

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Thursday, August 31, 1972

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

**ASSENT TO BILLS**

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Parliamentary Superannuation Act Amendment,  
Police Pensions Act Amendment,  
Public Purposes Loan.

**ADVANCES TO SETTLERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

**BUSH FIRES ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

**QUESTIONS****SCENIC HIGHWAY**

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier, in his capacity as Minister in charge of tourism, say whether in regard to the planning of the new scenic road to Western Australia any consideration has been given to establishing tourist accommodation at any point or points along the route? The Minister of Roads and Transport announced yesterday that this highway would be constructed along a new route and that it would give the travelling public an opportunity to see, as the Minister said, "magnificent views of the Great Australian Bight". I ask whether any consideration has been given to planning or establishing tourist facilities, bearing in mind that this scenery would be an obvious attraction to tourists.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This matter has been considered, but negotiations are not at the stage of allowing us at this point to make an announcement. It is quite clear that accommodation along the route is desirable, and this matter will be pursued.

**PACKAGING**

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Premier a reply from the Minister of Lands to my recent question about the packaging of goods and

the printing on packages of "giant economy" and such like?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Acting Minister of Lands states that the Packages Act, 1967-1972, came into force on October 1, 1968, and has been enforced by the Weights and Measures Branch of the Lands Department as from that date. The Act does not prohibit the use of the phrases "giant size", "economy size" or "family size" on packages. It refers to these as restricted expressions and provides that where such statements are used a statement of the true weight or measure of the article shall be marked on every part of the pack on which the restricted expression appears. The Act further provides that the statement of weight shall—

(1) be so placed that both statements may be clearly seen at the same time;

(2) be of a size of print not less than the minimum prescribed for the packet and not less than one-third of the size of the largest letter or figure contained in the restricted expression; and

(3) be marked in a colour of distinct contrast to the colour of its background.

The Act provides that the packers shall not pack an article or articles in an opaque outer pack so that the volume of the other pack exceeds the volume of the article or the aggregate of the volume of the articles—

(a) in the case of an article or articles enclosed in an inner pack by more than 35 per cent of the volume of the outer pack; or

(b) in any other case by more than 25 per cent of the volume of the outer pack. Whilst the amounts may seem large, the Acting Minister of Lands assures the honourable member that they are fair and equitable when it is remembered that packages are filled by automation rates up to and exceeding 500 a minute. It should be appreciated that, powders settle considerably after packing and a large percentage of free space may appear in the pack. The test in such cases is to open the pack and empty it into a suitable container, then pour the product back into the pack as quickly as possible, lift the pack and tap it down smartly once, and then measure the free space. It must be realized that there is an extensive range of packaged products on the market, and the Weights and Measures Branch would appreciate the assistance of members of the public in reporting instances in which they consider that articles do not comply with the Packages Act.

**DUNCAN INQUIRY**

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier say how long it is intended that the two men here from Scotland Yard in connection with the Duncan case shall stay? Detective Chief Superintendent McGowan and Detective Sergeant O'Hanlon, both of Scotland Yard, arrived in Adelaide, I think on Sunday, August 6, in connection with this matter. I understand that they are here at Government expense, and no doubt the Government is anxious not to increase expenses; it has refused to meet the costs of witnesses at the inquest, for example. I suppose that, if the two gentlemen, with the staff which I understand has been made available by the Police Department for them to conduct their inquiries, are successful in solving the matter, that will be the end of it, except for their possible appearance in any court proceedings, which could keep them here for a considerable time, but if, unfortunately, they are not successful, presumably there must be some limit of time on their being in South Australia. Therefore, I ask the question of the Premier, and hope that he can give an immediate reply.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No time limit has been set for the investigation and I have not received a suggestion from the Commissioner of Police that one should be set.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you going to ask him?

The SPEAKER: Order! There must be one question at a time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have stated the position for the honourable member, and I do not believe that it is a satisfactory form of police administration to say that there is a time limit on any investigation. If it seems that we are getting nowhere with the investigation the matter will be reviewed, but that has not been reported to me.

**WINE TAX**

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport influence his colleagues to remove the imposition of licensing fees on the gross purchases of wines by licensees? Earlier this week the Premier told me, when replying to a question, that he did not intend to introduce amending legislation to alleviate the imposition of licensing fees on the gross purchases of wines and spirits. This happened after I had pointed out that this fee was levied on, amongst other things, a wine tax that was imposed by the Commonwealth Government. The Minister of Roads and Transport, in a press statement early

this year under the heading "Virgo hits wine tax—'absurd' ", stated:

This absurd wine excise has severely hampered the wine industry, should never have been imposed, and should be repealed. At this stage the Barossa Valley is seriously in need of a supplemented economy now that the Federal Government has decided to hold fast the wine excise.

This statement was made by a Minister whose Government imposed a tax directly on that tax.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is starting to comment.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am explaining and putting the facts to the Minister about the imposition. Will the Minister either retract that statement or use his influence with his colleagues to have the imposition of licensing fees on that tax removed?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think it would be straining things considerably to suggest that the Commonwealth Treasurer and I were colleagues, and the statement to which the honourable member has referred deals with a tax imposed by the Commonwealth Treasurer. I should have thought that the member for Alexandra and the Commonwealth Treasurer would be much closer to each other than I am to the Commonwealth Treasurer, or even to the member for Alexandra, for that matter. What I said then I believed then, and I still believe—

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Why do you tax it?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: —that the tax imposed so viciously by the present McMahon Government in Canberra was a serious blow to the wine industry.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: And yet you—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member is willing to support a rotten Commonwealth Government on that tax, let him go into the Barossa Valley or into the Chaffey District and say so. I certainly do not support that Government's action: I believe the tax was wrongly imposed and it was introduced to do nothing more than destroy a valuable South Australian industry.

Mr. Coumbe: Why not answer the question?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I believe what I said then, and still do.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Why not remove your licensing fee, then?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The question asked by the honourable member about removing the taxation in South Australia was adequately handled by the Premier and I assure the honourable member that, if he cannot

receive the reply he wants from the Premier, he cannot use me as a pawn to press him.

### MASSAGE PARLOURS

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Premier say why legislation dealing with massage parlours has not been proceeded with? The Governor, in opening this Parliamentary session, said that it was Government policy to introduce legislation dealing with massage parlours. However, several weeks ago it was reported that the Government did not intend to proceed with this legislation, and I should like to know the reason for this decision.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Legislation relating to massage parlours (people operating in massage parlours and like places, that is, so far as massage is concerned in those places) was prepared by the Parliamentary Counsel on the basis of a policy that would ensure that physiotherapy work (that is, work of a remedial nature which is supposed to cure injuries and for which a fee is paid) could only be done by people who were properly qualified. The examination of the legislation continued over a period but it became obvious that there was no way, at the time of the drafting of the legislation, by which satisfactory definitions in this area could be obtained that would be acceptable to the Government and also to physiotherapists. The restrictions imposed and the definitions proposed in the Act were far too wide, and we could not reach a satisfactory drafting situation. That is why it is not intended to proceed. There were many difficulties in the drafting, and the original draft would have meant that people doing rub-downs in football clubs or health studios and similar places where there was no suggestion that curative work was being done, although the work was perfectly proper and a fee was charged, would be caught by the terms of the legislation. As we have not been able to sort out a satisfactory series of definitions, the legislation has not been introduced.

### COUNTRY DENTIST

Mr. RODDA: Will the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Health, confer with his colleague on the possibility of having a mobile dental unit visit the Keith-Bordertown area? The need for this unit arises because the resident dentist in Bordertown is leaving and this area will be left without a dental service. Much concern has been expressed by residents in the area on this matter.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes.

### HOLDEN HILL LAND

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Premier, as Minister in charge of housing, obtain a report from the Housing Trust on what plans, if any, the trust has for the development of an area which is owned by the trust and which adjoins Grand Junction Road near its intersection with the North-East Road at Holden Hill?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

### SAND REMOVAL

Mr. BECKER: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to my question of August 3 about the regular removal of sand at Glenelg?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The matter raised by the honourable member has been the subject of an investigation by the Coast Protection Board, the board having asked the Glenelg council to call tenders for the transfer of 10,000 cub. yds. of sand from the beach immediately south of the Patawalonga entrance breakwater and its transport and deposition on the beach at North Glenelg. Plans and specifications would in this instance be provided by the Director of Marine and Harbours. It is expected that this work will have two beneficial results: first, nourishment of the north beach and beaches to the north; and secondly, diminution of sand supply to the sand bar off the Patawalonga entrance that is causing so much trouble.

