggested that reports had been received that it was at least 12 years since it had been painted. I can only wonder whether the question is embarrassing to the department.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Nothing particularly embarrasses me or the department. The honourable member is correct in saying that the question was asked on August 18, but it is a question in respect of which I am still awaiting a reply. In the light of this further question, I will ensure that a reply is made available as soon as practicable.

GOATS

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to consider appointing an officer (even on a part-time basis) to the Agriculture Department in order to cater for the needs, and try to solve the problems, of the goat industry? At the recent Royal Show I was invited to meet people connected with the goat industry, and they told me of their problems. As it is a small industry, they have had difficulty with the department in having an officer appointed specifically to look after this industry, and they told me that, although it is only a small industry, it plays a significant part in supplying milk to people who suffer from asthma and other complaints. It is therefore considered that the industry plays an important part in the health of the people of this State. I suggested that they might amalgamate with the Angora side of this industry in order to build up the goat

population and make the industry more worth while. I said that I would investigate this matter for them.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will have my colleague examine the matter and bring down a report for the honourable member.

GAWLER ROADWORKS

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about roadworks being undertaken at Gawler?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There are no immediate plans for the Highways Department to duplicate the Main North Road northerly from the Gawler by-pass junction, as such measures are not considered justified by present traffic volumes. However, the department will investigate the hazardous traffic conditions at the southern end of the racecourse and, if duplication would correct the situation, the department will consider giving the project a higher priority than at present.

EARTH-MOVING WORK

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport ascertain whether it is possible for tenders to be called in connection with earth-moving work on highway projects, so that the work may be undertaken by South Australian earth-moving firms? I have recently been approached by one of my constituents who is involved in the earth-moving business and who states that tenders have been called for work on the South-Eastern Freeway. The scrapers in question are of a size not available in South Australia, and my constituent states that, as a result, the contract must be let to a firm from another State. This matter is worrying him personally, as well as members of the Earthmoving Contractors Association, of which I believe he is an executive member, and I undertook to raise this matter with the Minister in the House. Apparently, the scrapers provided in South Australia are somewhat smaller than those referred to in the tender notice. There may be some logical explanation for the necessity to use the larger scrapers but, in any case, any information that the Minister could obtain would be appreciated.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As I can speak only from memory on this matter, it may be desirable if I obtain specific details on tenders involving earth-moving equipment and operators connected with work on the South-Eastern Freeway. If my memory serves me correctly, I believe there is a variety of types of equipment that the Highways Department desires to hire. Much of this equipment must

of necessity be of large capacity, because the Highways Department intends to undertake what can only be described as the mammoth task of removing about 2,000,000 tons of earth and rock. This will take place in the coming summer, between October and March, the only period when, because of the weather conditions, significant progress can be made. The Government desires to proceed with the work on this freeway with all possible speed. The Highways Department undertook and performed a tremendous task last year, and we are hoping for an even bigger effort this year; hence the need to hire this large equipment. As I am not aware that the stipulation of the size of the equipment will mean that it must be hired in another State, I will have the point examined and let the honourable member have any further information that may be available.

WORKING WEEK

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether Cabinet has discussed the matter concerning a 35-hour week and whether a policy on that matter has been formulated? If this has been discussed, will he say what is the policy? This is normally a question I would have asked the Premier, but on another occasion when I asked him a question on a matter concerning the department of another Minister I was reproved. A statement appears in the *Sunday Mail* of September 4, to the effect that the Minister has said that the matter of a 35-hour week was to be discussed by Cabinet on the following Monday, and it concludes as follows:

Mr. McKee said, "If Cabinet considered the idea of a 35-hour week had merit, it would be considered."

I think I am correct in saying that recently, the Minister has personally advocated a 35-hour week, and I therefore ask him the question.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The dispute was discussed by Cabinet, but the matter of a 35-hour week was not discussed.

Mr. Millhouse: Despite what you said.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: However, it seems to me that there is a need for some alteration, especially with regard to the motor vehicle industry. A young man spends five years of his life, during which time he earns low wages, learning a trade. He does this so that later he and his family will have security. One would expect that such a person would be employed full time in his trade, rather than employed as a seasonal worker. These matters will be discussed possibly this afternoon and when we

confer with the management of the motor vehicle industry.

O'HALLORAN HILL RESERVE

Mr. HOPGOOD: As I understand that the State Planning Authority has recently purchased land at O'Halloran Hill, in the Mawson District, for recreational purposes, can the Minister of Environment and Conservation give more specific details about this purchase?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: On September 2, 1971, the State Planning Authority finalized the purchase of a further 72 acres of land in the recreation reserve No. 19, O'Halloran Hill. This specific area is section 192, hundred of Noarlunga, contained between Ocean Boulevard and Morphett Road. This means that a total area of 1971 acres costing nearly \$535,000 has now been acquired, by the authority, at O'Halloran Hill.

WATER RATING

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Treasurer a reply to my question of August 31 about the additional revenue likely to accrue to the State as a result of the recent increase in water rates?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The revised valuations and the increase in the price of rebate water are expected to yield increased revenues approaching \$2,000,000 in 1971-72.

TEA TREE GULLY LAND

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to my question of August 11 concerning the continued use or lease by the Pegasus Pony Club of about four acres of cleared land facing Perseverance Road, Tea Tree Gully, that is part of the property of the State Planning Authority?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The State Planning Authority has recently purchased land from Mr. Ellis at Anstey Hill as part of the proposed major district open space at Anstey Hill (reserve No. 13). The area used by the Pegasus Pony Club is outside the area originally proposed for acquisition, but was acquired as part of a total parcel of land owned by Mr. Ellis. The club has been using the land for 11 years by verbal agreement only from Mr. Ellis, and no approach has been made by the club for the continued use of the land. The use of the land by the club was not made known to the authority at the time of acquisition. The club has now been asked to make an approach to the authority for consideration.

FUND INTEREST

Mr. VENNING: Has the Treasurer a reply to a question I asked some time ago about interest earned on the Cattle Compensation Fund and on the Swine Compensation Fund?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Interest is credited on balances held at the Treasury for the Cattle Compensation Fund and the Swine Compensation Fund. The rate applied in 1970-71 was 4.5 per cent, which was the ruling rate paid by the Savings Bank of South Australia on depositors' funds.

SPEED LIMITS

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about speed zones at Two Wells?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The petition to which the honourable member refers was received and considered during my recent absence overseas. However, in view of recent correspondence from the District Council of Mallala, I have now determined that the concern expressed by the petitioners arose from a discussion to amend the speed limits applying on the outskirts of the township of Two Wells which residents considered would increase the hazards to children walking to and from school. Because of a number of features affecting the movement of pedestrian traffic at this location, I can appreciate the anxiety expressed by the parents of the school children. These children are at present obliged to cross over a road zoned at 45 miles an hour to take advantage of a footpath which is constructed on the opposite side of the road to their homes. Once in the township proper, they must cross the road again to obtain access to the school. There is little doubt that the most satisfactory solution to this problem is for council to construct a footpath from the homes of the children to the school, thereby removing the need for them to cross the road. Unfortunately, this is not as simple as may first appear, as there is a narrow bridge over Salt Creek along the road which, because of its narrowness, does not cater satisfactorily for pedestrian traffic. I have advised the council that the Highways Commissioner is prepared to assist by contributing 50 per cent of the total cost of providing footpaths on both sides of this bridge but, at the same time, have made this offer conditional upon the council preparing, submitting and obtaining approval of the detailed plans and, in addition, providing proper footpaths to and from the bridge on both sides for a sufficient distance to cater for the needs of children attending the school.

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport ascertain why a 25 miles an hour speed limit applies on the road bridge at Murray Bridge? The Minister probably knows that the speed limit through the township, on either side of the bridge, is 35 m.p.h.,

and on the bridge the limit is 25 m.p.h. Probably, the effect of the weight of heavy vehicles on the old structure is the reason for the reduced speed limit. If it is, will the Minister consider placing the 25 m.p.h. limit only on vehicles over a certain weight, say, five tons, thus allowing other motor vehicles, such as cars and utilities, to have the same speed limit on the bridge as applies through the township proper?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

EAST GAMBIER SCHOOL

Mr. BURDON: Can the Minister of Education say what plans the Education Department has for the building of a six-unit open-space classroom at the East Gambier Primary School, and whether it is expected that this open-space classroom will replace the present temporary timber-frame classrooms?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: From my recollections of the East Gambier Primary School, although the six-teacher open-space unit would make a considerable inroad into the present temporary accommodation, it would not replace all the temporary accommodation at that school. I will check on the programme for the honourable member to find out precisely when it is expected that tenders will be called for the open-space unit and when work is expected to be completed. I will also check on the specific point as to the extent of the replacement of temporary accommodation that will occur at the school as a consequence of the decision to construct the open-space unit.

FOOD PROCESSING

Mr. BECKER: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about food-processing prices?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Industrial Development Branch is aware that many essential food supplies are manufactured in the Eastern States and transported to South Australia for sale. The practice is in fact quite marked in the case of breakfast foods, especially cereals. The prevalence of this situation in the food and other industries highlights the need for a well-documented systematic drive to place directly before the companies concerned the advantages of locating in South Australia. I am therefore pleased to say that the Industrial Development Branch is at present engaged in such an exercise and that the branch has placed national food manufacturers high on the list of firms to be approached. I therefore hope that the present situation will in time be reversed.

WITNESS FEES

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Attorney-General consider increasing the fees payable to prosecution witnesses, as provided in the regulations under the Justices Act? I understand that at present the total sum payable is \$10 a day. Therefore, one would think that the fee for half a day would be \$5 but, in two cases that have recently come to my attention of working men who have lost a half a day's working time and the pay therefor, the fee paid has been only \$2.50.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will examine the matter and get a detailed reply for the honourable member.

SCHOOL OVALS

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Education now give the reply to my question about the use of school ovals on Sundays? The Minister gave me notice of the reply on the day on which the House adjourned for the show but, because of an agreement between the two Whips that Question Time on that day was to be cut down so that the Budget could be presented, I did not ask him for it then.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am pleased to be able to give the honourable member the reply now. The existing departmental practice regarding the use of school ovals is that outside sporting organizations may have the use of the grounds provided the following conditions are observed: (1) no charge for admission to be made; (2) proper decorum and ground cleanliness to be observed; (3) in the opinion of the Headmaster and school committee or council, the grounds are not subjected to excessive wear and tear to the detriment of normal school activities on the grounds; (4) the organization shall be responsible for any damage to school facilities on the grounds which may be caused through use of the grounds and the facilities by the organization; and (5) any other details be a matter for decision by the Headmaster and the school committee or council. The Director-General of Education considers that the present policy is satisfactory and does not need altering at present, and I concur with him in his views.

DUTHY STREET

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question regarding the upgrading of Duthy Street, Unley, and safety on that street?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The prime cause of the hazardous traffic conditions in Duthy Street and George Street is that it attracts

arterial traffic on what is essentially a suburban street. The grid pattern of streets gives rise to numerous priority problems where through traffic conflicts with local traffic. The Road Traffic Board furnished the Unley council with a report on Duthy Street in August, 1969. This report anticipated the "breaking up" of the through traffic movement by the installation of star-shaped islands at some intersections. These measures were not entirely acceptable and subsequently the board has recently authorized the erection of "stop" signs in Duthy Street in an attempt to discourage high-speed through traffic in this vicinity. The effectiveness of these signs cannot be accurately determined at present, owing to the short time lapse since their installation.

PORT LINCOLN HOSPITAL

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary to reconsider his attitude to the Port Lincoln Hospital, as detailed in the reply given on August 25, to my earlier question about this matter? In that reply, the Minister stated:

... the accommodation situation at the hospital is not yet considered to be such that detailed planning should be commenced. The only problem at present being encountered is one of allocation of available beds.

At that hospital 71 beds are available and a peak demand of 66 beds has been reached. Although this is the overall picture, the situation must be considered in relation to various sections in the hospital, such as the general, children's, and midwifery sections, and this is where the situation appears to be entirely different. I ask the Minister to consider, as I have considered, the situation within the various sections. Also, I know that, when the hospital appears to be reaching capacity, patients are discharged earlier than they would have been otherwise, so that spare beds will be available in case of an emergency. Because of this, the figure that I have given is not necessarily absolutely accurate.

However, it is the last part of the Minister's reply, in which he states that when the proposed domiciliary care scheme is fully operative it is expected that the need for beds for geriatric patients in Port Lincoln will be reduced significantly, that I consider warrants reconsideration. Most of the patients who need fully-hospitalized care are not those who can be attended to at home, even by a fully-organized domiciliary care unit. In Port Lincoln geriatric patients who should be receiving full hospital care are being turned away because there are already nine or 10

permanent geriatric patients in the hospital, which was not designed for any such patients.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

KIMBA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Works say what plans his department has to supply Kimba with water in the coming summer? A report in the local press states that at present Kimba has less water in storage than it has had for some years, and the relevant figures were given by the Hon. Mr. Whyte in another place.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will examine the honourable member's question. Understanding his concern, I will confer with officers of the department on whether they have yet considered any plans. I think the honourable member can rest assured that, if there was a problem there, the department would, as in the past, come to the aid of the people in the honourable member's district. In particular, if the honourable member looks at the Auditor-General's Report that he has received today, he will see that the greatest loss in the State is in respect of the Western Water District.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question regarding investigation of the activities of Planned Financial Management?

The Hon. L. J. KING: When replying to the honourable member's question on August 17, I indicated that I would make a further statement if further information came to hand. I have now received advice that the proprietor of Planned Financial Management has indicated that he is not proceeding with the scheme and that he will refund any moneys already collected.

STURT PEA

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say how many prosecutions have been launched for destroying the Sturt pea since this plant was proclaimed a protected plant in 1968? Until this year, 1968 was the last year in which we have had an abundant supply of wildflowers in the Flinders Ranges. This year we have a wonderful show of Sturt pea and hops, but I understand that, again, some of the Sturt pea is being destroyed. A report in the *Advertiser* of Monday, September 6, in relation to this matter states:

The Flinders "desecrated unwittingly". The Flinders Ranges are being desecrated unwittingly and by ignorance, according to Mr.

Dick Lang, a director of Desert Trek. Mr. Lang says destruction of the area's natural resources by travellers has been reported by drivers of the outback tours. Tourists have been seen picking the wild Sturt desert pea, a protected flower, by the carton. Mr. Lang says the whole plant is being picked up by the roots, which means it cannot regenerate in the next year. Although this vandalism is unintentional, people should be made aware of the consequences, he says.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will try to supply the honourable member with the number of prosecutions, although I accept that at best they would not be a considerable number, because of the problems of noticing where the picking had occurred. I agree that this is a matter for concern and that attention should be given to placing sufficient notices telling people who visit the area of the dangers they could cause. I shall be pleased to investigate this matter and to provide the honourable member with whatever information is available.

SWEENEY REPORT

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Education say what sections of the Report of the Inquiry into Salaries of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers in Colleges of Advanced Education, commonly known as the Sweeney report, the Government has implemented and whether he has given any thought to paragraph 12 (4) of the report, which states:

Encouragement should be offered to lecturing staff to go out into commerce and industry to refresh and deepen their knowledge of current practices and needs. Industry and commerce in their turn should be encouraged to furnish a number of suitably qualified people who can bring to the institute the fruits of their experience in these fields.

Other factors are mentioned in paragraph 12 (4) but I should like information from the Minister about how much of the report is accepted and on the section that allows for an interchange between industry and institute staffs.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: With respect to the Institute of Technology, the Sweeney report was implemented shortly after this Government came into office last year. Regarding the School of Art and the teachers colleges, the salaries for lecturers and senior lecturers are currently being reviewed by the Teachers Salaries Board and I understand that the report's recommendations are being considered by the board. I think the honourable member would appreciate that the salary determination by the board is not subject to the control of the Minister of Education. Regarding Roseworthy Agricultural College as presently constituted, the salaries of lecturers and senior

lecturers are controlled by the Public Service Board, and I imagine that the same applies to the School of Dental Therapy. Regarding the interchange of staff between tertiary institutions and industry, I am not aware of any exchanges that have taken place. Certainly, there was an exchange involving a teacher who was working in private industry in the United Kingdom, and this was approved. However in general, as I think the honourable member would also appreciate, any interchange between tertiary institutions and industry requires the co-operation of industry as well as the co-operation of the tertiary institutions. Inevitably, arrangements are somewhat complicated unless—

Dr. Eastick: Are you fostering them?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is difficult to say precisely what one should do to foster them. If the private industrial organizations have research arrangements, they can offer posts to people from tertiary institutions. However, most industrial firms do not have a research establishment in Adelaide and, as a consequence, the secondment of someone from a tertiary institution to a private firm would involve, in most cases, the replacement of someone already employed by the firm. It is all very well for the honourable member to say, "Have you fostered them?" The actual effect of interchange between industry and tertiary institutions depends not only on the willingness of the institutions, the Government or the Minister of Education, but also on the extent of effective co-operation from private industry. If the honourable member knows of a case where appropriate arrangements might be made, I should be grateful if he would let me know.

RAILWAYS PROMOTION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of August 12 about promotion in the Railways Department?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member asked me if I would have the system of promotions reviewed, and I presume from the tenor of his explanation to the question that he considers that a review is desirable. I understand that the Commonwealth Railways has adopted a system whereby the fireman classification has been replaced with a driver No. 2 classification and, if this is the type of reform the honourable member desires, I should be pleased to give it proper consideration. However, at present, the position regarding promotion from fireman to engineman in

the South Australian Railways is that, when a vacancy occurs, applications are called through the South Australian Railways *Weekly Notice*. All applications are thoroughly examined, but the provisions of the relevant award are that the fireman who is senior within his grade, and in all respects qualified and suitable shall have prior claim to be appointed as a driver. I have studied the case referred to by the honourable member and am completely satisfied that in all of the positions for which Mr. P. R. Ford applied, he being the person referred to by the honourable member, he has been junior to many other applicants.

LAND CLEARING

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to my question of August 24 about land clearing in the Adelaide Hills by the Woods and Forests Department?

Members interjecting:

Mr. EVANS: I should appreciate it if the Minister would give me the reply and if honourable members would keep quiet.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Conservator of Forests reports that the Woods and Forests Department will not be clearing any further areas of predominantly native forest on reserves adjacent to reservoirs in the Adelaide Hills catchment area. It has not bought any areas of predominantly natural forest for the purpose of clearing for pine planting for a number of years, and this policy will continue. Planting operations in the Adelaide Hills, necessary to meet an increasing timber demand, are being concentrated on purchased cleared and semi-cleared land as far as is practicable.

JUVENILE COURT

Mr. CUMBE: Does the Attorney-General recollect that on September 2 I asked him a question about the Juvenile Court magistrate's annual report, which is submitted to the Attorney? The Attorney replied to the effect that he would provide me and the House with the statistical tables contained in the report but that he would not publish the magistrate's comments. Is the Attorney-General aware that, for many years (and I have checked this point), the annual report of the Juvenile Court has contained comment by the Juvenile Court magistrate? As this is a matter of considerable importance not only to members but also to the community, and as a Bill dealing with this general subject is before the House, can the Minister say why on this

occasion (which, I think, is the first time for many years) he does not intend to publish or make available the comments of the Juvenile Court magistrate?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am aware of the practice that has been adopted of publishing the report of the Juvenile Court magistrate, and I am aware that in the past that report has contained comments of various kinds. I think that the question of whether the report should be published depends to a considerable extent on the character of the report and the comment. This year the Juvenile Court magistrate made a report that contained comment relating to matters of Government policy and, indeed, matters of controversy in the community regarding Government policy. This is a report to the Minister, and the comments of the magistrate are made to the Minister. In deciding not to publish, I had in mind that it had been a long-standing tradition of our Judiciary not to engage in public controversy on matters of policy; indeed, the same tradition applies to the Public Service, of which the magistrate is a member. It does not seem to me to be proper practice for a Minister to publish a report containing comment that the judicial officer or public servant would not make publicly in accordance with his duties. For that reason it seems to me that, whilst it is desirable that a public servant or, in certain circumstances, a judicial officer make comments to the Minister, it would be wrong to publish those comments if they were of a nature that the judicial officer would not, in accordance with the long-standing tradition, make in public.

CROWN LEASE RENTALS

Mr. VENNING: Has the Premier a reply to my question of August 11 about rural rents?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has asked that consideration be given to reducing the rentals of crown leases. In a rather similar question asked on the same day the member for Mallee asked that rentals on perpetual leases issued since 1960 be reviewed. Because of their similarity, this reply from the Minister of Lands will therefore cover both questions. Most perpetual leases were issued before 1960. At June 30, 1960, there were 13,620 ordinary perpetual leases in existence. Of these, 670 have a clause requiring the rentals to be revalued every 14 years, and for the remainder the rent is fixed in perpetuity. By June 30, 1965, there were

14,000 perpetual leases, and this number increased to 14,620 as at June 30, 1971.

Of the increase of 380 perpetual leases between 1960 and 1965, rents were fixed for 350 new leases, whilst there were 360 new leases in an increase of 620 perpetual leases between 1965 and 1971. In general, perpetual leases were issued with rents related to a conservative value of the land in the unimproved state at the time of commencement of the lease. Perpetual lease rents vary from a fraction of a cent an acre to quite substantial amounts, but most have rentals which, in present day monetary terms, can only be described as nominal.

In several areas, particularly in the Mid North, there are some perpetual leases, following the repurchase of large holdings for closer settlement. The holdings were developed or semi-developed, and the rents fixed on perpetual leases subsequently issued over these lands are at higher rates than for similar unimproved lands allotted at the same time, as the repurchase value of the clearing has been included in the rent. A similar situation applies for marginal lands perpetual leases which were issued in the 1940's in the main over repurchased, partly developed land used for building up small farms.

Before outlining the action that has been taken regarding rentals, the Minister of Lands wishes one thing to be made perfectly clear. With the exception of the comparatively few leases issued many years ago that have a clause providing for the rent to be revalued every 14 years, the Crown has no power to increase the rental of an existing perpetual lease that is being used for agricultural purposes. In 1969 and 1970 the rents on perpetual leases issued after January 1, 1966, were reviewed and reduced. Recently, the Minister of Lands approved of extended concessions for perpetual leases over lands under development. The effect of the concessions has been to freeze the rental at a figure substantially below the full rental fixed in the lease for as long as the present rural difficulties continue and the land remains undeveloped or partly developed.

In addition to the rental concession, the lessees are not being required to comply with the development conditions in the leases during the period of the concession. Furthermore, the concession applies not only to the allottees of development land but also to those who purchased land from other lessees at speculative prices. Finally, the Minister points out that

any lessee can apply to him for a reduction in rental and that any such applications would be considered on an individual basis.

BRIGHTON ROAD

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about property acquisition on Brighton Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There are only two outstanding property acquisitions on Brighton Road between Sturt Road and the Hove railway crossing, and they are Nos. 459-475 (one property) and No. 431.

FLINDERS RANGES

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to my recent question about a 16mm. colour film depicting wildflowers in the Flinders Ranges?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The film *Flinders, Ranges of Legend* has been shown regularly in Tourist Bureau Wednesday night film shows, for interstate and overseas visitors. These film shows are at present conducted in the theatre in the State Administration Centre. The film is borrowed extensively by various clubs and schools from the Tourist Bureau library, and it has been televised on several occasions. Fifteen prints have been made of the film. Besides our own library, these prints have been placed with the Agent-General in London, with State film libraries in New South Wales and Victoria, with the Australian Tourist Commission for overseas distribution, and, on loan, with shipping companies. The filming of wildflowers in the Flinders Ranges, which took place in 1968, was combined with a film shot in the Mount Lofty Ranges to produce a new film called *Springtime in the Ranges*. Ten prints of this film have been made. These have been given a similar distribution to prints of *Flinders, Ranges of Legend*.

PORT LINCOLN HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Minister of Education obtain a report on the type of solid construction that will be used to construct the Port Lincoln High School, the construction of which was recently approved by the Public Works Committee? I have been approached by a manufacturer of modular cement masonry in Port Lincoln who wishes to tender for the supply of brickwork for this project. As the Minister is aware, the module for this type of construction is different from that used for ordinary clay brick. Therefore, I ask what type of construction is contemplated in the plans and specifications for this school and

whether they can be adapted to modular masonry in order to allow this firm to tender. As it is a local firm, a considerable saving may result.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to investigate this matter.

SCENIC ROAD

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I recently asked about the scenic road at Coromandel Valley?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The final alignment of the scenic road through Coromandel Valley has not yet been determined by the Highways Department. The owner of the property in question has discussed his proposals with the Highways Department, and every effort is being made to minimize the effect on his proposals whilst maintaining a satisfactory alignment. However, further work is required on this proposal before it can be considered final, and the owner will be kept fully informed of developments. It is expected that a final decision in this matter will be available within two months.

EYRE HIGHWAY

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the Government has considered approaching the Commonwealth Government for a long-term loan so that work on sealing Eyre Highway may be continued?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The State Government has consistently approached the Commonwealth Government in an endeavour to have work on the Eyre Highway proceeded with at a reasonable rate. The Premier has probably become sick and tired of making requests in this regard. I do not know whether he has kept a tally of the number of requests made, but I point out that there has always been a consistent approach to the Commonwealth Government. I as Minister have taken every possible opportunity to encourage the State to take any steps that may be necessary to obtain the assistance needed to do this work.

Mr. Venning: Why don't you talk to some Commonwealth members in this State?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am pleased that the member for Rocky River has interjected. Although he is completely out of order, I suggest that, if members opposite were fair dinkum and not hypocritical, as is one member I know who made certain statements a day or so ago, and if in the interests of South Australia they approached their Commonwealth colleagues who, after all, occupy the Treasury benches, I believe that some useful purpose

could be served. Rather, we have the sniping from members that is going on at present.

Mr. Venning: No, no!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is no good the member for Rocky River saying "No, no", because the member for Eyre, who asked this question, has previously written to the Commonwealth Minister on this matter. He has done that on his own admission, and he has made no attempt to induce the Commonwealth Government to spend money on this road. This is a national road: figures have been consistently quoted in this House to show that basically it is not South Australians who are using it. Therefore, there must be a national approach: we must take politics out of this matter. If members opposite are willing to make approaches, I assure them that the Government will be most appreciative. Let members opposite show just how much influence they may have on Mr. McMahon, Mr. Snedden, Mr. Nixon—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Or whoever's there.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I know, from what I heard on radio, that Mr. McMahon was Prime Minister yesterday. I repeat that, if members opposite are willing to make these requests in the interests of South Australia, their efforts will be greatly appreciated by the Government.

