

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, September 12, 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 that the Governor's Deputy had assented to the following Bills:

Book Purchasers Protection Act Amendment,
Judges' Pensions Act Amendment,
Police Offences Act Amendment,
Road Traffic Act Amendment (Safety),
Superannuation Act Amendment.

PETITION: ACKLAND HILL ROAD

Mr. EVANS presented a petition signed by 239 persons stating that, as a result of increased motor traffic, the condition of Ackland Hill Road, Coromandel East, for a distance of about 2¼ miles represented a situation of real danger to people using that road, and praying that the Government would grant a sum to the Meadows District Council in order to seal it.

Petition received and read.

QUESTIONS**ROAD TOLL**

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say what tangible efforts the Government has made in order to reduce effectively the continually increasing road toll? When a survey was conducted by the press in this State during March and April of this year, the Minister and Opposition members indicated that they were willing to consider and give effect to any tangible method of reducing the road toll. However, a statement in the press this morning indicates that there will be an injury each hour on our roads: in fact, the article states that road accidents in South Australia are causing injury to someone every 53 minutes. Therefore, can the Minister say whether legislation is to be introduced that will try to reduce the increasing road toll?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I say with due humility that this Government has probably done more to try to reduce the road toll than has any previous Government in this State: I go further, and say that it has probably done more than has any Government throughout Australia, including the Commonwealth Government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I know that Opposition members dearly love to play Party politics about the road toll. Since I have become Minister of Roads and Transport I have tried to keep the problem above Party politics, and I believe we have been successful.

Mr. Millhouse: Why not—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I know that the member for Mitcham, like his colleagues, loves to introduce Party politics into this matter, but I acknowledge that you, Mr. Speaker, do not wish me to comment on his disorderly interjections. Since coming into office we have rejuvenated the Road Safety Council in a way that has never occurred in the past, so that this council is now able to fulfil the function for which it was established. Also, we have introduced a new driver instruction course; we have introduced driver and road safety courses into our public schools for the first time; and His Excellency the Governor will open the Road Safety Instruction Centre on October 17. I trust that all Opposition members will hide their prejudices and attend on this auspicious occasion, because I believe that we have taken action that will lead ultimately to a considerably reduced road toll. A reduction in the road toll cannot be achieved overnight. There is no magic way that we can automatically bring this about, unless perhaps we took the virtually impossible course of banning motor cars from the road. What we are attempting to do is protect people from themselves. In addition to the matters to which I have already referred, another matter well worth considering (and I point this out especially for the member for Mitcham) is that this Government agreed to legislation introduced by the member for Mitcham to provide for the compulsory wearing of seat belts. I commend the honourable member for showing some statesmanship, at least on that issue. It is rare to see this from the honourable member, but I commend him for what he did in this respect.

Mr. Mathwin: Who's playing politics now?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Government desires to introduce legislation to deal with other matters connected with road safety. Soon, I expect to be able to introduce a Bill to amend the Road Traffic Act to deal with the problem of the drinking driver. Obviously the Leader has now lost all interest in the matter, because he is more interested in talking to the member for Bragg than in listening to details of what is being done. For his benefit

I repeat that I hope we shall be able to introduce legislation this session to deal with the problem of the drinking driver. The matter is currently before a committee of experts in the medical and legal fields. The only other point I need make to convince the Leader of the Government's activities in this regard is to refer to the legislation which was previously before the House and which provided for additional safety in relation to commercial vehicles. Regrettably, because of the political feeling that was engendered into the matter, that legislation was not proceeded with.

Mr. Mathwin: You're getting worse.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I know that the honourable member does not like to hear the truth. However, I hope that at some time in the future we shall be able to introduce legislation that will provide for the safety features needed in respect of commercial vehicles. Anyone who would advocate increased speed limits for commercial vehicles without these safety factors having been provided would be completely irresponsible.

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister arrange for a more significant enclosure to be included with drivers' licences when sent out for renewal by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles? All members and all drivers in the community should have received one of these notices headed "You are privileged". The enclosure refers to the privilege of holding a licence to drive a motor vehicle. It reminds drivers of their responsibility, but I have been informed by several constituents that it would be far more suitable for the Minister to use this means of publicity to remind drivers of the road toll statistics, or the rules of the road that they may have forgotten, or to summarize the correlation between drinking drivers and road accidents. This type of enclosure provides an excellent opportunity to reach drivers concerning road safety and I have been asked why this has not been done instead of trying to give the impression that the Government is doing more than it is.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not think that the enclosure sent out with the licence suggests, as the honourable member suggests, that the Government is doing more than it is.

Dr. Tonkin: It is doing less.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The enclosure is merely pointing to the fact that the holding of a licence to drive a motor vehicle is a privilege. The enclosure draws attention to this and asks drivers to respect that privilege. The member for Bragg was careful not to disclose where he stands (as is his normal

fashion), but it would be most interesting to know whether he believes it to be a privilege to drive a vehicle.

Dr. Tonkin: Read *Hansard*!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I read *Hansard* and know the views of Liberal and Country League members who believe that it is a privilege to drive a motor vehicle, but I do not know the views of the member for Bragg—

Dr. Tonkin: You have not read enough *Hansard*.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Bragg will be delighted to know that a decision was made five or six weeks ago not to reprint the enclosure to which he has referred once existing stocks were exhausted.

Dr. Tonkin: At last.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am pleased that the honourable member is at last agreeing with some of the things that this Government is doing. We are currently looking for a suitable enclosure to replace the current one, but I do not believe that it would do much good to refer to the road toll, because the enclosures are printed in bulk and are used over a long period. Therefore, the subject of the enclosure must be more topical, and I am working on the basis of attempting to draw to the attention of drivers some of the most pertinent points associated with the Road Traffic Act in an endeavour to try to educate drivers even more, because often it is not acknowledged (and it was significant that the Leader did not acknowledge it) that 99 per cent of road accidents are caused by the driver of the vehicle, and that is the person to whom we must always strive to get if we are to reduce the road toll. We are trying to do this by means of the reprinted enclosure that will be sent with licence forms.

CHURCHILL ROAD

Mr. JENNINGS: My question is to the Minister of Roads and Transport, who may appreciate a sensible question now. Will the Minister ask the Chief Secretary to arrange for police protection at the gates of the Islington workshops on Churchill Road? This would involve the services of a traffic policeman for a few minutes each evening. I am certain that the Minister has been travelling along Churchill Road, as I have frequently, when employees are leaving the workshops.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Speak up.

Mr. JENNINGS: As most of the employees leave their cars opposite the entrance of the workshops, they have to cross Churchill Road to get to their cars; when they are doing this

it is like a mad woman's scramble. On several occasions a traffic policeman has been travelling along the road and has stopped to direct traffic leaving the factory, enabling it to leave that area in an orderly manner in less than 10 minutes. As a result of the efficiency with which this matter could be resolved, the employees request that a traffic policeman be made available each evening for this duty. Will the Minister refer this matter to the Chief Secretary?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes.

WHYALLA DISPUTE

Mr. BROWN: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry confer with Conciliator Wilson, of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, and ask him whether, during the recent hearing before him regarding the most recent inter-union dispute between the Ship Painters and Dockers Union and the Miscellaneous Workers Union at Whyalla, he considered the tactics adopted by one union in reaching the conciliation table? I have been led to believe that, in this case, the methods adopted could lead to a charge of criminal assault, and it seems, on the surface, that the Conciliator and, in fact, all those engaged in arbitration are not only condoning such methods but also agreeing with them. I consider that, if what I have said is found to be correct, once again the whole arbitration system has failed and has condoned and fostered industrial unrest to the extent of a state of Fascism in this country.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: First, the honourable member is referring to the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, as this is a Commonwealth Government matter. Although members opposite do not always agree with the Secretary of the Australian Council of Trade Unions (Mr. Hawke), I am sure they agree, as I do, with his remarks made in Canberra on Sunday evening, and reported in yesterday's *Advertiser*, that no trade unionists who attacked people or property should receive special protection. I understand that police action has been taken regarding certain acts of violence that occurred at Whyalla last week, involving a trade union dispute. Being extremely concerned about what happened at the Whyalla shipyard last Wednesday, I obtained a report from my department's District Inspector at Whyalla. On receiving that, I contacted the Acting Secretary of the Miscellaneous Workers Union, which is the union that the cleaners concerned had joined. That union has now placed the matter

in the hands of the United Trades and Labor Council. Mr. W. Wilson (a Conciliation Commissioner of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission) went to Whyalla last Thursday and Friday in connection with this and another industrial matter. At Whyalla he held a conference at which were present Mr. E. Naylor (Whyalla Secretary of the Ship Painters and Dockers Union), Mr. B. Cohen (the cleaning contractor), and Mr. A. Summer-ton and Mr. D. Farrar (representing the Whyalla Ship Building and Engineering Works Proprietary Limited). Although the *Whyalla News* last Friday reported Mr. Naylor as saying that at the conference a result favouring the painters and dockers was given, last Monday the same newspaper reported a comment by Mr. Cohen that this statement was incorrect. Mr. Wilson is a Conciliation Commissioner whose powers under the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act authorize him only to try to reach agreement, but he does not have any power to make a decision. Further, in this case there is involved one Commonwealth union (the Ship Painters and Dockers Union), operating under a Commonwealth award, and one State union (the Miscellaneous Workers Union), operating under a State award. Mr. Wilson does not have any jurisdiction over a State union operating under a State award. As I have said, the matter has now been placed in the hands of the Trades and Labor Council, which I am sure will consider it quickly.

Mr. HALL: Is the Minister aware that persons connected with the Whyalla firm of Benaco Cleaners, which has contracts for cleaning new ships' accommodation before delivery of those ships to the owners and whose employees are members of the Miscellaneous Workers Union, in the past have had to make an unofficial payment to the Ship Painters and Dockers Union in order to be able to proceed with any contract, and is he aware that, when Benaco Cleaners refused to continue to pay this sum (or, as is popularly known, "sling" this money) to the Ship Painters and Dockers Union, men from that union armed with iron bars and rubber hoses attacked Benaco employees, locked them in a ship's cabin, and refused to withdraw from the ship until it was agreed that the matter should be made the subject of conciliation? What does the Government, as the responsible body administering this State's affairs as distinct from the unofficial Trades and Labor Council, intend to do about such standover tactics?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I consider that the charges made by the member for Gouger relate to the criminal law. As I pointed out earlier, I understand that, as action has already been taken, the matter is now *sub judice*.

Mr. HALL: Can the Minister say whether it is a fact that the matter of a firm's having to pay an unofficial sum to a union is not the subject of the charges being handled now by the South Australian Police Department and is quite the opposite of being *sub judice*? What does the Minister intend to do about a firm that has had to make an unofficial payment to a union not concerned with the men's employment in regard to that company's being able to perform its work on the ship?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I think the honourable member would be well aware that the remedy regarding this situation should be in that organization's hands. I have had no approach from any organization: in fact, I am unaware of what the honourable member is talking about. It should be a question of the union's taking police action if it is a case of extortion, as the honourable member almost implies.