### MOTOR VEHICLES DEPARTMENT

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport re-examine the situation with regard to establishing at Port Lincoln a branch office of the Motor Vehicles Department? In reply to a question I asked on this matter on Tuesday, the Minister said that the main criterion for deciding where to site these branch offices was the number of vehicles registered within a radius of 25 miles of the prospective site. In his reply, the Minister made the following concession with regard to Port Lincoln:

In the case of Port Lincoln, it is accepted that, because of the isolation of the area and the rather unique geographical layout of the peninsula, more than an area within a 25-mile radius could be involved.

However, he then went on to use figures of motor vehicle registrations within a radius of 25 miles of certain towns. Several towns that use Port Lincoln as a major centre are over 25 miles from Port Lincoln, as the Minister well knows. These towns range from Tumby Bay, which is 30 miles from Port Lincoln, to Elliston, which is 100 miles away,

and there are many towns in between. Moreover, many farmers have several motor vehicles. In view of the unique situation at Port Lincoln, which the Minister admitted on Tuesday, will he re-examine the situation, perhaps using figures of motor vehicle registrations in an area within a radius of 100 miles as the criterion, as this would be a more realistic distance in this case?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to have a further look at the matter, although I do not think the criterion of a radius of 100 miles, as suggested by the honourable member, is very realistic.

Mr. Carnie: People from that distance would use it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: From memory, I believe that the distance between Whyalla and Port Lincoln is about 150 miles, and I cannot imagine people travelling 100 miles to Port Lincoln to transact business when they could go 50 miles to Whyalla to transact the same business.

Mr. Carnie: What about Elliston?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Carnie: Elliston is—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Jennings: You're not Millhouse.

Mr. Millhouse: What's this about me?

Mr. Jennings: You ought to know.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Ross Smith must learn to contain himself. The honourable member for Flinders has asked his question, which is almost the same question he asked on Tuesday. He has asked the Minister to reconsider this matter. However, I will not permit the honourable member to debate the matter. The honourable Minister may reply to the question, but interjections must cease.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As I was saying, I do not think a radius of 100 miles from a centre, as suggested by the honourable member, would be a sound basis, because of the reasons I have stated. However, I agree that, regarding what could probably be described as areas north-west of Port Lincoln, the criterion to which I have referred would not apply. It could be that towns that are well beyond a radius of 25 miles of Port Lincoln should be considered, although whether or not a radius of 100 miles would be desirable I do not believe I am competent to say. Figures that I had at that time showed a large drop in vehicle ownership in the Port Lincoln area compared to the area immediately above it. I am prepared to have another look at the problem at the appropriate time. As I indicated on

Tuesday, the next office to be opened will be in Berri, notwithstanding the report in today's *News*, which is incorrect. This will be followed by an office in Port Pirie. A decision about the next branch office will be made when those two projects are under way. I think it would be premature to make a decision now, because we are talking about something well into the future and the ownership of vehicles is changing considerably. When decisions of this nature are made, they should be made on the latest information available.

#### **MURRAY BRIDGE PRIMARY SCHOOL**

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Premier ask the Minister of Education to obtain a report for me about the present position of the planning for Murray Bridge Primary School? The planning of this school has been taking place for at least five or six years. Several ground plans have been submitted, but each plan has been altered. At present no-one knows what form the plan will ultimately take and I should like to receive the latest information about it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will ask my colleague to bring down a report for the honourable member.

#### **ILLEGAL OPAL MINING**

Mr. GUNN: Will the Premier, as Minister of Development and Mines, consider urgently the laws relating to illegal mining on opal fields? Many of my constituents who live at the opal fields have told me that they are concerned about attacks by people who are deliberately flouting the law by working a night shift on other people's cuttings. In view of this present situation, will the Minister take urgent action in order to rectify it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Maintaining law and order and protection on the opal fields has been a constant worry to successive Governments. I will ask the Director of Mines and the Commissioner of Police for a report on the matter. It is not possible for us to maintain a police guard over all the cuttings and gougings on the opal fields. I have experienced on the opal fields, while making Ministerial visits to the area, an attitude to law and order which is perhaps unique in Australia. I will get a report to see whether anything further can be done to protect the honourable member's constituents.

#### **GALLERY AMPLIFICATION**

Mr. MATHWIN: Will you, Mr. Speaker arrange for the improvement of the amplification system in the Speaker's Gallery? I have

received numerous complaints from people who visit the Speaker's Gallery regularly. They have found it absolutely impossible at times to hear questions, replies or even debates.

The SPEAKER: I agree with the honourable member's general observations regarding the position. Men from the Public Buildings Department are down here continually looking at this problem. I will follow up the question and get a report on what can be done.

### GARDEN SUBURB

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wish to ask an intellectual question of the Minister of Roads and Transport, and I seek an intellectual reply (as the member for Torrens reminds me). Can the Minister say whether a decision has been made yet on the future of the Garden Suburb and, if it has been, will the Minister announce that decision? I refer to questions that I have asked previously on this topic over the years, and I remind the Minister that on February 24 this year he wrote to me, stating, in part:

I regret the delay which has occurred in replying—

to a couple of questions I had asked in November, 1971—

but I have been hoping that I could give some definite information on proposals.

The first question concerned the future of the Garden Suburb and the second question concerned the hall in Colonel Light Gardens. The Minister also stated:

I am at present negotiating with the Garden Suburb Commissioner concerning the financing of this work.

My good friend the member for Mitchell and I were in Colonel Light Gardens a few weeks ago and were met by a storm of complaints because nothing had been done. On June 5, I again wrote to the Minister reminding him of his letter of February 24 and asking him whether he had any news. I received an acknowledgment from his Secretary dated June 9 and I received from the Minister a letter dated July 18 that can be regarded only as a pot boiler. Since then I have heard nothing at all.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is starting to comment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes; I admit that was getting a bit close. Because of the length of time that has elapsed, we may regard this matter as one of great concern to persons living in the Garden Suburb. In the past week I have had two inquiries from residents (and I think these inquiries have been prompted by these residents' rates) asking about the future of

the Garden Suburb. I have undertaken to try yet again to find this out from the Minister, and I now invite him to reply.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not sure whether the term "pot boiler" is an intellectual one. If it is, I must confess that I cannot comprehend it. However, probably I do not need to remind the honourable member that the problem at Colonel Light Gardens is one of many that I inherited from his Government and one that his Government had had on its plate for a long time without being able to solve it.

Mr. Millhouse: You've had it long enough.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I concur in that remark. I have had it on my plate for a long time, and I repeat the statement in my earlier correspondence, which the honourable member was good enough to read, that I regret that the matter has not been determined yet. Regrettably, that is still the position. However, as the honourable member should know and, I believe, would know, there are authorities vested in the Garden Suburb Commissioner that he is required to carry out in terms of the Act that this Parliament has enacted. There are also requirements in the Local Government Act that must be carried out. I can do no more than negotiate, and these negotiations have been continued, although not as quickly as I should have liked. However, when one asks various organizations to consider proposals, one cannot say to them after a few days, "What is your answer? I am sick and tired of waiting." The member for Mitcham may be able to say that to me across the Chamber, but I think he would be the first to acknowledge that, if he had the Ministerial responsibility, he would not be willing to make that statement to organizations to which he had submitted proposals. Therefore, time must run its course on this matter. I hope that it will be resolved, because the position is completely unsatisfactory to me. The honourable member knows my views and he knows that no-one would be more pleased than I would be to have this position resolved. I am working to that end.

### POVERTY INQUIRY

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Community Welfare say whether he intends to make submissions to the national inquiry into poverty, to be headed by Professor Henderson, whose appointment Mr. McMahon announced a few days ago? My question is prompted by the thought that the Community Welfare

Department may well be able to give direct information on this matter.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have had no communication from the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You might at least do the Commonwealth Government the courtesy of congratulating it on setting up the inquiry.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra must learn to contain himself. He has had sufficient experience now and he must not behave in a disorderly way.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have not had a communication from the Commonwealth Government about the inquiry into poverty in this country. Of course, I have read in the press, as other members have done, of the appointment of this inquiry, and I repeat my earlier statements that I welcome the appointment of the inquiry. I think it is long overdue, but it is gratifying that at least at this late stage the Commonwealth Government has seen fit to accede to the pressures and requests from organizations over the years to institute such an inquiry.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Do you congratulate the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I hope that the inquiry will have the result that we all wish for and benefit the areas of poverty in this country and find a way to remedy them. Not having received a communication from either the Commonwealth Government or, of course, the inquiry, I do not know whether it would be appropriate for the State Government or the Minister to make any submissions to the inquiry. However, I assure the House that, if any information that the Community Welfare Department has will assist this inquiry, that information will be made available readily.