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say what plans the Government has to continue with the sealing of the Eyre Highway after the sealing of the section between Ceduna and Penong has been completed? The sealing between Ceduna and Penong is making excellent progress and my constituents are wondering what plans the Government has to continue with work on the next section. I hope that, when the Minister replies, he will give me a reasonable reply, not a dissertation insulting the Commonwealth Government, as he did in reply to another question.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I thought the earlier reply that I gave the honourable member was very reasonable. We have repeatedly said that this State will continue with the building and sealing of the Eyre Highway. However, I think it has been worked out that to complete the job with the resources that the State is able to provide for the work will take about 25 years. I am not sure when the sealing of the section to Penong will be completed but I know that, as soon as it is, forward work will be commenced and the job will continue to the extent that State finances

are available. However, I think it is asking a little too much to ask me to try to predict very far into the future. I do not know whether the present Commonwealth Government will change its mind and give this assistance to South Australia. It has assisted every other State in Australia with national projects, particularly just before Commonwealth elections. It will be interesting to see whether the Commonwealth Government decides to change its mind about the Eyre Highway perhaps about the middle of next year, as a gimmick to try to buy a few votes. However, let me say that, if it does not do that, it will then be too late, because a Labor Government will be in office after the next Commonwealth election.

EMERGENCY HOUSING

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about emergency housing?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The question asked seems to put emphasis on the provision of capital for housing and seems to assume that if there were more capital available for housing it would be best employed in building what seemed to be called emergency dwellings. There are, however, certain problems associated with this type of housing. It will be recalled that in the immediate post-war years the housing position was so acute that hundreds of families were living in sheds, shanties and many even in tents pitched on metropolitan beaches. The trust erected and administered the emergency dwelling scheme on behalf of the Government and provided accommodation for these families who were living under the worst conditions. However, many difficulties were experienced with the emergency scheme, particularly from a local government and a social welfare point of view. The scheme was eventually replaced with permanent houses. The trust has noted the current interest in this housing problem being taken by social welfare agencies and certainly admires the efforts which they are making. The present problem is not peculiar to South Australia, and all Australian housing authorities are of the opinion that there is no solution at the moment for the immediate housing of those on lower incomes within the context of the present financial arrangements. The trust has now built more than 33,400 houses for rental and depends extensively on vacancies occurring from these to assist families urgently requiring accommodation. In the past year, 4,487 families were housed by the trust in rental properties, and this represents about 86 each week. The

problem and process of selecting tenants is literally a never-ending one and is a difficult matter. The trust has always held the view that it does the greatest justice if it selects its tenants as far as possible in the date order of applying.

True, every family who applies to the trust for rental housing appears to have a need, even though the reasons and apparent degree of urgency vary considerably. There is no doubt that, if applicants were housed on urgency alone, many ordinary families, equally deserving and worthy of assistance, who have not come under the notice of outside agencies, would just never be housed, because each time their turn came they would be superseded by an apparently more immediately urgent case. However, this does not mean that the trust never houses families out of their turn. Each week several cases are approved by the trust for special treatment, and this will continue. In the current discussion about emergency type accommodation it sometimes seems to be inferred that the trust is not housing low-income families. During July, the trust housed 374 families in rental accommodation; 27 of these were in receipt of an income of less than \$40 a week, and nearly 100 families were earning \$50 or less a week. The trust's study of those families housed in July is summarized as follows:

95	or 25.4 per cent	earning \$50 a week or less
196	or 52.4 per cent	earning \$60 a week or less
271	or 72.5 per cent	earning \$70 a week or less
304	or 81.3 per cent	earning \$75 a week or less
70	or 18.7 per cent	earning more than \$75 a week

The majority of those in the higher income level housed during July were as a result of oversea or interstate recruiting by the universities and the State Public Service, and those tenants would have been housed in the single-unit type houses and paying a comparatively higher rent than the average tenant. Naturally, like any other authority on whom there are such pressures, the trust could use other funds if they were available. The trust, of course, cannot determine the overall allocation of the Loan funds available to the Government but, in any discussion concerning the allocation available to the trust, the above factors concerning the present programme, the method of allocation of the houses and the dangers and difficulties of emergency housing certainly must be taken into account.

STATE BANK

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say whether the State Bank has considered opening a branch

in King William Street? In view of the Government's action in purchasing the A.N.Z. Bank building, I should like to know whether the Premier or the board of the State Bank has considered recommending that that bank open a branch, preferably in these premises. This would provide a service to people working in that part of the city who are paying instalments on housing loans and conducting general business with the State Bank.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is one of the uses being examined.

ELLISTON HOSPITAL

Mr. GUNN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary when it is expected that the report on the future development of the Elliston Hospital can be sent to the council, which is anxious to carry out work at this hospital? Some months ago, a Mr. Rankin of the Hospitals Department visited the Elliston Hospital, inspecting it with a view to reporting to the council so that it would know how best to develop the hospital in the best interests of the citizens of the area.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

OVERLAND TAVERN

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say what plans, if any, he has for augmenting or extending the only section of the South Australian Railways that pays its way (other than the movement of grain)—the Overland Tavern at the Adelaide railway station?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Although this matter is being considered at present, I cannot give the honourable member details.

MOORUNDE RESERVE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation consider chairing round-table talks on the question of the Moorunde Reserve? In the last few weeks, the subject of the funds that were collected for the Moorunde Reserve has been canvassed publicly and in this place, doubts having been expressed whether the money has been spent to the best effect (that probably sums it up). A week or so ago (during the Parliamentary recess), I noticed that the Minister had said that the best thing he thought he could do was to bring the parties together around the table, and that he was looking for someone to chair such a meeting. At the risk of commenting, I must say that it immediately occurred to me that the Minister could do the job.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I should be only too happy to chair a meeting such as the honourable member has suggested if I thought it would serve a useful purpose. I called together the people who were interested in this project, suggesting to them that such a discussion might serve a useful purpose and that one of the problems in arranging that discussion might be the difficulty of finding a chairman to suit the needs of all concerned. I said I should be happy to chair such a meeting or do whatever I could to provide a chairman who would meet with the approval of all concerned. However, after that discussion with the parties involved, I received correspondence from those who had been invited to the conference. Although two groups said they would be happy to participate in discussions of this type, the third party (the Natural History Society) said it was not prepared to take part in any further discussions. Therefore, the question of who should chair such a meeting is not important at this stage.

Mr. Millhouse: Where do we go from here?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: If the honourable member looks at the other replies I have given in the House on this matter, he will see that there appears to be no area in which the Government can become involved; apparently any action that can be taken must be taken by the parties involved in the dispute.

GAS

Mr. CUMBE: I wish to ask the Premier a question about the development of the natural gas pipeline from Gidgealpa to Sydney. My understanding is that the valuable new finds in the Gidgealpa area that have recently been announced prove that further extensive reserves are now available over and above the reserve of at least 20 years required for the South Australian pipeline. I understand that, based on this extra quantity, negotiations are now proceeding to build a pipeline from this field to Sydney. I believe that our present legislation provides that a licence is required for that part of South Australia through which the pipeline will travel. Can the Premier say what transactions have been completed and what stage negotiations have reached? This matter is of interest to South Australia, as we collect royalties on this sale.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A letter of intent has been signed between the producers and the Australian Gaslight Company of New South Wales providing that the Australian Gaslight Company will take gas from the field of Gidgealpa-Moomba and will be responsible for

the construction of the pipeline from New South Wales to Gidgealpa-Moomba. The price has been negotiated, and the letter of intent is subject to proof of reserves at stated levels. It is expected that the proof will be obtained. The present process of setting out the proof of reserves in the area is ahead of schedule. On all indications, the reserve proved will be in excess both of the requirements of the supply of the Sydney market and of the supply of the South Australian market with the existing pipeline. In addition, it is evident now that we will prove sufficient liquids on the field that the combination of oil and of wet gas extracted from the gas to be supplied to Sydney, plus the wet wells which we have but which are not being operated for that purpose, could give us the base of a liquid pipeline to Adelaide or some other place in South Australia where the liquids would be used. That is the subject of a current feasibility study.

BRIDGEWATER SCHOOL

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Education say what is the result of his discussions with the Minister of Works about repair work to be carried out at the Bridgewater Primary School? When I raised the matter with the Minister of Education on August 17, he said that he would take it up with the Minister of Works. General maintenance of the Bridgewater school is in a fairly poor state, and I know that the Minister and officers of his department are concerned about this. Work at this school was originally delayed as a result of the contractor's walking out on the contract. If the Minister does not now have a report of his discussions with the Minister of Works, will he obtain it for me soon?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As the honourable member would appreciate, discussions with the Minister of Works are often complicated, always pleasant, but sometimes drawn out. He can also rest assured that, when the report is available, it will be given to him, and that the Minister of Works is as concerned as I am about solving satisfactorily the problem to which he has referred.

OH! CALCUTTA!

Mr. VENNING: Will the Attorney-General say whether he intends to recommend to Cabinet that the Government subscribe to the fund (should it be established) to enable an appeal against the decision of the Full Court of South Australia to prohibit the performance of *Oh! Calcutta!* in this State? I want to make perfectly clear that I and many of my colleagues

on this side do not support the staging of this play in South Australia. However, as you know, Mr. Speaker, the Government has at this time permitted *Oh! Calcutta!* to proceed, inasmuch as the company that intended to stage it went ahead and altered the theatre, amongst other things, and spent about \$300,000, whereas the Government, in the early stages, could have done the right thing and prevented this situation from developing.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am very much impressed indeed by the tenderness that the honourable member feels for the entrepreneurs who sought to stage *Oh! Calcutta!* in South Australia and I am sure that they, too, will appreciate greatly the tenderness that the honourable member displays about their financial loss. Of course, the fact is that from the beginning these people were told that it was necessary for them to comply with the law of South Australia. The initial correspondence on the matter has been tabled in this House and I have made many statements on it, both here and outside the House. Everyone was aware of the situation. If the entrepreneurs chose to go ahead and spend their money without first ensuring that they could stage a production that complied with the laws of South Australia, that was entirely a matter for them and for their decision. The reply to the honourable member's question is "No".

NUMBER PLATES

Mr. HALL: Has the Premier a reply to my question regarding the supply of reflectorized number plates?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am afraid that there is little I can add to what I told the Leader on August 31 regarding this matter. The members who represent Whyalla and Mount Gambier (as well as the Minister of Works) have taken up the case of manufacturers in the cities concerned. Investigations are proceeding and a report to Cabinet will be made in due course.

BELAIR NATIONAL PARK

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say what progress has been made on investigating the suitability and acquisition from the Heyer brothers of about 70 acres on the east of the Belair National Park?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You could buy that for the State yourself, couldn't you?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. EVANS: Recently I wrote the Minister stating that the property was available for

purchase, to be added to the Belair National Park if it was suitable. A report by William Reschke in last weekend's *Sunday Mail* states that the creeks in the national park are becoming polluted and, if there was further subdivision in the Upper Sturt Estate area (where the land to which I refer is situated), there would be greater pollution of the creeks in the national park. I have also been told that private persons interested in this land are negotiating to have the price reduced to acquire it and, perhaps, to subdivide it in future. I consider it important that, if the land is suitable as an addition to the Belair National Park, negotiations be carried out as quickly as possible. If the land is not suitable, we need not worry about the matter.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I recall the honourable member's correspondence, requesting that this matter be considered. I referred it to the Commissioner of National Parks, asking him to investigate the area and to report whether it was suitable for purchase as part of the national park. I do not recall receiving a reply and, because of the honourable member's question, I will try to hasten the submission of a report.

METROPOLITAN PLANNING

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has the State Planning Authority re-examined the development plan for the metropolitan planning area, pursuant to section 35 of the Planning and Development Act?

2. If not, when will such a re-examination be undertaken?

3. If so, has a supplementary development plan for this area been prepared?

4. Has the authority yet made any report to the Minister pursuant to section 35 (7) of the Planning and Development Act?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. Not applicable.

3. Yes.

4. The reference to section 35 (7) is not understood. The State Planning Authority has submitted the development plan to the Minister in accordance with section 35 (2) as it relates to section 31 of the Act.

THE BUDGET

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): When I attended a meeting at Waikerie last evening I was reminded of the previous Government's intention to renew the police facilities in that town and of the negotiations and consultations the previous Government had had concerning the provision of a new police building at Waikerie. The situation there is of extreme local concern: the police station consists of a 12ft. by 12ft. room which, as I understand it, must provide accommodation not only for the public who may require the services of the Police Force but also for the two officers who serve there, and now a third officer has, I believe, been appointed there. The premises therefore are totally inadequate, and my inquiries of local councillors have revealed that the council knows nothing of any further move of any substance for the replacement of this outmoded facility. Although it may be that the Government has plans ready to announce soon, I urge on the Government the great need at Waikerie for facilities for police staff as well as for the public who use the services of the Police Force. This project is something that cannot be put off any longer, and it is the Government's duty to ensure that the previous negotiations and consultations are carried through to an effective conclusion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I had not intended to speak now, except for a matter which came up during Question Time and on which I desire to make a most emphatic protest (and I am glad that the Attorney-General is present to listen to what I have to say). I understood the Attorney-General, when replying to the member for Torrens, to say that he did not intend to make public, as has been done ever since I have been a member (and even longer than that), the report of the Adelaide Juvenile Court magistrate. The only conclusion that one can draw from the Attorney-General's reply is that there is a matter in the report which is critical of certain of the Government's proposals.

Mr. Gunn: That would be understandable.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not canvass the rights or wrongs of the issue, but the only conclusion I can draw is that there is matter in the report which is critical of the policy and proposals of the Government, and that the Attorney-General wants to conceal the points made by the Juvenile Court magistrate from members of this House and from the public generally. It is very bad that the Attorney-General should try to get through this House his own legislation and muzzle those who have knowledge and experience of the matters by

doing something that has never in my experience been done before, namely, suppressing a report of the Juvenile Court magistrate. The tradition in this place, as I understand it (perhaps I am wrong), is that Ministers make public reports of various kinds. Some such reports must be made public because of a statutory direction, but other reports are made public as a matter of course. Reports are made public whether or not they are critical of Government policy. After all, the people of this State are entitled to know what are the views of the Juvenile Court magistrate. What does it matter whether they are adverse to the Government or not? Surely the Government can stand up to criticism.

If the Government believes that Mr. Beerworth is wrong (this is the only conclusion I can draw), the Attorney-General is here to reply to anything raised in debate. It is very bad for reports of this nature, which previously, as a matter of course, have been released to the public, to be released no longer, simply because it does not suit the Attorney-General of the day. I make a most emphatic protest about this matter. It is perhaps a result of the fact that the Attorney-General is new (actually, he has been here for about 18 months) and does not fully understand the conventions.

I could not help but smile at the reply given by the Attorney when he was talking about members of the magistracy making public their views on things. I well remember that, some few months before the honourable gentleman became a member of this place and when I was the Attorney-General, the then Leader of the Opposition (the present Premier) did not scruple to use the publicized views of the magistrates in opposition to the intermediate courts legislation. Almost the whole of his speech on the second reading in opposition to the Bill was composed of the views of magistrates in the Adelaide Magistrates Court. I did not like those views and I disagreed with them, but they had been expressed and they were used against the Government of the day. Now, when the present Attorney-General is in office, he is apparently going to conceal from the public and members of this place the views of another magistrate on a matter that is coming before this House for debate. This is a very poor show.

The views of successive Juvenile Court magistrates have always been publicized, and they have always been worth considering. They have been taken up by newspapers and other media because this is a matter of very great concern. I cannot but think that the views

of Mr. Beerworth, who has been a Juvenile Court magistrate for well over 12 months (he was appointed in May of last year), would be very valuable to this House. It is entirely wrong for the Government to suit its own convenience and avoid controversy by suppressing his report. I hope the Attorney-General and the Government will change their position and publish the report of the Juvenile Court magistrate so that we may have the benefit of his views when the matter is discussed here. Of course, I do not know whether or not I will agree with them.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I support the remarks of the member for Mitcham. A fundamental principle is being violated. I have not always agreed with reports of Juvenile Court magistrates in the past, as the Attorney-General will well know. As a member of the Social Welfare Advisory Council, I was present when that council received lengthy submissions from the magistrates. Although one did not always agree with everything they said, one had to admit that they were learned men putting a view that they thoroughly believed in. I did not agree fully with the last report; I thought the principles were relevant to the Middle Ages. The magistrates said that there had been a large increase in juvenile crime because the number of offences was increasing. The disposition of juvenile offenders causes us all great concern. I shall not canvass the matter any further, but the Attorney-General knows very well what I mean.

I suspect that the report of the present Juvenile Court magistrate follows very much the same lines as the last report, and that this line does not agree with the Bill that has been introduced. I think it does a great disservice not only to this House but to the public and the magistrate, because surely he has a right to put forward his viewpoint to the community. Whether we agree with it or not, this matter should be brought before the House and the community, because otherwise there is no basis for discussion. If the Attorney-General and the Government have decided not to release this report because of the Bill before this House, the Government's policy is entirely misguided, and I strongly protest against it.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): On the previous sitting day I asked the Attorney-General whether he would present the report of the Juvenile Court magistrate, because I believed that members would find it valuable when discussing the Bill that had been introduced.

I was surprised to hear the Attorney-General conclude his reply by saying that he did not intend to publish the magistrate's comments on matters of policy. Up to that time I had had no idea that the Government contemplated that action. I then went to the library and found that for many years the report of the Juvenile Court magistrate had been made available not only to members but also to members of the public and bodies interested in juvenile welfare. I stress that what was made public was not only the statistical section of the report but also the magistrate's comments. I therefore asked the Attorney-General earlier this afternoon why he intended to make available only the statistical record—not the magistrate's comments. The Attorney-General's reply was an example of him at his very best in evading a question. I know that the Attorney-General is very skilled in that respect.

Successive Governments, including the Government in which the present Premier and Treasurer was the Attorney-General, published the report. Every Attorney-General whom I can recall has published the magistrate's comments in full. Admittedly, the magistrate reports to the Minister, but it has always been the custom to publish freely his comments. In other words, the magistrate has been free to make his comments available to the public and to interested parties, and he has not been muzzled or shut up. However, that is what seems to be happening this time. I do not know what is in the report, because only the Minister or possibly Cabinet would know that.

The Hon. L. J. King: That puts you at a great disadvantage in deciding whether or not it should be published.

Mr. CUMBE: That is another matter entirely. Whether or not I agree with the contents of the report, I believe, as a matter of principle and following past custom, that the magistrate's comments should be published. Why hide something under the carpet? Why not bring it out into the open? Whether or not the magistrate's comments suit the Attorney-General or this House, and whether or not they are acceptable to the public, I believe that they should be aired. It is a matter of principle and freedom that they should be made available to the public. Irrespective of who the magistrate may be, I believe that his views should be given freely, and without favour or restraint, to the people who are interested in this subject. For the first time for many years the comments of the magistrate are to be suppressed.

I was dissatisfied with the Attorney's reply to my question this afternoon. The magistrate's comments may have some adverse effect on the legislation. However, I asked my question in the hope that the information might be of some guidance to members when discussing the Bill being promoted by the Attorney-General. Members could have made up their minds whether or not they accepted the magistrate's comments, but I object to the fact that, for the first time for many years, the report is not being made available. In other words, it is being suppressed. As members can speak for those they represent, I am concerned that the Government is doing a disservice in not making this report available to the House and, through the House, to the people of this State. It makes me suspicious that there is something to hide, and I strongly deprecate the Government's action. The Attorney's reply this afternoon was completely unsatisfactory, and I regret the action that has been taken.

Whether or not the report is acceptable to the House, it is for this House to judge: that has been the practice for many years. I remind the Attorney that many reports have to be made public by statutory requirement or by command: for example, the Auditor-General's Report. The Auditor-General may criticize the Government, but he cannot be discharged from his high office in normal circumstances. His report is published in this House under Statute. Although there is no obligation to publish the Juvenile Court magistrate's report, it has been the custom in the past (and one that should be continued) for it to be published. I condemn the action of the Government, and of the Attorney-General in particular, in hiding this report and pushing it under cover.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I wish to reply briefly to what has been said, because one of the great difficulties in discussing this issue is that one really cannot discuss it without referring to the contents of the report that has not been published. This makes useful discussion of such a decision extremely difficult. Indeed, the member for Torrens, when pointing out that he did not know the contents of the report, emphasized the difficulty of carrying on a discussion of this kind. I emphatically disagree with the point of view of the member for Mitcham. This is a report by a judicial officer who is a public servant, but my emphasis for the purpose of this debate is rather on the fact that

he is a judicial officer. It has been a long-standing tradition, and one that I subscribe to, that a judicial officer does not take part in public controversy on the issues of the day.

I realize that this is not a tradition that has been universally observed and, regrettably, there have been instances where people holding judicial office have seen fit to take part in public controversy. However, I believe that the status, the independence, the detachment, and the respect of and for the Judiciary all suffer when this situation arises. Let me say at once that the report that has been made by the Juvenile Court magistrate contains comment on matters of Government policy and on matters relating to the Juvenile Courts Bill that is now before the House. Without referring to the contents of the report, I make it clear that there are comments on that subject matter. The member for Torrens need not rely on suspicion that there may be something in the report on this subject: there is, and that is why I decided that the report should not be made public. In these circumstances I believe that to make the report public would lead inevitably to involving a member of the Judiciary in a current public controversy, and I think that would be entirely wrong, because of the time-honoured judicial tradition of remaining aloof on matters of public controversy.

That is the point of view that would be recognized by the magistrate himself (although I cannot speak for him), and it is a well-accepted tradition. Therefore, if it would be wrong for a judicial officer to engage in public controversy, it would be doubly wrong for the Minister to publish a report made to the Minister that contained controversial matters of this kind. Necessarily, a discussion on this topic has to turn on generalities, because one cannot be specific without referring to the contents of the report and, in the long run, it must be a matter for the judgment of the Minister to decide whether a report by a judicial officer can be published without harm to the judicial tradition of detachment from public controversy, or whether it cannot.

The member for Torrens has referred to the fact that previous reports have been published: of course they have, and, in the judgment of the Minister who was responsible for their publication, it did not, in the circumstances, cause any detriment to the detached position of the Judiciary. I considered that, in the present circumstances and having regard to the contents of the present report, it could not be published without involving a member of the Judiciary in a public controversy on

a current issue, and that it would be entirely wrong for the Minister by his action to bring about that situation.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I should like to refer to a matter that has been raised in this House in the last few months: the insect lerp. I believe the Minister of Environment and Conservation has dodged his responsibility in this matter. Very little is known about this insect, which is causing considerable damage to the pink and red gum trees in the South-East. No-one seems to care about this. On July 15, I asked the Minister of Environment and Conservation to confer with the Minister of Agriculture to see what could be done to eradicate this insect, and in reply he said:

I assume the honourable member is referring not to trees in national parks in the South-East but to those growing generally in that area.

I was merely asking the Minister to confer with his colleague in an attempt to do something about this insect. It took 12 days to get a reply, which meant very little. The Minister merely said that he had discussed the matter with the Minister of Agriculture and the Conservator of Forests and that the Government was examining it. He then virtually left the problem to the people in the area. The member for Victoria raised the matter again on August 26, and in reply the Minister said:

The problem concerning this lerp infestation was first referred to by another member opposite who had expert knowledge of country areas.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Hear, hear!

Mr. BECKER: The Minister can be facetious if he likes, but I want him to do something about this matter. Being the Minister responsible for conservation, he should, instead of shooting pellets at me, shoot them at some of the trees in the area in an attempt to eradicate this insect. This is indeed a serious matter, and I wish the Minister would treat it as such. The member for Victoria and I again raised the matter on August 31, and the Minister said:

Although I believe that the Minister of Agriculture would undoubtedly have taken this course—

referring to the course mentioned by my colleague—

I shall be happy to ask whether he has inquired of the C.S.I.R.O. whether or not it can help.

The people in the South-East are most concerned about this insect and want something done about it, so much so that the Coonalpyn Downs council has approached the Minister of Environment and Conservation, as was reported in the *Border Chronicle* on August 5. Although

the Agriculture Department has examined this problem, it has not solved it. A friend of mine in the South-East received a letter from the Agriculture Department regarding this insect. I will read it, and perhaps then I can challenge the Minister, who should be concerned about preserving this State's gum trees. Next week is tourist week, when tourism in this State will be promoted. Everyone will be encouraged to grow native trees, but there is no point in one's doing this or growing gum trees if the Minister allows this pest to destroy them. Part of the letter to which I have referred, which is not dated, is as follows:

Lerp insects on eucalypts have three generations each year; there are two during the summer and one during the winter. The winter generation develops from eggs which are laid and hatch during late January-February. Populations can build up to large numbers and remain over a long period of time, which can ultimately kill a tree. Trees that are well watered during the summer and autumn can withstand the attack of lerps much better than trees grown under dry-land conditions. This would be due partly to the better growing conditions and also because the lerp population does not become as dense on well watered trees. The control of lerp insects can be tackled in the following ways:

- (1) In home gardens, if there is an adequate supply of water, watering infested trees during summer and autumn may alleviate the problem.
- (2) Regarding saplings, young trees can be treated with a 0.1-0.15 per cent malathion (malathion®) spray. This spray is best applied during autumn (February-March) to control the winter generation when the nymphs are small and the lerp cases have not been fully formed.
- (3) Regarding mature trees, spraying of large trees is not practical. These trees can be treated with bidrin.

The letter goes on to say that bidrin, which is manufactured by the Shell Company, can be used in various ways, and that one must be a specialist to use it. The Government is doing little to help the people of the South-East control this insect. These people want to control it, and the Government should be assisting them to do so. It is now up to the Government to take the appropriate steps to supply the necessary chemicals to control this insect and eventually to eradicate it. I challenge the Minister to get moving quickly on this matter, or he will find that there will be no red or pink gum trees in the South-East to protect.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation): I am surprised that the honourable member has raised this matter in the way he has today, as I have provided him with a comprehensive reply to

a question he asked earlier. It appears that I may have provided him with too much information. Since then, the member for Victoria has raised the matter; I told him that I should be happy to take up the matter with the Agriculture Department and to ask the Minister of Agriculture to seek information that might provide an answer to this problem. It was clear in the earlier reply I gave that, because of the conditions obtaining in the South-East, land that had been cleared created conditions suitable for this pest. It therefore surprises me that the honourable member attacks the Agriculture Department as if it were doing very little about this matter. I am surprised, first, because of the comprehensive reply with which I have already provided him and, secondly, because of the detailed report which he read out and which had been provided to the Young Liberals organization in the South-East. I believe that was a very good reply and, indeed, that it was useful to those people in that area experiencing difficulties with this pest.

As I have said before, I have asked the Agriculture Department to do what it can to solve this problem, and I have asked it whether it will discuss the matter with the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization. I am awaiting a reply to the question asked two weeks ago by the member for Victoria, and I hope that when that answer is available the questions raised today will be answered.

Motion carried.

In Committee of Supply.

The Estimates—Grand total, \$449,218,000.
(Continued from September 2. Page 1353.)