Mr. Hall: What about the Miscellaneous Workers Union?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I will have the matter investigated but, if there has been extortion, as implied by the honourable member, the police should be approached.

Mr. Hall: You will get a report, though?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I will do that.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended June 30, 1972.

Ordered that report be printed.

BREAKING OFFENCES

Mr. BECKER: Has the Attorney-General information further to that contained in his reply to my Question on Notice of August 29 regarding offences of breaking and entering?

The Hon. L. J. KING: On August 29 the Minister of Roads and Transport on my behalf gave certain answers to the member for Hanson. He indicated that further answers to questions 1 and 2 were capable of comparatively early reply. Certain other parts of the question can be partially answered from information in the possession of the Depart-

ment for Community Welfare. The further information now available is as follows:

(1) Between July 1, 1972, and August 31, 1972, 1,315 breaking and entering offences in the metropolitan area were reported to the police.

(2) The number of the above offences which have been cleared up is not available. It would not be a meaningful figure because—

(a) offenders are often not apprehended until a considerable time after the offence was committed; and

(b) offences cannot be regarded as cleared up until the offender has appeared in court and been found guilty.

The latest statistics from the Police Department show that between 22 per cent and 24 per cent of all breaking and entering offences are normally cleared up.

(3) A total of 61 breaking and entering offences committed by juveniles under 18 years in July and August, 1972, have been cleared up by now. Fifty-five of these offences were committed by 41 males and six by six females.

(4) Thirteen males committed 17 of the above offences whilst absconders. Seven were absconders from McNally Training Centre and six from Brookway Park. None of the girls was an absconder and none of the offences was committed by any absconder from Windana.

(5) The question regarding penalties imposed on persons committing breaking and entering offences can be answered only as it relates to juveniles. Details for adults are not available. The penalties imposed for the 61 offences committed by juveniles were as follows:

	Males	Females
Committed to the care and control of the Minister	11	—
Committed to the care and control of the Minister with an ancillary committal order	7	—
Released on a bond with supervision	6	—
Released on a bond without supervision	1	—
Fined	1	—
Other order (dismissal, etc.)	12	6
Dealt with by a juvenile aid panel	17	—
Total	55	6

(6) Previous breaking and entering offences committed by the 47 offenders are as follows:

	No previous charges	Previous charges				Total
		1	2	3	4 or more	
Males.....23.....		4	4	2	8	18
Females.....	6	—	—	—	—	—
Total.....29.....		4	4	2	8	18

The statistics given in answer to questions 3, 4 and 5 relate only to offences committed in July and August where the offender has appeared in court or before a juvenile aid panel for the offence. An analysis of all Juvenile Court and juvenile aid panel appearances in July and August for breaking and entering offences shows that 245 offences were committed by 154 male offenders and 10 offences were committed by seven female offenders. Forty-eight of the offences were committed by 29 male absconders (16 from McNally Training Centre and 13 from Brookway Park). None of the offences was committed by female absconders or by any male absconder from Windana.

Because abscondings from training centres are reported immediately to the police and most absconders are apprehended within a few days, it is reasonable to suppose that a higher proportion of breaking and entering offences com-

mitted by absconders is cleared up than in respect of those committed by other juveniles.

Penalties imposed for the 255 offences were as follows:

Committal to an institution . . .	9
Committal to the care and control of the Minister.....	28
Committal to the care and control of the Minister with ancillary committal order.....	10
Released on a bond with super- vision.....	36
Released on a bond without super- vision.....	27
Fined.....	11
Other order (dismissed, etc.) . .	106
Dealt with by a juvenile aid panel	28
Total.....255.....	

Previous breaking and entering offences committed by the 161 juvenile offenders were as follows:

	No previous charges	Previous charges				Total
		1	2	3	4 or more	
Males.....	94	18	12	11	19	60
Females.....	7	—	—	—	—	—
Total.....	101	18	12	11	19	60

(7) An attempt was made to keep statistics of the times of day when breaking and entering offences were committed by juveniles but this was abandoned as being impracticable. In many cases the time of the day when the offence was committed is incapable of being determined.

CHRISTIE DOWNS RAILWAY

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of August 9 concerning a railway from Port Stanvac to Christie Downs?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The sum of \$496,000 is to provide for land acquisition and construction to the extent contemplated during

1972-73. Discussions are currently being held with the appropriate authorities in respect of the impact of the railway on Sherriff Road, and two alternatives are being considered. One involves some road closure, in which case no grade separation will be involved; the other would involve a rail under-pass. A final decision has not yet been reached. Current planning has involved the following: survey work is completed; land acquisition is partly completed; exploratory drilling is completed; grading and alignment design is nearing completion; designs for passenger stations, goods yards and grade separations are in hand; and physical work could start towards the end of this calendar year.

EYRE HIGHWAY

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Does the Minister of Roads and Transport intend to confer with the Minister of Environment and Conservation with a view to reconsidering the new route of the Eyre Highway? The Minister has probably seen the report in this morning's paper that an Australian naturalist (Vincent Serventy) will protest over the proposed rerouting of the Eyre Highway, and the reasons given, both by that gentleman and by a Mr. Ellis, who is also associated with the matter, are that the rerouting and sealing of the Eyre Highway between the Nullarbor Station and the Western Australian border "would be a hazard for grey kangaroos, wombats and bird life in virgin scrub along the top of the Bight". Mr. Serventy expresses the opinion that the highway should follow its present route, with spurs to the coast. All members know that there has been much huffing and puffing over the sealing of the Eyre Highway, rather more than over its rerouting, but it does seem that there is a reason for reconsidering the rerouting of the highway.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have read the report in the paper this morning and, although I do not belittle the gentleman to whom the statements are attributed (I know nothing of him and do not know on what authority he speaks, but I am happy to accept the fact that he knows what he is talking about), I think I should point out that surveyors of the Highways Department, who have spent many months in this area, would know what they were talking about.

Mr. Millhouse: They're not interested in the conservation aspect, though.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am happy to accept their advice. In addition, the honourable member ought to know (I made it clear in my press release) that, prior to determining the route of the highway, discussions on this matter had taken place between the Minister of Environment and Conservation and me, and it is agreed that, from a conservation point of view, the new route will be preferable. I do not know whether the member for Mitcham has referred in full to the comments made in the paper this morning, but I read something about the route's being so close to the cliffs that they would crumble and the road would be unsafe. I do not know whether the member for Mitcham agrees with the point of view of this gentleman, who presumably thinks that the road will be only about 3 in. away from the edge of the cliffs but, of course, that is not so. In fact, the Minister of Environment

and Conservation is currently proceeding to declare the land between the new route and the cliffs as a national park to be preserved, so clearly the route will be some distance from the cliffs, and the construction of the road will involve no danger. I am happy about what has occurred to this stage, the matter having been considered fully. The Minister of Environment and Conservation is also happy about the matter, and I am certain that there is no danger in respect of the environment in this area.

Mr. RODDA: Will the Premier say whether he acknowledges the valuable work and representation made by the special committee of the Federated Chambers of Commerce to have the Commonwealth Government recognize the need to provide funds to complete the sealing of National Route No. 1 to the Western Australian border? I understand that a committee (comprising Messrs. John Watt, J. Shanks, C. Schwerdt and R. Edson) did valuable work in collecting data and doing research on completing the sealing of this highway with Commonwealth Government funds. I also understand that the committee had many meetings with the Premier on the matter and also made representations to the Commonwealth Treasurer. Therefore, it is fitting that the efforts of the Federated Chambers of Commerce in this matter should be recognized.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: True, I had some meetings with the committee in Whyalla and with certain other representatives in Adelaide later. Unfortunately, at one stage the committee saw fit to attack the South Australian Government for what it claimed to be our failure to provide funds, although, rather than approach the Commonwealth Government for the additional funds, we had provided funds far beyond what every other State Government considered was our responsibility. I tried to apprise the representatives of the matter, and I understand that they approached the Commonwealth Government, supporting the State's case. To the extent that the committee, like many other bodies, occasionally supported the case submitted by this State to the Commonwealth Government, I think we owe the committee our thanks. However, I should not like the honourable member or anyone else to take the view that what happened resulted from something that had come forward from the committee. In fact, the representations that finally were successful were those of the South Australian Government. Those representations had been

made at many levels and resulted finally in a proposition that was made earlier this year. We received no support at all from the Commonwealth Government until the Commonwealth Budget was introduced, which was long after the Premiers' Conference. I point out to the honourable member that the South Australian Government decided to proceed at the full rate of expenditure, assuming eventual Commonwealth support, a long time before any announcement by the Commonwealth Government. We put the matters in train to proceed with the sealing of the Eyre Highway, and that was not as a result of any representations by the committee. However, I was naturally grateful for the committee's interest and support, like the interest and support of other interested bodies and the public who were concerned about the sealing of the highway, to the extent that it was given.

LINCOLN HIGHWAY

Mr. KENEALLY: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to a question I asked recently about the Lincoln Highway?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Tenders have been called for the construction of the Eyre Highway between Port Augusta and Lincoln Gap and it is intended shortly to recall tenders for the construction of the Lincoln Highway between Lincoln Gap and Whyalla. It is expected that work will be carried out on the Port Augusta to Port Pirie section of National Route No. 1, commencing with the construction of two bridges over Mambray Creek, expected to be called in November this year. The reconstruction between Port Pirie and Port Augusta will depend mainly on the structural sufficiency of the pavement to carry increasing traffic, and a detailed examination is being undertaken to determine the extent of reconstruction and when such reconstruction will be necessary.

POLICE PATROLS

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Attorney-General take up with the Chief Secretary the matter concerning the new police system which I understand is being introduced in the City of Port Adelaide and, as a result of which, policemen are being put back on the beat, in contrast to the car patrol system that has been in existence for some time? If this experiment proves successful, does the Government intend to extend it to other similarly built-up areas, with a view to reducing the growing incidence of breaking and entering, a factor to which the Attorney-General alluded in a reply just given?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to the Chief Secretary.

FAIRVIEW PARK SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Works ascertain what stage has been reached regarding the extension of the sewerage system into the Fairview Park area to sewer new subdivisions and to provide discharge points for common effluent schemes in the area which at present discharge into oxidation lagoons? The Minister will be aware that I have previously written to him on this subject, and he replied by letter on July 3 stating:

A long approach sewer, temporary pumping station, and rising main is required and this work is under construction. Some difficulty is being experienced because of the amount of rock excavation, but on present indications it is anticipated that the work will be completed in August, 1972, when it will be possible for the Tea Tree Gully council to connect into the sewerage system and eliminate the lagoons.

The Minister will be aware that a tragedy occurred last June in one of these oxidation ponds, a small child having drowned, and the elimination of these lagoons is therefore necessary as soon as possible.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will inquire and let the honourable member know.