#### **GAUGE STANDARDIZATION**

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport report to the House on the present position concerning the standardization of the railway line from Adelaide to Crystal Brook? Previously questions have been asked about what progress has been made in this regard, and the Minister has told the House of certain progress. We also understand that the Commonwealth Parliament must pass legislation, probably during the spring session, so one may expect that by now local authorities and the Maunsell committee authorities will be reaching a decision.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think that the last time I reported to the House I said

that the Commonwealth Minister and I had had a discussion and had reached agreement on the broad principles, and that we had constituted a committee consisting of representatives of the Commonwealth and State departments, that committee, together with the consultants Maunsell and Partners, being responsible to prepare the master plan and, of course, in doing this, to resolve all of the numerous side issues associated with the project. This committee, which met the whole of Monday and again the whole of yesterday, is making considerable progress, but at this stage I cannot say when the report will be brought down because, of course, we are (I would say regrettably) in the hands of private consultants. As I replied formerly to the member for Mitcham, unfortunately one cannot go to these people in the same way as one can go to members of one's own staff and say, "I want this by a specific date."

The consultants will bring down the report just as soon as they are able to do so and we, of course, must wait and see what they bring down. I had hoped that the report would be brought down in time for legislation to be enacted by both the Commonwealth and State Parliaments prior to rising for the recess. It seems at this stage, however, that the odds are that this matter will not be considered by the Commonwealth Parliament until after the election. That is my own personal view; I hope I am wrong, but that is what it seems to me to be at this stage. However, there is still considerable groundwork to be done and, of course, in addition, as with most of these projects when we start to get into specifics, there is an astronomical increase in the capital costs involved. The net result of this will be that South Australia will incur a tremendously greater debt burden than would previously have been the case,

#### **MURRAY RIVER POLLUTION**

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Premier, in the temporary absence of the Minister of Works, say whether his colleague has determined firmly to enforce the Engineering and Water Supply Department regulations relating to pollution of the Murray River with respect to piggeries and dairies situated within 300ft. of the river or of one of its anabranches, or whether he is willing to have this matter further investigated? If the Minister is going to persist in enforcing these regulations, is he satisfied that no hardship is being imposed on the few people who may be affected? As only a few people may be affected, is the Minister

willing to consider providing compensation for those persons who may be, as a result of being victims of circumstances beyond their control, forced to suffer extreme financial loss because of the introduction of these regulations?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report from my colleague.

#### **PETROL SHORTAGE**

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Premier say whether there are sufficient supplies of petrol in the northern part of the State to cater for tourists and, if there are, will the Government take steps to inform the public accordingly? People living in the northern part of the State who are involved in the tourist industry are concerned about the drop in numbers of tourists visiting the Flinders Range during the present school vacation. Indeed, I understand that the number of visitors to this area has dropped considerably. Also, people entering South Australia from the Eastern States are reluctant to travel north, as they are afraid that there will be a shortage of petrol, and this applies also to people living in the southern part of the State who might wish to visit the area.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not at this stage fully informed on the quantity of petrol in storage in the northern part of the State, but I will have my officers inquire and get a reply for the honourable member as soon as possible.

#### **ROLLING STOCK**

Mr. COUMBE: In the temporary absence of the Minister of Roads and Transport, I ask the Minister of Labour and Industry whether he has a reply to the question I asked during the Loan Estimates debate about employment at the Islington workshops and about the rolling stock of the South Australian Railways referred to in the Loan Estimates.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Broad gauge bogie freight rolling stock, which is to be used on the northern line, and which has been constructed since 1965, is suitable for bogie exchange. Alternatively, this rolling stock could be converted at minimal cost for use on the standard gauge.

#### **SHARK SALES**

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Premier, representing the Minister of Agriculture, say whether compensation will be paid to shark fishermen in respect of shark already caught and in storage and, in the event of the ban on shark by Victoria being long term, will he say whether it is contemplated that any compensation will be paid concerning redundant

equipment? I am informed that shark is held in South Australia to the value of about \$150,000 and that it had been caught and was in storage prior to the Victorian ban being imposed. This could well represent a total loss in the event of the ban continuing, and that is the reason for the first part of my question. As I said, in the event of this ban becoming permanent, many thousands of dollars of specialized shark-fishing equipment may become redundant, and that is the reason for the second part of my question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As I know of no compensation provisions, I will discuss the matter with my colleague and bring down a report.

#### **BUILDING SOCIETIES**

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say what legislation is proposed through revising the Building Societies Act and the reason to regulate the activities of credit unions? This matter is referred to in His Excellency's Opening Speech and, as I have a constituent who is concerned about investments in building societies, I should like the Premier to indicate the Government's intentions so that I can inform my constituent in relation to his proposed investments.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The legislation which completely revises the law relating to building societies in South Australia will be introduced this session. The final discussion with officers of building societies took place a few days ago. Agreement has been reached with the building societies on the nature of the legislation, and the societies have expressed great enthusiasm for the provisions of the Bill which I expect to be introduced soon. The Bill relating to credit unions will require somewhat longer preparation. Consultations are still taking place in relation to credit unions, and precisely when we shall be able to introduce that legislation is not as yet known.

#### **VICTOR HARBOUR RAILWAY SERVICE**

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport investigate the possibility of closing the Strathalbyn to Victor Harbour railway service? The Minister has supported a statement made by the Railways Commissioner that, if people are not using a country service, it will have to be closed. I understand that, since this statement has been publicized in the Mount Barker *Courier*, the Mount Barker District Council, the Strathalbyn District Council, and the Port Elliot and

Goolwa councils are asking that other investigations be made into the closing of this service, which is used but rarely. In this regard they have in mind the future progress of the district.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have seen a press report that the Mount Barker council was to ask me to conduct another investigation, but apart from that I have seen nothing. Perhaps the correspondence is wending its way through what is called the system. However, I am at a loss to understand where the honourable member stands on this matter. I remind members that the future of this service was previously considered by the Transport Control Board, which decided that it should be closed. As members know, an order made by this board cannot come into effect until it has been approved by the Public Works Committee. Subsequently, that committee considered the proposed closing of this service and, from memory, I believe it unanimously agreed that the service should be retained. The member for Heysen is a member of that committee, and I do not know whether he has had a change of heart or whether his memory is failing him, but it seems to me that some double-talk is going on here.

Mr. McANANEY: I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. McANANEY: In his reply to my question the Minister of Roads and Transport digressed from the point I was trying to make, but I should like to state where I stand concerning this railway service. I have always advocated that the service should be closed, although I represent an area that adjoins it. The Public Works Committee has voted against closing the service, because it is the job of that committee to ensure that reasonable alternative transport is provided. The Transport Control Board did not arrange for a modern passenger bus service from Victor Harbour to Adelaide.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is going further than making a personal explanation: in fact, he is trying to make a statement on behalf of the Public Works Committee for which he has not the authority of the Chairman and other members of the committee, and I cannot permit him to continue in that strain.

Mr. Coumbe: It is in a public document.

Mr. McANANEY: I understand that a public document contains a report about this matter, and I am not criticizing the committee. I had about three more words to say.

The SPEAKER: Order! If a public document has been printed the information is available. It would be repetitive to say it again in the House, and the honourable member is contravening Standing Orders.

#### VAUGHAN HOUSE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say when, if at all, he intends to arrange for members, including me, to visit Vaughan House and Windana? You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that some weeks ago I asked several questions (and other members did, too, I think) about the situation at Vaughan House, and in reply to me, after a prompt, the Minister ended his statement by saying:

I invite any members who may be interested in this to let me know so that the staff of the institutions will not be inconvenienced by having a succession of visitors; it will be better if we can organize a tour so that members may see for themselves what is being done for the inmates of the institutions.