THE LEGISLATURE

Legislative Council, \$56,893.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): The Budget is, to say the least, most ambiguous: it endeavours to do what, for instance, the Attorney-General is doing regarding his portfolio; that is, create a cloak of secrecy or confusion. It is interesting to note that the document put out by the Treasurer to confuse the media of the State treats lightly the matter of increased revenue raising in South Australia. The document states that the effect on the average citizen will be little, and I think the Treasurer said that most of the increases were graduated charges that would have little impact on the average citizen. It is interesting to note also that in the last 15 months the Government's publicity effort has been largely successful, because the public of South Australia does not total month by month, or

sequence by sequence, the total impact of the taxation that the Treasurer has introduced into South Australia.

I believe that few people have taken the trouble to tally the score as it stands today, and few understand that within the 15 or 16 months of his Administration the Treasurer has introduced record high increases in taxation, to be met by the citizens of this State. The Treasurer has done this astutely and with the correct publicity, and I believe that he has been largely successful in redirecting the gaze that might otherwise have been cast at the various measures introduced. In this case, the Treasurer adds significantly to taxation, and he has diverted the gaze by saying he regrets that there may be a deficit of \$7,000,000; the taxation will have little impact on the average citizen; and he hopes that the Commonwealth Government will provide more finance by the time the year is out. This is a good tidy statement to the public which ignores the increasing grip of Government taxation on the people of South Australia.

In this instance, the Treasurer hits particularly at young people. This is a young person's Budget, but in a reverse sense, because it goes straight to the hip pocket of the young people of South Australia. It affects students in our tertiary institutions: it applies, for example, when they buy a motor car or a house. It is to the young group that the Government has said, "You will be the target this time." Of course, by next March the Treasurer may introduce another of his rolling taxation measures. If we examine this rather short period of 15 or 16 months in which the Government has been in office, we see that it has introduced a rolling series of taxation measures, the public having been led to believe that these measures have a minimal effect on the average citizen. The Treasurer's statement began in a confusing way, and I read the first sentence or two with interest. The Treasurer said:

The Revenue Budget I present to the Committee today forecasts aggregate payments of \$453,968,000, aggregate receipts of \$446,622,000, and accordingly a current deficit of \$7,346,000. This present estimate of a deficit somewhat greater than I would wish to contemplate should be considered against a background of changes in Commonwealth-State financial relationships and an accumulated deficit on Revenue Account despite the achievement of a nominal surplus last year.

What on earth would a "nominal surplus" do to reduce the deficits handed out by the previous Walsh and Dunstan Governments? What does the Treasurer mean by those useless words that I have just quoted? The

situation concerning this Government is one of a considerable accumulation of resources provided by the taxpayers of South Australia and by the Commonwealth Government. We note in this document a distinct lack of information on Government programmes, no reference being made, for example, under "Highways Department" to what the Government intends to do about the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan; nothing is said about how much of the plan the Government will implement, how much of it has already been implemented, how much of the work is in progress today, or how much will be implemented in the coming year. None of this information is detailed, and we must continue to take the smacks of the Minister of Roads and Transport when he replies to questions properly asked of him.

Dealing with the cloaking of Government taxation and with the real facts concerning the increase in Government expenditure, I find it interesting to look back over the years at the increased receipts of Government: in 1960-61, there was a 7.5 per cent increase in Government receipts in this State; in 1961-62, there was an 8 per cent increase; in 1962-63, 4.7 per cent; in 1963-64, 8.1 per cent; in 1964-65, 5.3 per cent; in 1965-66, 6.6 per cent; in 1966-67, 9.3 per cent; in 1967-68, 6.1 per cent; in 1968-69, 8.7 per cent; in 1969-70, 13.5 per cent; in 1970-71, 14.3 per cent; and in 1971-72, 15.44 per cent. The average citizen is led to believe that this Government is reduced to the situation of being a pauper, as a result of the Commonwealth Government's attitude. Nothing is more false or deceitful in political life in South Australia than the way in which this Government maintains that attitude.

It is plain deceitfulness to mislead the public of South Australia into believing that the State Administration is suffering from a lack of funds, in comparison to sums provided in other years, because the rate of increase in State receipts has, for all practical purposes in the last year or so, doubled the rate of increase that obtained a decade ago. The rate of payments generally parallels that of receipts. The story over the years, especially under a Liberal Government, has been one of balance between payment and receipt. We are interested to note the Government's intention this year, receipts increasing at a record rate of 15.44 per cent and payments increasing by 17.35 per cent, to give us a deficit of \$7,300,000. I have previously stated in this place that State Governments, especially the Government in this State, will be unable to maintain an increased rate

of expenditure compounded at a rate of 15 per cent a year. The reason why that rate of increase cannot be maintained year after year is simply that the Government is existing on new additional non-repeatable hand-outs from the Commonwealth Government or new non-repeatable forms of taxation that have been applied to the South Australian citizen. Is it not interesting to compare the increase in Mr. Average's salary each year with the increase in Government spending? This Financial Statement tells in simple terms of the Commonwealth's and the State's assessment that wages will increase over the relevant period by 9½ per cent; that is the estimated increase in Mr. Average's wages. That man will pay for the taxation under this Budget, yet his Government will increase its expenditure by 17.35 per cent. Where will this type of increased expenditure lead? One knows where it will lead: it will lead to a break-down in Government service eventually in this State because the Government chooses to ignore the vital issues of the day.

It is interesting to read the Commonwealth Treasurer's report when he introduced the Commonwealth Budget. His Budget is the subject of much criticism but, if we read it, we find that closer attention is given to economic trends within the community and a forecast is made of the way in which the economy will develop and progress in the coming year. The Budget may be framed to take into account the expansion or the development of the community. If some means of control of inflation is required, a surplus Budget is instituted at Commonwealth level. This year we have been subjected to a Commonwealth Budget in which the Commonwealth Treasurer said:

We accept that the Government must take the lead—this we are doing—but we must have the co-operation of the community. We would be lacking in duty to ignore our responsibility or fail to take that action which lies within our hands as a government.

Later the Commonwealth Treasurer said:

Therefore, it is essential to achieve the right rate of increase in demand through the year. It must be high enough to make possible full employment of the labour available—new labour as well as existing labour. At the same time it must not be so high as to facilitate and encourage further cost and price increases. Since, as I have said, demand has been running too high in some sectors, this indicates the need for a degree of restraint on demand. One obvious direction in which restraint should be applied is that of public authority spending in its various forms.

He went on to say that the Commonwealth Government had been ruthless in pruning expenditure proposals. Later, he said:

After adjustment to remove the estimated effects of the transfer of pay-roll tax to the States, our outlays in Australia are estimated to increase by 11.7 per cent compared with the actual increase of 14.9 per cent last year. So in this way the Commonwealth Treasurer has demonstrated that the Commonwealth Government is deliberately reducing the rate of increase of Commonwealth Government expenditure from 14.9 per cent to 11.7 per cent, and our State Government, contrary to that move, has, with the resources from the Commonwealth Government and those collected from the taxpayers in South Australia, moved to an increase of 17.35 per cent for this financial year 1971-72.

I have mentioned the taxation by stealth that the Treasurer has instituted in his 15 months or 16 months in office. This massive diversion from the private pocket to the public Government sector has been a diversion of record dimensions. In the document that the Treasurer introduced into this House 12 months ago, he instituted, by his standards, somewhat minimal increases in taxation which involved at that time \$1,300,000 additional collection by the State Government from citizens by way of an increase in stamp duty and harbour charges, and a foreshadowed \$2,000,000 additional increase in succession duties, giving a total in last year's Budget of \$3,300,000; but in March of this year the Treasurer saw fit to introduce further taxation measures. We, therefore, had the spectacle of the Treasurer increasing taxation on South Australian citizens by seven additional measures, one of which has since been declared a mistake. The Treasurer, as he has done and as his Ministers have done in other directions, reversed his decision on the entertainment tax—and thank heaven he did! Under pressure from entertainers, who were unwilling to exhibit or involve themselves in the Festival of Arts, the Treasurer had to give in on entertainment tax.

Dr. Eastick: And under pressure from the hall owners.

Mr. HALL: Yes; under the pressure of theatre proprietors of all sorts, the entertainment tax was removed, despite the involvement of the member for Spence in lengthy correspondence with the theatre owners on that matter. We saw the introduction of six effective measures for taxation, which are raising \$6,000,000 a year additional taxation. They were: a levy equal to 3 per cent on the gross revenues of the Electricity Trust of South Australia; an increase of 20 per cent in the registration fees for motor vehicles; an increase in bookmakers' turnover tax from 1.8 per cent

to 2 per cent; an increase in bus and tram fares, as recommended by the Municipal Tramways Trust; an increase in rail fares; and an increase in valuations for water and sewerage rating. All that involved \$6,000,000 out of the hip pockets of South Australians, which made a total of \$9,300,000 for the year, in two doses, because the Treasurer believed it to be more palatable that way.

So we move into this financial year, and already we have had notice of two further taxes, one being the pay-roll tax. There, I congratulate the Commonwealth Prime Minister on putting the responsibility for collecting taxation back to where it belongs (on those who spend the money) and on giving the State a growth tax and giving it the responsibility for fixing the rate of that tax. But, however collective the decision may have been, the fact remains that our Treasurer was responsible for raising the rate of pay-roll tax from 2½ per cent to 3½ per cent, an increase of 40 per cent.

Mr. Payne: The same as in the other States.

Mr. HALL: This slugs South Australians of \$8,000,000 to \$10,000,000 a year. However, the Budget states that we will have another \$4,100,000 in taxation, plus \$500,000 from students, plus \$900,000 from hospital patients. What does the total come to in this rolling taxation by the stealth method that the Treasurer has adopted? I know the figure is not complete: there must be other measures that the Government covers up somewhere. Last year, there was an increase of \$3,300,000; there was an increase of \$6,000,000 in the new taxation measures; the increase in this Budget is \$4,100,000; and the increase from pay-roll tax is \$8,000,000 to \$10,000,000. Therefore, the total in 16 months is close to \$24,000,000 or \$25,000,000. The news media has referred to this by saying that it is not too bad to have two teeth out instead of three. Well, we have had the lot out, but the Treasurer's publicity has been successful.

What form of media has ever pointed out the extent of increases in taxation since this Government has been in office? Where has it ever been published that this Government has collected about \$25,000,000 additional taxation through its own decisions? We see headlines referring to record spending on education and hospitals. Of course it is record spending. It would be fantasy to suggest that an increase would not be needed to meet a 9½ per cent increase in wages and salaries for the year. Naturally, practically every line

shows record spending. All but \$1,000,000 of the \$20,500,000 increase for the Education Department is taken up by increased salaries and wages. Therefore, this huge increase is necessary simply to stay still. If we are to have the type of attitude that the Government has towards expenditure, someone will pay. Someone must pay to provide for the festival complex, the A.N.Z. Bank building, and the \$1,000,000 gift of Victoria Square land to millionaire overseas investors for an international hotel. At least we should now be able to see forward as far as next March, when we may get another supplementary dose, and we know that South Australian citizens will pay out to that time \$25,000,000 more in taxation. If that is apportioned among the voting public of about 700,000 it works out at \$40 each a year extra for the luxury of having a Labor Government.

The matter of increased Parliamentary salaries for a few individuals falls into insignificance when compared to the attack on financial stability of this State by the Labor Party since it has once more been in office. What Frank Walsh did to the State is simply chicken feed compared to what this Government is doing. To cover up and justify what it is doing, the Government has set up one of the best quality publicity campaigns the State has ever seen. This Budget is inadequate. It provides for a deficit of \$7,000,000, and it has made provision for only \$4,750,000 for increases in wages and salaries. The Treasurer knows that that sum is inadequate, as it represents possibly only 50 per cent of the amount that will be necessary to cover increases in awards and wages in the coming year. The Budget is one of great risk. If the economic situation in South Australia declines, the deficit may become one of raging proportion and, if it does, South Australia will be in greater trouble than it is now under the hands of Labor.

While this is going on, other things are occurring that warrant attention. The seat of extravagance is the Premier's Department itself. When one studies the various lines in the Budget, one can see whence the impetus comes for record expenditure and taxation. Within the Premier's Department there is a creation called the Policy Secretariat, which this year is to cost \$154,000. There is not one whit of evidence of effective work in this Parliament as a result of work by this organization. As far as I can see, the Policy Secretariat is an apology for Ministerial inaction and inability. I have never before known

a Cabinet to surrender its responsibility, as this Cabinet has done, at a cost of \$154,000 this year, which is a 36 per cent increase over the actual expenditure last year, and a 73 per cent increase on the voted expenditure last year. The provision for the Industries Promotion, Research and Assistance Branch is \$128,000, which is a 53 per cent increase on the expenditure last year, and a 92 per cent increase on the voted expenditure for last year; but where are the industries? Month after month we have asked where these industries are in South Australia, and we have waited to hear announcements about them. All we have seen is the expansion of some industry or another that was brought here by a previous Government, and there has been a dearth of new industry. Yet the expense in the Premier's Department goes on, providing for non-productive activities.

We have the magnificent increase of 168 per cent in the relatively small provision of \$28,000 for the Builders Licensing Board. I imagine that this expenditure will grow enormously year by year as bureaucracy moves in and as the Chief Secretary is pushed out of the eleventh floor by the expansion of the staff of the Premier's Department. Therefore, there is a magnificent leading increase in the Premier's Department, which leads all other Government departments. The increase in the provision for the Premier's Department makes the public think what a busy department this must be. The other day in this place, when we were discussing the Dartmouth dam proposals, we saw the result of some of the work of the staff of the Premier's Department. The Treasurer produced a file containing every letter I had ever written as Premier. I saw then some of the work of this increased staff of the Premier's Department, which has been used to search through files of correspondence in an effort to give the Labor Party political advantage and to obtain dossiers in the hope that the Labor Party may be advantaged and its political opponents embarrassed. Although there is an increase of 32 per cent in the line "Industries Promotion, Research and Assistance", the allocation for "Publicity and information for industrial promotion" is down by 18.7 per cent, and the increase in the total vote is made up by the provision for "Feasibility studies by consultants".

One wonders why the Government has failed in its industrial promotion during its first 16 months of office. One can see some of the reasons for this in the attitudes adopted by the Government towards industrial matters.

In reply to my question today, the Treasurer's attitude was one of great partiality. He will condemn anyone who becomes involved in controversy concerning industrial matters except members of the Labor Party. Although the member for Florey can blast to high heaven the industrialists who make up the backbone of industrial expansion in this State, the Treasurer abuses Opposition members who refer to matters subject to consultation and negotiation. Yet, when the member for Florey blasts industrialists, the Treasurer supports him. We see time after time Government Ministers taking sides on industrial matters, when they say that sides should not be taken. The Minister of Labour and Industry is very clearly involved in this and his statements of his views of company activities, made before arbitration has been concluded, show that he is there only to carry out the wishes of industrial labour, and this, of course, is the objective of this Government.

However, one must wonder why South Australia is suffering from a dearth of new industry and why our industrialization programme has suffered so much. Today I received an example of why this is occurring, and I will refer to that later. At the Treasurer's suggestion, I wrote to Mr. Hawke, the President of the A.C.T.U., on August 9, after asking the Treasurer in this House whether he would write to Mr. Hawke expressing fears and concern that any ban imposed by the A.C.T.U. on trade with South Africa would be harmful to South Australia and its citizens. The Treasurer said, "No, you write," so, being of a reasonable nature, I wrote a reasonable letter, which I have read out in this Chamber.

However, Mr. Hawke has not deigned to reply to me. He has not deigned to acknowledge my letter. From the date the letter was posted, August 9, until today, September 14, Mr. Hawke has not deigned to reply to my letter. I stress that I had asked the Treasurer to write the letter and that he suggested that I should write, which I did. Although my letter was respectful, I have received no reply. Perhaps this is how the Labor Party works, perhaps it is that Party's attitude, and perhaps that Party does not want to foster South Australian industry.

Today, I received a letter from a Mr. Goree. Frankly, I know nothing much of Mr. Goree, except from correspondence that I have had with him. However, on June 8, I received a letter from him, from 1605 Richardson Road, Merritt Island, Florida, U.S.A., and the letter was addressed to me in a rather nostalgic way,

in that it was addressed "Hon. Steele Hall, Premier of South Australia." Obviously, this man was a little late in his appreciation of the scene in this State: I am sorry, he was a little early! It is of interest, when considering industrial promotion in this State and the actions of those charged with this responsibility, to read the letter from this gentleman. He states:

I read with much interest the article on South Australia by Mr. Howell Walker in the April 1970 *National Geographic Magazine* and have attempted several times to contact an organization in the prestress-precast concrete business. After several frustrating efforts I decided to contact you in hopes you would direct my query to the proper people who could place me in contact with a prestress-precast concrete manufacturer who might be interested in expanding his line. I am one-third owner of a prestress-precast concrete company here in Florida that has developed several products which I have reason to believe should be both useful and profitable in your country. We have developed an inexpensive prestressed hollow core extruder system and a revolutionary prestressed rib slab which has all of the advantages of the hollow core yet costs half as much. Also, we have developed a total building concept that provides all structural items for buildings up to 18 storeys. This concept has been well received by architects, contractors, and owners in the Florida area. Since your climate is similar to ours, the same systems should work equally well there. While I am interested in selling systems, my primary objective is to become a participant in an Australian company and move my family to South Australia. Therefore, I would sincerely appreciate your forwarding this letter to an organization which might be interested in some profitable arrangement.

As I had recently moved out of the Premier's Department and from the office of Minister of Industrial Development when I received that letter, I obviously placed the matter in the hands of the Treasurer, in his capacity of Minister of Development and Mines, and I wrote to Mr. Goree, stating:

I have received your letter of June 8, and am pleased that you became interested in South Australia after reading the article in the *National Geographic* of April, 1970. I am not so pleased, however, to inform you that since that time I have lost an election in South Australia and now occupy the office of Leader of the Opposition. The brief reference you make to your activities and innovations in prestressed concrete are very interesting, and I have forwarded your letter to the present Premier, the Hon. D. A. Dunstan, Q.C., M.P., so that he may contact you as Minister of Industrial Development. You should receive a letter from him in the very near future. I can assure you that any proposals you have will receive the very best of consideration in South Australia, and I will be very pleased to see you if ever you come to this State.

I also wrote to the Treasurer on June 16, stating:

I am enclosing a letter which I have received from Mr. C. J. Goree, of Florida, and which is self-explanatory.

This morning I received from Mr. Goree a letter that states:

I certainly appreciated your prompt answer to my letter of June 8. However, I have not received any word from Mr. Dunstan; therefore, one more imposition if I may.

This gentleman has not received one word from the Treasurer, as Minister of Development and Mines, whose department increases in leaps and bounds. Of course, this matter does not involve any local Labor politics, and he is not interested. This man, whose letter I properly and with all propriety referred to the Treasurer, has been ignored. Although I wrote to the Treasurer on June 16, Mr. Goree has written me a letter dated September 8, stating that he has not been contacted. Yet we wonder why industry does not come to South Australia! I wonder what a survey of the files in the Treasurer's office would show and how many of these letters have simply been put on the shelf and ignored.

No-one here can say, except the Treasurer. His Ministers on the front bench look blindly for leadership that is not there. Government members may laugh at that statement if they like. I know nothing of Mr. Goree, except from these letters that I have in my hand. Does that correspondence not require following up, and does it not warrant an inquiry? What am I to do about the further request by Mr. Goree? Am I to send it to the Treasurer? I would not waste my time doing that, and I will go direct to some industrial organization in this State. If the Treasurer will not do it, I will try, from the far less effective office of Leader of the Opposition.

This is simply another instance of ineffectual Government, whilst the huge taxation and expenditure wheel continues to turn. The Government's obvious intention is to buy votes ruthlessly, and it will please as many minority sections of the community as possible. It will buy an old worn out bank and speak of putting public servants in it, at great inconvenience to them and to the Government: it will give \$1,000,000 to millionaire developers for an international-style hotel, and it will provide a festival complex. The millions go unnoticed because there are so many of them. The Government will continue to spend ruthlessly to buy the votes of minority groups.

It will continue to criticize the Commonwealth Government deceitfully when, in fact,

that Government has increased revenues to the State to a record amount. The increase to the State this year from the Commonwealth Government is extremely significant. The total increase in receipts is \$60,000,000, most of which is made up of Commonwealth revenue. The present Government will continue to promote industrial labour by taking a one-sided attitude to the industrial problems of this community. I will continue to oppose the implementation of such policies in the State. The Government is denying to South Australians many personal freedoms and it will continue to ignore the rural sector.

I refer members to the increase of \$2,400,000 in land tax to be collected this year. Whilst the Government says in other debates that it can afford give-aways in connection with multi-million dollar developments, apparently it cannot afford to abolish rural land tax, which involves only \$1,000,000 a year. As a result, the overheads and debts of the rural community will be increased annually. Many farmers who have to leave their properties will blame this Government for taking an active part in removing them from those properties. This Budget is designed to be ambiguous. It is part of a rolling system of taxation that has already in 15 months imposed additional charges amounting to \$25,000,000 on South Australians. Those charges were fully documented in four separate major announcements. So far, the Government has had much success in its programme of confusing the public and the media in connection with the imposts it has levied on South Australians. It is up to this Parliament to reveal fully to the people of this State just what sort of monster they have as a State Government.

Mr. HOPGOOD (Mawson): I congratulate the Leader on his speech. Since I have been a member I have not heard him to better effect, but I must qualify my statement by saying that I judge a speech by the amount of difficulty that surrounds its delivery. I can illustrate this point by referring to an issue that a Labor Party back-bencher could criticize with ease—our Vietnam commitment. One does not have to do very well to give an extraordinary speech on that matter, because it is so easy to criticize it. The difficulty that confronted the Leader of the Opposition was that he was speaking to a document that is very difficult to criticize. He made some sort of effort, and consequently it is only fair to congratulate him on making the best of a bad job.

I listened patiently to him for some idea of where expenditure might be cut down; I listened for some sort of constructive suggestions to the Government. On the day following the introduction of the Budget the Deputy Leader of the Opposition made some critical noises about increased costs and charges. Evidently the Leader had wandered off somewhere and left it to his Deputy to make the best of a bad job. We assumed that the Opposition, if it was to be consistent, would suggest areas in which expenditure could be cut down. However, apart from some criticism of increases in expenditure in the Premier's Department (I shall say one or two things later about departments under the Premier's control), we have had no suggestions whatever from the Leader about how expenditure should be cut down. Does the Leader think that we should not be expanding some of our services to the public, such as education, health, hospitals and social welfare? Does he think that we should be cutting down on them or keeping them static?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He says we are expanding too quickly.

Mr. HOPGOOD: That is the sort of generalized statement we get from Leader, but he is not willing to go into detail. He says that increases in the votes are largely the result of wage increases. I take issue with him on an important detail. Let us suppose that we accept that 95 per cent of the increase in our vote results from wage increases. What does he suggest that the Government should do about it? Does he suggest that we suspend the arbitration awards? Does he suggest that we repudiate our contracts under arbitration with our public servants and other Government employees? We did not hear that suggestion from the Leader. What other possibilities are there? A further possibility is that we could increase the deficit, but the Leader did not suggest that either. I challenge other Opposition members to look at each of the three areas in which it would be possible to cut down on the increased cost to the community. What do they want? Do they want a slowing down in the rate at which these essential services are provided? Do they want us to suspend or repudiate arbitration awards? Or are they willing to countenance a larger Budget deficit? We will listen with interest for some constructive suggestions from members opposite.

The Leader rehashed all the business about the Victoria Square complex that had been

dealt with in the debate on the Loan Estimates. We should look carefully at his suggestion for using this facility—to continue to house the very same bureaucracy that he has just denounced in his speech. In other words, the Leader speaks as though, if he were suddenly Premier again, we would no longer get large-scale increases in the Public Service. I assume that the block of land would continue to lie idle and that it would not be necessary to erect extra buildings to house the Public Service. In fact, if used as a site for a building to house an expanded Public Service, that block would not have returned us any more than it is doing right now. This Government has ensured that the block will be put to productive use. True, certain remissions have been granted to the investors, but the investment will expand employment. I shall refer to this matter later in connection with the line dealing with tourism.

The Leader also referred to a massive transfer of funds from the private sector to the public sector; he implied that that had been going on under this Government. I remind him of the observation made by the American economist Galbraith with regard to all Western economies: "Private affluence and public squalor". That is exactly the situation with which we are faced. In fact, earlier writers than Galbraith and later writers, too, have shown that the face of private affluence has many ugly pockmarks. Overall private affluence in Australia is blighted by areas of poverty.

Dr. Tonkin: Then why is the Government developing a hotel by private enterprise and giving away the block as a gift?

Mr. HOPGOOD: I repeat that the block of land was not giving any return to the State. We are no worse off in that respect: we are considerably better off because of the stimulus it will give employment in a sector of our economy where such a stimulus is badly needed. I was referring to the fact that we have in Australia, as in most of the developed Western economies, public squalor amid private affluence. If there is a Government that is effecting a transfer of capital from the private to the public sector, it is doing something that has been long overdue. It is all very well for the Leader to speak in these terms, but let us consider what it means in practice. It means better educational facilities, better social welfare facilities, and better health facilities, and these are the sorts of service we applaud and we need. When we speak in terms of meeting needs, no-one would disagree, but of course

the Leader tries to hide what is going on with some rather fine general phrases.

I notice that, for the Immigration, Publicity and Tourist Bureau Department, the proposed expenditure is \$1,059,177, an increase on last year's proposed expenditure (\$822,257) and on the actual payments (\$915,381). It is to be hoped that this increase in expenditure will continue in future, because tourism is one of the things we need to increase investment. It could bring to us the employment that is badly needed: employment for women and young school leavers, particularly girls, and these people need employment. The Leader referred to industrial development and spoke about the increased funds for this. I do not see how industrial development can be stimulated except by going out and chasing it. As another Government speaker will detail what this Government has been able to achieve in recent months, I shall not speak about it, but we have to be willing to spend money to go out and stimulate this sort of development if we want it to take place.

I notice that the vote for inspectors and clerical staff of the Builders Licensing Board will increase from an actual expenditure last year of \$10,761 to \$18,703, and this is an expenditure that I believe is highly desirable. The board is bringing to us, as members of Parliament, and to the general public of South Australia a much needed public facility. I represent an area of the State in which there has been considerable and rapid building development in the last few years, but some of this development has taken place in areas with very poor soil. Often people find their houses are cracking soon after they move in, because the builder has not taken sufficient precautions about the foundation.

Mr. Jennings: Where is this?

Mr. HOPGOOD: In the District of Mawson, particularly at Morphet Vale and Hackham and extending to Happy Valley. The soil is extremely poor, but the young house purchaser relies on the builder's taking action to prevent cracking by using a proper design and foundation for the house. I receive many complaints from people about poor workmanship in buildings, particularly concerning cracking. It is useful to have an organization such as the Builders Licensing Board to which one can refer these complaints as they arise. I hope that the board will have a long life, because it is a valuable arm of Government enforcing the private builder to provide the standard of building required by the purchaser.