SOUTH-EAST LAND TAX

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Works confer with the Minister of Lands regarding the deputation of landholders from the Padthaway-Keppoch area which waited on the Minister earlier this year with a view to considering a reassessment of the land tax applying to their properties? I understand that a deferment was granted until the end of August this year, and that before that date officers of the Valuation Department would visit the area to consider the arguments raised by the deputation. However, I understand that, because of the petrol shortage, officers of this department have been unable to attend to these arrangements and that, although the extension of time granted for payment has run out, no visit has been made by these officers. For these reasons, I ask whether the Minister will discuss with his colleague the question of having this arrangement and the deferment considered.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to do this, but it seems to me that the deputation should have met the Treasurer, because he is the Minister responsible for the Valuation Department.

DESERTED WIVES

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply to my question of August 30 about improvements in financial

assistance payments to deserted wives and single mothers with dependent children?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The improvements made in financial assistance payments by the Community Welfare Department to deserted wives and single mothers with dependent children are as follows:

- (1) The waiting period of up to six weeks for a deserted wife or single mother to receive payment at the higher Group A rates has been discontinued. As from September 1, 1972, applicants in these categories will be paid at the higher Group A rates (equivalent to Commonwealth pension rates) from the date they first apply, if they are eligible.
- (2) If a deserted wife or single mother has a dependent child under six years of age in her care a supplementary allowance of \$2 a week will be paid.
- (3) Single mothers with dependent children will be paid at the higher Group A rates irrespective of whether they are living at home with their parents or not.
- (4) Deserted wives and single mothers with children will be allowed to have liquid assets of up to \$500, without it affecting their eligibility for assistance.
- (5) Income up to the following amounts will be allowed without it reducing the amount of assistance the department can pay: a woman with one dependent child, up to \$10 a week; a woman with two dependent children, up to \$10 a week; a woman with three dependent children, up to \$12 a week; and a woman with four dependent children, up to \$16 a week, plus a further \$4 a week for each subsequent dependent child. The waiting period of six months for a deserted wife to become eligible for a Commonwealth pension remains unaltered.

SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. VENNING: Can the Treasurer say what has happened to the item of correspondence which passed between him and the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated concerning succession duties, and which the Treasurer said in this House on August 8 he would try to obtain for me so that I could peruse it? I had asked the Treasurer a question about succession duties, after the member for Gouger had asked the Treasurer whether he intended to introduce legislation to help people who were experienc-

ing financial difficulties because of succession duties. In his reply to the member for Gouger, the Treasurer said:

If the honourable member has special cases he wishes to put to me showing difficulties and anomalies, I shall be happy to examine them and to discuss them with him.

Following that reply I asked the Treasurer what additional assistance he had in mind to give these people other than what he had said previously about considering the waiving of interest on the overdue payment of State succession duties. I should like to know what happened to the item of correspondence the Treasurer said that he would procure for me, because in his reply to me on August 8 he said:

I think it would be useful to the honourable member if he was to see (I presume he has not seen) correspondence between the U.F. and G. and me on this matter. I understand he is a member of that organization so presumably he would have seen the correspondence.

Perhaps the Treasurer is unaware that there are 13,000 members of the U.F. and G., and that it is not possible for members willy-nilly to have access to correspondence that goes to and fro between the Treasurer and that organization.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I regret that I have not so far supplied the honourable member with a copy, but I will see to it that he gets it.

COMMUNITY WELFARE CENTRES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether the Community Welfare Department intends to set up a community welfare centre in the Barossa Valley? I believe that, under the terms of the Community Welfare Act, which Parliament passed some time ago, it is intended to set up community welfare centres. It has been suggested to me by residents, and one in particular from the Barossa Valley, that this would be an eminently suitable location, as this is the centre of a large population in this part of the State.

The Hon. L. J. KING: No final decisions have been made about the location of community welfare centres, except in three instances where immediate plans have been made. It is planned that about 20 community welfare centres throughout the State will be established in the reasonably immediate future: that is, within the next three years to five years. Certainly, a community welfare centre would be situated in a position where it could serve the needs of the residents of

the Barossa Valley, but I cannot say where it will be located. However, I will further consider the matter and consult with officers of my department to ascertain the present thinking of the department about the location of such a centre.

OVERLAND

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of July 19 about details of passengers carried on the Overland during 1971 and 1972?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As this reply is set out in a statistical table, I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

OVERLAND PASSENGER PATRONAGE

	Depart		Arrive	
	Adelaide		Adelaide	
	1971	1972	1971	1972
April	9,203	6,983	8,713	7,219
May	10,804	9,431	10,461	9,365
June	6,610	4,741	6,995	4,648
July	6,331	6,263	6,218	6,066

YORKE PENINSULA SCHOOLS

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question about Minlaton Primary School and Yorketown High School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Minlaton Primary School is among the considerable number of schools recommended for replacement, but it has not yet been possible to place it on the design list. In view of the number of schools already on that list, it is unlikely that Minlaton will be replaced for at least several years. Certainly, as soon as we are able to replace the school, we will do so. The provisional school-building programme provides for tenders to be called for Yorketown High School about the middle of 1973, and it is hoped that the new school will be available at the start of the first term in 1975. The Yorketown school project is being treated as a matter of urgency.

GLENELG TRAM

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport take action to have the Glenelg trams repainted, using a more imaginative colour scheme than the Victorian scheme of grey and red used at present? The only thing that a Victorian colour scheme has in common with this tram service is that the service terminates in Victoria Square.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not comment.

Mr. MATHWIN: I ask leave to explain my question. All four trams used yesterday were in bad need of repainting. I point out that two in particular (Nos. 365 and 366) have broken doors and rotting woodwork around the windows. These trams could be reclaimed and recycled, perhaps by the Minister of Environment and Conservation, then painted strong purple, as an alternative to the present colour scheme of an aluminium roof and body with a red plinth line. With terra cotta roof and the present battleship-grey body, they look something like a leftover from last week's cake stall.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting, and he does not have the leave of the House for his explanation.

Mr. MATHWIN: Mr. Speaker, I did ask leave to explain.

The SPEAKER: I called the honourable member to order, and he persisted in commenting. The honourable Minister of Roads and Transport.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Glenelg has paid little attention, if any, to at least three replies I have given in the House to, I think, the member for Hanson about the refurbishing of the Glenelg trams. I am pleased to see that the member for Hanson is acknowledging the fact that those replies have been given. Perhaps the member for Glenelg may care to check *Hansard* to see what was said on those occasions. In any case, I can tell him briefly that the Tramways Trust is engaged in a programme to refurbish the Glenelg tram fleet.

Mr. Millhouse: You've said—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not want to start entering into a discussion with the member for Glenelg about the colour scheme for the trams, nor do I want to discuss anything with the member for Mitcham, who continues to interject. In South Australia there has been established something of a tradition whereby each year the top of the West End Brewery is painted in the colours of the football premiers. If we followed that practice with regard to the trams, I am not sure what colour we should paint them. I think it is far better that we follow the practice that has been followed by the trust. I think that the refurbished trams are a credit to the trust. I say plainly that I would like to see the trams completely replaced. At the meeting of the Australian Transport Advisory Council, it was stated that the Commonwealth Government's own experts in the Bureau of Transport Economics had made out a strong case showing that

over \$500,000,000 must be spent on public transport within the next five years. Regrettably the Commonwealth Government is ignoring that advice, as it has ignored advice with regard to so many other important projects.

Mr. Mathwin: You're not suggesting that we should spend \$500,000,000 on the Glenelg trams?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must stop interjecting.

PETERBOROUGH COTTAGES

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say how many new railway cottages will be erected at Peterborough during this financial year? The following article appeared in Saturday's *Advertiser* under the heading "20 New Cottages":

Peterborough: The South Australian Government will spend \$210,000 this financial year to build 20 new South Australian cottages and improve others. This was announced by the Minister of Roads and Transport (Mr. Virgo) following a request by the Australian Railways Union for 30 new cottages to replace sub-standard dwellings.

On first reading the article, I was pleased for Peterborough because I thought that the 20 new cottages would be built there but, on reading the article again, I realized that the 20 new cottages were for the whole of the State.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As I do not have the list with me, I will obtain details of where these cottages are to be located and give the honourable member this information.

AGRICULTURE QUESTIONNAIRE

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he can explain the purpose of section I of a questionnaire recently circulated by officers of the Agriculture Department to farmers living in the Edillillie area? A few weeks ago, officers of the department called on some of the farmers in this area and gave to them an extremely comprehensive questionnaire, which I believe it took them about three hours to 3½ hours to fill in completely. Most of the questionnaire dealt with routine departmental matters relating to the soil, crops, stock, marketing, and so on, and there is no quarrel about these sections of the questionnaire. However, section I, which was the last section, caused much concern because of the personal nature of the questions. As an example, I will read parts of section I as follows:

1. How long has your family lived around this area?
2. Did you go to school in this area?

3. Have you brothers or married sisters living around or in the area?
4. Do you see a lot of (say, once a week)
 - (a) Your relations living in the area?
 - (b) School friends?
 - (c) Neighbours?
 - (e) Have you any close friends who live outside the area?
5. Which farmers in the area are worth having a yarn to?

Various matters are then referred to. The questionnaire continues:

5. (e) Do you in fact ever talk to the people you have mentioned about any of those problems?
- (g) Do you attend any functions or meetings regularly—say bowls, tennis, golf, Emergency Fire Services, United Farmers and Graziers, church, parents, and so on? (If church mentioned, ask which one.)

Several farmers objected to this part of the questionnaire, as they could not see what bearing it could possibly have on information required by the department about the area. A letter was sent to the Director of Agriculture voicing the disapproval of the farmers. Mr. Irving replied that all section I's that had been filled in would be returned and that no information provided therein would be extracted. However, the explanation given by the Director for the inclusion of this section did not fully satisfy the people concerned. Therefore, I ask the Minister to explain fully why such personal questions were included in an Agriculture Department questionnaire.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take the matter up with my colleague. I take it that it is not compulsory to answer any of the questions listed.

Mr. Carnie: Certainly not.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I just wanted to make the point that it was not compulsory to answer any question, but I will certainly check with my colleague on the reason for the questionnaire.

ILLEGAL OPAL MINING

Mr. GUNN: Has the Premier a reply to my question of August 31 concerning illegal opal mining?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Deputy Commissioner of Police has reported that the department recognizes that there are unusual features about the policing requirements of the Coober Pedy district. The needs of the district as a whole have been considered in reaching a decision to deploy additional men in the area. The police have performed and will continue to carry out patrols to suppress and detect illegal

mining as part of their normal duties. However, the vast area and difficulty of terrain do nothing to assist the success of police operations. The miners themselves must expect to provide some protection to exposed mines likely to contain valuable property. Increased surveillance will be possible when the police strength is increased and this will be effected as soon as a new house now nearing completion is available for occupation and new quarters for single men are erected, site works having commenced on September 5, 1972.

MURRAY BRIDGE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question concerning Murray Bridge Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Revised plans are almost complete and work will commence soon on detailed sketches for presentation to the Public Works Committee. A date cannot be stated at this stage for the commencement of the school. Consideration is being given to building it in stages as the project is a costly one. More definite information will be available in October.