The Minister had previously said that we were not to ask questions but that we could go and see. On August 21, following that reply, I wrote to the Minister, as follows:

I desire to avail myself of your very kind offer to visit Vaughan House and Windana, extended in your reply to my question in the House last Tuesday.

That was 10 days ago and I have not heard from the Minister. Therefore, I am bold enough to put the question to him directly in the Chamber.

The Hon. L. J. KING: In recognition of the honourable member's boldness I shall try to give him whatever information I can at this stage. I received the letter to which he referred, but I laid it aside in the hope and expectation that some of his colleagues might wish to join the tour because of the interest they had shown in the treatment of juvenile offenders. I have been considerably surprised, because I have received no further letters, and the honourable member therefore stands alone in being interested in a visit to these institutions. I deferred making the arrangements lest others might wish to join him. However, as it now seems—

Mr. Mathwin: Would you like a show of hands or something?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I like to consider the difficulties that Opposition members experience in the discharge of their duties, as I understand that they have other matters to which to attend—

Mr. Millhouse: Come on, give a reply.



The Hon. L. J. KING: —and that they cannot give their undivided attention to the affairs of the State. However, if after the weekend it appears that no other Opposition member wishes to join the member for Mitcham, I shall ensure that my officers communicate with him so that his personal convenience in this matter may be met on a day suitable to him.

### PARLIAMENTARY BROADCASTS

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Premier reconsider the decision he made when replying to a question I asked in 1970 about direct broadcasts of some of the proceedings of this House? Members of the public have approached me about this matter and, no matter what the Premier may think, many people believe that Parliamentary proceedings should be broadcast because such broadcasts would be of great value to the community. Many people interested in politics listen to the broadcasts from the Commonwealth Parliament, and no doubt they would listen to broadcasts of this Parliament, because many of them cannot attend the sittings of Parliament. I believe it would be a distinct advantage to those people and to this House—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

Mr. MATHWIN: I apologize, Mr. Speaker, and ask whether the Premier will reconsider his decision.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No.

### GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Mr. BECKER: Will the Premier ascertain the total cost and/or the fees paid to the independent consultants who reported on the design of the suspended roof structure of the new Government Printing Office at Netley?

The SPEAKER: Order! I think that this is a repetition of a question that has been asked. I am not sure of the wording of it, but a question has been asked of the Premier previously.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will try to obtain the details for the honourable member, although I understand that he has already been given a full report. I will speak to my colleague.

### CONCESSION FARES

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say why concession fares recently granted to students who are over 18 years of age cannot be implemented at the commencement of the third term this year?

I understand that the new concession will not commence until the first term of next year. In view of the question I asked the Minister on August 3 last (which no doubt led to the Minister's prompt decision), why cannot the new concession be implemented at the commencement of the third term this year?

The SPEAKER: I think this question has been asked previously.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The implementation of such a scheme requires much preparatory and back-room work. Forms must be prepared so that the required declarations can be made, and these forms must be drafted, printed and circulated to the schools, together with the necessary instructions. I point out that the age of 18 referred to by the honourable member is incorrect, because it is 19. Also, the Government can make a decision applying only to its own organization—the Municipal Tramways Trust. The Government desires the scheme to operate throughout the whole of the bus transport system and therefore negotiations are necessary with the Bus Proprietors Association, representing the bus proprietors. These negotiations are currently proceeding between the B.P.A. and Treasury officials. It must be realized that all these matters cannot be completed overnight and, although I cannot say exactly when this school term commences (I understand that schoolchildren are currently on holiday and will return to school in a week's time), it is just a physical impossibility for the system to be implemented more quickly. However, I suggest to the honourable member that it could have been implemented many years ago if the Governments of those days were so inclined to introduce it.

### STANDING ORDER 154

Mr. McANANEY: Would you consider, Mr. Speaker, the introduction by the Standing Orders Committee of a new Standing Order to give to a private member the rights to reply to a Minister when he breaks Standing Order 154 by imputing to a private member an improper motive for doing something? The Minister, in replying to my question, contravened Standing Order 154 and said that I was "round the bend" or that my attitude in asking my question was inconsistent. When I asked leave to make a personal explanation, I was not permitted to do so. Either Standing Order 154 should be enforced or we should have another Standing Order to allow a member to make proper explanations.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is starting to break Standing Orders and he is out of order. The honourable member should take a point of order at the time an alleged offence occurs. Ample opportunity for that is provided by the Standing Orders, so there is no purpose in pursuing the matter now.

#### **ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (SAFETY)**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### **PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (BOARD)**

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:

Page 2, line 39 (clause 5)—Leave out “such number of full-time commissioners as he thinks fit” and insert “not more than six full-time commissioners”.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

The original provision enabled the Governor to appoint as many full-time Commissioners as he thought fit, whereas the amendment provides that the number of full-time Commissioners shall not exceed six. As three full-time Commissioners are required for the immediate future in addition to those Commissioners undertaking part-time duties, I hope that this amendment will enable the Planning Appeal Board to operate effectively for a considerable period.

Motion carried.

#### **APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)**

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for all purposes set forth in the Estimates of Expenditure for the financial year 1972-73 and the Appropriation Bill (No. 2), 1972.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act for the appropriation of revenue of the State for the financial year ending on June 30, 1973, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

At the outset, I pay a tribute to the Treasury officers, especially to the Under Treasurer (Mr.

Seaman) whose last Budget, in effect, this is. Mr. Seaman has given service to this State which, I think, has been unexampled. He is an officer whose calibre is exceptional, as informed administrators with knowledge of Government administration in Treasury matters throughout the Commonwealth well know. It is a great loss to the Government that he has decided to retire at the end of this year, not that he will not be serving the people of South Australia, because he will still be doing so in several capacities; nevertheless, it is obviously a blow to the people of South Australia that he should be leaving the Treasury at the end of the year. I am sure that all members of this House, whatever their political persuasion, will join with me in paying a tribute to Mr. Seaman and in expressing our heartfelt thanks on behalf of the people of this State for the great work he has done.

I present the Government's Revenue Budget proposals for 1972-73, which forecasts aggregate receipts of \$509,235,000 and aggregate expenditures based upon present wage and salary levels of \$509,753,000. However, the Commonwealth grants included in the receipts are based upon a rate of increase in wage levels which could involve an additional Budget expenditure for South Australia of about \$7,000,000, and thus the deficit to be presently expected is increased from \$518,000 to \$7,518,000. The eventual outcome will depend not only upon whether in fact the increase in wage levels involves more or less than this but also upon such other matters as seasonal influences, changes in the economic climate in other States as well as South Australia, and the extent of any supplementary Commonwealth grants which may arise from the promised review at a mid-year Premiers' Conference.

Each annual Budget should not be considered in isolation but rather should be regarded as a step in a continuing Government programme of providing services in response to the community's needs after having regard to the overall financial situation and the flow of funds required to finance improved extent and standard of services. So it is with this Budget, and, before commenting on it in detail, I would draw the attention of members to some aspects of our changing responsibilities, to our experience in the recent past, and to prospects in the foreseeable future. In particular, I would refer to major Commonwealth grants in which all States share, to special grants recommended by the Commonwealth Grants Commission, and to the State's own measures

to raise revenues and to allocate available funds to the best effect. On each of these major matters I believe we should ask the question as to what the future may hold.

The last two years have seen a number of important changes in the extent and kind of general purpose financial assistance given by the Commonwealth to all the States. Following strong submissions by all States in 1969 and early 1970, the Commonwealth agreed to a major review of the financial assistance arrangements and, at the Premiers' Conference of June, 1970, offered a new deal which provided for an increase in the base grants, an improvement in the annual betterment factor, a grant towards debt services on a specified portion of existing State debt eventually to be taken over, and a grant determined in lieu of interest-bearing loans to finance portion of the States' capital works programmes and so lessen the build-up of future debt. Any hopes that these measures would yield the long-term solution to the States' financial problems (and I had no such hopes; I was one of the two Premiers who did not agree to those proposals, pointing out that they could not meet our long-term needs) were soon dashed, however, and late in 1970-71 it proved necessary for the Commonwealth to provide a supplementary grant. Also in 1970-71 it proved necessary for the Commonwealth to provide grants in lieu of the receipts duty, previously an important source of State revenues, which had been challenged successfully on constitutional grounds in 1969 and validated by Commonwealth legislation only until the end of September, 1970.