In the same category I place the Prices Branch. Many times during the short time I have been a member I have referred matters to the Prices Commissioner for a proper investigation, and I have nothing but praise for the work done by this branch in the interests of the consumers of this State. This Government, by Statute in the last session, increased the responsibilities that now lie with the Prices Commissioner, and we will continue to increase the responsibilities as this session proceeds, so it is only fitting that we should be increasing the vote to the Prices Branch. It is pleasing to see that from a vote of \$146,247 last year with respect to investigating, accounting and clerical staff, with an actual payment of \$156,369, this year we are allocating to that department \$183,660 for the same purposes. That is not the total vote: I have considered only that aspect in which there will be an expansion of the services of this public facility. I look forward to the completion of this trinity when, during the life of this Parliament, the Government will introduce legislation to provide for the office of ombudsman. The Prices Branch, the Builders Licensing Board, and an ombudsman will be in the advantageous position of being able to protect the interests of consumers and builders of this State.

Mr. Jennings: What will the ombudsman do?

Mr. HOPGOOD: I receive many complaints from people who, as a result of misunderstanding and for other reasons, have problems with Government departments. An ombudsman could be in the advantageous position of being able to consider many of these complaints and do something about them. For the benefit of the honourable member (and he probably knows this much better than I do), I refer to one matter that will probably still remain untouched: that is, where people have problems about insurance and the payment of insurance claims. It seems to me that, as a Government, we should be considering ways of dealing with complaints made by people about insurance. This matter would not be covered by the ombudsman, who would be considering Government departments only. However, I hope that this problem may be partly solved by the competition given the private sector of insurance by the Government Insurance Commission.

In referring to the line "Deputy Director of Planning, Drafting and Clerical staff and temporary assistants" in the State Planning Office, I remind members that there has been an increase in this vote from \$169,755 to \$232,747. I applaud this increase because,

as I have said before, I regard the State Planning Office as one of the most important Government departments. The whole problem of our cities and their planning requires considerable investigation. I note with interest, for example, that there has been a transfer to the Planning and Development Fund of \$300,000. Concerning this matter, the Treasurer, in his statement, said:

Members will recall that the Land Tax Act Amendment Act passed last year imposed a surcharge of 1c for every \$20 of unimproved value on all metropolitan land in order that funds of about \$600,000 a year should be available to assist in the provision of parks, reserves, and open-space areas. This surcharge is effective from the commencement of this financial year, and the revenue derived from it will be used to the extent of \$300,000 for public parks for which provision is made under the Minister of Local Government . . . In all, there should be \$1,200,000 available for public parks this year and in future years, in addition to funds in hand and receipts from subdividers required under the Planning and Development Act.

I applaud this move. This is an additional cost that the public will certainly not mind paying, because it is getting real value for its money. The Labor Party announced before the last State election that it would levy this charge. No effort was made to hide this in any way. This charge will provide a fund by means of which assets that would otherwise be alienated can be retained. Areas of bush-land close to the city that would otherwise be subdivided will now be able to be retained, and other areas that would otherwise be used for open spaces will be used for recreation purposes.

Members who have seen the 1962 Town Planner's Report will be aware of his ambitious programme for the development of these regional parks and major district open spaces. While the Minister is present in the Chamber, I refer to what I believe to be a major omission in the 1962 Town Planning Committee report: no provision was made then for a major district open space near Hallett Cove. I spoke briefly on this matter last session, and it has been brought to the attention of the press today as a result of the meeting of the Marion city council last night. Most people who have knowledge of the value of Hallett Cove as a site of geological interest would deplore the possibility of a subdivision close to the area bringing about a deleterious effect on these deposits. For what it is worth, I suggest that we should take steps to declare a part of this area as a major district open space. Members may be aware

that the top of the cliffs on which the glacial striations occur (the so-called Sanderson reserve) is owned by the National Trust. In addition, the 51 acres which surrounds the reserve and which is subject to a planning regulation is still in private hands. I doubt whether this is a sufficiently large buffer zone to protect the glacial deposits in the area.

My suggestion regarding a major district open space would prevent all subdivision west of the Lonsdale railway spurline. If this could be achieved, there would be continuous open spaces from the Sanderson reserve through to the valley of Hallett Creek, which is zoned as a rural B area and which is, therefore, unlikely to be subdivided. This area could be used for recreation purposes by people from local areas as well as by those from the inner suburban areas. This would remove pressure from the existing national park, the environmental quality of which is deteriorating because of its over-use, and it would also provide a desirable buffer zone to protect the valuable geological deposits that already exist there.

Reference is also made in the Estimates of Expenditure to the Valuation Department. I note that its vote is increased from last year's amount of \$763,299 to \$828,348 this year. I look forward to the introduction of legislation that will centralize this State's valuation procedures. I realize that at present certain local councils carry out their own valuations. However, this can give rise to considerable ill feeling on the part of ratepayers, and it provides an undesirable comparison when the councils' valuations do not compare favourably with those of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I see no reason why there should not be only one valuation for all purposes.

I should like briefly to deal with some other lines, and I refer first to libraries, the allocation to which has risen from about \$1,300,000 to \$1,550,000. I stress how important a library system is to the people of any State. I praise those who work in what is perhaps a little known department of our library system: the newspaper reading room at the State Library. This room provides a valuable facility for the people of this State. Although this section is not used as much as it should be, it is sometimes used undesirably by some people. Nonetheless, it is available for use. I take this opportunity to commend Mr. Marquis and his staff in that part of the State Library to which I have referred for the courtesy they have extended to me when I have carried out

research in that area and for the same courtesy they have extended to the public generally.

I refer also to the increased vote for museums. Last year, \$232,853 was allocated, compared to this year's allocation of \$262,262. I am pleased to see that this allocation has been increased. Of course, the increase is not enough, although I hesitate to say that in the presence of members opposite, who may say later that this is one of the areas in which we are wasting money and in which we should be reducing the vote. However, the museum is a great public asset to this State, and we should seek to make it more available to the public and more accessible for research and entertainment purposes. I understand that the museum has hoards of valuable material: Aboriginal artifacts, and materials of geological and anthropological interest which cannot be displayed to the public generally because sufficient accommodation is not available.

Having thought a little about this problem, I can only suggest that, save for a costly complete redevelopment of the museum site, there should be a decentralization of museum facilities. Why should it not be possible for the museum to have Elizabeth, Christies Beach and Blackwood annexes that would enable people in those areas to enjoy many exhibits they can only enjoy at present by making a costly visit to Adelaide? I make that suggestion for what it is worth, as it may be a possible solution to the problem of decentralization of the museum's facilities. The main solution would be to allocate more money to the museum. A larger allocation is being made to it this year and, although it is not enough to solve the problems of the museum, it is a step in the right direction.

I congratulate the Government on the increased allocation to the Service to Youth Council. I have been a member of this worthwhile body for many years now. Last year it received \$4,800 in grants, and this year it is to receive \$6,400, which increase will be gratefully received. The council has for many years provided a facility unique in Australia as it carries out social welfare work *in situ*: street work, and the like. At the same time, it is a non-governmental agency. Such an agency has certain advantages in approaching rebellious youth; the normal social worker faces certain drawbacks, because he has the imprimatur of authority stamped on him. Beginning from three men many years ago, this organization has increased in size. Were it a public organization, the Leader of the

Opposition would say that it was suffering from creeping bureaucracy. But, in fact, of course, what is happening is only what happens in most Government departments. As the demands for these services increase, so they must be met, and the Service to Youth Council has considerably increased and broadened its facilities so that it can meet these demands. Finally, with regard to some of these specific references, I note the new line "Provision of community facilities for children and youth", for which \$100,000 is allocated. For its size this may be the most valuable entry in the Budget. Recently, I received a press release from the Minister of Social Welfare which briefly sets out some of the details of how this money will be spent, and which states, in part:

The new \$100,000 grant for youth organizations, announced in yesterday's Budget, will be spent on new buildings, including special facilities such as "drop-in" centres and youth camps and equipment, the Social Welfare Minister (Mr. King) announced today. A special six-member committee is to be set up to advise the Government on where the money should go. Mr. King said today it was hoped payments could be made by next March to the various organizations which would receive the money. It was intended that priority would be given to facilities catering for the young people in the 12-18 age group.

I only have to look at my own district to see the crying need for this type of expenditure. If one goes into a new area (typically, I suppose, Mawson would be a new area, where there is less surplus money than in any of the other new expanding areas of the State) one finds virtually no public recreation facilities. The reason for this is that the population expansion has run far ahead of what local government can provide from its meagre capital and meagre rate returns. The problem has exercised my mind for some time: just exactly what can the people in a new area do where they are faced with a continual influx of population? The many young people in the area are building up the number in their families, and this creates a great problem. All they have are two or three broken-down halls where a few kiddies are trying to do gymnastics and related activities, and these halls are crowded out every night of the week.

Generally speaking, such church facilities as exist in these new areas are taxed to the utmost to provide this type of recreation facilities, but, again, the churches are ill-equipped to provide this sort of thing in the new areas, because they, too, are just getting off the ground and are trying to get money

to build up their structures to provide the same sort of facilities for their own congregations. There is simply a dearth of capital and a dearth of facilities available for organized recreation activities for young people. This is a problem that Elizabeth and Salisbury have faced, and it is a problem that faces Tea Tree Gully and Christies Beach. Of course, there has been a certain amount of development by the Housing Trust in the northern areas associated with the trust's development of Elizabeth as an integrated living centre. On the other hand, Christies Beach has never been developed in this way by the trust; it has simply been an area where trust houses have been built, and facilities must unfortunately come later. I believe that this \$100,000 grant will go some way towards assisting in implementing some of these new facilities.

By way of a rather general conclusion to my remarks, I note that the Leader of the Opposition made some contrasts between the recent Commonwealth Budget and this Budget. I really think that he was batting on an extremely sticky wicket in referring to the Commonwealth Budget, because rarely have I seen a document that has been more thoroughly criticized than has that document.

Mr. Mathwin: It's the press that works that out.

Mr. HOPGOOD: I do not find too many press magnates who are raving lefties. Generally speaking, if something is strongly criticized in the press it usually means, if it has been introduced by a Liberal Government, that it has been criticized justifiably. I justify my reference to the Commonwealth Budget on the ground that we are not discussing this State Budget *in vacuo*: we are concerned here about revenue and expenditure, and revenue is greatly concerned with the continuing health of the economy. I am afraid that this Commonwealth Budget could have some most deleterious effects on the continuing health of the economies of all the States, and this will have grave effects on our Revenue Budget.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You would agree with the increased surcharge on income tax in the Commonwealth Budget though?

Mr. HOPGOOD: Yes, I think I would; but at the same time I cannot agree with the massive surplus that the Commonwealth Treasurer has in the Treasury. He has been given all sorts of warning signals about mounting inflation, and so he has decided to budget for a surplus in order to dampen down the

fires of inflation. In doing so, he has been very much ham-fisted about this. Honourable members have previously had explained to them the difference between cost-push inflation and demand-pull inflation. Obviously, the Commonwealth Treasurer has reacted to the present situation as though we were facing demand-pull inflation, whereas the gravamen of the charges by the pundits against the present Commonwealth Budget is that what we have is cost-push inflation. Why is it that the Commonwealth Treasurer has backed the wrong horse? Why has he run the risk that we will face a situation in which, although unemployment will increase, there will also be continuing inflation? People have been scratching their heads over this.

If we go back to the late 1950's, when we had a situation of demand-pull inflation, the Commonwealth Treasurer took certain steps to counter this and, although it was at the expense of considerable unemployment throughout Australia (and we deplore this sort of thing), it did for the time being dampen down inflation. There was cost-price stability during the early 1960's, but the result of this Commonwealth Budget, through its mass application of economic controls and the wishy-washy type of planning favoured by the Commonwealth Government, is simply that we will continue to have this inflation, although there will be an increase in the pool of unemployed.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Would you like another credit squeeze?

Mr. HOPGOOD: Certainly not one of the type instituted at the time. What the Commonwealth Government did at the time was to identify correctly the factors occurring in the economy, but I am suggesting that the wrong medicine has been used in this case and, as a result of this, a disease will set in that has nothing to do with the other complaint from which we are suffering at present. Why has the Commonwealth Treasurer bucked at doing the sort of things that have to be done in order to control cost-push inflation? The things that have to be done to counter the type of inflation facing us are quite opposed to the ideological presuppositions of the Liberal Party; that is to say, that Party is quite happy to create a pool of unemployed in order to counter inflation, but it is not happy to take the difficult decisions that have to be taken in order to counter the type of cost-push inflation which we have at present and to which the level of unemployment is virtually irrelevant.

I have a document that is getting rather ancient now, namely, the 1959 report of the Joint Committee on Constitutional Review. This was an all-Party committee formed by the Commonwealth Parliament, and it brought down a considerable number of recommendations on constitutional review that have never been acted on by the present Commonwealth Government, despite the fact that its representatives were on this committee and all but one of them accepted its recommendations.

I will read out the names of the committee for the benefit of honourable members. They are: Neil O'Sullivan (Chairman); P. J. Kennelly, member; N. E. McKenna, member; Reg. C. Wright, member; Arthur A. Calwell, member; A. R. Downer, member; D. H. Drummond, member; Len W. Hamilton, member; P. E. Joske, member; Reg. T. Pollard, member; E. J. Ward, member; and E. G. Whitlam, member. What were some of the recommendations that that all-Party committee made with regard to countering inflation and providing the machinery whereby the Commonwealth Government would have control over the economy in the way in which it should? In chapter 19—"Economic Powers"—the committee talked about capital issues, and said:

The committee has recommended that the Constitution should be amended to provide, in substance, as follows:

(1) The Commonwealth Parliament should have power to make laws with respect to (a) the issue, allotment or subscription of capital and (b) the borrowing of money whether upon security or without security, by corporations which engage, or may engage, in production, trade, commerce or other economic activities.

The report goes on to deal with consumer credit and states:

The committee has recommended that the Constitution should be amended by vesting the Commonwealth Parliament with a power to make laws with respect to hire-purchase and other agreements or transactions entered into in connection with the sale, purchase, hire or encumbrance of goods which involve the making of periodical payments or deferment of payment of the full amount payable.

The report then deals with interest rates in connection with loans secured by mortgage of land. It states:

The committee has recommended that the Commonwealth Parliament should have power to make laws with respect to rates of interest and other charges payable in connection with loans obtained upon the mortgage or other security of land.

The Commonwealth Government never acted on those recommendations. There are recommendations even with regard to restrictive

trade practices. The Commonwealth Government has acted partially in respect of those, but we know what the Liberal Party, through its representatives and through the Upper House of this State, has done about restrictive trade practices. All those things add to costs and are inflationary.

Finally, I raise the whole question of Commonwealth price control. The Vernon report was produced in 1963, another economic document never acted upon by the Commonwealth Government although it had ordered that inquiry to take place. This important committee was set up by the Commonwealth Government. I quote from what are really its terms of reference:

Having in mind that the objectives of the Government's economic policy are a high rate of economic and population growth with full employment, increasing productivity, rising standards of living, external viability, and stability of costs and prices, to inquire into and report its findings on the following matters.

Those are supposed to be the Commonwealth Government's aims—a high rate of economic and population growth with full employment, increasing productivity, rising standards of living, external viability, and stability of costs and prices. Does anybody suggest that the present Commonwealth Budget will have the effect of producing stability of costs and prices and a high rate of economic and population growth with full employment? No.

Yet this committee brought down reports to the Commonwealth Government that would have the effect of countering some of those things. The Commonwealth Government has never done anything about it. But an important statement was made by the people who framed that report, who said:

We utterly reject the notion that the contriving of such a level would be a proper means for securing price stability.

I am sorry, but I shall have to go back to before those words because what they are talking about here is the demand for labour. May I just quote this:

The conflict between full employment and price stability is evident in Australian experience since 1948-49. In general, years of inflation have been years of negligible unemployment and, when unemployment has increased, the rate of change of prices has abated. But it is important to appreciate that the relationship between unemployment and price movements is by no means exact. Other factors, such as changes in overseas prices, or movements in award wages independent of the state of demand for labour, operate on the general price level. Moreover, we wish to stress that, while there may be some level of unemployment, probably greater than that experienced

in Australia in the past fifteen years, which would eliminate internal pressure on prices, we utterly reject the notion that the contriving of such a level would be a proper means for securing price stability.

Yet this is exactly the sort of weapon that the present Commonwealth Government has contrived to use in order to dampen down the fires of inflation that it sees flaring up before it.

I have spent some time speaking about the Commonwealth Budget because it will have a large-scale effect on the level of economic activity both in this State and in Australia generally. If it has this effect, it will also have an effect on our State Budget: it will reduce the level of our returns. It will also reduce the suggested deficit. We have this statement from Mr. Crean, the shadow Labor Party Treasurer, who says:

If present unemployment trends continue, 150,000 people could be out of work by January—the highest figure since the 1961-63 recession.

That is all completely unnecessary, because the present Commonwealth Government will not take the hard decisions involving the amendment of our nineteenth century Constitution, which is sorely needed, so that central economic planning can take place. Until we have those changes brought about by Constitutional means and by legislation—

Mr. Goldsworthy: What do you mean by that?

Mr. HOPGOOD: —by returning the powers from the States to the Commonwealth, we shall have in Australia economic anarchy.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You want the Commonwealth to hand the taxing powers back to the States?

Mr. HOPGOOD: Certainly not. I want the Commonwealth Government to have complete control of the economy and the fringe banking institutions.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You want to get rid of the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. HOPGOOD: No. In a debate, the honourable member's usual tactic is to set up a straw man and knock him down. I have tried to explain the sorts of things that the Commonwealth Government should be doing in line with this report that was presented to it back in 1959. It said nothing about returning taxing powers to the States. It spoke of the sorts of controls we should have on the fringe banking institutions and marketable securities that we do not have at present. Until the hard decisions are taken, we shall continue to have our present type of inflation,

on which the level of employment has no bearing whatsoever.

I congratulate the Treasurer on this Budget. It has been a difficult Budget to bring down but I think he has been able by a minimum of increases in charges considerably to expand the services that will be available to the people of this State. But we cannot ignore the fact that we could run into economic squalls because of the irresponsible way in which the Commonwealth Government has approached its own Budget procedures. I hope that these squalls can be overcome in some way—if not in the immediate future, then by the vote of the people in November, 1972.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): When I made a comment on the Budget immediately after it was introduced—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I think you made a fool of yourself on television.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thought I did rather well on television and what the Leader said today confirmed my contention that I had done well. I was going on to say, when the Minister interrupted me so rudely, that I wanted to make two points. One is that the increases in taxation in the Budget will be felt by the people of South Australia; the second is that I deplore the way in which the State Government takes every cent it can get from the Commonwealth.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I had just started to make a point before the dinner adjournment when the Minister of Environment and Conservation said I had made a fool of myself on television. The rest of the time until the bell rang was taken up with a discussion on that most fascinating topic. I have been home to dinner this evening where I have checked up with my family on this, and they say that I did not make a fool of myself and that what I said was extremely good and accurate. When I made my comments on the Budget immediately after its delivery by the Treasurer I made two points. First, I said that the people of South Australia would feel the increases in taxation in spite of the Treasurer's attempts to say that they would not. The other point I made (and I do not think it was used) was my criticism of the Government for taking every cent it could from the Commonwealth while at the same time, for political purposes, kicking it as hard as it could. In those two comments I am fortified by the fact that my Leader, for whom I was deputizing last Thursday week—

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You made a shocking job of it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We will not go back into that again. We have dealt with whether I did well or badly; I think we are satisfied that I did well. As the Leader used the same two points as I used, I am fortified in the rightness of what I said then. I may say that a more careful perusal of the speech and Budget Papers also confirms the immediate impression that I had. The Treasurer's speech in this place is different from the handout which he gave the press, which was used, and in which he minimized the effect of the increases in taxation. The Leader has quoted this earlier today. The statement, which was pre-prepared, was given out by some of the Treasurer's press officers and states:

Mr. Dunstan said outside Parliament that most of the increases were graduated charges which would have very little impact on the average citizen.

My retort to that (and I think it is valid) is that the Government cannot take \$2,250,000 out of the pockets of the people of this State between now and June 30 next year (or \$4,150,000 out of their pockets in a full 12 months) without someone feeling it, and I should have thought that stood to reason.

Mr. Jennings: That would be well known by a pickpocket.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Is the honourable member referring to the Treasurer?

Mr. Jennings: I'm referring to you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What I have said seems to me to stand to reason. On the day following my statement, I understand the Treasurer made some derogatory comments about me. Referring to what I had said about this Budget's hitting younger people especially, the Treasurer said that I must have been thinking about the Burnside Young Liberals, and that is a typical way of his to try to turn an argument.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You disagree with that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is absurd. This will hit every person in the State, especially young people. If one looks at the speech (and one need look no further than that), with regard to stamp duties the duty on applications to register a motor vehicle is to go up. Most people in our society have motor vehicles. The duty on conveyances of real property will affect the purchase of houses. Admittedly this applies to sums beyond \$12,000, but we all know that \$12,000 does not go far these days and, with the increasing inflation, it will not go even as far as it has gone up to now.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Will you admit it's higher than the average?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, it is about the average amount. Does the Minister deny that?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I do, yes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think the Minister is not realistic on this, as on so many other matters. Conveyances on marketable securities perhaps will not affect the generality of people but it will affect those who dabble on the stock exchange. The increased rate of interest on instalment purchase and credit arrangement contracts will affect many people who buy on hire-purchase terms. Few of us are without a cheque account, and the stamp duty on a cheque will increase from 5c to 6c. The provision regarding mortgages in excess of \$10,000 refers back to houses again.

Those are only the matters that the Treasurer has mentioned in his press release as being imposts. He did not mention in the press release (but it is already buried in the statement in such a way as to make one think it has already been announced and accepted by the people of this State) that university and hospital fees would rise. I do not know the details of the increases in university fees, but they are expected to save \$500,000 for the Government, so presumably that amount is the aggregate in a full year of the increased fees that will be taken from those studying at tertiary education level. I should like more information about this, including the details of these increases in fees. Likewise, there are increases in hospital charges.

That we will feel the impact of the Budget is my first comment about it. The second comment, which is a more fundamental matter and one that I want to deal with, is the immorality of this Government's policy of attacking the Commonwealth Government at all times but of taking every cent that it can get from that Government. The increases in taxation may be said not to be great and it may be said that an extra \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 in a full year in State taxation (and I disregard pay-roll tax for the moment) is not a big increase in taxation generally. Why is this?

The answer is that the Commonwealth Government is now giving enormous support to the Budget of this State, as well as of other States, and there has been an enormous increase in the amount that we are getting from that Government, either by way of grant or because of the ability to raise our own pay-roll tax. I have done a little arithmetic,

and other members may care to check it, although I think it is simple enough. If members look at the summary of the estimates of receipts by consolidated revenue accounts, they will see that the State taxation increases from \$58,700,000 to \$91,300,000. The main increase is about \$24,000,000 in pay-roll tax. That is a transfer of a taxing power from the Commonwealth Government to the State, and I think \$17,300,000 of it would have been paid by the Commonwealth to the States if power to raise pay-roll tax had not been handed over to us. In fact, we are increasing this tax by 1 per cent, from $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, and we are getting about \$24,000,000 from it.

However, that \$17,300,000 must be added, in all fairness, to the extra amount that the Commonwealth Government is giving us in grants if we are to make a fair comparison for the purposes of the increased amounts that we are getting from the Commonwealth Government in one way or another. If one does this arithmetic one finds that the increase in either the amounts we have been paid by the Commonwealth Government or the taxing power we have been given and are using is about \$23,000,000, or about 15 per cent on the actual figures of the amounts we received from the Commonwealth Government last year and the estimate we expected this year, or if one goes from estimate to estimate the increase is more than \$41,000,000, or 24 per cent. These are enormous increases, and it is because the Commonwealth Government has given us so much more money in one way or another in income tax reimbursement, as a grant from the Grants Commission, or in other ways, that we have been able to keep down the taxes that have been imposed by the State for a long time. Even so, we will feel their impact. However, what about pay-roll tax? That is a tax that I think no-one likes, and I have heard many people criticize it as being a regressive tax.

Mr. Coumbe: It is a sectional tax.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course, but we are glad to get it because it is a growth tax. If we have to have a growth tax then we are glad to have it, but let none of us fool himself and think that it is a good form of taxation: it is a rotten form of taxation. At least we have it, and the Government will net this year more than \$24,000,000 from it.

Mr. Jennings: Only the South Australian Government?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is an extraordinary interjection from the member for Ross Smith. I do not know why he made it, because he

knows, as I know (and I have not argued to the contrary) that every State is taking over pay-roll tax at the rate of 3½ per cent, but that does not affect my argument. It is a completely irrelevant interjection and not up to the honourable member's usual standard, because his interjections can be occasionally witty and to the point.

Mr. Jennings: You are trying to kid people that we are the only State doing it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I did not make that suggestion for one moment, and if the honourable member had been more alert he would have known that. The member for Mawson, who has just spoken, canvassed—

Mr. Harrison: He spoke well, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member may have done a good job. I say, I hope without any lack of charity to the member for Mawson, that I find it extremely difficult to listen to his speeches.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: The feeling is mutual.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I find it much easier to read them afterwards, and I think this is a fairly common opinion amongst members. One of the points in his speech (and I do not agree with the way he made it) concerned the constitutional review. I believe that the 1959 report and its recommendations for constitutional change is completely dead. I do not believe we shall see that either from a Liberal and Country Party Government or from a Labor Government, but I believe strongly that constitutional review is necessary. I do not believe that the financial and other arrangements between the Commonwealth Government and the State Governments are in a satisfactory condition. Few people who think about these things would think that they were. It is wrong that the State Governments should not have financial independence, and wrong that they should be able to exhibit the irresponsibility that this Government exhibits in taking everything from the Commonwealth Government while at the same time kicking it in the teeth.

Mr. Jennings: And the previous Government, and the previous Government, and the previous Governments.

Mr. Coumbe: Listen to the parrot!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is wrong that this immorality should be allowed to continue, although it will continue so long as the constitutional arrangements between the Commonwealth and the State are in the condition they are in at present. Alas, I think it unlikely that

there will be any revision of the Commonwealth Constitution soon or even at all, because the Australian people have shown themselves to be extremely conservative in relation to amendments to the Constitution. It is my view that, 70 years or more after it came into operation, there are so many deficiencies in the Constitution that it can only be revised after consideration at some sort of a constitutional convention, certainly similar to those which met in the 1890's when the Constitution was first hammered out.

I support the idea of a constitutional convention representative not only of those in Commonwealth politics but also of those in State politics and other spheres of community activity. This is the only way there can be a thorough-going review of the Constitution with any chance at all of getting through, under the present provisions, alterations to the Constitution. I should like to see this position altered, because it is too restrictive. Experience shows that it is almost impossible to get a majority of people in a majority of States, as well as an overall majority, to agree to constitutional amendments, and I should like to see the State Parliaments having, as is the position under the United States Constitution, the responsibility for constitutional amendments.