ADVERTISING

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say why the Government will not place Government advertising with the publication *Origin*? The Premier (and no doubt the Minister of Community Welfare) is aware that this publication concentrates on matters concerning Aborigines. I notice that in the August issue of *Origin* a complaint is made on page 2 that the South Australian Government will not place advertising in that newspaper. The report is, in part, as follows:

An international firm of advertising consultants refused to "recommend" *Origin* to the South Australian Government as an advertising medium and an appeal to the Premier to override this decision brought the reply and a very weak excuse that, if he did, the Auditor-General might object to the expenditure of a paltry \$200.

The report then compares that figure with the \$10,000 paid out as the cost of legal expenses incurred by a union secretary in the recent Kangaroo Island dispute. This Government has, as its predecessor certainly had, a lively interest in Aboriginal affairs and in the encouragement of the pursuits of those also interested in these matters. Certainly, *Origin* is a newspaper that is worthy of support in this way, and I therefore put the question to the Premier as he has apparently been personally involved in the request for support.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The request related to the total advertising budget for the State which is prepared by officers of the Tourist Bureau. The budget for advertising was recommended after an examination of the areas from which we could get specific benefit from advertising and was specifically related to the market we were seeking to penetrate. *Origin*, as a newspaper, does not qualify in this area and any expenditure of money with *Origin* in those circumstances would have been simply a subsidy by the Government, obtaining no benefit whatever to the Government. It is not the policy of the Government to spend money in subsidizing a publication in that way, as other publications could then say that they, too, should have Government support because they were worthy, rather than on the ground that any benefit would be obtained from the advertising. That is the plain fact of the matter, and the kind of attack made in the newspaper has no basis whatever, as the honourable member must know.

Mr. Millhouse: I would not have asked the question if I did.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member can point to an instance in which, when he was Minister, he paid subsidies of this kind—

Mr. Millhouse: You're becoming defensive.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. If the honourable member can point to such an instance, I shall be interested to re-examine the matter.

WHYALLA ROAD

Mr. KENEALLY: In the temporary absence of the Minister of Roads and Transport, will the Minister of Environment and Conservation please give his colleague's reply to my recent question about work on a part of National Route No. 1?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Duplication is already planned for National Route No. 1 north of Adelaide as far as Two Wells, via Yorke Peninsula Main Road No. 6 and the proposed Virginia and Two Wells by-pass. In addition, duplication is proposed for a short section of Lincoln Highway Main Road No. 8 near Whyalla, which connects to National Route No. 1. On present indications of traffic growth, it is unlikely that a fully-duplicated route between Adelaide and Whyalla could be justified within 20 years, particularly in view of improvements to the basic two-lane facility that will be carried out in the meantime; for example, pavement widening and town by-passes at Snowtown and Crystal Brook. About 90 per cent of the

Adelaide-Whyalla route has a reserve width of 40 metres or more, allowing additional traffic lanes to be accommodated as required in the future.

FOOD POISONING

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Health to my question regarding inspections to prevent food poisoning?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague states that Health Inspectors of the Public Health Department and local authorities make regular inspections of food-handling premises throughout the State, and immediate action is taken to have any unsatisfactory conditions amended. All instances of food-borne infections reported are investigated to determine the cause of the infection and to ensure that suitable action is taken to prevent a recurrence. The few reports of food-borne infections would indicate that the situation in South Australia is, in general, satisfactory.

TEA TREE GULLY TRANSPORT

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of August 22 regarding facilities available for public transport between the Tea Tree Gully area and Port Adelaide?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There is no direct bus service between Tea Tree Gully and Port Adelaide, but a licensed industrial service is operated between Windsor Gardens and Port Adelaide in accordance with the route and time table shown on the schedules, which I will make available to the honourable member. In normal circumstances, patronage on this service is poor, and the available surplus capacity was adequate for the additional patronage experienced during the period of petrol shortage. No complaints concerning the operation of this service or requests for an improved service were received by the Municipal Tramways Trust or the licensee during this period.

METRICATION

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question about the conversion of motor vehicle speeds from miles an hour to kilometres an hour and also about the changeover in respect of vehicles produced in Australia or imported?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: A decision has been reached that Australia will adopt kilometres an hour as the unit of speed measurement. Arrangements are being made to con-

vert during July, 1974, all relevant road signs to show kilometres an hour. The Australian Transport Advisory Council agreed that the present 35 m.p.m. speed in built-up areas should convert to 60 km/h (equivalent to about 37 m.p.h.) and that the present 60 m.p.h. speed limit outside built-up areas should convert to 100 km/h (equivalent to 62 m.p.h.). A statement on this matter in the press about a week ago attributed to me referred to conversion from 65 m.p.h. to 100 km/h. This was an error. The correct figure is 60 m.p.h., which is the *prima facie* speed limit in South Australia. The South Australian Road Traffic Act makes no provision for the mandatory fitting of speedometers. However, I expect that in due course the Australian Transport Advisory Council will fix a date at which all new vehicles will be required to have a speedometer calibrated in km/h. No doubt, conversion dial faces showing km/h will also be available before that date for those vehicles with speedometers calibrated in miles an hour. In general, all fully-imported vehicles must comply with Australian design rule standards, but there is provision for certain exemptions in specific cases.

HOSPITAL FEES

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Premier a reply from the Minister of Health to my question regarding a fee being charged in respect of non-public patients in public hospitals?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The matter was not discussed departmentally until yesterday. A decision cannot be made until information is obtained. A meeting was held yesterday to discuss service charges, but the Government has not yet had a report on the matter.

MINING ACT

Mr. GUNN: Can the Premier say how the Government or the Mines Department intends to implement the provisions of the Mining Act in relation to the back-filling of bulldozed cuts? During the weekend I was at Coober Pedy, where several constituents told me they were confused because one or two of them had been told that if they were conducting mining operations in certain areas they would be forced to back-fill whilst others, in a different part of the field, would not be made to observe the provisions of the Act.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know off-hand, but I will get a report for the honourable member.

ABANDONED MOTOR CARS

Mr. EVANS: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about abandoned motor vehicles?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Attorney-General states that he has had the honourable member's question examined by the Solicitor-General, who advises that the proposed charge would constitute an excise duty, the power to impose which is denied to the States by virtue of section 90 of the Commonwealth Constitution.

MAFIA

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about the Mafia?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary states that there is a continuous exchange of information with the police in the Commonwealth and the other States on all criminal activities. No advice received from the Commonwealth police to date has necessitated investigating Mafia activities in this State.

MOUNT GAMBIER INTERSECTION

Mr. BURDON: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport ask the Road Traffic Board to investigate the desirability of having "stop" signs erected at the intersection of Ferra's Street and Lake Terrace, Mount Gambier? Following a serious accident at this intersection yesterday, I have been told that last year there was one fatal accident and seven other accidents at the intersection and there have been five accidents this year. I think this indicates that some action is necessary. During the past year or so "stop" signs have been erected at other intersections in Mount Gambier, and I believe they have had a beneficial effect. I request the Minister to ask the Road Traffic Board to investigate this matter, bearing in mind the desirability of doing something to lessen accidents, particularly fatal ones.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to consider the matter.

QUORN SCHOOL

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to a question I asked recently regarding craft facilities at the Quorn Area School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Headmaster has made certain proposals concerning the overall development of the secondary section of the school, including, of course, craft areas. These proposals are currently being investigated. At this time it is not possible to give any firm indication of the likely dates when new craft buildings can be placed on a

tender call programme. In the interim period, however, design work will proceed with a view to providing the most economical and effective answer to the question relating to the craft needs of the Quorn Area School.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE ACT

Mr. BECKER: Does the Minister of Environment and Conservation intend to introduce a Bill to amend the National Parks and Wildlife Act? The South Australian Field and Game Association Incorporated wrote to all members on April 7 seeking their support regarding amendments to sections 30 and 31 to give game reserves the same security of tenure as national parks under sections 26, 27, 28 and 29 respectively. It also requested an amendment to the fifth schedule regarding Woolenook Bend Game Reserve, hundred of Murtho, section 42. Does the Minister intend to take action as requested by the association?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I do not intend to do that. The submissions referred to were made to the Government and to members of both Houses during the debate on the National Parks and Wildlife Bill earlier this year. For the reasons that were set out by me during that debate I believe there is no need for the amendments suggested.

OPEN-UNIT TEACHING

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question on open-unit teaching?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The evaluation to which Mrs. Thatcher referred was not made in connection with the teaching of reading in open-space areas or the usual self-contained classroom. It was carried out by the National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales. Among some of the findings were that the reading standards of children aged seven to 11 years were generally better in the bigger schools in the better-class urban areas and that schools which used a formal, systematic approach to reading in the reception class, basing their instruction on a primer, seemed to produce better readers than the more permissive infants schools; and schools which undertook phonic instruction with five-year-olds produced better results, at least with children of average and just below average ability.

The main field work in this study was completed in 1964, before much of the development in open-space had taken place. There is a tendency to refer to open-space as a method

of teaching. Open-space is a method of building designed to allow flexibility in organization and methods of teaching. It is possible to use the formalized teaching of reading mentioned in the survey, or informal methods based on groups or an individualized approach. It should also be kept in mind that the philosophy behind open-space in South Australia is different from that in the United Kingdom, where the demand came for special purpose areas as adjuncts to the normal classroom, and the economic solution resulted in shared areas common to a number of semi-closed class home stations. Obviously, evaluation of open-space and the teaching carried out in it can cover a wide area. Not only should there be evaluation of subjects such as reading but there also needs to be evaluation of social development, attitudes, etc. The Evelyn Low School, which was one of the early schools with open-space in England, has had some proper evaluation that indicated maintenance of standards in reading or mathematics and some gains in social development.

Mr. Rowley Johns, Principal Schools Architect, recently spent some time in Canada, where there has been a general move towards open-space and where there has been quite a deal of evaluation. Reading and mathematics in such schools have been found to be at least as good as in other schools, and there are gains in attitudes and social development. It is clear that what is most important to achievement is the method used and above all the quality of the teaching. The implications of the survey have been critically examined in South Australia.

WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he intends this session to bring down legislation that will enable wheat quotas to be negotiated? I understand that Victoria has already legislation concerning this matter, and I believe that Western Australia is considering introducing legislation with regard to negotiating either the lease or the sale of quotas for a year or, as it were, for a lifetime. I am wondering whether, during this session, the Minister intends to implement such a system in South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I may be wrong but, if my memory serves me correctly, I think a reply has already been given recently, during this session, to a similar question, and I think that reply was "No". However, I will check that. It is my personal belief that the necessity for wheat quotas has disappeared and that quotas should be lifted altogether.

GLADSTONE ROAD

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the Gladstone to Port Pirie road?

Mr. Clark: Ask him what he did about the Liberal Movement member in his district!

Mr. Venning: We took care of him!