Then at the Premiers' Conference in June, 1971, the States made it clear that the problems in prospect in 1971-72 were greater than they had actually experienced in 1970-71, and the Commonwealth, convinced by the urgency of the case, agreed to further improvements to the States' share of financial resources. It offered a package deal of which the three components were the transfer of pay-roll tax to the States from early 1971-72 with corresponding reductions in financial assistance grants, the adding back into the base of a sum of about \$22,300,000 to be escalated in accordance with the formula in future years, and the provision of a special supplementary contribution for 1971-72 only. As members may recall, the fact that these arrangements were still inadequate to meet minimum needs was shown up clearly by the unanimous decision of the States, before leaving the conference table, to increase the pay-roll tax rate from

2½ per cent to 3½ per cent immediately on the transfer to the States taking effect.

Again, in 1971-72 as in 1970-71, any hopes that a long-term solution had been found to the problems of Commonwealth-State finances were short-lived. In February last, at a special Premiers' Conference, supplementary grants of \$15,000,000 were offered by the Commonwealth. Of course, at that time Australia had the problem of greater than normal unemployment, a lack of growth in employment opportunities and accordingly a situation in which it was desirable for Governments to spend more on essential facilities and services to generate such opportunities, as well as to try to overcome part of the backlog which undoubtedly existed.

We come now to the most recent Premiers' Conference, that of June, 1972, to which the background was one of continuing unemployment in need of remedy, and a continuing desperate need on the part of the States for yet further increases in general purpose Commonwealth grants beyond those in prospect under the formula, if reasonable progress was to continue in the provision of services in education, health, welfare, and in other areas of State responsibility. Again the Commonwealth was convinced of the genuineness and urgency of State submissions and agreed that the formula grants, which escalate from year to year in accordance with movements in State populations, Australian wage levels and the betterment factor, should be supplemented by additional general purpose grants. I believe the Commonwealth was somewhat more realistic at this conference in not regarding the supplements as temporary additions but in agreeing that the sum of \$112,000,000 to be shared between all States should be built into the formula grants and form part of the base for the purposes of escalation to calculate grants in future years. Further, the Commonwealth offered to increase the separate per capita grants to New South Wales and Victoria from \$2 per capita to \$3.50 per capita, and accordingly to provide an additional amount of about \$12,500,000 this year and increasing sums in future years. The Prime Minister also indicated that the Commonwealth would be prepared to meet with the States early in 1973 to examine the effects of new salary and wage awards and other factors difficult to forecast to determine whether some further supplement may be required to achieve Budget stability.

In summary, then, we have seen a continuing search for solutions to the problems of

Commonwealth-State financial relationships and for an equitable and workable distribution of that part of the nation's resources which Governments seek to use in providing services for their citizens. This search has taken us a long way from the major conference of a little more than two years ago when some people were hopeful that stability had been achieved. We have seen receipts duty replaced by Commonwealth grants, pay-roll tax transferred from the Commonwealth to the States, supplementary grants secured during the course of each year, and now substantial additions to the base grants built in to protect the future. What, then, are the prospects for the future? Despite all those recent measures, the assurance of continued increases in the formula grants, and the Prime Minister's agreement to meet with the Premiers to consider the desirability of supplementary grants later this year, I believe that the same kinds of problem are likely to continue until, at the very least, the formula grants are linked to the longer-term movements in Commonwealth receipts from income tax at constant rates.

As well as sharing directly with other States in the effects of measures determined in June, 1970, and subsequently, the South Australian financial situation has been influenced considerably by the recommendations of the Commonwealth Grants Commission. In June, 1970, I was very hopeful that a significant increase in the main South Australian grant could be arranged, but the Commonwealth took the view that, if we were not satisfied with the general arrangements for all States, we could go back to the commission and seek a special grant. This we did, and the State secured special grants on the recommendation of the commission of \$5,000,000 in 1970-71 and \$7,000,000 in 1971-72. I have explained to the House previously that the grants recommended for those two years were not to be regarded as final sums. They were each in the nature of an advance grant determined in the absence of a full examination of the State's accounts, its problems and its resources. Accordingly, we believed that they were likely to be somewhat conservative estimates of what was due to the State, that the commission would have allowed a reasonable margin of safety in its assessments, and that in due course, in line with the commission's procedures, the State could expect some further assistance by way of a completion grant for each of the two years.

Our belief has now been borne out, and the Government was gratified to receive advice

recently that the commission had recommended grants aggregating \$21,000,000 to be paid to the State in 1972-73, being made up of a \$7,500,000 completion grant in respect of the period to June 30, 1971, and \$13,500,000 advance grant in respect of the current year. The completion grant of \$7,500,000 is to be paid to the credit of Consolidated Revenue Account of previous years, which means that the deficit of a little more than \$5,600,000 accumulated to June 30, 1972, will be completely eliminated and we will be able to hold a small net surplus of almost \$1,900,000 to set off against future deficits. The advance grant of \$13,500,000 is to be credited to the accounts of the current year, as received, and I have taken it into account in estimating the prospective 1972-73 deficit of \$7,518,000. At this point it would be appropriate to ask the questions whether the State is likely to receive subsequently a further special grant, that is, a completion grant, in aid of the 1972-73 accounts and what are the prospects for increased special grants in future years. As to the 1972-73 accounts and the special grant presently determined at \$13,500,000, I believe we would be justified in assuming that the commission would have held in reserve a margin of safety and therefore that there was likely to be a completion grant in due course.

However, we must have regard to the fact that during 1971-72 the commission conducted a thorough review of the State's 1970-71 accounts and, as well as being in a position to assess the appropriate completion grant for the period up to June 30, 1971, the commission is now in a much better position to make a reasonable assessment of our current needs and problems relative to those of the standard States, New South Wales and Victoria. This contrasts with the situation in 1970-71 and 1971-72, when the commission was forced to make its judgments on the basis of much less information than it has now. Accordingly, we would be wise to assume that any margin of safety, and accordingly any completion grant for 1972-73, would be much smaller than in respect of previous years.

As to possible movements in the special grant in future, South Australia cannot expect increases such as have occurred in the recent past with its movement from no grant in 1969-70 to an advance grant of \$13,500,000, and possibly a final grant rather greater than \$13,500,000 in 1972-73. When this Government took office in 1970, South Australia had for many years been behind most of the other Australian States in its provisions of social

services, but I believe that, with very considerable increases in expenditures in social services and other Revenue Budget provisions in 1970-71, 1971-72 and 1972-73 (as proposed), we are now approaching the situation of having caught up in extent and quality of standards of service and Budget provisions overall. If this is so, then we may still expect modest increases in the special grant from year to year, increases broadly consistent with higher cost and wage levels and with the improvements in standards which the more populous States may be able to afford, but it would be unrealistic for us to expect annual increases as great as we have secured in recent times.

Of course, the State's ability to finance improved extent and standard of services will depend also on the extent to which it may be practicable to increase revenue yields from taxes and charges under its own control. In the last few years all States have made considerable efforts to increase their own revenues in an attempt to provide finance towards the better services in education, health, and welfare which the community demands and which all Governments accept as being their responsibility. In 1970-71 and 1971-72, South Australia's efforts to help itself in this way were second to none. For 1972-73, that effort is continuing in a more modest way, with the major increases in charges being limited to water and sewer rates and fees for the services of the Registrar-General. If we ask the question as to what new taxes or charges or what increases in existing fields may be feasible in future I must say that, at this stage, I do not have the answer. All States will, no doubt, continue to review their scales of taxes and charges in line with increasing cost and wage levels, and some States may be fortunate enough to secure increases in royalty receipts following the discovery and exploitation of minerals. However, I find it difficult to foresee any really significant increases in revenues from State sources unless those sources are broadened by transfer of fields from the Commonwealth.

In any consideration of the future of Commonwealth formula grants, of special grants on the recommendation of the Commonwealth Grants Commission, of local revenue-raising efforts and of the effects on expenditure patterns, South Australia must pay particular regard to the situation and prospects in New South Wales and Victoria. In the first place the Commonwealth, in determining the formula grants and any supplements thereto, in which all States share, would naturally be expected

to pay considerable regard to the problems and trends in the two larger States where some two-thirds of the Australian population live. In the second place the Commonwealth Grants Commission, in a more formal way, has determined that the budgetary experience of New South Wales and Victoria shall be the standard by which the needs of the three claimant States, Queensland, South Australia and Tasmania, are to be measured. This budgetary standard comprehends Commonwealth formula grants, local revenue-raising effort, levels of service, control of expenditures, and actual budgetary results, so that in one way or another all aspects of our Revenue Budget are matters for comparison with those of the two standard States.