Mr. Payne: Do you suggest a conference on this matter?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I have already said that. I have said I favour a convention along the lines of the conventions held in the 1890's.

Mr. Jennings: What year would that be?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know whether it would be in the honourable member's time, but the sooner the better. These are matters of fundamental importance. Since Federation, power has been flowing from the States to the Commonwealth. One of the paradoxes of our time is that, with the revulsion against bigness in all sorts of things, we may well see a reversal of this trend and a greater enthusiasm for smaller units of State Government than we have seen in the last few years, anyway. I would not have believed this possible a few years ago. However, with the revulsion against big units of Government, big cities and so on, there may well come, and this may be the salvation of our whole federal system of Government, a system which members on this side have always upheld. However, I must admit that sometimes the actions of some of my Commonwealth colleagues have made me wonder how strongly they uphold it. Members on this side of politics believe in the federal system of Government. This is in

contrast to the platform of the Australian Labor Party. I was surprised to hear the member for Mawson say he did not favour the abolition of State Parliaments, because this is one of the planks in the platform of the A.L.P. Although members of the Government try to ignore it, as they try to ignore so many other of their planks, it is certainly something to which they are pledged. We on this side believe in the federal system of Government, because we believe in decentralizing power of all sorts. This is one of the fundamentals of Liberalism. I said a moment ago that there are new ideas abroad and a revulsion against bigness. Apart from this, we are becoming aware of the dangers to the environment, and the member for Mawson himself has spoken eloquently on this matter on other occasions in the Chamber. In some respects, I agree with what he has said. I said in another debate earlier this session that we ought to canvass new ideas and topics of relevance and importance of the day, and I still believe that. Certainly, there is no hint of any of these things in these Estimates, which have been prepared on the same old bases as Estimates have always been prepared in this place.

Mr. Payne: It's a pretty soft line to work on when you say that but when, if we bring in something different, you go crook at the change in the format.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If I may say so, that merely illustrates the shallowness of the member for Mitchell's thought and his innate Conservatism. There is no doubt that the most Conservative members of Parliament are in the Labor Party. They are still pledged to an objective that was adopted 50 years ago, and their thinking simply has not changed in that time. It may have been original then, but the times have certainly passed them by. I do not want to go on with that, because I wish to say other things. I do not know how many members heard Dr. Paul Ehrlich, the Australian Broadcasting Commissioner's guest of honour last week. He made an excellent speech—

Mr. Wright: Mr. McMahon doesn't agree with him.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not really concerned whether or not Mr. McMahon agrees with him; I thought it was an excellent speech. Dr. Ehrlich said that politicians are less progressive than is the average citizen, and I think that is probably correct.

Mr. Wright: Actually, I think he was talking about you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I do not think he even knows me; that is perhaps his loss, but I do not think he was talking about me. I think he was talking about people who make interjections such as the interjection made by the member for Mitchell just now, and that interjection could not have illustrated it better. Paul Ehrlich in his speech referred to the environment crisis. Referring to the population crisis, he said that there are 3,700,000,000 people in the world now and that this is three to seven times greater, according to the estimates of various authorities, than the world should be carrying.

Mr. Keneally: I think that, like me, you heard him too late.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, it made me feel just a little guilty about these things. However, that is by the by. Dr. Ehrlich referred to the environmental deterioration, and so on. He referred to population control and, as the member for Stuart said, it is perhaps too late for some of us. Dr. Ehrlich did not say this, but I understand from my brother-in-law, who was in the United States a couple of years ago and who is a medical practitioner, that nurses in the maternity hospitals in the U.S. wear little badges saying, "Stop at two" as a hint to patients. I saw in the paper only last week that there has been a dramatic drop in the birth rate in the U.S.; I think it is down to 15.5 in a thousand, and that is indeed a significant drop. Of course, it is the sort of thing that Ehrlich is advocating. However, I am thinking now of the preservation of our way of life or our civilization, because we are, after all, part of the same western civilization as the Americans. It is all very well for us to do it, but the danger that I see is what will happen to us if other races do not follow suit. That is a problem that is rather too big for us.

Mr. Clark: And if we all do it, the logical answer is what?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The preservation of the world, as I understood it.

Mr. Clark: Or the end of the human race.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, I do not know. The grim alternative that we are given is that, if we do not do it, it will be the end of the human race.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must link his remarks with the first line.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I can do so, Mr. Chairman. The point I am making is that these are matters of very great moment to us now, yet there is not one hint that these thoughts have penetrated the thinking of those

who have prepared these Estimates. I have been told by a friend of mine, a scientist with whom I was talking last week about Ehrlich's broadcasts, that the things he said then are taken for granted by scientists. We talk about them in here, as we talk about so many things, but when it comes to translating these ideas into action we do not get very far, and no account of them at all has been taken in these Estimates.

It may well be that we should be revising our ideas on the question of the development and the expansion of our economy and the question of the population of the State. I know it will be said that the present Government has been progressive in the appointment of a Minister of Environment and Conservation. I am glad to see that the honourable gentleman has come back into the Chamber.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I was attending to my duties.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wanted to say a few things about the Minister's duties. The Minister was appointed to his present portfolio in, I think, November of last year. He had previously been Minister of Labour and Industry, and that was the sole portfolio he was given. He has had a remarkably light Ministerial load since he came into office.

Mr. Clark: And he has borne it well.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, that is a matter of opinion; those on this side of the Chamber may feel differently about it. But if one looks to see how far it goes, one sees that the appointment of the Minister (I speak not personally of him now but of the Minister of Environment and Conservation) is not much more than a sham. He ranks here eleventh in the order of Ministry. We find that the only line for him is under "Miscellaneous", and the total sum it is intended to spend under "Minister of Environment and Conservation—Miscellaneous" is \$328,402. Admittedly, he does figure, although very modestly, in the Premier's Department because he is also Minister assisting the Premier. But there again, compared to other expenditures, the sum that will be spent on behalf of this Minister is peanuts.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: There are many other things to be transferred to him.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know what the Government's plans are, but they are jolly slow in coming to fruition. He has been in his present job for 10 months, and I do not know why these things have not been transferred to him if they are to be transferred. Although the Minister of Education probably

knows more than I do about it (at least he ought to), the Estimates show that the office of the Minister of Environment and Conservation will be spending \$31,000, and under "Contingencies" there is a sum of \$3,700. Apart from that, we have the line to which I referred under the Ministry itself showing proposed expenditure of \$328,402, of which \$293,102 is for the National Park Commissioners in relation to national parks and wild life reserves. There is a substantial increase of \$100,000 there but, if money is power, the portfolio of Environment and Conservation is a sham. If means nothing compared to the other Ministries. Certainly, it is not enough to appoint a Minister, call him the Minister of Environment and Conservation and say, "We are dealing with these problems which are current in the community today". I am afraid that is the conclusion I must draw from these Estimates for the Minister of Environment and Conservation.

Mr. Harrison: But what about his other uses; don't you take those into consideration?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is a great pity the Government did not take some notice of the points made by the member for Mawson about conservation. I do not agree with them all but it was at least something relevant to the present day and should loom large in our debates. There are only two other things I want to say on the first line. We were given today, as is traditional (and it is one of the ways in which successive Governments have hobbled successive Oppositions) the Report of the Auditor-General. Naturally, none of us has had much time to consider what is in that report. The Minister of Roads and Transport (who, unfortunately, is not present at the moment) used the fact that he, too, had only just got the report as an excuse for not answering a question this afternoon. On this occasion, I admit that the excuse that he had not got it (which I accept) was fairly well founded. However, I want to say something else about the Minister's responsibility which I have picked up at page 73 of the report. Since this Government has come into office the Minister has been asked many questions about the Government's proposals regarding the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan and freeways, and he has persistently refused to answer those questions except to give the impression that freeways are dead and we are not to have any; but, if one looks at page 73 of the Report of the Auditor-General, one finds that in the last financial year (for which

the Minister was entirely responsible) an amount of \$3,487,000 was spent by the Highways Department on the acquisition of land for freeways—a most extraordinary thing if we are not to have freeways; and their names are set out there, too. The explanation in the report is that we are to have freeways and, to add insult to injury, they are called “freeways”, not “high-speed corridors” or anything nonsensical like that. They are “freeways”, and this is what the Auditor-General says:

Capital works include the acquisition of land for road purposes, and payments for the past five years for this reason were—

and he set them out. Freeways expenditure has risen. In 1966-67 it was \$754,000; in 1969-70 it was \$4,728,000, the expenditure on other roads being \$1,884,000. Last year, the expenditure on freeways, as I have said, was \$3,487,000, only \$1,364,000 being spent on other roads. This is a significant fact. The Auditor-General goes on to say:

The expenditure of \$3,487,000 on acquisition of land for freeways was \$1,241,000 less than for the previous year, and related to the following projects—

and he lists them. What are they? They are all the freeways set out under the M.A.T.S. plan.

Mr. Harrison: Cannot you understand the position?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The word I see written down in front of me is “freeways”.

Mr. Harrison: Yes, but particular projects.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Albert Park is trying to anticipate the point that he knows I will make and, as an attempt to protect his Minister, I cannot think of anything better. However, we find that \$987,000 has been spent on the Hindmarsh Interchange; \$785,000 on the Noarlunga Freeway (that vexed route); \$507,000 on the Modbury Freeway; \$308,000 on the Salisbury Freeway; \$244,000 on the Dry Creek Expressway; \$210,000 on the South-Eastern Freeway (we all agree on that; even the Government calls that a freeway); \$205,000 on the Hills Freeway; \$135,000 on the North Adelaide Connector; and \$106,000 on the Foothills Expressway. I do not know how the Minister can explain this expenditure, but I will certainly ask him to explain it.

Mr. Coumbe: What would Dr. Breuning say about this?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Dr. Breuning will be disappointed in the Minister. I do not know how the Minister will explain that expenditure. Obviously we are going ahead with the freeways; the Government's actions speak louder

than the Minister's words. We must go ahead with these works, whatever the Government has said. Apart from the political chicanery that we hear from members opposite (they regarded the M.A.T.S. plan as a good issue to thump us on when we were in office), I am perturbed about the fact that all this land is to be tied up for an unspecified time under the ownership of the Highways Department before it is used for the purpose for which it was bought.

Mr. Venning: They couldn't care less about that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: True. I am confident that the Highways Department is easily the biggest landowner in the Adelaide metropolitan area. Yet members opposite deny that they are going ahead with these plans. I am looking for an explanation about this. The only other matter with which I wish to deal in this discussion of the first line is with regard to the National Fitness Council.

Mr. Langley: You've changed on this. The Hills Freeway ran through your district.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Through my old district. I do not know what the honourable member is trying to say; it does not make much sense to me. Anyway, I had already turned from that subject. When I was in office as Minister of Social Welfare I had much to do with the National Fitness Council. Before that, I had known for many years members and officers of the council, and in the two years or so during which I was the responsible Minister I came to know them better and to appreciate the work they do for the State. I am perturbed to find that the council is apparently being brushed off in these Estimates. Under “Minister of Education—Miscellaneous” the National Fitness Council of South Australia is to receive \$66,500, which is the same sum as it received last year for this general purpose. However, the sum of \$50,000 which was paid last year and in the immediately preceding years for the training of youth leaders and the subsidizing of the establishment of youth clubs is gone.

The line itself has been transferred to “Minister of Social Welfare and Minister of Aboriginal Affairs—Miscellaneous” where we find, for training youth leaders and to develop clubs and activities for children and youth, \$50,000 is provided. That is not going to the National Fitness Council. Apparently, it is to be disbursed by the department direct, and there is a new provision of \$100,000 for the provision of community facilities for children and youth. That is a total of \$150,000 for similar purposes. In this State for, I believe, 20 or 30

years the National Fitness Council has had the responsibility of disbursing funds of this kind to various organizations and, in my experience, it has done it very well indeed.

Now, I understand, without explanation or warning, this task and responsibility is being taken away. Apparently, it is to be assumed directly by the department, for reasons that I do not know. We can say that this is an insult to the council, and I consider that it is, but apart from that, why has it been done? Have there been complaints that the council has not done the job properly? I have had no such complaints. Admittedly, the council has not sufficient money to give all the organizations deserving of it, but it has cut up the cake well. Why has this task been taken away from it and why does this Government show a lack of confidence in the council?

I do not know the answers to these questions, but this action is most regrettable. It calls for an explanation and I mention it now so that we can get the explanation when we are dealing with the relevant line. I am sorry that this has happened, because I should like to see the National Fitness Council continue to discharge this responsibility, and the only reason I would expect for the transfer would be that the department would do the job better. Frankly, and with great respect to the departmental officers, I do not believe that they will do it any better than the council has done it and would have continued to do it.

I will be able to deal with many other matters in the debate on the lines, at the appropriate time. Perhaps I can summarize what I have said by the statement that we will feel the impact of the new taxation measures that the Government is introducing. I consider that they will be felt by a section of the community that can ill afford to feel them, namely, the younger family people. I consider it unfortunate and wrong that the Government should continue to attack the Commonwealth Government, when it is getting a very good deal from that Government, and we can see the evidence of that financial assistance.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is unfortunate that the Government has ignored entirely conservation and the environment, and the problems that are arising in this field, in framing these Estimates. I cannot but think that the Minister of Environment and Conservation has not a job to do. He is a front, nothing more. I

will be wanting explanations of the money spent on freeways or freeway routes, and I look forward to getting an explanation of the insults that have been proffered to the National Fitness Council. I support the first line and look forward to getting answers to my questions and to asking more questions and making more observations as the debate proceeds.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): This is a lacklustre Budget, and I do not think anyone would query that statement. The member for Mawson has suggested that it is a Budget that is extremely difficult to attack. I am sure that that is what the Treasurer wanted it to be and that he had his people working very hard. The Government says it will spread out the tax increases on a State basis over 15 months. We have had four bites of the cherry now. The member for Mawson is correct: it is a difficult Budget to attack taken on its own, but it is a repressive Budget, and all the geniality and smooth talking will not change the unpalatable fact for the people of this State. The whole point is that we have seen tremendous increases in taxation, I think about \$24,000,000 is the figure quoted, in the last 15 months. I am particularly concerned at the second increase in hospital fees in 12 months. We have increased fees at tertiary institutions. We have had the pay-roll tax with us, and we should not forget it, although it does not come into these Revenue Estimates, but that tax is a revenue-raising measure. These increases all add to the money that the average South Australian is being asked to pay because we have a Labor Government in office.

The Treasurer made one relevant remark when he said we might be faced with a somewhat uncertain future. I am not sure to what he referred, but I think he probably meant the State, because this State has an uncertain future as long as the present Government stays there. The Commonwealth Government is being continually blamed for any State Government shortcoming and, let us face it, there have been many shortcomings. The Leader has ably covered the increases in receipts and the fact that we now have a record level of 15.44 per cent, but, in spite of this record level, we have proposed payments and expenditures by this Government at the rate of 17.35 per cent, and that means a deficit. Again, we are living beyond our means as we did during the term of the previous Labor Government. I think somewhere we will have to pay for this.

We cannot expect the Commonwealth Government to pick up the tab every time, but that is basically what we have been doing. We will see a breakdown in Government services: we will have a breakdown in confidence, and we will not stimulate confidence in this Government on the part of the Commonwealth Government, which will be much less likely to pick up the tab. The Treasurer said that the Commonwealth Government was becoming more aware of the States, but the Commonwealth Government has been well aware of the problems of the States for a long time and has done pretty well for South Australia. We have not done at all badly. Last year it was estimated that about \$147,000,000 would be received from the Commonwealth Government, but about \$164,000,000 was received with supplementary grants, and this year it is estimated that about \$172,000,000 will be received. No doubt the Treasurer has already planned on receiving additional supplementary grants, and there is no reason for the Commonwealth Government's not coming to the party again, provided it has some evidence that the State is being run on a sound basis.

In fact, the Treasurer has said that the Commonwealth Government has indicated from the beginning of the year that it will consider supplementary grants. He looks at this as an early indication of support, but it is up to the South Australian Government to administer its finances responsibly. The problem facing the Commonwealth Government is a tremendous one. I am pleased that the member for Mitcham referred to the problem of population and the responsibilities that go with our increasing population, because it is a most relevant problem. I congratulate the member for Mawson, who was fulsome with his congratulations earlier. I am not sure how sincere he was; he still seems to have a slight bulge in one cheek. Nevertheless, I congratulate him, and I have no bulge in my cheek, because I believe that at least one member opposite is beginning to understand the problems facing this Government, the Commonwealth Government and the people of Australia. We are now beginning to get down to tin tacks.

Everyone wants a slice of the revenue pie and, if one listened to the various groups (which can be groups of certain interests or States of the Commonwealth), one would think that their needs were the most important that existed. As I have said before,

we all have a tendency to regard ourselves and our own business as being more important than that of anyone else. This is a human trait and a part of the characteristic of the human animal.

Mr. Keneally: What about—

Dr. TONKIN: I am sure it applies in this Chamber, too, because the member for Stuart would not be interjecting if he did not consider that what he had to say was more important than what anyone else in the Chamber had to say. He may well be right, but I will not give him the pleasure of knowing that I am listening to him. Many groups have asked for more money: groups interested in education, health, care of the elderly, social services, conservation, ecology and many other aspects. All members agree that these are most important subjects. The groups of concerned people that continually bring these matters before members of Parliament and the public generally are to be commended for their enthusiasm and interest.

All members remember the meeting held at the Norwood Town Hall, when members of school committees, parents and teachers discussed education. Listening to what was said that night, one would think that education was the most important subject in the community today. I agree that it is an important subject; it is probably one of the most important things that faces us. However, it is not the most important one, because there is no most important problem. We have many important problems. As I remember it, the Minister of Education was at that meeting most scathing (and I am sure Government members will correct me if I am wrong) in his remarks about independent schools. He kept on making snide remarks regarding the standards in independent schools and said that the State cannot do what the rich independent schools can do. He made quite a point of this, and received support from sections of the audience.

However, all honourable members would have received recently a statement from the Catholic Bishops, who were concerned, with just cause, about the state of independent schools in Australia. They consider that the independent schools (and they referred to the small parish schools, because there are tremendous problems in some of the smaller Catholic schools), because of their status and because they take off the Government's shoulders much of the responsibility for educating a fair proportion of our young population, should receive more help than do the Government

schools. That is an understandable and a perfectly natural point of view, but should they receive more assistance than Government schools? It would be wonderful if all the help that is needed could be given to every school, but this cannot be done.

The Treasurer has said that nearly 25 per cent more is being spent in the Education Department this year than was spent last year. That sounds very good on paper, and I am sure it is tremendously impressive to everyone who hears it, particularly the teachers and students. However, there is only one snag about it: as all members realize (although I am afraid members of the public do not), this increased expenditure is going almost entirely on salaries. The teachers have much to be thankful for. I think their campaign for better education has paid off. I hasten to add that I do not blame them for this; I am not saying they have done this with any self-interest at heart but, by improving their conditions, they certainly should be able to attract more trainees into the profession, and they are probably now being paid what they are worth. It will be good to see that our more satisfied teachers will be able to get on with the job of educating our children more efficiently and with their customary enthusiasm.

We are certainly spending 25 per cent more on salaries, and it has all come from the Commonwealth Government; do not let us forget it. This whole problem of the Commonwealth Government's expenditure and its allocation to the States for various purposes comes down, as the member for Mawson and the member for Mitcham have intimated, to our population problem. It is not just a matter of having more people in our population at present: whether we like it or not, we have more and more young people in our community. The proportion of young people in our community under the age of 20 is now 45 per cent. The proportion of people over 65 is under 10 per cent, and the proportion of people who, in fact, earn an income and pay income tax, and who therefore contribute to the revenue that makes up the revenue "pie", is getting smaller and smaller.

At the same time, we have more and more young people requiring the education that we believe they deserve, and more and more young people requiring health services and all the community benefits, which are being financed by fewer and fewer taxpayers. This is a tremendous problem; in one way or another, the Commonwealth is faced with

having to divide up the revenue "pie", and it will do what it can and give what it can in what it believes to be a fair proportion. It cannot give as much as everyone would like to see it give in social services or education, including independent schools; nor can it give as much as it would like to give for health services. Nevertheless, it will give what it can when it can and when it is wise to do so. As I have said previously, if we want better education, health facilities and social services, etc., we must pay for them, and I believe that this problem is more fundamental than is any other problem that faces any Government today in any country.

I believe that we must make better use of our schools and that we must seriously consider implementing the two-tier arrangement operating in other countries. We should save on our capital works and spend that money instead on training more teachers and putting them to training more young people. I believe that no cost analysis study of this matter has been undertaken or even attempted. I do not know whether it will work, and I do not know whether in fact in our community it will save us money in the long run. However, I believe that a study should be made to see whether it will work, because on the surface it seems reasonable. If we can stop, just for a short time, building new schools, update the old schools and spend on training more teachers the money we save on capital works on, perhaps, teachers colleges and utilize the existing buildings more efficiently, we will get better value for our money. I do not think anyone can deny that. If we are not going to do anything about it, at least we should look at this matter to see whether it will save us money.

Although the two-shift system may have difficulties, it works successfully in other countries. I was rather surprised to see that it will cost \$130,000 to bring into this State teachers and lecturers from outside this State. I understand from the Treasurer's statement that it is all to do with the recruitment of teachers to make up some of the lack we have. I cannot see why this is so, because I would think that we should now be able to attract more students, for the salary and the conditions are much better. Perhaps we are not doing enough to recruit young people. I am rather surprised to see a reduction in the proposed expenditure for teacher training, because this does not make sense to me, either. I think there is something wrong here

in our recruitment programme, and that somewhere along the line we are not presenting teaching as an attractive profession or career for young people. I think this must be looked at, too. I shall be very interested when we get to the lines to see whether there are any explanations for this.

With regard to universities, one problem that faces us today is the alienation that occurs from a sense of failure in many young people, people who have been led to expect that they will go to university if they matriculate. The Matriculation standard is now so high that there are many children who in fact never get to university, because it is so designed to pass about the correct number of young people expected to enter university each year. It is all very well to say that nobody who matriculated last year was refused a place at either Flinders or Adelaide Universities. That has been said. However, it is another thing to look at the standard of the Matriculation examination. Admittedly there was, I understand, a slight problem with the computer last time, and some people who had matriculated were not shown as having matriculated; but in fact that was corrected afterwards. However, this is a problem.

Now there is a proposal which has been examined by universities throughout Australia to use a three-part year, with three parts of four months at a time, and any two parts of that year will qualify as a year's work. It is much the same as the condition that applies now inasmuch as most university students work for eight months of the academic year and have about four months off. If this system is involved, it is possible to complete a year's work towards a degree in two successive terms each of four months: it could be the first and second terms, the second and third, or the third and first. By doing this and by providing the extra staff necessary to cover the extra tuition, it is possible for a university with existing capital facilities to take half as many students again.

This plan has been looked at, but it has been shelved for the time being. However, I believe that it will have to be looked at again. In my opinion, we will be implementing this plan within a few years because it will be much cheaper for Governments and much cheaper for the community to use the existing capital works to the maximum possible extent. I think the member for Mitcham pointed out that we are tending to go along in the same old way. We tend to keep on with the same school-building pattern—

"Let us build new schools and let us use them for two-thirds of the time. Let us consider a new university or a new institute of technology. Let us use it for eight months of the year." These are the attitudes that were fine when we had time, space and resources to cover the needs of our population; but we no longer have those resources or facilities or that time: what we have is a tremendously demanding and ever-growing dependent proportion of our population. It is about time we got away from some of our traditional ideas of government—ideas, as the member for Mitcham said, that are typified by the activities of the Labor Party, that conservative Party. I agree that it is conservative: it wrote down its ideas 30 or 40 years ago and has not changed them since. Every time it waves a little book in the air, it says, "Look at us! We have tradition; we are conservatives. We have our ideas and we are not changing them." However, for the good of this country, those ideas must be changed.

Mr. HOPGOOD: This still puts us 30 years ahead of you.

Dr. TONKIN: We are not encumbered by the need to change concepts that became out of date almost as soon as they were adopted by the Labor Party. The Karmel report is a milestone; it is something of which South Australia can be tremendously proud. It is a wonderful piece of work and the members of that committee deserve our everlasting thanks. I am only sorry that Professor Karmel is no longer Vice-Chancellor of Flinders University but I am pleased that he has now moved on to what the Deputy Premier, I think probably rightly, said is a very handy position; but I am sure he would not allow his natural ties with Flinders University to interfere in any way with his duties as Chairman of the Universities Commission. He is a very well-informed man to whom we can be grateful for the work he has put in on the committee that is now known by his name.

We can be pleased, in respect of education, at the new allocation of \$100,000 for capital grants to community organizations with facilities for children and young people. It was traditional previously for the \$50,000 to be administered by the National Fitness Council. I agree entirely with the member for Mitcham in this respect: this is, in effect, a vote of no confidence in the National Fitness Council; it can be taken in no other way. The National Fitness Council was not informed at any time that the administration of these funds would pass from its hands into the hands of the

Department of Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs. Indeed, I think that in the lines of the Estimates it comes under the heading "Education", and the money that was last year under "National Fitness Council" is now referred to as being under the Department of Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs. There is one slight omission when we see the lines for that department: that the National Fitness Council does not appear by name. It is a slight. It should have been told that this was in the offing and should have been given the opportunity to comment. It certainly was not given that opportunity, and it is extremely poor that it was not. For many years the council has been in the business of helping community youth. However, it was not even asked what it thought about this transfer. I should think that amongst its committees are the most knowledgeable people in South Australia, and possibly in Australia, when it comes to youth activities in the community.

At this stage I think it is appropriate to run briefly through the history of the council, which was first established in 1939. Its object is to carry out the intentions of the Commonwealth National Fitness Act of 1941. That Act states that the Commonwealth council shall advise the Minister with respect to the promotion of national fitness. The South Australian council has always acted on the assumption that it was appointed to advise the State Government; indeed it has always done this well. All the funds received by the council have been used according to a schedule. It has paid the salaries and travelling expenses of the Director and Assistant Director, provided services to associated groups, subsidies to youth organizations and grants to local groups, and it has assisted in the establishment of sports associations and youth centres. It has developed camps and youth hostels. Having inspected the camp at Mylor and the other facilities of the council, I have nothing but admiration for the programme it has undertaken.

The policy behind the National Fitness Act was enunciated by the National Health and Medical Research Council and, broadly interpreted, it involved physical education and recreation. It is the third partner in a national scheme which comprehends courses in physical education at universities, teachers colleges, schools and, finally, in the community at large. From the beginning, emphasis has been placed on training leaders, establishing camps and generally assisting organizations, such as sports associations, in providing sports fields, swimming pools, playgrounds and camps. Youth has

received the major emphasis in all these activities. The council established its first camp at Mylor, setting up youth hostels in the Hills, and established boys' and girls' clubs. I believe the old Our Boys Institute, which we all remember with some nostalgia, came under the National Fitness Council. The council sends leaders to other States to attend courses in youth leadership and, in 1945, it undertook the administration of subsidies. The Commonwealth provides a \$1 for \$2 subsidy on all money spent in this way. The administration of these grants by the association in liaison with the existing organizations has become one of the council's chief concerns.