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not a Party meeting.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Of the six fatal accidents that have occurred this year on the Gladstone to Port Pirie road (I do not think any of them involved Liberal Movement members), two were due to motorists failing to give way, two to excessive speed, one to dangerous driving whilst overtaking, and another involved a person suspected of being in a "drag race". It is considered that the condition of the road did not contribute to these accidents.

SCHOOL TRANSPORT

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I recently asked about the operating costs of school buses?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The latest figures available are for 1970-71. In that year, contract and subsidized school buses travelled 18,658 miles a day at an average cost of 26.1c a mile. Departmental buses travelled 19,922 miles a day at an average cost of 24.4c a mile. These are purely statistical averages based on overall costs of the two types of service and are of little value for comparison purposes, in view of the different circumstances connected with each service. The mileage rates paid to contractors vary considerably, for the following reasons:

- (1) original rate tendered for service and increases subsequently applied for;
- (2) standard of bus supplied, that is, age, condition and price paid;
- (3) daily mileage, that is, low (say, 32 miles a day) or high (say, 90 miles a day);
- (4) conditions of roads traversed; and
- (5) isolation and resulting higher cost of petrol, maintenance and repairs.

WITNESS ROOMS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked on August 17 last about heating in witness rooms and general facilities?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Arrangements are in hand to provide heating in the two witness rooms which serve courtroom No. 11

(formerly No. 1 local court), and to upgrade the existing seating in those rooms. Similar action is contemplated in respect of other unheated witness rooms serving courts in the Victoria Square area. Requests for heating of witness rooms elsewhere in the metropolitan area and in country areas will be considered on an individual basis.

TORRENS RIVER POLLUTION

Mr. CUMBE: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Health to my recent question about pollution of the Torrens River?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Minister of Health states that the section of the river referred to has been tested periodically by the local authorities, the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Public Health Department. It is a relatively static body of water which is subjected to varying levels of pollution from time to time from a number of sources. For these reasons, the Public Health Department has for years advised against swimming in the river.

MORPHETTVILLE PARK SCHOOL

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Education inquire of or confer with those people responsible for the long delay in completing the resealing of the yard at the Morphettville Park Primary School? This work was started on May 15 and was nearly completed by the end of May except that the people concerned ran into some trouble regarding water. The area in question is about 100 sq. ft. and is adjacent to the timber classrooms in the schoolyard. I point out that it is now September and, when I called at the school about six weeks ago, I was told that the matter would be attended to in a short time. When I again called at the school recently, I found that, following recent rains, much water was lying about in the area and that cleaners, as well as teachers and parents, were concerned about the problem of stagnant water and the smells emanating therefrom.

Mr. Jennings: How would it smell if you weren't there?

Mr. MATHWIN: I could smell it from here.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will look into the matter for the honourable member and obtain a report as soon as possible.

CRIME

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Chief Secretary to the question I asked on August 24 about the increased crime rate as a result of drug dependence?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary states that the relationship of drug dependence to crime incidence has been noted in certain cases of serious crime, but at this time statistics are not maintained and the total extent of the relationship is not known.

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Attorney-General say why statistics relating to the incidence of drug dependency and crime incidence are not kept at present? Will he ensure that the keeping of such statistics is instituted urgently? When does he expect that the total extent of this relationship will be known? I point out that this is a serious matter. It is well recognized that the incidence of drug dependency and crime go hand in hand. There will be disquiet in the community that steps have not been taken before to keep these most important statistics.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to the Chief Secretary and get a reply.

WATERSHED REGULATIONS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Works say whether the Engineering and Water Supply Department intends to tighten up the provisions relating to zone 2 regulations applying to watersheds? I have been approached by several residents concerning this matter and, in this case, by someone in the Birdwood and Mount Pleasant area who, in company with many other people living in zone 2 watershed areas, is concerned about the possibility that some of the zone 1 regulations will eventually come into force in respect of zone 2 areas. Without canvassing this matter any further, I ask the Minister whether it is intended, first, to vary the boundaries of the zones and, secondly, to tighten up the regulations regarding zone 2 areas.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I have had no report regarding this matter from any of my officers or from the Engineer-in-Chief, I must say at this stage that the answer is "No", and that there is no such intention. However, I will inquire whether the department is contemplating any recommendations to be made to me. To my knowledge, no recommendations have been made but I will check that. If any recommendations have been made, the final decision, of course, will rest with me.

FAMILY PLANNING

Mr. EVANS: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Chief Secretary to my question of August 9 about the Government's plans

to help establish family planning clinics throughout the State?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary states that, in addition to the increased financial assistance support to which he has already referred the Government intends to support further expansion of voluntary family planning services, and to assist them with closer liaison by officers of the Public Health Department.

SUBDIVISIONS

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether the Government intends to alter the present law concerning 20-acre subdivisions in the Hills watershed area? Rumours have been circulating that surveyors are telling land-owners that changes to 70 acres will be made, and I should like the Minister to comment.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Amendments to the Planning and Development Act to be placed before the House soon will make the situation clear.

RURAL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Acting Minister of Lands to my question of August 8 about the use of funds, obtained under the Commonwealth rural employment relief grant, for retraining purposes?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that the basic requirement of the Commonwealth in providing funds to the State under the scheme has been to create employment opportunities for those unable to obtain a job in the non-metropolitan areas of the State, or, in other words, to provide jobs for the unemployed. In consequence, it is not possible to use portion of the funds specifically for training purposes, particularly when it is realized that several retraining schemes are provided by the Commonwealth at present.

Concerning the retention, or permanent employment, of those at present engaged under the scheme, it must be realized that it is operative for a relatively short period only, and is designed to provide alternative, short-term employment to assist as many people as possible whilst they search for a more permanent position. As a matter of interest, many of those who have been employed under the scheme have attained new skills: for example, the competent completion of kerbing and water tabling, taking of elementary levels, operation of council plant, semi-skilled construction techniques, etc. This has been

possible, as most employees under the scheme have been supervised by either a tradesman or an experienced council employee.

BREAD

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Health to my question of August 30 about wrapping unsliced bread with tissue paper?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Minister of Health states that local authorities can compulsorily require the wrapping of bread sold in their areas by making a by-law under section 667 (7a) of the Local Government Act, and some country councils did, in fact, make by-laws on this matter some 20 years ago. Since then there has been a steady increase in the amount of bread sliced and wrapped in waxed paper wrapping. The price margin for wrapping bread, as fixed by the Prices Commissioner at present, is mostly 3c a loaf, with the margin being 2c a loaf in general country areas. It is estimated that at present about 60 per cent of bread sold is sliced and wrapped.

Requests have been made from time to time by various organizations of consumers that all bread should be wrapped. To date these requests have not been acceded to on a State-wide basis, because it has not been shown that bread is a factor in the transmission of food-borne infections and intoxications, because of heat treatment received during baking, and that the crust is an unsuitable medium for the growth of bacteria. The adoption of compulsory wrapping of bread depends on the public demand for this and also a willingness to accept the extra cost of wrapping.

PETROL SHORTAGE

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about insufficient supplies of petrol being available in the northern part of the State to cater for tourists?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member asked his question on August 31, and the reply relates to conditions at that time. No special effort is being made by oil companies to divert petrol from the city storages to the country to cater for tourists. Supplies in the country are proportionally better than in the metropolitan area, because tankers can off-load directly at Port Lincoln and Port Pirie. The Government is doing all in its power to ensure that the petrol stocks in all areas of the State are evenly distributed and that the public is kept informed of the situation. Tourists who wish to proceed to

the Flinders Range area are advised to do so with caution, and to ensure their petrol supplies are adequate.

MAIN ROAD No. 44

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of August 24 about plans for sealing Main Road No. 44?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Tumby Bay to Cummins section of Bratten Way Main Road No. 44 has, for the greater part of its length, been realigned and constructed to an open surface sub-base standard. It requires the placing of a base course before the road can be sealed. Until sufficient finance can be allocated to complete the base and sealing, traffic must continue to use the open surface road, with some resulting deterioration of the road surface. This is unavoidable in the circumstances. No indication can be given at this stage as to when sufficient funds can be allocated to complete the construction and sealing of this road.

SERVICE STATIONS

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Works obtain from the Acting Minister of Lands a report on the feasibility of providing land for service station proprietors whose businesses are being by-passed by the rerouting of the Eyre Highway? Following the announcement by the Minister of Roads and Transport that the Eyre Highway would be rerouted, one service station proprietor that I know of has had his business completely by-passed, and he has asked whether it would be possible to have about 10 acres made available so that he could start a new business.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a report from my colleague.

SOLDIER SETTLERS

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Works obtained from the Acting Minister of Repatriation a reply to my question of August 29 about the assistance to be given to soldier settlers under the policy announced recently by the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that, since he replied to a question asked in another place on August 24, further information has come to hand. Recently the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry introduced a Bill, which provides for an increase in the sum allocated for war service land settlement purposes in South Australia of \$2,500,000 compared to the levels that have ruled over the past few years. When introducing the Bill, the

Minister stated that the increase would be made available for two broad purposes.

First, for a Kangaroo Island improvement programme comprising, initially, scientific investigation, partial rental remission, credit for fodder conservation facilities, recasting of settlers' accounts in appropriate cases, and provision to pay out stock mortgages for credit-worthy settlers. The Acting Minister of Repatriation does not yet have specific details of this programme, which results from a joint Commonwealth-State investigation into the problems of Kangaroo Island war service settlers made at the request of the State. The investigation confirmed the State's view that these settlers have encountered special problems, which have contributed to their financial difficulties.

South Australia has already taken action to increase research activities financed from State resources supplemented by money from the Commonwealth extension services grant. Research has centred on a potentially highly significant practical method to overcome ewe infertility and high mortality in lambs. Secondly, the provision to enable creditworthy settlers to be given access to departmental finance will also apply to soldier settlers on pastoral holdings elsewhere in South Australia. War service settlers holding single-unit blocks will therefore be eligible to apply for their stock mortgages to be taken over by the Lands Department. The number of stock mortgages that can be taken over will be related, of course, to the total funds available and the extent of settlers' indebtedness.

DANGEROUS DRUGS ACT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked some time ago about section 14(7) of the Dangerous Drugs Act?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Minister of Health states that the certificate of the analyst which was tendered in the case referred to by the member for Mitcham was drawn in accordance with the relevant regulations. As the honourable member has implied, there are no regulations under the Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act which specifically prescribe the manner in which a drug or substance is to be submitted to the analyst. The Crown Solicitor has advised that, although proof that a substance which was tendered in evidence is a drug to which the Act applies may be given under the law as it stands at present, appropriate amendments to section 14(7) and the regulations would render the evidentiary

provisions of section 14(7) more effective. Consideration is being given to appropriate amendments being made.