Members will realize from my previous explanations that, in individual aspects of the Budget, South Australia, or any other claimant State, has a large measure of flexibility, but it must be very conscious of how the overall effect of its financial policy compares with the standard. In short, if we wish to achieve Revenue Budget results no worse than the standard, then we must ensure that our levels of services and expenditures and our efforts in taxation and charges are, on an overall balance, comparable with the standard. South Australia may expect to achieve a similar Budget result to the standard if it has better than standard services coupled with greater than standard taxation. It may achieve a similar Budget result with below standard taxation only if it is also prepared to hold services to a lower level. The only way we could combine services right up to or beyond the standard with lower levels of taxes or charges would be to accept Budget results more adverse than standard. In a situation in which all States are finding it most difficult to avoid revenue deficits, this would be to court the prospect of continuing and significant deficits with an inevitable diversion of capital funds away from development to the financing of those revenue deficits.

The Government has these matters continually under review in its efforts to achieve the most effective allocation of all the financial resources at its disposal. As was explained in the Loan Estimates debate it is our judgment that, at this stage, we should continue to hold in reserve the unspent balance of funds on Loan Account, which at June 30 last amounted to a little more than \$10,000,000, to finance possible future deficits on Revenue Account, the extent of which cannot be seen

clearly. We intend to maintain a continuing review in our efforts to secure a reasonable balance between taxation and expenditures on services, and between expenditures on capital projects through Loan Account and expenditures on maintaining and running those capital facilities through Revenue Account. Moreover, we plan, in concert with other States, to continue to seek a more equitable distribution of resources as between the States and the Commonwealth.

#### RECEIPTS

Receipts on Revenue Account in 1972-73 are estimated to amount to \$509,235,000, which would be \$53,990,000 above the actual receipts in 1971-72. The principal categories of these receipts are as follows:

	\$
Taxation.....	107,781,000
Public works and services ..	196,886,000
Territorial.....	3,274,000
Commonwealth grants . . .	201,294,000
	<hr/>
	\$509,235,000

Taxation: State taxation estimated at \$107,781,000 is \$15,505,000 in excess of last year's receipts. The principal part of this increase will result from a full year's operation of the pay-roll tax which was transferred by the Commonwealth to the States on September 1, 1971. Nine months collections in 1971-72, based on wages and salaries paid in the period September 1, 1971, to May 31, 1972, amounted to \$23,436,000. The estimate for 1972-73 is \$34,000,000, an increase of \$10,564,000. As well as the additional three months collections in 1972-73, the estimate allows for prospective increases in salaries and wages and in the work force. Because of a greater volume of transactions the receipts from motor vehicle taxation in 1972-73 are expected to amount to \$20,600,000, that is, some \$1,046,000 above collections in 1971-72. The land tax estimate of \$10,000,000 is slightly above actual collections in 1971-72, mainly because of an expected reduction in outstanding accounts.

There are no proposals for increases during 1972-73 in the rates imposed by the Stamp Duties Act, but the carry-over effect of increases that became effective during 1971-72 is reflected in the estimate of additional collections of \$3,089,000. Total collections in 1972-73 from all stamp duties are estimated at \$25,621,000. Succession and gift duties, by their nature, are always difficult to estimate and, in the absence of specific information about very large individual estates or gifts, the estimate of duty

in each case normally has regard to trends, both recent and in the long term. Succession duty for 1972-73 is estimated to produce receipts of \$11,000,000, about \$300,000 above last year's actual collections. Gift duty, on the other hand, is estimated to produce only \$600,000 this year, \$234,000 less than the actual amount collected in 1971-72 because in that year revenue from an abnormally large single assessment was received.

Public works and services: Receipts from public works and services in 1972-73 are estimated at \$196,886,000, or \$13,032,000 above the amount received in 1971-72. The changes are estimated to be as follows:

	\$	\$
The operation of public undertakings is as follows:		
Normal receipts from services, etc.....	1,276,000	
Transfer items that do not affect the Budget result ....	3,000,000	
		<hr/>
		4,276,000
Recoveries of interest and sinking fund.....		3,425,000
Other departmental fees and recoveries.....		5,331,000
		<hr/>
		\$13,032,000

Public undertakings: In 1972-73, the estimate for receipts from marine and harbour services is set at \$7,200,000, or \$613,000 below the receipts for the previous year. A large reduction in the quantity of grains handled is expected to affect receipts adversely, and to be offset only in part by some smaller increases for other commodities. For the Railways Department the estimate of receipts from operations in 1972-73 is \$35,000,000, or \$743,000 below actual receipts for last year. Reduction in the expected quantities of grains and Broken Hill ore concentrates to be carried, partly offset by expected additional tonnage of merchandise, is the principal cause.

Receipts from water and sewer rates and excess water charges are estimated at \$37,200,000, an increase of \$2,441,000 over actual receipts last year. The estimate for 1972-73 allows for the normal annual increase from new and extended services, for the elimination of the concession rate which previously applied to annual values of properties in excess of \$2,000, and for increases already authorized in the price of excess water and in minimum charges. Following continuation of profitable operation by the forestry undertaking, I have budgeted for a \$1,800,000 revenue contribution in 1972-73, \$60,000 above

the contribution required last year. The contribution from the Electricity Trust of South Australia in 1972-73 based on 3 per cent of its gross revenues from sales of electricity is estimated at \$2,250,000, while the State Bank contribution of 45 per cent of its 1971-72 profit will be \$576,000.

Recoveries of debt services: Total recoveries of interest and sinking fund are expected to reach about \$37,108,000, or \$3,425,000 above similar recoveries last year. The largest item in this increase will be the first of the eight equal annual repayments of \$1,875,000 by the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority of South Australia in relation to a \$15,000,000 special Commonwealth loan. The recovery of this amount by the State is fully offset by the payment of an equal amount to the Commonwealth, appropriated in the Estimates of Expenditure under Part V Treasurer—Miscellaneous.

Other departmental receipts: The aggregate of departmental fees and charges is expected to increase by \$5,331,000 to \$50,982,000 in 1972-73. Higher fees are proposed for registration of documents relating to transactions of real and personal property, and this measure is expected to produce additional revenue of about \$650,000 in a full year and some \$400,000 in 1972-73.

Hospitals Fund: Receipts of the Hospitals Fund in 1971-72 were \$5,421,000. Of this amount \$2,451,000 came from the Totalizator Agency Board, \$1,981,000 from the Lotteries Commission, and \$989,000 from stamp duty in respect of third party insurances. Payments toward Government and subsidized hospitals from the fund totalled \$5,142,000. This year receipts are expected to aggregate about \$5,900,000, mainly as a result of a larger contribution from the Totalizator Agency Board. Estimated receipts do not include possible contributions to the fund which may eventuate from new lottery schemes presently under consideration by the Government. Of the \$6,200,000 expected to be paid out of the fund in 1972-73, \$4,820,000 is to be used to assist subsidized hospitals and \$1,380,000 towards meeting the costs of Government hospitals. This would reduce the balance in the fund at year end by \$300,000, about the amount of its increase in 1971-72.

Commonwealth grants: The Commonwealth Budget introduced a fortnight ago provided for a taxation reimbursement grant to South Australia of \$181,900,000. This amount has been calculated on the basis that the population increase in this State in the year to December, 1972, will be the same as in the

previous year and that average wages throughout Australia will rise by 8.5 per cent in the year to March, 1973. The estimate also takes into account the present betterment factor of 1.8 per cent. Prior to these escalation factors being applied to the 1971-72 formula grant, the latter was adjusted in accordance with the arrangements determined when the Commonwealth transferred the pay-roll tax to the States. Finally, the estimate of \$181,900,000 also includes South Australia's share of an extra \$112,000,000 which the Commonwealth agreed to make available to the States, to be distributed in proportion to the 1971-72 formula grants as escalated in 1972-73 under the formula, and which will be built into the formula grants for calculating grants in subsequent years. The Estimates of Revenue also include the advance grant of \$13,500,000 recommended by the Commonwealth Grants Commission for 1972-73 and an amount of \$4,487,000, being the debt service reimbursement following Commonwealth acceptance of responsibility for a further instalment of State debt. The commission's \$7,500,000 recommended grant in respect of prior years will be credited against the accumulated deficit on Consolidated Revenue Account for those years.