Without dealing with all the worthy history of the council from that time, I point out that in 1963 Sir Thomas Playford provided \$50,000 for the training of youth leaders and the development of youth clubs, and the provision in these Estimates is exactly the same. Good use has been made of that money. The council has instituted further inquiries into facilities available for youth, doing everything in its power to assist youth in our community. I shall be interested at the appropriate time to hear why this administration has been taken away from the council and why the Government had the discourtesy not to notify the members of the council that such an action was even being contemplated.

As I have said, this Budget is repressive. Once again, the poor old car owner or car purchaser is getting it in the neck. One of the matters to which I have referred is the effect of the increased car registration and licence charges. This is being done nicely and in a piece-meal fashion. No wonder the press did not twig the total impositions when they were finally summed up in the Treasurer's Financial Statement.

Motor vehicle taxation will be about \$3,873,000 more than it was last year. This amount will be paid by those who own motor vehicles. Stamp duty costs will add to the cost of buying a car. The duty on applications to register a motor vehicle, apparently, will be reduced slightly on cars costing less than \$1,000. I wonder how many cars could be purchased for that price, and I suppose we could say that this encourages the running of bombs on the road, which is hardly likely to improve road safety. However, this is a reduction and we must give the Treasurer credit for it, but I submit that it is extremely slight.

The new rate is to be \$1 for each \$100 or part thereof, instead of \$2 for each \$200 or

part thereof. The reduction is slight, and I do not think a fall in revenue from that section of the car-buying public will worry the Treasurer. However, for costs above \$1,000, the increase is steep. The present \$2 for each \$200 will be replaced by a charge of \$2 for each \$100 in the case of values between \$1,000 and \$2,000, and the charge will be \$2.50 for each \$100 on that portion of the value in excess of \$2,000. This increase is extremely steep and, once again, the motorist is getting it right in the neck. We have also been told that the hire-purchase agreement charges will increase from 1.5 per cent to 1.8 per cent. Once again, this will hit the car buyer.

Turning to primary production, it is small consolation that the Government has paid lip service to the plight of the primary producer by making a half-hearted gesture. I understand that it has changed the date of valuation by 12 months. We should not sneer at this. Perhaps the Government is beginning to understand a little of the primary producer's problems. This move may have been an accident, but I think that it has been done deliberately and that it is lip service. The Government will still get \$10,000,000 from land tax, which is \$2,450,000 more than receipts in 1970-71.

Water rates, too, have increased steeply. Water is a precious commodity and I wonder whether the Treasurer's reluctance to provide South Australia with the water it needs is a deliberate attempt to keep up the price of water or to justify the increased costs. I am not being serious: I am sure that he would not do that. However, one wonders.

I am also concerned that hospital charges have increased for the second time in 12 months. During the last financial year we have been told that the charges were increased to meet increased costs, and it was expected that those increases would significantly increase receipts. In hospitals we are doing things for patients (and saving lives as a result) that would have been impossible to contemplate even a few months ago. We are doing these things and, as a result, the people (and rightly) have come to expect the highest standard of service from hospitals. The first increase to meet increased costs was probably justified, but the reason we are given for the recent increase is that the charges must be brought into line with charges in the Eastern States. It is typical of this Government that any sort of cost advantage we have had in South Australia is being whittled away. Why are we not obtaining industries for South Australia?

Obviously, because we do not have anything to offer them. The total result of both increases in hospital fees from \$7,100,000 to \$9,000,000 leaves us with an increase of \$1,900,000. I suppose this is important: after all, we will need more than \$2,000,000 for a performing arts centre and we have to find a like amount somewhere. I suppose the hospital budget is as good a source as any, but I think many members of the public will find it difficult to equate a performing arts centre with—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You know that that money comes from the Loan Estimates and that it is not coming from these Estimates. Why do you talk such nonsense?

Dr. TONKIN: Of course, but I do not believe that people in our public hospitals should be imposed on by a sum that is almost as much as the performing arts centre will cost. And further to this matter, despite the Deputy Premier's comment that an obscure journalist was not worth listening to (and that journalist, Mr. Justin McDonnell, is attached to the Drama Department of the Flinders University, and he has been well aware of the situation concerning the performing arts in South Australia), it is generally considered that this is a premature move. It is considered that the South Australian Theatre Company may well be directed into a definite line of development as a result of this move. I have no doubt that the gesture was well meant, but I think it will restrict tremendously the development of this company. This is not only my point of view. I know that the Treasurer is interested in the performing arts, because he is a performer of some note, but, nevertheless, it is the considered opinion of people who also are acknowledged as experts in this subject that this is a premature move, and that it would be far better to devote money from revenue to hiring a theatre and giving the theatre company security of tenure for five years, letting it develop its own technique and attitude to the theatre, instead of being forced into a stereotype way—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What is stereotype about the theatre being built? It is the most flexible theatre in Australia. How is the company going to be bound?

Dr. TONKIN: I was told that probably the argument that would be suggested was that this is a flexible theatre and the design is flexible. That is correct, but I cannot understand that it will be as flexible as all that, and neither can many other people.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You cannot have looked at the design.

Dr. TONKIN: I have seen it and I have considered the comments of experts on drama about the design. Although it is more flexible than many other conventional theatres—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Certainly any that can be hired.

Dr. TONKIN: —it still has walls, a front door, a stage and proscenium. It can be varied and changed, but it is directing the performing style, and undoubtedly, it will tend to force the South Australian Theatre Company into a fixed way. It will be fixing an attitude of mind and, for the free development of theatre in this State, I think the company should be allowed to develop freely, certainly with the support of this Government. However, let us not restrict the company to set ways. Let the arts develop as they wish and not be dictated to by the whims of the Treasurer.

Mr. Rodda: Hear, hear!

Dr. TONKIN: I am grateful for the support members are giving me, even though the Treasurer finds it a subject for mirth. Who was consulted about this theatre? Was anyone in the general community or the artistic community of this State consulted?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Obviously, you have not read the DeGaetani report, which was the basis of the project.

Dr. TONKIN: Although that might be so, other people interested in drama and the theatre were not consulted.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You ought to look at the number of people consulted by Mr. DeGaetani; they represented every major area of theatrical activity in South Australia.

Dr. TONKIN: I am reassured by what the Treasurer has said. Obviously, Mr. DeGaetani spoke to more than one or two people. However, I will deal with this matter no longer as it obviously upsets the Treasurer.

Mr. Clark: I think you would be very wise.

Dr. TONKIN: I refer now to the allocations being made for public parks. It is interesting to note that four sums of \$300,000 are referred to. This relates to public parks under the control of the Minister of Local Government, and a sum which is being transferred to the Planning and Development Fund, which is administered by the Premier's Department. These sums have been raised as the result of an amendment made to the Land Tax Act, whereby 1c is obtained on every \$20 unimproved value of all metropolitan land. The recurrence of this figure brings to mind that \$300,000 was proposed for the acquisition of properties under the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan "not yet approved."

The dash signifying no expenditure in this respect for the coming year intimates that it is indeed a good thing and is intended to prove beyond doubt that recommendations contained in the M.A.T.S. plan are no longer proceeding.

The Deputy Leader has covered this matter fairly well and I am indebted to the Auditor-General for his report. I merely draw members' attention to this fact. I have it on the best authority that the Deputy Leader is correct in saying that the Highways Department is the biggest property holder in the metropolitan area. Members are not sure what it is doing with the land, except retaining it. Although only a new member, I should like to know whether any return is being received from this land. I hope a return is being received.

I am sorry the Minister of Roads and Transport is not present; I suppose he has heard all this before and does not worry about it, as criticism runs off his back like water does off that of a duck. I resent the duplicity of the Government, which has said that the M.A.T.S. plan is dead and that nothing will be proceeded with for 10 years. The Government has purchased property not only in respect of what we were told would be a revised plan but in respect of almost every single freeway and expressway referred to in the M.A.T.S. report. I refer particularly to the Hills Freeway. Admittedly, some of these freeways may now be called high-speed corridors. The Minister of Roads and Transport has never replied to the question I have asked in Parliament or to the several questions I have asked him privately. What is the difference between a freeway and a high-speed corridor? The Minister is either not telling us or he does not know, and I think the latter is the correct position. This money is being spent on acquiring property, and I think that if this sort of thing is going on the Government should be honest about it and let us know. I think it has been presented in this way deliberately to give the people the impression that the project is not, in fact, going forward. I should like to hear what the Minister has to say about this at the appropriate time.

It is interesting that the major proportion of expenditure was \$987,000 for the Hindmarsh interchange and that the Noarlunga freeway, which seems to have vexed and occupied the Minister's mind for so long, is next on the list. I hope that the Minister will not get into trouble about this in his own district. The Minister is fond of saying that

freeways cannot be built without destroying houses and property. I should like to know what is his magic formula: why does a high-speed transport corridor not involve the demolition of buildings and the relocation of people? What is the difference? What magic formula has this wizard of transport? The Minister still has not explained it, and I cannot. The only difference I can see is in regard to what travels on a road. Cars will travel on freeways, and perhaps other means of transport will use high-speed corridors.

I do not know what we will do with the 4 per cent per annum annual increase in car registrations in 10 years' time. We will have to do something about it. Let us develop our public transport, but we must be realistic and do something about the cars that will clog up the roads and prevent our public transport from being effective. It is all very well to talk ideally but it is another thing to be practical about these things, and this Government has not shown much evidence of being practical. In fact, in 10 years' time we will find that the M.A.T.S. plan will have come around by the back door, or by the back road. Finally, the Treasurer has been reticent about the Premier's Department. I suppose that is a good thing; after all, I suppose he does not want to draw too much attention to his own activities.

Mr. Coumbe: I thought you were going to say he was modest.

Dr. TONKIN: That term had occurred to me, but I think "reticent" will do. I want to know exactly what a policy secretariat does. Who are the members; how many are there; and what do they all do? Who are they that they should justify an increase from a vote of \$89,000 in 1970-71 to \$154,000 this year? I have no doubt that the \$154,000 will be exceeded in just the same way as the allocation was exceeded last year by a considerable sum. I can visualize the policy secretariat overflowing, displacing the Chief Secretary's Department and, in fact, taking over the entire building soon. I think the member for Mitcham was a little unkind to the Minister of Environment and Conservation and Minister Assisting the Premier, because, after all, it is a new department that has only recently been set up; but \$31,000 is not an inconsiderable amount of money.

Mr. Coumbe: Do not forget Parkinson's law!

Dr. TONKIN: It is a nucleus, and I shall watch with great interest what develops. Con-

servation and environment are tremendously important things, and I hope that we get going and get some useful service from that department and not merely the lip service that we are getting now. I am sorry I am worrying the Minister, but he has not heard the last of me yet. If we look under the heading "Industries Promotion, Research and Assistance", we see that under "Feasibility studies by consultants" nothing was voted last year and \$27,000 is proposed this year. We are at it again: we have this committee-forming and report-seeking Government. I only hope the Government does not shelve the report as so many other reports have been shelved.

Mr. Langley: How many others?

Dr. TONKIN: If we can get a conservation report, perhaps the Government will act on it. At least, it will show that the department is doing something. We often hear of reports on things. We get reports on the M.A.T.S. plan; we get an instant reassessment of it in about three days after an election by the Minister concerned, and then another report by Dr. Breuning. As far as we can ascertain from this publication, we still have the M.A.T.S. plan with us, anyway. That is what I mean by "shelving".

Mr. Coumbe: So many reports are not given to this Chamber.

Dr. TONKIN: I am interested in the proposition for extending the engineering, technical, promotion, research and clerical staff under "Industries Promotion": the figure has been increased from \$66,000 to \$128,000 (including \$12,000 for the Director of Industrial Development). That is very good except that, as the Leader has pointed out, we have seen nothing from it and it does not look as though we shall, either, unless we call millionaires, taking over a free site in the heart of Adelaide, industry. It will cost a great deal of money.

Mr. Langley: Stop laughing.

Dr. TONKIN: I am not laughing; I have never been more serious in my life. It is a disgusting state of affairs. I notice that under "Overseas visits of Premier and officers" \$3,800 was voted and the actual payments came to \$13,466; and \$10,000 is proposed for 1971-72. I hope that that \$10,000 does not expand in the same ratio as the \$3,800 expanded last year, or we shall be confronted with a huge bill. I do not quarrel with these visits. If the Treasurer has to go overseas, he must. I almost wish he would go overseas more frequently. If the end result of his trip

overseas was beneficial to the State, I would be the first to agree to the trips. But perhaps there is something wrong here. If he spends \$13,500 on going overseas to promote South Australia, we are entitled to see something for that money, but we are not seeing very much yet. The Leader has covered many of the other things here.

Mr. Langley: I think you are a Doctor of Divinity.

Dr. TONKIN: I do not think even a Doctor of Divinity could save the member for Unley.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Bragg.

Dr. TONKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will return to my original remarks. I think this is a very depressing subject. We are not getting value for money, and we are seeing much irresponsible spending at a time when we are budgeting for a deficit. We are seeing irresponsible spending. I am sorry the Minister of Education was not here earlier when I was dealing with his department. This spending at a time when we hope that the Commonwealth Government will come and pick up the tab for us if we run into more trouble will discourage the Commonwealth Government from wanting to help us. It is a form of blackmail. The member for Mawson asked whether we should cut down on expenditure on hospitals or education. I do not believe we should cut down; I believe we must keep these services going. I repeat that it is futile to say that we are spending 25 per cent more on education when in fact all we are doing mainly is meeting the increased costs of salaries. In other words, we must keep services going. The Government should not give the public the impression that by spending an extra 25 per cent we will get a 25 per cent improvement in services.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The Treasurer said nothing of the kind; he said what you say he should have said.

Dr. TONKIN: He uses words very well. The member for Mawson said that private affluence means public squalor. He developed this theme and, as a good Socialist, he showed that he disagreed with private ownership and enterprise. However, he said that the development of the Victoria Square block and its gift presentation to private interests overseas was a good thing. If nothing else, this showed how inconsistent, if not misguided, the member for Mawson is.

I do not think this is a responsible Budget; I believe it is an attempt to cover up the massive imposition of charges on the com-

munity over the last 15 months. I hope that the newspapers and the public generally will become aware of this. Certainly people will feel the effect of the Budget on their pockets. I do not think the Government has taken a responsible attitude at all, and I can only look forward to better things in the future.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I believe it is the job of Government members to praise the Budget. However, it is the bounden duty of Opposition members to probe deeply and critically into the Treasurer's statements and the financial papers presented to the Chamber, and that is the approach I intend to adopt this evening. My overall impression is that the Budget is like the curate's egg: parts of it are good (let us not delude ourselves about that) but, like the proverbial egg, parts of it are not so good. In the case of the previous two sets of Estimates recoveries were made from the position at the time the Estimates were presented, and one thing that stands out a mile is that that applies to this Budget, too. When the 1970-71 Budget was presented, the Treasurer estimated a deficit of \$4,896,000, but he finished up with a nominal surplus of \$21,000. In the case of the Loan Estimates which we discussed some time ago, we saw a significant increase. We are now considering a Budget for an estimated deficit of \$7,346,000. Incidentally, I believe this is the largest estimated deficit to be recorded in this State. I suggest that the Treasurer has deliberately gone into deficit budgeting to this extent in the hope and fairly sure knowledge that the Commonwealth will come to the party and rescue the State again. This happened in the last year, and I shall quote from the Treasurer's own document. He was careful not to put this attachment into the published press release that went out: we did not hear a word of this in the news media. As this statement has the Treasurer's own imprimatur, I suppose it is his word, and in the attachment he states:

As a result of this unexpected boost to the formula grant, the special assistance announced in April, the State's own revenue measures and control of expenditures, and the operation of certain awards a little later than forecast, it was possible for the Government to finish the year with a nominal surplus of \$21,000.

The Government had started the year with an estimated deficit of \$4,896,000. How much of this difference between that and the \$21,000 surplus was accounted for by Commonwealth grants?

Mr. Rodda: The wicked Commonwealth Government!

Mr. COUMBE: Yes. The Commonwealth Government is the bane of the present Government. I wonder what the present Government would have to complain about if it did not have the Commonwealth Government as its whipping horse. What is the sum that the Commonwealth Government has given to this State this year? Apart from the actual amount, the attachment shows that \$16,503,000 was provided by the Commonwealth Government over and above the estimate. That is the amount already provided, but there is no mention of this in the press hand-out. Let us be fair: I should have thought that someone on the Government side would have made some statement about this amount, or recognized it.

We must look at the amount that the Commonwealth Government has given. We realize that the State Government is budgeting, in this financial year, for about \$7,000,000 from the Grants Commission, and I expect that the Treasurer is banking heavily on an increased amount from the Commonwealth Government in the coming year. In the last financial year, the estimated amount to come from the Commonwealth Government was \$147,703,632. The Treasurer estimates that in the present year the amount to be derived from the Commonwealth Government will be \$172,998,672, an increase of a "mere" \$24,295,040 over the estimate last year. That is not a bad slice of money, and I want to relate this, of course, to education, because I am one of the first to admit that a substantial amount of money is required from the Commonwealth Government for education purposes.

The Commonwealth Government has given this money to the States for general purposes and, naturally, this State will use some of it for education. As far as the revenue line for the Education Department is concerned, the increased amount is \$20,477,000. Unfortunately, \$19,500,000 of that is taken up in wages and salaries, so there is barely \$1,000,000 to go for increased services and facilities. I recall that the Treasurer, when he was Leader of the Opposition, made a policy speech in which he criticized the Liberal and Country League Government then in office for not spending all the moneys it had at its disposal for education. At that time the present Treasurer said:

The Labor Party pledges itself to spend all available moneys in this area.

Mr. Rodda: This was the start of the "crisis"!

Mr. COUMBE: The Treasurer also said:

We will use our natural resources to the full.

I remind the Committee that at that time the then Leader of the Opposition, the present Treasurer, was criticizing the former L.C.L. Government for not using the \$12,000,000 that it had in the Loan Fund. The present Government now has \$15,000,000 in that fund. How does this equate? In considering the revenue-raising items in this Budget, we must also look at the mini-Budget of February-March which has been referred to by other members. I recall that the Treasurer chided the Deputy Leader when he said that the actions of this Government in raising taxes would affect young people. However, it does affect them. The first item was a levy of 3 per cent on the Electricity Trust. Would that not affect young people? When this levy was introduced it was left to the trust to fix a charge to compensate for the 3 per cent levy. The second item was an increase of 20 per cent in registration fees for motor vehicles, with the Highways Fund undertaking financial responsibility for certain services. There was an increase in bookmakers' turnover tax and a 71 per cent levy on admission charges for public entertainment. Thank goodness the Government removed that tax. There were increases in bus and tram fares, and an increase in rail fares. Surely these increases would affect young people.

Mr. Harrison: Didn't your Government ever increase charges?

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, but I also recall the late Frank Walsh doing it. I criticized him because he had said before the election that he did not believe it should be done, yet when he came into office the first thing he did was to increase bus fares. The next increase was in water and sewerage rates. I have received complaints about this matter and I presume that other members have received similar complaints. The quarterly rate demands have gone out in some districts. These increased rates have had two effects. The valuation of property has increased by between 7½ per cent and 10 per cent, and the charge for water used has increased from 30c to 35c a thousand gallons. I received a shock recently when my quarterly water rates bill came in, and last evening I received the account for my council rates, which have been based on the water rates assessment.

What amount was to be raised by these measures? I understand they were to raise \$6,000,000 in a full year. The present measures are expected to raise about \$4,000,000

in a full year, and then we have the natural increases that occur in many charges. Therefore, we have to consider a figure of about \$10,000,000 for this year. I do not recall seeing this figure highlighted in press releases from the Treasurer when he presented his Budget, or being highlighted in any of the media. I believe the Treasurer's boys did a smart job in trying to minimize the impact on South Australia of some of these measures. Whilst we are facing rising costs, a national wage case is set down for hearing and, obviously, there will be wage increases during the coming year. These will affect the State, but I am sure the Commonwealth Government will come to the party again. I believe that the Treasurer is taking a calculated risk in budgeting for this deficit, as he is relying heavily on the Grants Commission and the Commonwealth Government for assistance.

Honourable members have referred to several lines which can better be discussed in the later stages of the debate. I notice that a large sum has been spent in my district for the M.A.T.S. plan. In his report, the Auditor-General refers not to high-speed corridors but to freeways. Much money has been spent on two committees but the reports of these committees has not been seen by members. Earlier this afternoon I referred to a report that the Attorney-General was suppressing from this Chamber and from the public. I refer to the Sangster report and the Bennett report: we do not know whether we will ever see them. The Minister in his arrogant manner has said that he will look at them himself, but members may not see them for some time, if at all. In this Budget the fairy godmother, the Commonwealth Government, has come to the party with an excess of \$16,500,000 above the amount estimated to be received from the Commonwealth Government, and this fact has been emphasized three times in the Treasurer's statement.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The increase this year from the Commonwealth Government is much less.

Mr. COUNBE: Let the Minister get on the same wave length. I was speaking earlier about what the Commonwealth Government had done in the financial year just concluded. For the Minister's information, it is stated in the Treasurer's speech and in the Auditor-General's Report that the Commonwealth Government's grant was \$16,500,000 above the estimate. The estimate for the coming year is \$44,000,000 over the estimate for last year.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That is not so.

Mr. COUNBE: For the benefit of the Minister of Education, who is so knowledgeable on all subjects, I refer to the Treasurer's official document. What better proof have I than his own colleague's paper? The estimated receipts from the Commonwealth Government for the year ended June 30, 1971, were shown as \$147,700,000. The amount actually received from the Commonwealth Government was \$164,200,000. The estimated amount for the 1971-72 financial year is \$171,998,000. Therefore, one arrives at a figure of \$44,295,000. The Minister can put his own interpretation on it. The figures are in the Estimates of Revenue at page 4.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Look at appendix 1.

Mr. COUNBE: I see; they do not agree. The Minister is doubting his own colleague's words.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The increase is from \$164,000,000 to \$171,000,000.

Mr. COUNBE: That is right. I was not talking about that. I broke the figures up into two sections.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You did a fiddle.

Mr. COUNBE: I did nothing of the sort. I said there was \$16,500,000 this year over and above what was expected; I quoted that figure, and I quoted \$44,000,000 as the difference between the two estimated receipts in 1970-71 and 1971-72. Those are the actual figures, and they cannot be denied. It is about time someone on the other side gave some credit to the Commonwealth Government. If there was not the Commonwealth Government to attack, this Government would have nothing to talk or complain about.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The Commonwealth has opposed each application to the Grants Commission.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Burdon): Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. COUNBE: The Grants Commission gave \$5,000,000 last year and it is estimated that \$7,000,000 will be provided this year, to quote the Treasurer's own words. These sums are quite apart from the financial assistance and other special grants. In fact, if we look at the Auditor-General's Report, we see a significant increase in the grants made to this State compared with those referred to in the Auditor-General's Report of the previous year. This is especially apparent if we look at the items concerned, quite apart from the assistance in connection with debt recovery and

other items. I expect that with a bit of luck we might hear someone on the other side at least get up and support the Treasurer concerning this document whereas, so far, we have heard the member for Mawson ramble on about sundry items. Being duty bound to support the first line, I now do so.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): This is a debate in which only a few Government members are interested in speaking. The member for Mawson made a few vague general comments but apparently Government members find there is nothing to say in support of this Budget. That is a true conclusion to draw, but there are some comments pertinent to this Budget. The Treasurer persists with the myth he has propagated throughout the State that he is taxing the wealthy. We have heard that over and over again in the last few months. It is a deliberate attempt to hoodwink and mislead the public of South Australia. He has said many times, "We are interested in looking after the little man; we will tax the wealthy."

Let us look at where State taxation lies, where it impinges on the community of South Australia. The six areas of taxation covered under the Stamp Duties Act are outlined in the Financial Statement on page 17. There are six areas in which the Treasurer intends to tax the residents of South Australia and he claims that this will cost the average citizen 1½c a week, the ridiculous figure quoted recently in the press. He has propagated some nonsense in his time here but this is probably the worst: it will cost the average citizen 1½c a week! Let us look at the proposition. There are six measures here. I remember that some relief was expressed by, I think it was, the Treasurer (although my memory may not serve me correctly) when the Commonwealth Budget was announced; some relief was expressed in South Australia that there was no increased tax on the sale of motor vehicles. There was a fairly widespread rumour that the Commonwealth intended to increase the tax on motor vehicles, which would have had a severe effect on the South Australian economy because we are major producers in the motor industry. So there were some sighs of relief, and the Treasurer was one of those people who heaved a sigh of relief that the Commonwealth Budget did not increase the tax on the sale of motor vehicles.

What is the first revenue-raising matter in the South Australian Budget? We see that the duty on motor vehicles is to be increased. In other words, this is a blow at an industry that Government members have said is part of the

lifeblood of the industrial economy of this State. The Treasurer has stated that the Budget is aimed at the wealthier section of the community, as only the wealthy people can afford a motor car these days. A person can buy any car up to a value of \$1,000 and pay the same duty as operates at present. If it happens to be an odd multiple of \$100, he may save a dollar; but that is the maximum he can save if the car is of a value that is an odd multiple of \$100. I see no difference between \$1 on \$100 and \$2 on \$200, except that a man may save a dollar; but thereafter the tax increases steeply.

If he buys one of the average motor cars commonly seen in this State (say, a Holden, a Valiant or a Ford Falcon) the value of the car is about \$2,500 or \$2,600. What do we think of this item of taxation on that sort of premise? At present the duty on the sale of a new car worth \$2,600 is \$26, by way of State stamp duty. The proposed increase will make this charge \$45, an increase in taxation of 70 per cent. If a person buys this make of car on hire-purchase, as many people do (and they would certainly not be the wealthiest members of the community), he will pay once again an increased duty. All of these items represent a steep increase in the duty payable. There is a steep increase in the duty on conveyances. As this is on a sliding scale, it is difficult to calculate what the percentage increase will be. Up to \$12,000 the rate remains as it is and thereafter it is increased fairly steeply. Above \$12,000 at present it is 2½ per cent up to \$15,000 and then it becomes 1½ per cent. The Government intends to increase this to 3 per cent for any portion in excess of \$12,000; this is in effect a 100 per cent increase in duty in this field.