PRIVATE BUSES

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of August 10 about the routes taken by private buses and the convenience of constituents of mine, particularly those living in Walkerville?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The licensed bus service which proceeds along Frome Road serves suburbs in the Tea Tree Gully area where no other form of public transport is available. To ensure that an adequate standard of service is maintained to and from the outlying areas, this bus service operates express between Gilles Plains and Adelaide and a Municipal Tramways Trust service is operated between these points. It would be impracticable to permit certain classes of passenger, such as nurses and other employees at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, to travel by the licensed service within the restricted area and to preclude other passengers from making similar journeys. The removal of travel restrictions on this service altogether would undoubtedly result in short-distance riders causing overcrowding on the private buses to the extent that long-distance travellers from the Tea Tree Gully area could be precluded from using this service which is specifically provided for their convenience. Furthermore, the number of additional stops which buses would be required to make would increase journey times and, in general, the standard of service could be expected to deteriorate.

In addition, there would be some transference of patronage from the Tramways Trust service to the licensed service and, apart from loss of revenue by the Tramways Trust, it could become necessary, because of reduced patronage, to widen bus frequencies on the trust's service. Such an arrangement, therefore, could result in the present standard of service being worsened in respect of both the trust and the licensed service, leading to a possible decline in public transport patronage in these areas. In an effort to assist the nurses to whom the honourable member refers, the possibility of rerouting, via Frome Road, of either of the two trust services which are now operated through Walkerville to Adelaide, via King William Road, has been thoroughly examined. However, it is considered that such rerouting would not be warranted in view of difficulties associated with longer journey times, the provision of an additional

bus and driver, traffic congestion, and space for bus zones. The present route suits the convenience of the majority of passengers using this service and, in the circumstances, a change of route is considered to be undesirable.

FARM SERVICE INDUSTRIES

Mr. VENNING: Will the Premier inquire into the possibility of giving some type of relief to farm service industries, which are suffering from the effects of the earlier dry season and of the general rural recession? At a committee meeting of the Rocky River District a few weeks ago, a general resolution was passed asking that the Government investigate the possibility of giving some assistance to these country industries. Over a period, they are the life-blood of our country towns. Because of the inability of clients to pay their accounts, these industries are having much difficulty in weathering the storm. The resolution of our district meeting was that the Premier be asked whether some financial assistance could not be given to these industries to keep them solvent.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will examine the honourable member's proposition and bring down a full reply.

TENDERING

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about tenders for earth-moving equipment to be used on the South-Eastern Freeway and other works?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Highways Department intends to call tenders for the hire of earth-moving equipment for the South-Eastern Freeway soon. As I have told the honourable member previously, this is a continuing process, as the equipment is hired for a specified number of hours each year, or as warrant demands. The specification for this work will not preclude South Australian contractors from tendering. The acceptance of any tender depends on compliance with the specification or an alternative which can be proved to be economical as well as suitable for the work required. A simple "per cubic yard" basis is not suitable for large earth-moving projects. Consideration must be given to other factors such as time, the space which may be available in which to operate, cycle times, and the balance of associated equipment that is necessary to arrive at a true economic and engineering evaluation.

MATTNER ROAD

Mr. McANANEY: I refer the Minister of Works to the condition of Mattner Road,

Balhannah, which is used by contractors who cart sand for use in work on the Engineering and Water Supply Department main. Considerable damage has been done to the road, and several accidents have occurred. When I spoke to the department some time ago about the matter, a grader was used on this stretch of road. Although this made its condition better for a day or two, the road is now again in a dangerous state. Will the Minister have the department grade the road regularly, and repair bad patches, so that it may be kept in a satisfactory state?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the honourable member knows, the Engineering and Water Supply Department is most efficient and is always ready and willing to co-operate with local authorities, especially in cases where the department is using a road excessively and where, because of that use, the condition of the road has deteriorated. I will ask the Director and Engineer-in-Chief to have the matter examined to see whether or not the honourable member's request for regular grading (and I think this is a reasonable request) can be acceded to by officers of the department in due course. As I know the honourable member is concerned for the safety of his constituents who use this road, I will ask that investigations be carried out as promptly as possible, as I think it is only right and proper that this should be done.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Why has it not been possible before September 12, 1972, to make available to members the report of the Auditor-General?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Auditor-General reports:

It has not been possible to make my report available to members before September 12, 1972, because some of the material for inclusion in the report will not be in the hands of the Government Printer until September 1. Section 39 of the Audit Act requires me to transmit my report to the President of the Legislative Council and to the Speaker of the House of Assembly, and the earliest date on which that can be done is September 12, when Parliament resumes. After the close of the financial year a considerable amount of work is necessary in the various departments and statutory bodies to prepare financial statements for submission to me. My officers are then required to examine those statements to enable me to certify them. Further time is then required to prepare comments on those statements. The printing of the report of over 300 pages also imposes a heavy load on the Government Printer, particularly at this time of the year when priority must be given to the Budget papers.

A search of Parliamentary records over the last 20 years has revealed that the Auditor-General's Report was not available to members on the day the Budget was introduced during any of the years of the Hall Government or in most of the years of the Playford Government during that period.

PLACES OF PUBLIC ENTERTAINMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Places of Public Entertainment Act, 1913-1972. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time. Restrictions are placed on Sunday entertainments by section 20 of the principal Act. Unless the consent of the Minister has been obtained, it is an offence under subsection (5) of that section to screen a film or present a theatrical performance in a place of public entertainment between the hours of 6 p.m. and 8 p.m. on a Sunday. Subsection (5) of section 20 was enacted in 1967. Since its enactment, there has been general acceptance by the public of Sunday entertainment in a variety of forms. Many cinema proprietors screen films on Sunday evenings, and some, with permission granted under the principal Act, commence screening before 8 p.m. Theatrical performances, dances, cabarets and other entertainments are also provided for the public on Sunday evenings. However, only film screenings and theatrical performances are subject to restriction between the hours of 6 p.m. and 8 p.m. In these circumstances, no useful purpose appears to be served by section 20 (5). Church attendance is unlikely to be affected by its repeal. The amendment will remove an inconsistency in the present law and will be of benefit to the public and to theatre proprietors and staff. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 2 repeals subsection (5) of section 20. Thus, the restriction on cinematographic entertainments and theatrical performances between the hours of 6 p.m. and 8 p.m. on Sundays is removed.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

JUVENILE COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It gives effect to a recommendation concerning the minimum age of criminal responsibility which was made at the recent conference of Australasian child welfare Ministers. It was resolved by the conference that the age at which a child can incur criminal liability be raised from eight years to 10 years. The raising of the age limit means that children between the ages of eight and 10 can be charged only with being neglected or uncontrolled or as being habitual truants. Figures reveal that prosecutions in the Adelaide Juvenile Court rise in proportion to increase in age. Very few children between eight and 10 have been charged with criminal offences in the last few years. In the 11 months from July 1, 1971, to May 30 this year, there were 3,659 prosecutions, of which 67 concerned children between eight and 10. In the year beginning July 1, 1970, there were 58 prosecutions in this age group out of a total of 3,117. Therefore, numbers in this group appear to remain at a low level that is fairly static. Where these children are alleged to have committed acts of a criminal nature, the matter may be dealt with by discussions between the police, welfare officers and the parents. This is a practice already in frequent use as an alternative to formal proceedings. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 5 of the principal Act. In the definition of the Community Welfare Act it is incorrectly cited as having been passed in 1971; this is amended to 1972. Clause 4 amends section 69 of the principal Act. The age of criminal responsibility is raised from eight years to 10 years.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 31. Page 1180.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I do not think that any member would dispute that, collectively, the Loan Estimates, the Budget and the Auditor-General's Report are the most important annual State documents. Notwithstanding the Premier's comment a few minutes ago in reply to a question by the member for Mitcham that it has not been the practice to make the Auditor-General's Report available to the House in advance of the debate on this Bill, I believe a sound reason exists why some alteration to this practice should be effected by the Government, regard-

less of its political colour. As I was handed the Auditor-General's Report, which deals with the State's finances for the year 1971-72, only this afternoon, I have had no opportunity to consider in depth the matters referred to by the Auditor-General or even to consider in a cursory manner any of the highlights he made. I accept that each of these documents stands on its own, but all three documents must be considered in concert if one is to gain the maximum benefit for the people one represents. It is no credit to the Government that it has not seen fit to alter the practice, even though it has been the normal practice for some years.

I believe that the Budget document handed down by the Treasurer is a clear exercise in deception. It is almost successful in its attempt to hide from the public the full detail of the increased taxation that will be taken from the people of this State during the present financial year. The apparent generosity of the present Government to the people of this State in holding out that the Government has not increased taxation to any marked degree is merely sleight of hand because, although on the one hand we have had no major taxation increases (and I do not deny that), on the other hand we see that in the documents presented to this House there is to be an increase in revenue of \$54,000,000, much of which is obtained from increased taxation from the people of South Australia. The Budget is weighted by design to make this Government appear to be a public benefactor considerate of the needs of the community, but when one looks into this document one clearly sees that the reason why the Government has not had to increase tax by \$1,000,000 here, \$500,000 there and \$250,000 elsewhere is that it has already undertaken the necessary exercises in the preceding financial year, the full effect of which will be felt in the current year. The Government will be obtaining the full effects of the pay-roll tax which it received from the Commonwealth Government on a previous occasion. When the State took over that tax the rate was 2½ per cent, but that was immediately increased by the Government to 3½ per cent.

The Hon. L. J. King: And by every other Government.

Dr. EASTICK: I do not deny that, but there was an immediate increase from the 2½ per cent to 3½ per cent. The increase this year is worth an additional \$10,000,000 to the State, and the total income from this area alone is expected to be about \$34,000,000.

In 1971-72 the income obtained during that part of the year when the tax applied was about \$24,000,000. This information has not been made clear to the people of this State, and it has certainly not been made clear in the Budget document, which leads the people to believe that this Government has been able to avoid increasing taxation merely by good management rather than by the carry-over of the massive tax slug handed down in the two preceding Budgets.

Close scrutiny of the Budget reveals for the first time public acknowledgment of the considerable help given by the Commonwealth Government not only to the States generally but to this State specifically. This increased Commonwealth aid has come in the form of new deals and formulas as outlined in the Budget papers. The statement also shows that South Australia has been in receipt of supplementary grants: I refer especially to those grants announced after the mid-term Premiers' Conference in 1972. South Australia has received special purpose grants and other special grants which have included completion payments. In recent weeks it has been announced that \$21,000,000 is being made available to this State (\$7,500,000 being a completion grant for 1970-71 and \$13,500,000 being the advance for the financial year 1972-73). However, it is interesting to note, regarding the increased sums that will undoubtedly be made available by the Commonwealth to this State, that no comment has been made on the amount that can be expected as a completion payment for the financial year 1971-72.

Comment is made about an advance of about \$7,000,000 to this State for 1971-72 and of \$13,500,000 for 1972-73, and about the completion payment of \$7,500,000 for 1970-71, but nowhere in the statement is there any suggestion of the amount that will be paid as a completion grant for 1971-72. Although I would be happy to accept that it is impossible to state specifically what that amount would be, I believe that, in line with other announcements made by the Commonwealth and with the funds that have already been advanced to this State in the last two years, it would be reasonable to assume that some millions of dollars will come forward as a completion grant for 1971-72. Has the purchasing power of that amount been earmarked and hidden away to appear later as a special election project? Can the Treasurer say that no project has been hidden away for subsequent announcement at an opportune time for his Government regarding these funds? In acknowledg-

ing the benefits to this State of the additional Commonwealth funds, the Treasurer has made the following statements:

Again the Commonwealth was convinced of the genuineness and urgency of State submissions . . . should be supplemented by additional general purpose grants.