#### PAYMENTS

Provision is included in the Estimates of Expenditure for:

	\$
Payments for which appropriation is or will be contained in special legislation	108,747,000
Payments for which appropriation will derive from the Appropriation Act . . .	401,006,000
	<hr/> \$509,753,000

The allowance of \$7,000,000 for possible further increases in wage and salary rates lifts the total of estimated payments to \$516,753,000. I shall deal with the major sections and provisions individually but, first, there are several matters which have wider application. It was necessary last year to provide departmental votes for the payment of pay-roll tax to the Commonwealth for two months at the rate of 21 per cent, but now that the tax is being administered by the State for the full year, no such provision is necessary for most departments. The two departments still subject to the tax, Highways and Motor Vehicles, will of course continue to pay at the higher rate of 31 per cent.

Certain changes in presentation have been made, particularly with regard to the new Department of Environment and Conservation,

which, in addition to expanding into new areas considered by the Government to be of vital importance, will include the functions of the Museum Department, the State Planning Office, the National Parks Commission, fauna conservation activities, and the national pleasure resorts section of the Immigration, Publicity and Tourist Bureau Department. The functions of other sections of the latter department have been absorbed into the Department of the Premier and of Development. These and other minor changes have been footnoted in the Estimates of Expenditure for the convenience of members.

**Special Acts:** The Government contribution to the South Australian Superannuation Fund is expected to increase by \$826,000 to \$6,150,000. This year there are three factors responsible for the increase. The first is the normal annual increase arising from greater numbers of former employees on pension and a higher average salary and pension entitlement on retirement. The second is the full year's Government contribution in respect of certain concessional units for advanced age employees for which legislation was effective for only part of 1971-72. The third is the proposal for which legislation was introduced recently to provide for a 5 per cent cost of living adjustment to all pensions which commenced prior to July 1, 1971. Members will know of the unfortunate failure of two large industries in country towns in respect of both of which the Government has given large guarantees. As far as the industry at Port Pirie is concerned, neither the company nor the receiver appointed by the debenture holder has been able to find any other company interested in making an offer for the company as a going concern, and the receiver is now in the process of endeavouring to realize on the company's assets. There will most certainly be a substantial short-fall between the total realizations and the loans of \$800,000 which have been guaranteed by the Treasurer, and provision is included in the Special Acts section of the Estimate papers to meet the short-fall. In the case of the industry of David Shearer Limited of Mannum, it is expected that the Government will be involved in expenditure to enable the industry to be continued.

Members will be aware that an offer has been made by Horwood Bagshaw Limited to the shareholders of David Shearer Limited which would enable the industry to be continued, and even expanded, at Mannum. Having regard to the fact that the Government would be obliged to meet large payments under

its guarantee were David Shearer Limited to be placed in receivership, we have decided to offer to find much the same sum provided this will ensure that the industry is continued at Mannum. A Bill will be brought down specifically to authorize such a payment to be made, and account is taken of the probable payment in this section of the Estimates. The requirement in respect of the two arrangements is estimated at \$1,650,000. I point out to honourable members that, in relation to the arrangements with David Shearer Limited, these depend entirely, of course, on satisfactory arrangements being arrived at between Horwood Bagshaw Limited and the shareholders and creditors of David Shearer Limited. Unless those arrangements can be arrived at, the payment forecast in the Budget cannot proceed.

The provision for payment of interest on State debt is \$75,250,000, an increase of \$5,130,000 over actual payments in 1971-72. Although still a major adverse impact on the Budget, the rise in interest payments has been tempered somewhat by the Commonwealth agreement in June, 1970, to make available a proportion of the State's allocation for works and housing as grants instead of loans, and by the recent decline in interest rates. In my Budget speech last year I made reference to the heavy burden imposed by the long-term borrowing rate of 7 per cent then current. Shortly afterwards, in the November loan, the Commonwealth, with the concurrence of the Australian Loan Council, reduced its long term rate to 6.7 per cent, and then in February offered a maximum of 6 per cent. This long-term rate has been retained for the August, 1972, loan and yields on the very short maturities have been cut back further still.

**Social services—Education Department:** The proposed appropriation for the Education Department in 1972-73 is \$105,820,000. To compare this provision with those of previous years and to understand the extent of planned improvement, it is necessary to adjust the provision to take account of changes in the department's structure, the cost of wage and salary awards, the effect of a changed number of pay days, and relief from pay-roll tax. It is proposed that the five existing teachers colleges and the School of Art should be autonomous from the beginning of 1973, with Western Teachers College and the School of Art being combined to form the new Torrens College of Advanced Education. Accordingly, provision has been made in the Miscellaneous votes under the Minister of Education for grants to the colleges of about \$3,055,000 for



the six months January to June, 1973, while for the first six months of the financial year payments on behalf of the colleges will continue to be made by the Education Department. To provide an appropriate comparison with actual payments in 1971-72, it is necessary to add the figure of \$3,055,000 for grants to the appropriation of \$105,820,000 for the department. The resultant total of \$108,875,000 is \$10,301,000 greater than the actual expenditure of \$98,574,000 recorded in 1971-72 for comparable purposes. Within this adjusted total of \$108,875,000 are allocations of \$5,737,000 for teachers colleges and the School of Art, \$9,658,000 for the Division of Further Education, which the Government proposes shall be a separate department once legislation has passed Parliament, and \$93,480,000 for the remainder of the Education Department.

In 1971-72, there were 27 pay days instead of the usual 26, and payments were made for pay-roll tax for the first two months of that financial year. The existence of these two factors in 1971-72 increased expenditure by about \$3,440,000. After adjusting for these factors, the provision of \$108,875,000 represents almost a 141 per cent increase over actual expenditure last year. This, coming on top of the heavy increases that occurred in the previous two Budgets cumulative on the education expenditure, has made this, in proportion, the greatest increase in education expenditure that has ever been seen by this State in a comparable period. This includes an estimate for additional costs aggregating about \$2,480,000 to be incurred by the department, because of the full year's cost of the last national wage decision and the cost of several other smaller salary awards. The rate of real improvement available for education purposes provided in this year's Budget is nearly 12 per cent, or a rate slightly in excess of the rate achieved in the last two financial years.

The budgetary improvements provide for further expansion of the teaching staff in primary and secondary schools to permit a reduction in the pupil-teacher ratio. Considerable improvement is planned in the employment of ancillary staff, the main areas of expansion being the appointment of additional teacher aides and bursars. The Budget provides for the final instalment of \$2 a student of the \$6 increase for book allowances promised for all secondary school students by the Government when it came to office in 1970. The scheme for providing grants for ground maintenance has been modified so that the grants depend on both enrolment and acreage.

Improvements have been made in the provision of books and materials for free scholars in both primary and secondary schools and for the rural and fifth-year scholarship schemes introduced at the beginning of 1972. Payments of grants in lieu of subsidies are estimated to be \$780,000 for the financial year. The Budget also makes provision for new arrangements which have been introduced with respect to transport of handicapped children.

Independent schools: At the beginning of the 1969 school year a scheme of assistance for independent schools was introduced, the Government contribution being at the rate of \$10 for each child in both primary and secondary schools. As from the third term of 1969, the payment in respect of secondary schools was increased by \$10 to the sum of \$20 a child. The annual cost of these payments, which the present Government is continuing, is about \$520,000. My Government has taken the firm view that assistance is both more equitable and more effective if it has regard to need rather than being determined as specific sums for each student across the board. Accordingly, the increased provisions made in 1971 and 1972, and now aggregating about \$700,000 a year, have been allocated to schools after consideration of need and recommendation by a special committee. We propose to provide a further \$400,000 in 1973 for these purposes, and again the distribution will have regard to the committee's recommendation based on an examination of need. The total Budget provision for a continuation of existing levels of assistance and a part year's cost of the 1973 proposals is \$1,525,000.