The third item in this list of increases under the Stamp Duties Act is an increase of 33 per cent in relation to marketable securities. The rate of instalment purchase and credit arrangement contracts will be increased by 20 per cent. These are the sorts of contract which the wealthy people of the State are purported to engage in. Stamp duty on cheques will be increased by 20 per cent. Mortgages in excess of \$10,000 will be subject to a duty which will be increased by 40 per cent. This represents a fairly hefty all-round increase in the field of taxation. I was interested to read what the Treasurer had to say on a previous occasion about these very matters. In 1964, when the present Treasurer was a member of the Opposition and was speaking in the Budget debate

when these taxation measures were being considered, he said, as reported at page 812 of 1964 *Hansard*:

On this occasion the Budget proposes to increase charges upon a certain section of the South Australian people. It does so in a number of ways, the first of which is an increase in stamp duties of certain kinds. That stamp duty increase will for the most part fall heavily upon the poorer sections of the population. Quite clearly, the increase in charges in respect of mortgages will most heavily affect those people who need to borrow to erect houses. The proposed new impost upon motor vehicles, not only new but also secondhand, will fall most heavily upon the working section of the people. These people are the heaviest buyers of used cars within the community, and also constitute a large proportion of those who purchase new cars.

This is strangely in conflict with the sort of statement he now makes widely on television and in the newspapers.

Dr. Eastick: Perhaps he is putting up a smoke screen.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will go further: I think he is misleading the public. In 1964, he continued:

The impost on personal loans, designed to catch the companies that are not now using hire-purchase agreements, will again fall upon those people who are involved in time-payment contracts. The proposal in the measure to see that the companies do not hand on this impost is simply useless: it is clear that this extra impost will be passed on to the people buying goods upon time-payment. In every case, except one minor one, these new stamp duties will fall heavily upon the working sections of the population in South Australia—and this within a tax structure which significantly within this State taxes the wealthy far less than does any other State of the Commonwealth.

The Treasurer's recent statements, in the light of his statement in 1964, are almost incredible, because he has increased the areas of taxation that he mentioned then, but he said then that the measures were aimed at the poorer sections of the community. A significant number of working people, those who purchase new houses, those who borrow money for new houses, and those who enter into hire-purchase arrangements, are the people in respect of whom he has seen fit to increase taxation, and he now tries to justify the increase by stating that he is taxing the wealthy.

I submit that this is balderdash and that it is an attempt, such as he makes on numerous occasions, to mislead the public. Many people who purchase cars now buy new cars, and the working people usually buy them on hire-purchase. It will cost them 70 per cent more in State taxation and stamp duty. So much for

the Treasurer's claim that he is taxing the wealthy in this regard. I think we should consider these new measures in the light of the earlier imposts on the people of South Australia.

Mr. Gunn: He was going to take those off.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The only one that he took off was the entertainment tax. He saw that there was trouble about that, because entertainment companies would not come here from other States. Two significant areas of taxation were the levy on the Electricity Trust and the increased water rates by way of increased assessment and the increased charge for rebate water. Does the Treasurer suggest that this is a tax aimed at the wealthy people? He said he would tax the tall poppies in the State, but I have yet to find where this has happened.

The Treasurer knows that the people of this State who are paying these taxes are the average citizens. I do not know of anyone who still lives in a house in the metropolitan area that has not a water main connected to it or of anyone who cooks on a wood stove or reads the newspaper by kerosene lamp. The Treasurer is talking nonsense when he says that these recent imposts are aimed at the wealthy. He cannot have it both ways. He said in 1964 that the measures were aimed at the poor people and now he says that they are aimed at the wealthier people. It seems that those who were poor in 1964 have now become wealthy.

Mr. Venning: That's his theory.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We cannot follow some Government members, even the skilled economists, lawyers, and the like amongst them. The average citizen is being sluggish.

Mr. Venning: And hoodwinked.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, and misled, through the Government's action in raising these amounts of money. Two other increases are mentioned in the Financial Statement. The Treasurer, I understand without prior consultation, has announced that university fees will be increased next year so that the university will raise an additional \$310,000 in fees. Since I have been on the Council of the University of Adelaide I have become acutely aware of the financial difficulties facing the university. For instance, I know that, until the supplementary grant by the Commonwealth Government was announced recently, no money could be spent on buying books for the library and there was considerable financial stringency regarding maintenance of grounds and property.

Nevertheless, the State Government has announced that it expects the university to increase fees so that it will raise an additional \$310,000, and the State Government's grants to the university will diminish by this amount. I also find this strangely contradictory in the light of statements made by the Treasurer and also by the Minister of Education. In 1969, the then Liberal Government had the courtesy to consult the university about the proposed increase in fees, but the then Leader of the Opposition, who is now Treasurer, saw fit to move a motion regarding the increase in these fees. He moved:

That in the opinion of this House a further increase in fees in tertiary education institutions in this State will cause grave hardship to students and should not be proceeded with.

Later he stated:

It is evident that the Government has requested of the councils of tertiary institutions in South Australia a 20 per cent increase in fees.

At least the Liberal Government had the courtesy to inform the university of what it intended to do. However, the introduction of the present Budget was the first indication the university had that it was expected to raise its fees. That is what I believe from what I heard at the University Council meeting.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: In England, if any details of the Budget were announced beforehand, the Treasurer concerned would be expected to resign automatically.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That would be a darned good thing in South Australia. In moving his motion the then Leader of the Opposition said:

This proposed move would perpetuate and aggravate the present situation in which the lower socio-economic groups are at a disadvantage as far as education, and in particular tertiary education, is concerned. In these circumstances, I believe that it is most unwise at this stage to proceed to a further fee increase.

That was said as recently as 1969. Here is a man who is trying to spread abroad this myth that the Government is looking after the underprivileged and taxing the wealthy. When the stamp duty tax was being debated in 1964 he said that the measure was aimed at the poorer classes, and in 1969 he said the increase in university fees was aimed at those who could least afford to pay them. However, we have a complete about-face in this Budget. We are becoming accustomed to the Government's doing a back-somersault, because hardly a week goes by when we do not see this happen, but

this gives the lie to what the Treasurer said. He has seen fit to increase university fees. Professor Badger, Vice-Chancellor of the university, speaking about the university finances at a council meeting that I attended, was reported in a press release as having stated:

The Commonwealth Government had provided for supplementary grants for the university for 1971-72, but the State Government had agreed to meet its share of the proposed grant for 1971 only.

The report then refers to what the students had to say. I believe the Treasurer introduced this motion in 1969 as a result of a petition from university students. I do not know whether that motivated him, although he was then the champion of their cause. The Treasurer was reported in the *Advertiser* of September 4, 1971, as having said:

The three organizations—
that is, the student organizations at Flinders and Adelaide universities and the South Australian Institute of Technology—

representing 17,000 students say that the proposed increase will further increase the inequalities of opportunity for tertiary education. The aim of the proposed rise in university fees was to extract more money from the Commonwealth Government.

That is not a lame excuse: it condemns the Premier. He is using these students, whom he said in 1969 he would help, as a tool to get at the Commonwealth Government. These fees have been raised so that the State Government's contribution can be decreased by the sum of \$310,000. Apparently the students were not happy about that comment. I have seen the Government espouse some feeble causes, and I have seen it do an about-face on many occasions. This is another example. The report continues:

The Premier denied any conflict between the Government's proposal to increase fees and the stand he took against higher fees which came before the Assembly in December, 1969. The fact of the matter is that the Treasurer was then in Opposition and is now in Government and, if it suits his purpose to say something, he will do so, just as he does each week not only regarding this Budget but also regarding statements in his policy speech. Time and time again this Government has said one thing and meant another. I point this out merely to show how hypocritical is the Government in stating that it is taxing the wealthy and looking after the little man.

Mr. Venning: How do you think an election would go?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I would like to predict the result of it. This is the sort of nonsense

that the Treasurer is speaking now. He is trying to mislead the people of this State but is not being very successful. I do not think the people of this State are as gullible as the Treasurer thinks they are. The announcement that the Budget will cost the average man $1\frac{1}{2}$ c a week would be all right if one did not drive a car, did not intend to buy a new car or a new house, had nothing on hire-purchase, did not have to pay university fees, did not have to use electric light but read by candlelight (although electricity charges were not affected by the Budget), or pumped water from the well by means of an old pump. I do not think anyone in my district lives in that way, so the Budget is certainly hitting the average South Australian man.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the Treasurer's district? Do you think there would be any there?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Although I do not know much about the Norwood District, I have not seen many kerosene lamps or pumps in operation there. However, I have seen many people driving cars there. Nevertheless, the Treasurer works out by some miraculous arithmetic that the Budget will cost the average man only $1\frac{1}{2}$ c a week. I should like to know who he classes as the average man. Members again saw in the Budget an increase in hospital fees. Years ago the Government prided itself on the establishment of the lotteries fund which, it said, would do much for the hospitals in this State. Members realize fully that this money may just as well be paid into general revenue. The Minister of Education makes a song and dance about assistance from the Commonwealth Government for education. Members realize that this is simply a ruse to obtain extra money from the Commonwealth Government. Of course, finance for education from the Commonwealth Government would be considered in the South Australian Budget when priorities are assessed.

We see again a steep increase in hospital fees following hard on the increase announced only recently. I believe that for the general public much of the proposed increased expenditure on education will be illusory. In fact, the Education Department has appointed additional teachers, and this has absorbed revenue. Increased salaries and wages amount to about 95 per cent of the proposed increase.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you saying that additional teachers shouldn't be employed?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Not at all, but last year the Minister complained bitterly that the former Minister of Education (the member

for Torrens) was being misleading in stating that there was an increase of, I think, 18 per cent in education expenditure at the time. The present Minister said that that increase was being absorbed in salaries and wages, and he is hardly being consistent in this regard.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Can you point to a single statement of mine that has not made it clear that—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I agree with the Minister, and I do not know what he is getting excited about. I am merely using the argument that he used previously, when he said that the member for Torrens could not take any great kudos for the increase in expenditure of 18 per cent, because most of it went on salaries. If we look at the Financial Statement, we see that about 95 per cent of the increased expenditure on education goes in salaries and wages, and I think what is left amounts to about \$2,000,000.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What about expansion in staff?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: There is not much left over for other areas of improvement in education. I suggest that, if the Minister's new book scheme gets off the ground, and if he honours the undertaking that I believe he gave headmasters (that the schools will not lose financially as a result of this scheme), the Government will be faced with having to make considerable payments to secondary schools to make good the deficiencies that will be only too apparent under this scheme. The Liberal and Country League in South Australia introduced a scheme for book allowances and travelling allowances. If we had been returned to office, the book allowance would have been increased by \$6. The Labor Party promised to increase it by \$6, but this Budget increases it by only \$4. Unfortunately, the Minister of Education, I believe as a result of some Labor Party conferences, has been committed to a free book scheme in secondary schools. One scheme has been tried out at the Norwood High School, with unknown success so far.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Is your Party opposed to a scheme of free books?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Our Party is not opposed to any sensible scheme that will lower the cost of education to parents; but at the same time I know perfectly well that this book scheme is only half-baked; in the long term there will be serious educational disadvantages and the parents will not be helped financially. It will cost the Government

money if the Minister is to honour his undertaking that the schools will not lose money if they adopt this scheme.

I note there is an allocation of money to the Attorney-General's department. First, let me refer briefly to the performance of the Attorney-General in the last few months, and even as recently as today. Despite long-standing precedent, he does not intend to release the report of the Juvenile Court magistrate. It is a document of some interest to many people in South Australia, and I have always read it from cover to cover. This action on the part of the Attorney-General is not only disappointing but also unjustifiable, in any circumstances. His reason is that he does not believe the Judiciary should take part in public controversy, but I notice he saw fit not to make up his own mind whether or not the show *Oh! Calcutta!* should go on.

The Chief Justice in giving his judgment said that in his view the thing should be tried out, but he said the Attorney-General had it in his power legally to prohibit the performance of that sex play. The Attorney-General had the power to do that, but oh no—he did not exercise it. I have seen some pretty fancy footwork in my time but nothing to equal that of the present Attorney-General of South Australia: "Oh, no; we will not involve the courts in public controversy; we will not show the members the report of the Juvenile Court magistrate. Oh, no; I will not make a decision about *Oh! Calcutta!* I will keep my hands clean. Let the courts deal with that."

We got the impression that he was on the side of the promoters. The Government would not interfere with morality; there is no such thing as public morality. The Treasurer has said, "Let us keep our hands clean; let the courts do the dirty work here," and it cost the promoters about \$200,000.

Mr. Venning: I think it was \$300,000.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: At least the former L.C.L. Attorney-General had the stomach to make these decisions himself, whether political or otherwise—but not the present Attorney-General. He says, "Let the courts do the dirty work. We must not involve the Judiciary in this sort of decision." What about the use of the streets of Adelaide? Again, he says; "Let us get a magistrate to tell us how to use the streets of Adelaide; it is not for us to say." The Government says it does not know whether people should be allowed to march down Rundle Street. It will not show us the report

of the Juvenile Court Magistrate. My guess is that the reason for this is that the report is in conflict with what is contained in the Government's proposed legislation.

Dr. Eastick: Do you think it might spell out the truth?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I know it will. The Attorney-General uses the courts when it suits him and suppresses them when it suits him.

Mr. Payne: You will be able to discuss the Juvenile Courts Bill later.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It would therefore be interesting to know what the Juvenile Court magistrate has to say about this.

Mr. Payne: Would you—

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It is a pity the honourable member was not a warder in New York recently.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The remarks of the honourable member for Kavel about something that happened in New York are out of order and no further reference will be made to that matter.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Sir; I could not help answering the interjection of the member for—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have ruled the honourable member's remarks out of order, and no further reference will be made to that subject.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Sir; I agree that it was out of order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the honourable member for Kavel continues to dispute the Chairman's ruling, I will have to take action.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am sorry; I did not speak loudly enough. I agree with you.

The CHAIRMAN: It does not matter whether or not the honourable member speaks loudly.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Attorney-General has the fancy footwork of a Fred Astaire. He uses the courts when he wants to and suppresses them when that suits his purpose. The Moratorium Royal Commission was set up because the Government was in a fix and decided to let someone else make a decision. It also passed off the decision on *Oh! Calcutta!* Last session, I asked the Treasurer a question about the appointment of a justice of the peace, and he was good enough to give me a civil reply in which he stated the reasons for not appointing this person a justice. He said that he would get the Attorney-General to bring down a detailed reply. The Attorney-General told me that he had some more information for me about the

justice of the peace. When I asked for the reply he said, "It is not my custom to give reasons for the appointment or non-appointment of justices," and sat down. This was the champion of democracy, who brings in much of the Labor Party's legislation! He is the champion of people's rights, who talks about democratic insights peculiar to the Labor Party in this State on compulsory voting and the like, insights that are denied to most peoples in democracies around the world. He will not involve himself in a controversy or make up his own mind. I believe that the promoters of *Oh! Calcutta!* have been involved in unnecessary expense that could have been saved had the Attorney-General had the stomach to make the decision that was rightfully his to make.

Mr. Brown: Did you watch this evening's television news?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: No, I did not.

Mr. Brown: What about the New South Wales Attorney-General's decision?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know what is happening in New South Wales; I am concerned with what is happening here. Nothing in the Budget gives any alleviation to the rural industry and the Treasurer has said that rural industry must pay its share of taxes and that there is no case for removing land tax. Of course, members opposite, including the Treasurer, have little first-hand knowledge of rural problems and little sympathy for rural producers. The reasons for that are probably electoral.

Mr. Mathwin: The member for Stuart is an authority on collective farming.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We are waiting for his words of wisdom. The Government's policies and statements tend to increase the problems of the man on the land. Although the Treasurer has said that rural water rates are subsidized, many rural producers pay high council rates for work on roads that city people use without making any contribution to councils. It is more expensive to get water to rural regions, but the development of South Australia has hinged largely on the supply of water and electricity in our remote areas.

The member for Florey does not consider that the increase in wages in the last Commonwealth determination was large enough, but I know that these wage increases are disadvantageous to the community. It is hard to justify the statement by the Commonwealth arbitration tribunal that it took no account of the rural economy in making a determination. The rural producers do not share in the bene-

fits that result from pressure on Governments and other bodies. This evening, for the first time, I heard a member of the Labor Party say that the Commonwealth Government was right in imposing the credit squeeze some years ago. The member for Mawson said that imposition of that squeeze had been the correct course of action and, in saying that, he made history.

In this Parliament we get a sustained attack on the Commonwealth Government and this is foolproof for the Labor Party politically, while the major taxing authority in Canberra is of a different political complexion. It suits Labor Party purposes to make this attack. I refer particularly to the Minister of Education and his statement to the schools in which he blasted the Commonwealth Government. This State Government is irresponsible in this regard and it suits it to attack the Commonwealth Government on financial measures. We heard something similar today from the Minister of Roads and Transport. The Government will not accept its rightful responsibilities in these matters. The Auditor-General's Report gives the true position, and perhaps it is a good thing that the Auditor-General does not come under the sort of authority that the Attorney-General seems to exert over some of the officers of the court. The Government cannot suppress the Auditor-General's Report, which states:

On the Consolidated Revenue Account at the commencement of the year under review there was a deficit of \$4,578,562. Although the original Budget Estimate was for a deficit of \$4,896,000, an actual surplus of \$21,057 was obtained. Variations which contributed to this are set out in Part II of this report, but significant factors were supplementary assistance granted on the recommendation of the Commonwealth Grants Commission and paid pursuant to section 96 of the Commonwealth Constitution and other Commonwealth assistance.

Mr. Venning: Do you think he will get his fingers rapped for telling the truth?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Fortunately, the Government cannot get at him, as I understand it. I believe that what the Auditor-General has stated gives a fair recognition of the Commonwealth Government's contribution to balancing last year's State Budget. When introducing the Treasurer for his television spiel immediately after the Budget was introduced, a commentator of the mass media said, "Well, Mr. Treasurer, you have managed to keep the deficit down to \$7,000,000." He said this as though it was an achievement! The only time in which we have had a similar deficit was during the life of the previous Labor Government, and that was not so long ago. Of course,

the Treasurer had some ideas then about expansion: it did not matter about running into a large deficit because he wanted an expanding Budget. He may have learned this economic theory from the Minister of Education. It seemed that, no matter how tough things were, there had to be an expanding Budget, irrespective of the deficit. Fortunately, I think the Treasurer has learnt something since then, and there seems to have been an attempt to curtail some expenditure, although it is abundantly clear in this Budget that there are significantly increased taxation measures in this State, and there have been ever since this Government came into office.

This is the second series of tax impositions, and it contradicts the Treasurer's statement that he is taxing the wealthy, a statement with which he is hoodwinking the citizens of this State. It is the average citizen who is being taxed, and that includes the young people: those who need transport and those who are purchasing a new vehicle. One only has to consider the increase in vehicle registrations to realize this. These taxation measures hit at the industry which the Treasurer states is the foundation of industry in this State. Many of these people have to borrow money to purchase a house, and they are being taxed significantly. It is absolute hogwash to talk about taxing the wealthy members of the community, and it is in direct contrast with the statements he made in 1964 regarding these taxation measures. I do not believe that the Treasurer is getting away with the sort of statements he is making. His remark that the Budget will cost the average man only 1½c a week is incredible and absolute nonsense, and one is left speechless when one reads things such as this. It would be nearer the truth to say that it was costing the average man 1½c an hour. If the Budget has been successful in any way, that success can be attributed to increased Commonwealth grants. Many of the Treasurer's statements are completely misleading. I support the first line.

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): This is the second Budget that has been brought down since I have been a member of this place. Last year the Budget did not indicate to the people the things that it should have indicated. This is another indeterminate Budget; it has been carefully drawn, and it is difficult for one to say just where increases have taken place. The first thing that strikes one when looking at the Estimates for the current year is the increase in overall expenditure. This year's total expenditure is to be \$453,968,000,

compared with last year's expenditure of \$376,760,000, an increase of \$77,208,000, or about 20 per cent.

When speaking in the debate earlier today, the member for Mawson criticized Opposition members and accused them of not wanting the State to expand. That is nonsense, as all members want the State to expand, but with the important proviso that this is done within the limits of our financial capabilities. I do not think an increase in expenditure of 20 per cent is within the present financial capabilities of this State. This whole country is suffering from an inflationary trend which, unless it is curbed, will have a serious effect on the entire economy.

All members know that one of the most inflationary causes in our economy is that of Government expenditure. In these circumstances, any responsible Government will try to do its best to curb expenditure. Indeed, all State Governments were requested by the Commonwealth Government earlier this year to do so. However, our Treasurer did not agree with this, and he introduced more taxes and charges in the form of a supplementary Budget in February this year. That action was completely irresponsible, and a 20 per cent increase in this State's expenditure, when it should be only 6 per cent or 7 per cent or perhaps even less, illustrates the Government's irresponsibility. Indeed, the Government has shown itself to be completely irresponsible since it came into office at the end of May last year. It has demonstrated even further irresponsibility by budgeting for a deficit of \$7,346,000.

Mr. Brown: That's never been done before!

Mr. CARNIE: Of course it has been done before, but not consistently. This is typical of deficit financing practised by Labor Governments everywhere. They think that deficits can be budgeted for year after year, and they will not recognize that there must be a day of reckoning. Why will they not attempt to obtain a balanced Budget? The Hall Government did so. Indeed, it left the Treasury benches with a surplus of about \$3,000,000. The Playford Government also balanced its Budgets although it did budget for a deficit on occasions. The member for Whyalla will see, if he checks the figures for the following year, that that Government budgeted to offset this deficit, because it knew perfectly well that there could not be an ever-increasing deficit year after year.

Mr. Brown: There wasn't a deficit last year.

Mr. CARNIE: Last year the present Government budgeted for a \$4,800,000 deficit and finished with a nominal surplus of \$21,000, this surplus being made possible simply by extra grants from the Commonwealth Government, which this Government so consistently denigrates. Who will pay for this increased expenditure of \$77,000,000 this year? The people of this State, of course! Obviously, it will not be the wealthy ones, as the Treasurer would have us believe: it will be the average citizen on an ordinary income. We see in the Estimates of Receipts that taxation will increase from actual receipts last year of \$58,700,000 to \$91,300,000, a 55½ per cent increase. Certainly, \$24,200,000 of this is from pay-roll tax, which is a new tax in this State that we are grateful to receive, because it is a growth tax. However, even that tax has been increased by 40 per cent. Even if we deduct this \$24,200,000 from the increase, it still leaves an increase in taxation this year, compared with last year, of \$8,400,000, or 14½ per cent.

Many of these taxes and charges were introduced in February, so there have been two bites at this cherry. The Government does not like to introduce all the measures at once, but the impact of the measures introduced in February and those referred to here will be felt in this current financial year. Receipts from various sources have increased substantially, and there are many of these increases, including motor vehicle registration, the estimated receipts this year being 25 per cent more than those of last year. In relation to land tax, the estimated receipts have increased by 33 per cent. The estimated receipts from builders' licensing fees (an interesting subject of debate in this Chamber) last year were \$50,000, and the actual receipts were \$100,508. This year \$120,000 is budgeted for, representing an increase of 140 per cent over the estimated receipts for last year.

The estimated receipts from public works and services and other sources have been increased by 12½ per cent, and there is a 14½ per cent increase in respect of public undertakings. I am particularly interested in the line "Produce—Adelaide and Port Lincoln—treatment charges, profit from sale of produce, commissions and other earnings"; last year the estimated receipts totalled \$585,000, whereas this year the estimated receipts amount to \$860,000, an increase of about 47 per cent.

This increase is due largely, I believe, to increased killing charges and to rental and other charges associated with these works, some of these charges having been introduced last

year. The actual receipts last year amounted to about \$809,000. I do not think anyone has any real objection to this, provided these increased fees will help offset the increase in losses sustained by the Government Produce Department, especially at Port Lincoln. Last year the Port Lincoln freezing works suffered a loss of \$237,000, a matter that caused great concern to me and many other people in my area. Therefore, I was pleased when early this year the Minister of Agriculture announced that a committee of inquiry had been set up to investigate the operations of the Government Produce Department, with particular reference to the operations at Port Lincoln.

This committee was not exactly as I would have desired it: it should have been an outside firm of management consultants to do an in-depth study of the operations. However, at least a committee was set up, comprising three able men. This was done early in the year, and on August 17 I decided the time was ripe to ask what progress this committee had made. I asked a question about when we could expect a report from the committee. To my amazement I found that it was just commencing its inquiry. In fact, it is in Port Lincoln today taking evidence on this matter. As I have said, this committee was set up, I believe, in January or February last.

I do not know the reason for this delay, but it is a great pity it has occurred because this has always been a matter of urgency; and it is of even greater urgency now because, in the Report of the Auditor-General given to us today, we see that the Port Lincoln freezing works shows a loss in the financial year that has just finished of \$317,000, compared with \$237,000 for the previous year.

Mr. Simmons: They want to increase the charges.

Mr. CARNIE: They have already done that, but still they show a loss. Why not look at the whole operation rather than just raise the charges? That is why the committee was set up. Why has it taken so long to commence its work? That concerns me, because these losses cannot continue. No Government of any political persuasion can continue to suffer losses in works of this magnitude. However, at the same time, we cannot risk losing the works to the area, because they are vital to the rural economy of Eyre Peninsula.

I notice that in this year's Budget a loss of \$136,000 is budgeted for at the Government Produce Department. I only hope the loss can be contained within that figure, because last

year it was close to \$300,000. The Auditor-General states:

As can be seen from the above table it is the activities of the Port Lincoln Branch which very largely determine the overall profit or loss of the department . . . The disturbing feature is that this increased loss resulted despite the substantially increased throughput. Why should this be? When more beasts are being processed in these works, why should the loss increase by about 34 per cent? This is what this committee was set up to find out. I only hope it can find the answer soon and make a report to this Parliament as soon as possible and that the Government will act on it. We have become used in the last 16 months to hearing Government members, on the front bench and the back benches alike, complaining about the treatment they have received from the Commonwealth Government. Let us look at what this miserly Commonwealth Government has done in the 16 months that the State Labor Government has been in office!

In 1969-70, which was the last year of the Hall Administration, the actual receipts from the Commonwealth Government were \$128,803,161. In 1970-71, the first year of the present Government, it budgeted for receipts from the Commonwealth Government of \$147,703,632, in itself an increase of \$19,000,000 over and above what had been received by the Hall Government in the previous year. What the Government actually received in that financial year, which has just concluded, was \$164,206,649, an increase of about \$36,000,000 over what had been received by the Hall Government. This year, 1971-72, the Government has budgeted for receipts from the Commonwealth of \$171,998,672. An interesting thing is that the last sum represents an increase of about \$43,200,000 or 33.6 per cent over the sum of about \$128,800,000 received in 1969-70, and this increase has taken place in only a little over a year. That is a big increase in anyone's language, yet members opposite still say that the Commonwealth Government does not provide enough. Like *Oliver Twist*, they want more.

The loudest of the Government members in this respect is the Minister of Education, as the member for Kavel has said. Let us see what the Commonwealth Government has done in regard to education. Commonwealth grants for university purposes have increased by 17 per cent; Commonwealth grants for advanced education purposes have increased by 29 per cent; Commonwealth grants for special purposes have decreased by 21 per cent; and sums

recouped from the Commonwealth for educational services have increased by 100 per cent. The total increase in Commonwealth grants for education is about 19 per cent, yet the Minister of Education sends out political pamphlets to all schools in the State saying that the Commonwealth is niggardly in this regard. When the Minister complains he almost gives the impression that he himself believes what he says; he is good in this respect. The Minister is on record as saying that everyone should be allowed to go to university, yet in the Budget provision is made to increase university fees. This will make it more difficult for everyone to attend the university, as the Minister wants. Also, the Budget cuts down the grants made by the State to the universities to offset the increased fees that they will receive.