He also said:

We have seen a continuing search for solutions to the problems of Commonwealth-State financial aid . . .

I believe that in those words there is an acknowledgment that a genuine and reasonable attitude was expressed by the Commonwealth at the conference table with the Premiers and that we in this State have seen (as have the other States) the advantage of the responsible and sensible approach to the Commonwealth-State financial relationship. It is also interesting to note that there has been an effective reduction in interest rates applying to the Commonwealth-State relationship. I refer to the final paragraph under the heading "Special Acts" of the Treasurer's financial statement, as follows:

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 of 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.

I highlight that comment, because once more we have an acknowledgment that I believe it is necessary to pinpoint: the Commonwealth Government's attitude to the States has been a responsible one and, indeed, has been to the advantage of the States, and particularly to South Australia.

Mr. Venning: They don't recognize it as such, do they?

Dr. EASTICK: They are starting to, and one wonders what is the reason for this changed attitude, which has been seen this session in the Governor's Speech, in the Loan Estimates and again now in the Budget. The temper of the Budget statement changes from paragraph to paragraph. In some instances consideration is given to extra pay-days, to departmental reorganizations, and to expected wage and salary rises, yet in other areas there are no such adjustments. It becomes impossible for one to relate clearly the effect of the various measures and payments outlined in the Budget in order to obtain a clear and positive percentage basis consideration as at

June 30, 1972, and, therefore, to be able to relate this to the potential situation during the whole of the 1972-73 financial year. For instance, it was stated that, because of the special circumstances of the revaluation that occurred, there was a short-fall of \$268,000 below the estimated receipts from land tax for 1971-72. This short-fall has been referred to, however; other short-falls have not been considered in other areas of the Budget.

One asks what other parts of the report submitted to this Parliament vary with fact because short-fall considerations were not presented to this Parliament. The Treasurer on many occasions, and certainly in this debate, has placed considerable store on the increased facilities available to the public. For example, in his financial statement he said:

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.

He then said:

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.

Certainly, the people of South Australia will acknowledge that this Government has helped itself to the public purse by way of the massive increases in taxation which it has imposed on the people of this State. I do not think a truer comment was made than that containing the two words "helped itself", because most certainly the Government has done so.

Even though the Treasurer saw fit earlier in his term of office to forward to unions a document indicating that he would prune the tall poppies and give the benefits of that pruning to the people in the community who were of lesser financial means, one has only to look at the effect of the taxation measures introduced by the Government to know full well that the effect has been felt by everyone in the community, not the least of them being people in necessitous circumstances. The fact that there has been an increase in water rates, in the charge for excess water, and in this financial year an increase in the minimum rate that applies to both water and sewerage, and that there have been increases in electricity charges, motor vehicle registration fees, stamp duties and many other spheres, clearly indi-

cates to the people of this State, and will continue to do so, that there is not one person in the community who is not seriously affected by the measures introduced by the present Government.

The Treasurer, when he went to the Premiers' Conference in June, said publicly that he had raised an additional \$30,000,000 in taxation from the people of this State. That sum did not include the over-subscription or over-collection effected by measures introduced into this House. But for the vigilance of Opposition members, both here and in another place, the sum obtained would have been considerably greater than it was. One can refer to two areas in which this was so. I refer, first, to rural land tax. Opposition members indicated clearly to the Government that its assumption on the valuation was incorrect and that there would be an over-production of taxation. The Government had to return to this House and set in motion a series of events that corrected the situation and pruned by \$250,000 to \$280,000 the sum to be extracted from the rural community for land tax.

Secondly, those of us who care to recall the discussion that took place regarding certain stamp duties legislation and the specific effect on some motor vehicle transactions, and certainly on land transfers, will know that, as a result of a conference between the two Houses and the concessions that were allowed by the Treasurer after discussions with Treasury officials, \$400,000 was pruned from the income to be derived from the legislation, which would have been an additional burden on the people of this State. The Budget indicates clearly, particularly at page 11, other over-payments and over-production that have occurred during the 1971-72 financial year. We find there a list of the receipts, and in taxation measures alone there was an above-estimate collection of \$957,000, and an over-production of \$1,256,000 on business undertakings under the heading "Public Works and Services". On recovery of debt services \$1,336,000 above estimate was collected, and on other charges relating to public works and services \$1,128,000 above estimate was collected. Territorial receipts were \$79,000 above estimate, and Commonwealth finance was \$3,867,000 above estimate, making an overall total of \$8,623,000 above estimate. That is not the whole picture, because the Budget document shows that the \$268,000 that I have already mentioned, being under-production by land tax, is still a charge to be

recovered by the State, and surely that figure can be added to the over-production of taxation for 1971-72.

Stamp duties yielded about \$901,000 more than had been estimated would be made available when legislation was presented to the House. There has been an increase of \$109,000 through additional betting tax. Whilst these figures could be added, there has been a dilution of the overall figure because of a decrease of \$764,000 below the estimate in respect of pay-roll tax. In other words, over and above these over-productions, and offset against the under-production of pay-roll tax, which will not be a feature in the coming financial year, we still show a marked increase in taxation alone of an over-production of \$957,000. I repeat what I have said publicly many times, namely, that I consider that the measures that the present Government has introduced have been an over-taxation of the people of the State and a situation to which the people will have due regard during the election campaign.

I shall now make a more detailed examination of the accounts, although not such a detailed examination as they will receive when we are considering the lines. In the section of the document dealing with estimates of receipts, there is additional taxation of \$15,500,000, which is an increase of 16.8 per cent in the taxation imposed on the people of this State for 1972-73. That hardly seems to fit in with how the Government has promoted the document earlier or with the Government's statement that it was looking to the interests of the people and was a kind of Father Christmas.

There is additional taxation of \$15,500,000, and this is as a result of the \$10,000,000 that I have mentioned for the full year of activity in the pay-roll tax area, the increase to be effected by the impact of earlier taxation measures (some of which I have referred to), and administrative charge increases. Notice of some of these administrative charge increases has been given, particularly the Engineering and Water Supply Department charges, and alterations come to mind. Again, there is to be increased revenue from the law courts of no less than 300 per cent. There is to be an increase in the public health returns from \$12,426 to \$21,500, an increase of 73 per cent. The Transport Control Board contribution is expected to increase from \$39,694 to \$45,000, an increase of 13.4 per cent.

We see in many other areas an increase in production and, because many of the measures can be changed by regulation, before the end

of the year there could be a large increase in many other fields. Also, the increase in receipts from the Commonwealth Government is substantial. There will be an increase of 14.8 per cent by way of additional tax grant and there is an increase of 50 per cent in the amount made available to reduce or improve the debt of the State.

There are many other areas where supplementary amounts have been announced by the Commonwealth Government and acknowledged by this State Government. An amount of about \$1,000,000 comes to mind. That was made available in December last year specifically for high schools. In February a special grant of over \$4,000,000 was made available, and the details of that grant are given in the Financial Statement.

What about the Estimates of Expenditure? Here we have the rather peculiar situation that the Government has seen fit to give us two sets of figures. For instance, by way of expenditure, it is expected that there will be a total of \$509,753,000 (an increase of 11.7 per cent) in State spending, compared to the figure for 1971-72.

Then, we see from the addendum that probably we will have to meet an additional \$7,000,000 in increased salaries and wages, so the actual expenditure for 1972-73 could be expected to be about \$516,753,000. The actual expenditure increase for the year would be at the rate of 13.2 per cent compared to the previous year. If we relate the information that we have on expenditure and receipts, more particularly in respect of receipts, to the population of the State over five-year spans commencing in the 1953-54 financial year, we find that the population of the State then was 797,094 and the State's receipts were \$104,751,438. This was a rate of receipt of \$131.40 a head of population. In 1958-59, five years later, the population increased by 15.6 per cent to 921,106, and State receipts increased to \$145,360,128.

Thus, there had been a 35 per cent increase in receipts or taxation, and the rate of receipt was \$157.80 a head. In 1963-64 the population increased to 1,035,300. Receipts had risen to \$211,006,330, representing a per capita figure of \$203.80. In the next five-year period the population increased by 10 per cent. In 1968-69 the total population was 1,138,800 and receipts totalled \$298,355,200, or \$262 a head.

Going forward to the prediction for 1972-73, the completion of the next five-year period, it is expected that the population will be 1,200,000 and that receipts, as indicated by the

Treasurer in this document, will be \$509,235,000. If we relate that to the population we find that receipts across the board will be \$424.36 a head. The increase in population in the 20-year period is 50 per cent, whereas the increase in receipts to the State is as great as 418 per cent, representing a 223 per cent increase in the per capita involvement of people in South Australia. This is significant when the two figures are related one to the other. The actual increase in income is 418 per cent on that of 1953-54.

I shall refer briefly to several specific areas. The first is the Railways Department, where payment to balance the accounts has been increased from \$19,500,000 to \$22,500,000 in the current year. In the same document we see an increase for the Municipal Tramways Trust from \$630,000 in 1971-72 to \$1,300,000 in 1972-73. One would expect that these sums would have been determined before the effect was evident of the increased revenue resulting from the recent petrol strike, but even with an improvement in the revenue, both in the Railways Department and the M.T.T., one can accept that the provision of public transport is a matter of considerable expense to the people of South Australia.

The Treasurer has said that it is expected there will be a significant increase in the amount to be obtained from the railways by an increase in the amount of merchandise to be carried. One could be rather suspicious and ask whether there is to be any direction to the people as to the extent to which they use the railway system. I will not enlarge on that point at this time, because I am sure the member for Heysen will have much to say about the railway system.

In the area of expenditure on education it was necessary to do some exercises to find the effects of the various figures produced by the Treasurer, and to see whether they were correct. There were more adjustments made in the figures relating to the Education Department allocations than in any other area of the Budget documents. However, as one would expect, the figures as presented were correct, and after adjustments there is a provision of \$108,875,000, representing almost a 14½ per cent increase over the actual expenditure during the previous year.

The financial statement goes on to indicate that, as a result of the estimate of additional cost, aggregating \$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

allocation for education purposes this year is increased by 12 per cent, or a rate slightly in excess of the rate achieved in the last two financial years. One could pick out the figure of 14½ per cent in the first instance and think that was a true figure, and perhaps fail to see that there is only a slight improvement and that the figure is 12 per cent. The total, having regard to figures over recent years, represents a marked reduction overall when one considers the total of the Loan Estimates allocation for education and the revenue allocation for education. In 1970-71, with a figure of about \$99,460,000, there had been an increase of 21.1 per cent over the preceding year.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: There was much more inflation.