Tertiary education: The provisions for the University of Adelaide, the Flinders University, and the Institute of Technology take into account the amounts calculated to be required to complete the financial arrangements for recurrent grants in the 1970-72 triennium, which ends on December 31 next, and estimates of the amounts likely to be approved by the Commonwealth and State Governments for the first six months of the 1973-75 triennium. These provisions are on the basis of existing rates of salaries and wages and would need to be increased in the event of a national wage decision or a general review of academic salaries becoming effective during 1972-73. As to the five teachers colleges and the School of Art, I referred earlier to the adjustments necessary to the provisions of the Education Department, and to the fact that grants aggregating \$3,055,000 are to be provided from January 1, 1973, in lieu of the previous appropriations for salaries

and contingencies. The total of provisions for grants to this group of colleges is, in fact, \$3,470,000, which is \$415,000 more than the amount transferred from the Education Department. This arises from the fact that, on becoming autonomous bodies in 1973, the colleges will take full responsibility for certain expenditures which have not been charged directly to their appropriation lines in the past. These formerly indirect expenses, which include special payments to practising teachers who tutor student teachers, costs of maintenance by the Public Buildings Department, and superannuation payments, will have to be recouped to the departments supplying the services in 1973 and subsequently. Accordingly, the grants are increased by the sum of \$415,000 estimated to be the cost of those additional recoups.

**Hospitals:** Expenditure by the Hospitals Department is expected to increase from \$43,070,000 in 1971-72 to \$51,239,000 in 1972-73, but salary and wage rates account for about \$3,000,000 of this, whilst \$400,000 was required last year for an additional pay day for some departmental employees. If we exclude these two factors from the comparison the amount provided for expansion and improvement of services and for increased cost of materials is \$5,569,000. Provision has been included for the opening of the first stage of the new Modbury Hospital, occupation of a further section of the Strathmont Centre, use of new wards and facilities at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, development of a renal unit at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and an increase in admissions at Port Augusta following the occupation of a new building. Home care services will be expanded in the Woodville area and it is intended to develop similar services at Port Lincoln and in the Wallaroo-Kadina-Moonta district. A new policy of paying maintenance subsidies to privately-operated psychiatric hospitals will also be initiated.

**Other medical and health:** An appendix to the Estimates of Expenditure sets out details of proposed grants to non-government hospitals and institutions which total \$12,898,000. Of this amount, \$8,078,000 is provided in the "Miscellaneous" votes of the Chief Secretary, while the balance of \$4,820,000 will be financed from the Hospitals Fund.

**Welfare services:** A total of \$11,302,000 is provided to meet the responsibilities of the Minister of Community Welfare as compared with a total expenditure last year of \$8,510,000. Even after deducting an amount of \$262,000

for wage and salary awards included in the 1972-73 provision, this represents an increase of \$2,530,000, or 30 per cent, over last year's figure. Making due allowance for awards in 1971-72, it shows an increase of \$4,080,000, or 62 per cent over the comparable expenditure in 1970-71. The payment of financial assistance (formerly known as public relief) is the main factor contributing to these very large movements. There has been a rapid rise in the number of persons, particularly deserted wives, seeking financial assistance and a considerably greater provision is required simply to cope with this. Further, certain rates of assistance are to be increased in line with recently announced changes in Commonwealth pensions. In addition, the Government intends to relax certain of the criteria at present governing the payment of assistance to unmarried mothers, deserted wives and other women in similar circumstances, to provide for more rapid payment, increases in supplementary allowances and payments to some people at present excluded. It is also intended to raise the number of professionally qualified and ancillary staff, and to employ 30 residential care and social work trainees who will begin in-service training courses conducted by the department. Expenditure on improvements at Aboriginal reserves will be increased to permit the implementation of a number of small but necessary works in areas too long neglected. Payments to foster parents will be raised and provision is included for much more to be paid by way of subsidy for capital works at children's homes, grants for the training of youth leaders and capital grants to community organizations providing facilities for young people.

**Public undertakings:** The Engineering and Water Supply Department is expected to increase its expenditure from \$16,535,000 to \$18,996,000. After adjustment for known wage and salary awards, which will cost the department about \$570,000, and for the full exemption from pay-roll tax which will save \$38,000, the effective increase is \$1,929,000. Of this increase \$178,000 is provided to enable South Australia to meet its share of the estimated higher cost of maintenance incurred by the River Murray Commission, \$901,000 is required to meet the expected extra cost of electricity for pumping water through the major pipelines, and \$850,000 is available for normal expansion and other increased costs. Pumping costs in 1971-72 were exceptionally low owing to high initial storages and a mild season which included some useful summer

rains. Unfortunately, the break in the 1972 season did not come until the end of June and first indications were that the provision for pumping costs in 1972-73 would have to be even higher than that proposed, but storages are now more satisfactory. However, even given reasonable conditions from now on, pumping costs will be much higher than last year.

The dredging fleet operated by the Marine and Harbors Department is to be concentrated mainly on capital works in 1972-73, with the result that revenue expenditure by the department is expected actually to decline from \$4,611,000 last year to \$4,539,000. An increase of \$2,270,000 is provided for the Railways Department which it is expected will require about \$45,367,000. A further saving of \$111,000 will be made this year in pay-roll tax but, with new salary and wage awards already known to have cost about \$1,425,000, only a comparatively small allowance has been made for the increasing cost of materials and for improved maintenance of the permanent way.

Other departments: The operations of the Highways Department have no net impact on the Revenue Budget, as the net proceeds of motor vehicle taxation, after the deduction of administrative expenses and certain other costs incurred by or on behalf of the department, are transferred to the Highways Fund. At the beginning of 1971-72, the balance available for roads was \$3,123,000 which, together with Commonwealth grants of \$25,850,000, State contributions of \$21,459,000, and repayments by local authorities of \$630,000, gave the department an aggregate of \$51,062,000 to use in the construction and maintenance of roads. Expenditure for these purposes totalled \$50,053,000, leaving a balance of \$1,009,000 to be carried forward into 1972-73. It is expected that \$28,350,000 will be provided this year from existing Commonwealth grants, \$22,255,000 from normal State sources, up to \$1,200,000 from a combination of new Commonwealth grants and State Loan provisions to finance work on the Eyre Highway, and \$705,000 from repayments by councils, and that the cost of works and services undertaken may amount to about \$52,170,000. This would leave a working balance of about \$1,350,000 at the year's end.

The clauses of the Bill give the same kind of authority as in the past, and with one exception they are in the same form as in the

second Appropriation Bill of 1971. Clause 1 gives the short title. Clause 2 authorizes the issue and application of a further sum. As the two Supply Acts effective for 1972-73 authorize the issue and application of \$120,000,000, the effective authority of clause 2 is \$281,006,000, to take the total of such authority to \$401,006,000. Clause 3 (1) appropriates the sum of \$401,006,000 for the purposes set out in the schedule. Members will recall that in last year's Bill the list of departments and miscellaneous provisions was set out as part of clause 3 itself. This year, as part of the changed procedures of the House in respect of financial measures, under which the Estimates of Expenditure and the Appropriation Bill are being introduced together, the individual purposes are listed in a schedule to facilitate discussion of the Bill and the Estimates in Committee.

Clause 3 (2) provides in the normal way that if increases of salaries or wages become payable pursuant to any determination made by a wage-fixing authority the Governor may appropriate additional funds by warrant. Clause 3 (3) provides that, if the cost of electricity for pumping water through the Mannum-Adelaide main, the Murray Bridge to Onkaparinga main, the Morgan-Whyalla main, and the Swan Reach to Stockwell main should be greater than the amounts set down in the Estimates, the Governor may appropriate the funds for the additional expenditure, and the amount available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund shall be increased by the amount of such additional expenditure. This is a normal provision, with the reference to the Murray Bridge to Onkaparinga main appearing for the first time.

Clause 4 authorizes the Treasurer to pay moneys from time to time up to the amounts set down in monthly orders issued by the Governor, and provides that the receipts obtained from the payees shall be the discharge to the Treasurer for the moneys paid. Clause 5 authorizes the use of Loan funds or other public funds if the moneys received from the Commonwealth and the general revenue of the State are insufficient to make the payments authorized by clause 3 of the Bill. Clause 6 gives authority to make payments in respect of a period prior to July 1, 1972. Clause 7 authorizes the expenditure of \$6,200,000 from the Hospitals Fund during 1972-73 and of \$2,000,000 in the early months of 1973-74 pending the passing of the Appropriation Bill

for that year. Clause 8 provides that amounts appropriated by this Bill are in addition to other amounts properly authorized.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

**ADJOURNMENT**

I commend the Bill to the consideration of members.

At 3.56 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 12, at 2 p.m.