In dealing with the details of the Budget, the Treasurer told newspapers that it would not touch the average wage-earner or young people. Does he really expect anyone to take that statement seriously? The Budget increases stamp duty by over \$4,000,000 in a full year. There is a substantial increase in the stamp duty on conveyances of real property of a value over \$12,000. The commonest buyers of new houses are ordinary people, especially young married couples, and not many houses cost less than \$12,000. Heavy increases are provided in the duty on applications for registration of motor vehicles. Who are the commonest buyers of new motor vehicles? The average citizens and young people! A decent motor vehicle cannot be bought for less than \$2,000. Certainly, this increased taxation does not apply to cars under \$1,000 where there has been a reduction. Again, the increase will hit the average man, yet the Treasurer said in a press statement that most of the increases were graduated charges that would have little effect on the average citizen.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: He was quite right, too.

Mr. CARNIE: Whom are the Treasurer and the Minister of Environment and Conservation trying to fool? They cannot honestly believe that statement. The average man on an ordinary income is the hardest hit by this Budget. Another matter, which has been referred to by the members for Mitcham and Bragg, is dealt with on page 60 of the Estimates of Expenditure, under the heading "Miscellaneous". The National Fitness Council of South Australia is granted \$66,500, the same amount as provided last year, but an amount of \$50,000 paid last year for training

youth leaders and subsidizing youth clubs has been transferred to page 89, in the miscellaneous provisions for the Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs Department, and this amount of \$50,000 will now be administered by that department.

Why has this been done? I am pleased that the Attorney-General has come into the Chamber, because I assure him that I will want much more information on this when we are debating the lines. The National Fitness Council has administered this fund for many years but it has been neither consulted about nor told of transferring the administration of this \$50,000 from the council to the department. The Minister of Social Welfare is new like myself, and very inexperienced in these matters, so we could make excuses. However, I find this transfer difficult to understand, because this action smacks of the arrogance that we have come to expect from the Attorney-General. I hope that he soon learns the common courtesy that we expect from Ministers and which we have come not to expect from Ministers of this Government. At least, the National Fitness Council could have been consulted on this matter.

Also, on this subject we see a new item, which deals with provision of community facilities for children and youth and for which \$100,000 is proposed. The National Fitness Council, to which I am proud to say that I belong, being on the executive of the council, has for many years asked for more funds for the purposes that have been outlined in the press since the Budget was presented. That report states:

The \$100,000 grant for youth organizations announced in the State Budget will be spent on new buildings, including special facilities such as drop-in centres, youth camps and equipment, and clubs for handicapped and troubled youth. The Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. King) said yesterday a six-member committee would be set up to advise the Government on where the money should go. It was hoped payments could be made by March to the organizations involved. In some cases, grants would take the form of a subsidy plan related to fund-raising projects. Priority would be given to facilities catering for the 12-18 age group. Mr. King said the committee would also advise the Government on the distribution of the \$50,000 grant for youth leader training previously dispersed through the National Fitness Council.

I repeat that the National Fitness Council has proved itself to be an able administrator of this fund. It has an intimate knowledge of where the need lies, yet without consultation this right has been taken away from the

council. Over many years it has proved that it is best able to make decisions of this nature, and it has the interest of youth as its prime purpose. The right that the council has had for many years is now to be placed in the hands of a committee that has not yet been appointed. I intend to raise this matter later, and expect a full explanation from the Minister.

In this Budget we see a further increase in hospital charges, the second within a year. Unfortunately, increasing costs probably make this increase necessary, but I will not accept the Treasurer's explanation that it is to bring us into line with charges in other States. That has nothing to do with the matter. We should fix our own charges in accordance with our own costs, and what other States charge should have no bearing on the matter. Country subsidized hospitals are a vital link in our health chain in this State. This increase, granted by the Government, will help in some way to allow them to cover their costs, but this advantage is being offset to some extent by the effect of a statement by the Treasurer when delivering the Budget speech, in which he said:

Likewise, the appropriation for grants to subsidize hospitals are adjusted by some \$300,000 to take account of their probable revenue from higher hospital fees.

This sounds to me like giving it with one hand and taking part of it back with the other hand. One or two members have referred to lip service being paid to primary producers, and that is all it is when referring to the remissions of land tax. That is the only matter in the Budget in which the primary producer has been considered, and in a small way only. All members, and certainly all primary producers, know the history of the debacle of land tax, and particularly the poor arithmetic of the Treasurer concerning this matter. It is safe to say that pressure from the Opposition has forced the Government to agree to a revaluation which, it is believed, will reduce the land tax payable to about \$1,000,000.

Mr. Jennings: What are you growling about?

Mr. CARNIE: The Treasurer said that this is all it would be, but he has now admitted that he will reduce it to \$1,000,000. In that case he must have been in error in his original calculations. The reduction to about \$1,000,000 is not as much as it would have been if we had been sitting on the Government benches, but at least it has not been increased. However, it is no reduction on

what was paid last year, although the Treasurer has said that the amount will be reduced to \$1,000,000. I assure the Treasurer that members will watch this revaluation that is proceeding at present and will ensure that this time it will be of the order that the Treasurer said all along it would be.

I refer now to the Premier's Department which, as a previous Opposition speaker said, the Treasurer glossed over. The estimates for this department make most interesting reading as last year, although the vote was \$547,249, actual expenditure was \$607,918, or 11 per cent above the budgeted amount. This year, proposed expenditure is \$1,166,067, an increase of 92 per cent over last year's voted amount. No wonder the Treasurer glossed over this aspect and made little mention of it in the Budget speech. This is an obscure Budget, which will obviously need to be fully debated on the lines. All Opposition members and, indeed, all members opposite, if they are honest, will have much to say then. This Budget illustrates the complete irresponsibility of the Government, which is spending more than the State can afford. It is budgeting for a deficit when it should be trying to balance the Budget.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What expenditure would you cut?

Mr. CARNIE: This is obviously a Budget to be debated on the lines.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Where would you cut \$7,500,000 from?

Mr. CARNIE: For how many years will we go on having a deficit Budget? This cannot continue for ever, as eventually judgment will catch up with us. It is completely irresponsible action by the Government, and it is merely adding to inflationary trends in the community to budget for a deficit of this magnitude. I support the first line.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): Like the Attorney-General, the Treasurer does not seem able to come to grips with plain, simple facts. This is illustrated by the way in which he has tried to break up the effects of the Budget and give a false impression to the casual observer or to the person making a preliminary investigation of the Budget. On the first page of the Treasurer's speech, one finds that the Commonwealth Government has been of much help to this Government and has come to the party on many occasions with assistance, as a result of which the State has been able to show a nominal surplus of \$21,000. This is the same thing the Treasurer mentioned in a document previously. However, on that occasion, as

now, it did not take into account that the actual surplus at June 30, 1971, was \$521,000 because, conveniently, \$500,000 had been set aside to enable the Education Department to pay increased salaries.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's not right.

Dr. EASTICK: The statement made in Parliament indicated that \$500,000 was taken out before the figures were finalized, in expectation of increased Education Department salaries.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That was to pay increased teachers' salaries between May 24, the date of the new award, and the end of June.

Dr. EASTICK: But they had not been paid, so that, in fact, at June 30 there was a surplus not of \$21,000 but of \$521,000.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: But if the pay day had occurred on June 30—

Dr. EASTICK: There are no "ifs" and "buts": if we are going to compare one set of figures for one year with a set of figures for the next year, we must take the figures that apply at June 30, and in this case it is a surplus of \$521,000, and not the \$21,000 referred to by the Treasurer.

The Treasurer said that, because of the firm control of expenditures, all States were able to improve their Budget results from the critical prospect at mid-year. South Australia's position was improved also by the implementation of certain revenue measures announced last February. These measures, which were the subject of considerable debate, caused the community some concern, and the figures contained in this document indicate what effect those measures will have on the community.

The Treasurer saw fit to state that the Commonwealth Government had come to the party and had been providing funds for the benefit of the State; hidden away under "Special Acts", we see that in 1970-71 for the first time the Commonwealth Government made available a proportion of the sum determined by the Australian Loan Council for works and housing by way of interest-free capital grants rather than by way of loans subject to both interest and sinking fund payments. It was stated that these funds had been made available under conditions advantageous to the State. However, despite this, it is expected that interest payments will increase by \$7,364,000. It is rather peculiar that that is exactly the amount of the deficit referred to at the beginning of the Treasurer's speech, and I suggest that the Treasurer has simply transposed the two sums, budgeting for a balance, except for interest due.

The Treasurer referred to a series of amendments, designed to increase revenue, which were considered last February. One of those measures has been referred to by other members on this side, although no-one on the other side seems to have anything to say about such a vital document as these Estimates. A new department was created for collecting entertainment tax but, almost before it started to function, it was told that the cost of collecting the money would be too great for it to be worthwhile.

That measure was introduced obviously without proper research or due consideration of the cost to this State of collecting such a tax. In addition, the Government saw fit to load on to the community, and particularly through local government, institute committees and persons responsible for providing halls and other entertainment venues, the responsibility of actually paying the tax and obtaining a like sum from those people who hired such places of entertainment. The cost of undertaking this exercise on behalf of the Government was phenomenal. There would have been no return to the district and municipal councils, except in so far as they could increase the hiring costs of halls and other places, which would have meant a further increase in the admission charge. Not only was the Government spending money in an attempt to raise money by taxation but it was loading the community with this cost that it could not recoup; it would have been a direct expense to those people attending places of entertainment.

Since then, on August 19, as reported at page 940 of *Hansard*, the Treasurer, in reply to a question from the Leader of the Opposition about lotteries and lottery regulations, said:

Several other amendments to the regulations have also been recommended by the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. Amendments include a "minor annual licence" which will allow organizations to conduct small lotteries, with prizes up to \$50, for the small fee of \$2 a year.

That is commendable, compared to the Government's previous proposal of a minimum fee of \$5. The Treasurer continued:

This fee of itself will not cover cost of administration.

Why is this State again loaded with expenditure that cannot be recouped? It would be a tremendous financial advantage to the State if the proposal was completely abandoned, as has been suggested in this Chamber by members on this side. So here

are two areas in which the Government intends or intended to spend money without due consideration.

Having praised the Commonwealth Government on the one hand, the Treasurer then proceeds to attack it. I do not know whether he could make up his mind. Obviously from the figures given by Opposition members the State has received favourable treatment. Referring to the five-year arrangement which came into effect in 1970-71, the Treasurer states:

The first comment is that the necessity for the Commonwealth to make supplementary grants in each of the first two years of the new five-year arrangement, and to make other adjustments after only one year of the five has elapsed, shows that the vital objective of an equitable sharing of financial resources between Commonwealth and States, a sharing which attempts to balance resources and responsibilities, has not yet been achieved. I foresee the necessity for further supplementary grants in 1972-73 and beyond, until this question is resolved satisfactorily.

How can this question ever be resolved satisfactorily if the Treasurer and other Ministers continue to spend money they do not have, and if they budget for deficits and then plead with the Commonwealth Government that the State is in financial difficulty and the Commonwealth will have to do something about it? Surely we cannot tolerate this situation. Where can we get a formula that is suitable when we have a Government that is hell-bent on spending more than it has and more than it can expect to receive?

Mr. Keneally: Which of the services will you cut back?

Dr. EASTICK: We have the situation where Ministers individually want to be first in best dressed. They are not prepared to cut expenditure in areas which are the least important and in which there is less immediate need to become involved. They want to go on even though some of their departments will become over-stretched because they cannot adequately service the empires being created.

Mr. Harrison: Which services would you cut back?

Dr. EASTICK: The honourable member has much to say by way of interjection. Why does he not make a speech, a method that will permit you, Mr. Chairman, to give him the floor, which he now tries to take unlawfully. As he continued his explanation, the Treasurer once again started to attack the Commonwealth. He said that the Commonwealth had favourably considered the requirements of the State. He said that there was an increase in the funds

available to the State because of the arrangement whereby councils, except in areas that were revenue producing, would not be required to pay pay-roll tax. Because they would not pay this tax to the State, the Commonwealth would make additional money available. Almost in the same breath, the Treasurer said that the Commonwealth would also pay to the State an additional sum because the cost of collecting the pay-roll tax was previously the responsibility of the Commonwealth and now, as the State has to undertake it, expenditure will be involved, which will be underwritten by the Commonwealth and handed back to the State. Actually, the State gets 3½ per cent clear.

Mr. Keneally: You are speaking as though the Commonwealth Government had done the State a favour.

Dr. EASTICK: The Commonwealth has given the State a considerable advantage in the sum it has made available to us. This is pointed out in the Treasurer's statement, and has also been pointed out by many Opposition members who have spoken. I hope that at least one of the members opposite, who seem to have lost their tongues except when they are not supposed to use them, will give us all the information. In the same document the Treasurer said that we had become a claimant State and he thought that this was a good thing. He said:

If we wish to provide services of a level comparable with the standard States and not record deficits any greater than theirs, we must be prepared to tax and to charge overall equally as heavily. If we wish to hold revenue deficits to levels below those of the standard States, we must be prepared to tax and charge more heavily or to provide social services and otherwise function more economically.

The Treasurer wants to have the cake and eat it too. Further revenue-raising measures that would be essential to overcome this prospective deficit are set out in the document. The Treasurer said:

... further revenue-raising measures would be essential if the prospective deficit were to be kept within manageable limits.

We have a play on words about manageable limits, not over-taxing, and not going too heavily. As other members on this side have asked, I ask the Treasurer whom is he trying to fool.

Other Opposition members have dealt with the situation of tertiary education. The true situation on this matter is dealt with at page 10 of the Financial Statement, which states:

The estimates of grants required also take account of the probably increased revenues to

be received in 1972 from an increase of about one-sixth in fees which the Government proposes to recommend to the three councils.

The councils referred to are those of the two universities and the Institute of Technology, and I ask the Committee to note the use of the word "probable". We are dealing with increases that the councils had not been told about until this Financial Statement was presented. We are also told that the increases are only probable, because the Government will only suggest that these increases apply.

Mr. Simmons: We have no power to do anything else.

Dr. EASTICK: I know that, but I wonder what blackmail, what method, will be used to ensure that the three councils toe the line. Will they be refused funds in other directions if they do not comply? We have already had the situation spelt out and we have been told that arrangements have been made to get this increase in fees, although it is in terms of probables and possibles. It is obvious from statements made elsewhere that considerable pressure will be put on the councils to make up this money if they see fit to disagree to the Treasurer's attitude. The Treasurer's statement lists three major factors that are uncertain: the first relates to the future movement in salary and wage levels, the second concerns the prospect of supplementary Commonwealth assistance, and the third factor is the extent of adjusting grants which may subsequently be recommended by the Commonwealth Grants Commission in aid of the 1971-72 accounts after the final results are known. Later, the Treasurer said:

I believe that the commission, in recommending an advance grant of \$7,000,000 this year, would have taken a rather conservative view of our needs, and I am hopeful that a full review that will have regard to our standards of effort, including our efforts in further taxation and charges as outlined above, will lead the commission in due course to recommend some further assistance by way of a "completion" grant for both 1970-71 and 1971-72.

At least he has the fortitude to spell out that he is trading on beliefs and not on any certainty, and that he is spending what he has not already got and what he is not certain of getting. In other words, he is emulating the actions of the Minister of Education, who last year spent \$3,000,000 before he had his hands on the money.

We have the situation spelled out by the Treasurer of the receipts tax. This money has been withdrawn as a direct return to the State Governments. We also know

that in lieu of the receipts tax, which the States introduced legislation to repeal, the Commonwealth Government again makes funds available. The figures show that \$24,200,000 has been estimated as the payroll tax receipts for 1971-72; the receipts duty estimated for 1970-71 was \$2,756,000, and for 1971-72 it is nil; and other forms of taxation which in 1970-71 were estimated at \$55,988,000 and which are shown in 1971-72 as estimated at \$67,119,000 do not really give a true picture, because added to the total for 1971-72 (if the factor of a receipts duty is introduced) there should be a figure shown that is the amount obtainable from the Commonwealth Government in lieu of this receipts duty fund. It is stated that receipts duty is no longer operating and that what arrears remain to be collected are expected to be paid under Commonwealth legislation and then transferred to the State as a Commonwealth grant. If anyone doubts my comment about the Commonwealth granting money to the State, here again the Treasurer admits that this will come forward as a Commonwealth grant.

I refer briefly to the heading "Public Undertakings" and in particular to water and sewerage rates. The estimated return therefrom for 1970-71 was \$30,500,000, compared with the actual return of \$31,702,842, an increase of \$1,202,842, or about 3.7 per cent. The estimated income for the current financial year is \$34,500,000, which is more than 13 per cent higher than the last year's estimate and 8.8 per cent higher than the actual return. I ask the Treasurer how correct these figures will be. Are we going to see a repeat of the previous situation, where we were told so many times by the Treasurer and his Ministers that the figures available from the computer indicated that \$1,000,000 would be received in land tax from rural land? When the figures were finally taken out, the return was about \$1,250,000, a small error of about 25 per cent!

If one refers to the water and sewerage rate notices being received by people at present, one sees some peculiar situations. One can always be told that the valuation notices that are sent out just prior to the end of the financial year give some indication of the amount on which a person will be rated. However, this means very little to the individual concerned. Certainly, such a notice does not mean much until a concise indication is given of the rate that will be payable. I do not think many people would compare their valuation notices. Therefore, they have no indication

that they are at a disadvantage compared with their neighbours. However, in due course, when the rate notices are sent out, and people find that they are having to pay a considerable increase, they compare their notices with those of their neighbours. They then find that there is considerable disparity between the rates they are paying. However, these comparisons are not made at the time of the valuation. As these people have only a limited time in which to appeal against the valuation, the real crunch does not come until they receive their rate notices.

I apologize to the member for Elizabeth if I use two or three comparisons that have come to my notice involving rural lands in his district, but I point out that the land in question is contiguous with land in my district. Owner No. 1 owns section 3185 in the hundred of Munno Para and owner No. 2 owns section 3186 in the same hundred: the peculiarity is that these two sections are contiguous and completely enclosed by a roadway around both sections; section 3185 comprises 56 acres, the quarterly rate being \$26.85; section 3186, on which there is a house and some sheds, including a greater quantity of fencing needed for the homestead, comprises 135 acres, but the quarterly rate is only \$10.50. Although the latter section is about 2½ times larger than the former section, the quarterly rate on the smaller section is 2½ times greater than that on the larger one.

Mr. Coumbe: And the larger one has a house on it.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes. One can instance a number of similar situations: in respect of a property of 60 acres, the rate is \$38.75, whereas on 170 acres it is \$22.31. Where is the parity here? Will we find that, as a result of computerization or some other method not currently known to us, the sum to be derived from this source will far exceed the sum outlined in this document? If a person is unfortunate enough to be in an area where the Engineering and Water Supply Department valuation is used as a basis for the council rate, he will find himself in an invidious position. In the instance I have cited, the land is used for cereal-growing and for grazing, and there is only a fence between the properties, with a roadway right around them. How can there be such a disparity in the rates? There is a similar situation in an area nearby, where the returns from rural production are considerably lower than they used to be. People like those I have just mentioned are paying in council and water rates and in land tax between \$6.50 and \$10 an acre a year to continue in

agricultural enterprise. They cannot do otherwise, because they cannot sell the land for subdivision as there are no buyers. In fact, some of them have been asked not to sell their land because it will be, or is expected to be, required at a given point of time for advanced education purposes.

Adjacent to that land, on which people are undertaking rural enterprise at an excessive (and I say "excessive" with some purpose) cost an acre a year, other people who do not own the land are indulging in exactly the same agricultural pursuits of grazing and cereal-growing on land that they rent from the Housing Trust. They can do that for \$4 an acre a year on a monthly basis for grazing purposes and for \$6 an acre a year on an annual basis for crop growing. Persons who have their capital tied up in land that has been held in the family for upwards of three generations are paying the sums of money that I have mentioned while other persons are following exactly the same agricultural pursuits on land adjacent to theirs at a much lower cost. As regards the money that the Housing Trust can get in rental for land it is holding against future needs for housing, industry or other purposes, it is an advantage to the State that it should lease that land out, but it is inequitable that people on adjacent land should be put in the unenviable position of being faced with costs of production weighted against them in this way.

I have mentioned the effects of water and sewerage rates, and I have indicated the proposed increases. I question exactly what the situation will be. One can go a little further in the sentences that spell out the increased sums of money expected to be obtained by the Electricity Trust. In March of this year, when introducing a Bill to amend the Electricity Trust of South Australia Act (at page 3738 of *Hansard*, on March 3), the Treasurer said:

As the annual revenue of the Electricity Trust is now approaching \$70,000,000 its contribution initially would be about \$2,000,000 a year.

He was referring there to the increased money that the 3 per cent levy would return to the State. The figure that the Treasurer has given us on this occasion as a return to the State is \$2,150,000. It could be said that \$150,000 is not a great increase when we are dealing with \$2,000,000, but this increase represents a return to the State of 7½ per cent in a little over six months. In this case the increases go back to every level of the community and return revenue to the State which will eventually be

far in excess of the sum that we were told would be available.

I have always found it difficult to accept statements made about the money in the Hospitals Fund. As I have said before, the promotion of the Totalizator Agency Board and the State lottery was to the effect that there would be additional money available to the hospitals of the State. I do not deny that the Estimates and actual expenditure on hospitals over the years since the Hospitals Fund was created in 1966 show a gradual increase in the funds made available to hospitals. However, the increase has not come greatly by way of money from the State. The allocation from Consolidated Revenue has been frozen, as can be seen in the papers available, and the increase has been from the Hospitals Fund at the same percentage increase as used to apply from Consolidated Revenue.

Referring to the Highways Department, the Treasurer said:

The balance available for roads purposes at the beginning of 1970-71 was \$1,688,000.

The Treasurer then referred to the additional funds which came from State and Commonwealth sources. He said that at the end of the year there was a balance of \$3,123,000, notwithstanding that the statement made to this Chamber when figures were presented only 12 months ago (and I refer to the Treasurer's explanation in 1970) was as follows:

It seems probable that the planning balance of funds of \$1,688,000 will be maintained at June 30 next and possibly increased a little.

An increase from \$1,688,000 to \$3,123,000 is hardly a small increase. Obviously the department has under-spent, even though funds have been available to it. It is interesting to see that the Treasurer states the following:

Pending an amendment to the Highways Act to provide for the financing of such purchases from the Highways Fund, a provision of \$300,000 was made last year in the Minister of Roads—Miscellaneous section of the Estimates to cover expenditure on the acquisition of property in cases of hardship in areas affected by possible freeway routes. Subsequently, only \$94,000 of this increase was required, as amendment was introduced and passed a little earlier than had been anticipated and fewer people than had been expected asked the Crown to purchase their properties.

That sounds well until we refer to the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended June 30 last, which was presented today. Page 73 of that report contains some startling information. It indicates the expenditure of \$3,487,000 on the acquisition of land for

freeways, which was \$1,241,000 less than expenditure in the previous year. The projects to which this amount related are set out as follows:

<i>Project</i>	<i>Expenditure</i> \$
Hindmarsh Interchange . .	987,000
Noarlunga Freeway	785,000
Modbury Freeway.....	507,000
Salisbury Freeway.....	308,000
Dry Creek Expressway . .	244,000
South-Eastern Freeway	210,000
Hills Freeway.....	205,000
North Adelaide Connector	135,000
Foothills Expressway	106,000
	<hr/> \$3,487,000

Mr. Goldsworthy: The Auditor-General is using the wrong word. We are not allowed to call them freeways any longer.

Dr. EASTICK: I have not heard that the Auditor-General has been taken to task on the matter. I should like to refer now to public parks. That is dealt with in the last paragraph of the Treasurer's Financial Statement, where he states that the Land Tax Act Amendment Act passed last year makes provision in this regard, plus the fact that there will be other money available from the Government. The total amount available for public parks this year and in future years should be \$1,200,000, in addition to funds in hand and receipts from subdividers required under the Planning and Development Act.

I am in full accord with the use of funds to provide public parks. Undoubtedly, that will be part of the new empire of the Minister of Environment and Conservation. Page 232 of the Auditor-General's Report states that during 1970-71 an additional 411,000 acres was placed under the control of the National Park Commissioners. This area comprised an increase in the size of an existing park and 22 new areas, the largest of which was the Oraparinna National Park of 124,000 acres in the Flinders Ranges. At June 30, 1971, 89 parks, totalling 8,479,000

acres, were under the care and control of the commission. This is a considerable area of the State, and I have no doubt that this area will increase. Generally, this practice has my support, but my point is that, in the more settled areas, the loss of rate revenue to district councils or municipalities by these purchases and by the purchase of land for Government works, whether for forestry, agricultural colleges, future railway lines, or freeways, is causing considerable concern.

The member for Kavel has said the District Council of Gumeracha now receives no rates

from about 30 per cent of its total area, and I am aware that the District Council of Barossa has about 26 per cent of its total area as non-ratable property because of forestry, reservoirs, or railway reserves. In practically every council area one can find an increase in non-ratable areas, and, therefore, an increase in non-productive areas to the council. On the other hand, the council in most cases is responsible for maintaining, conducting, and, in some measure, the expenditure of fire-fighting organizations. It is also responsible for maintaining weed inspection and to providing adequate safeguards to ratepayers adjacent to weed-infested properties.

I appreciate the fact that whenever the Government acquires land it suddenly (according to local view) becomes more heavily infested with noxious weeds, notwithstanding the fact that many weeds were present before the acquisition. For example, Katarapko Island, where noogoora burr was a problem in the past, but was controlled by the person who used the island, has, since becoming a park (but mainly because of flood conditions), returned to the state where it is a real problem to downstream areas because of the burr. One finds that councils are having increasing difficulty in providing services to those areas from which it has not been able to recoup any revenue. I strongly recommend to the Minister that, when conducting these parks in future and in considering councils in areas in which land is purchased, some thought be given to the associated expenditure by those councils.

I should like later, because I have too many aspects to raise at this late hour, to refer to the Roseworthy Agricultural College, and to the situation that has unfolded there over recent weeks, whereby members of the staff have been unaware of their future and unable to obtain reasonable consideration by the authorities within the powers of the Public Service Act, in that they have been given salary increases that have borne no relationship to the value placed on positions advertised for lecturers and senior lecturers at the college. This situation is not a credit to the Minister responsible for this state of affairs. I will, as I have been invited to do so, seek considerable information in this respect when the Committee is dealing with the Agricultural Department. I support the first line.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.57 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 15, at 2 p.m.