Dr. EASTICK: In 1971-72, with a total of \$124,096,805, there was an increase of 24.8 per cent. In 1972-73, with the total figure standing at \$137,813,343, the increase has been only 11.1 per cent.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: But in real terms the improvement is completely comparable because of the much lower rate of inflation.

Dr. EASTICK: The Minister will be able to make his contribution in due course, pointing out that the costs associated with the increased number of personnel available on the staff and the increase in salaries and wages associated with education were responsible for a considerable part of increased spending in previous years.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I am speaking only about the rise in wage and salary costs.

Dr. EASTICK: In fact, there is an 11.1 per cent improvement in education spending for 1972-73.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: In real terms it is as good as it has been in the last two years.

Dr. EASTICK: I shall refer now to some specific areas particularly affecting my own district. I was interested to see in the section relating to the Education Department an acknowledgment of the need to rethink and to adjust the administrative activities associated with grants to schools, more particularly in relation to schools small in number but having a fairly large school area to maintain. The Treasurer's report states:

The scheme for providing grants for ground maintenance has been modified so that grants depend on both enrolment and acreage.

That sound decision I laud and look forward to as being of advantage to the smallest high school in the State, Kapunda High School in my electoral district, which had been placed

at a serious disadvantage by the Minister's previous decision that grants would be on a per capita basis.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: But previously the smallest high schools got no grants for ground maintenance; they got nothing.

Dr. EASTICK: Only on the basis of the moneys available to them were they able to proceed with ground maintenance.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That is not true. You are confusing grants for ground maintenance with subsidies.

Dr. EASTICK: I am pointing out to the Minister that provision was made previously for certain improvements to be effected to school grounds as a result of specific funds made available by the Government. Whilst grants may not have been available for ground maintenance and whilst this may be something new in the case of the present Government, apart from having spent money on capital improvements to school properties, it is a farcical situation—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: But we still do that.

Dr. EASTICK: —to jeopardize the maintenance and preservation of the advances made to some high schools, because of their small numbers (although providing a real need for the community) not being able to finance the bare maintenance of their properties.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Your previous Government made no grants for ground maintenance.

Dr. EASTICK: The Government will appreciate that what I say I mean: this is an advance with merit. I look forward to my constituents participating in some advantage from this scheme. I am interested to see that financial provision is to be made for the Strathmont Centre. It is most unfortunate for a parent with a child requiring professional assistance and specific training facilities to find this statement from the Chief Secretary, in respect of the Strathmont Centre, in October 1971:

Figures provided show that there is a long waiting list for admission to Strathmont Centre, particularly in respect of children and total dependants. The child mentioned specifically by the honourable member would fall into the totally dependent category, for which there is a waiting period of approximately five years. Although I do not suggest that the responsibility for action in this area should not have been taken by other Governments in the past, I look forward, in view of the provision being made for improvements to be effected

at the Strathmont Centre, to this five-year waiting period for totally dependent children being considerably decreased. In fact, I hope that any waiting period will soon be eliminated.

It appears that the State's finances will be improved by increased revenue from forestry. I highlight the fact that recently there has been an apparent change in policy by reducing by 75 per cent the quantity of lumber available to people who rely on large amounts of State forest products to maintain their businesses. I stress this because these small industries have developed in rural communities. Whilst they may employ only three, four, or five people, the reduction of their lumber entitlement from the State forests by about 75 per cent will mean the almost complete failure of those industries in rural communities. This should not be permitted, more particularly when one is told, in other spheres, that the quantity of lumber available is increasing. It is difficult to accept that this action should be taken, because it will upset existing milling operations.

I turn now to that section of the Treasurer's report dealing with "Special Acts". I am upset to find that in the State a situation has arisen which has meant the closure of a business undertaking at Port Pirie and considerable anxiety about David Shearer Limited at Mannum. It is said in the Treasurer's report that, in making available funds that may be called upon, there is a genuine desire on the part of the Government to maintain the industrial complex at Mannum, and that there is an effort to maintain this work force in the area and allow the build-up or the recovery of the industry over a period of time. I have no doubt that the member for Murray will have something to say about this. The present Government has failed many times to help maintain industry (some of it viable, some of it near-viable) in the rural community. I refer to the decision taken by the present Government (and no doubt the member for Frome will comment on it in due course) to remove from the Morgan area the docking facilities and the Highways Department ferry maintenance service there. Some five years ago a considerable sum was spent on rebuilding the slipway at Morgan. Now, five years later, in a phasing-out arrangement people there are being moved: 19 or 20 families could be taken from the community. It is feared by the people there that the community will cease to function as a viable unit because of the loss of those families. I should like to believe it is not too

late for the Government to reconsider the position, to pay more than lip service to the general concept of decentralization, and to afford an opportunity for new or increased development in the Morgan area.

I mention, too, the Government's failure to give tangible help to retain the pyrites enterprise at Nairne. One cannot dispute that the decision to close down that enterprise at Nairne went hand in hand with a decision of the Commonwealth Government about funds being made available in that field. But in the detail provided to us it became clear that, with alterations of policy, advances in technique, and the demand to function as an independent organization with minor Government support, the pyrites undertaking at Brukunga could have been maintained and would have been an asset to the State in the future. Not only did it represent an advantage to the people of Brukunga and the surrounding area but also it provided a worthwhile backstop in respect of agricultural pursuits in this State, and here I refer to an expected increase in the demand for superphosphate in the future.

This undertaking also had other advantages, concerning both the railways and the general economy, which have been lost to the State through the cessation of operations of a \$300,000 a year contract that provided clinker to a concrete-manufacturing organization in Victoria. This and other similar documentation was available to the Government, yet it failed to enter into worthwhile discussions with the people involved and allowed this undertaking at Nairne to close. I believe that it is important for the future development of this State that a real effort be made by the Government of the day to maintain in the rural areas especially, or in whatever area they may be situated, our existing industries, especially those that have been shown to be viable undertakings or capable in the short term of becoming viable.

On behalf of members of the Opposition, I acknowledge the tremendous amount of work that has been done for this State over a long period by Mr. Gilbert Seaman, whose retirement at the end of this year has been announced. Although I personally have not had much contact with Mr. Seaman over a long period, I have appreciated the replies that I have received in this place, through the Treasurer, to questions I have asked, and I know that I speak on behalf of all members on this side when I pay tribute to the valuable contribution that Mr. Seaman has

made to the State. We all hope that he enjoys a long and satisfying retirement.

Finally, let us look briefly at this Government's contribution towards giving this State the guidance and administrative control necessary to steer it along a path of progress and prosperity. First, the Treasurer himself has acknowledged that up until the time of this Budget his Government had been responsible for introducing taxation measures in this State to bring in \$30,000,000 in additional revenue. We have seen in this House how the Government has had to be brought into line regarding some of its financial Bills, because of the Opposition's ability to detect deficiencies in various measures. Most of the Government's taxation measures have been unjust in their effect on minority sections of the community; some have been plainly inaccurate in their anticipated effect, and only the strongest efforts by the Opposition have brought about some measure of justice. Yet, even so, we have seen the evidence of over-collections from measures pushed through this Parliament by the Government.

Now, we have further taxation measures to be added to this total. The Government would like the public to think the taxation increases in this Budget are insignificant and that it has avoided any major new increases. Yet the simple fact is that the measures incorporated in this Budget include, as well as an additional \$10,000,000 from pay-roll tax, an overall rise of 18 per cent from an estimated \$91,319,000 in 1971-72 to an estimated \$107,781,000 in 1972-73. This is just the taxation component: it is not the total component including the revenue increases to which I referred earlier. This, then, is the way this Government manages the books of South Australia. It has tried, in this election-year Budget, to give the impression that it is considerate of the public and, by good management, able to avoid increased taxation. However, this is a characterization without depth, and the people of this State can see through the deceptions and examples of poor management inflicted on them by the Labor Government. They have not liked the Government's attitude towards law and order; they have not liked the Government's involvement in trade union disruption for the sake of political capital; they have not liked the Government's paying the court costs of union officials; they have not liked the Government's duplicity over the implementation of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan; and they will not like this Budget.

These are just some of the reasons for my Party's confident expectation that the next State Budget will be prepared by an L.C.L. Government, and that then we will see genuine concern for the tax-paying public of this State.

Mr. HOPGOOD (Mawson): It has been suggested that Budgets have had their day, and I think there is some truth in this: it is an extremely inefficient and illogical way to handle public accounts to do it all at one special time of the year, and I think probably that the importance that is given to a Budget at present arises from the fact that we have gone through a period characterized by what has been called the Olympian theory of economics. This theory, of course, is an outgrowth of Keynesian ideas and Keynesian planning, and those ideas have had a big bearing on the Budgets of modern democratic Governments and have been important in ensuring some sort of stability in neo-capitalism in the post-war world. But I call this Olympian economics, because the basic idea behind it is that once a year Zeus hurls a thunderbolt, and that is designed to do all the things the Government wants to be done for the coming 12 months.

I have never seen any of our Commonwealth Treasurers in the role of Zeus, and I do not see our State Treasurer in that role, either (Apollo, perhaps, but not Zeus). However, the Olympian theory is there, and it is clear that the problems existing in modern economies are far more sophisticated than admit of some sort of massive sledgehammer effect in 12-monthly doses. With modern accounting and the use of computer techniques, and so on, we have to look increasingly to the possibilities of some more continual readjustment of the way in which we handle our accounts. The other point about the Olympian theory of economics arises from the enormously expanded role that Governments play in modern economies and, of course, this is only right and proper. There was a time when the Budget dealt merely with the payment of wages or salaries to a few public servants, the Armed Services, and the police, etc., but, with the coming of the modern welfare State (the modern State paying premiums on its life assurance policy), we understand that far more must now be done. This, of course, is another reason why there has been a period during which an enormous amount of attention has been focused on Budgets. I am not suggesting that the Government should pull in its horns in connection with its activities in the economy, nor am I suggesting that Keynes is completely out of date. What I am suggesting is that we must

adopt some more sophisticated procedures in connection with the way in which Governments collect and spend money.

What is politics all about? Politics is not all about the making and unmaking of Governments: it should be about the making and unmaking of social conditions. This is the yardstick against which we should measure any Administration. Because the Budget is still a major document for an Administration, it is also a yardstick by which it should be judged. To what extent does this Budget produce some small progress in this State towards a more just society, a more humane society, and a more egalitarian society? To what extent does it meet the basic human needs of people? The Leader of the Opposition spoke about the taxpayers of this State, but I always like to think in terms of people rather than in terms of taxpayers. I believe that we must look at the basic human needs of people, work out the cost, and then set about ways of meeting that cost. In the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition there seemed to be some sort of assumption that the procedure should be the other way around. In other words, we should look at people basically as taxpayers and consider their rights as taxpayers; then, given that assumption, from what we can garner we should see what we can throw to the fatherless, the destitute, etc.

I want to make two points in connection with the Leader's speech. First, he did not mention the question of relativity between costs in this State and costs in other States. I found this a little surprising, because it is not so very long since Liberal speakers in both Houses of this Parliament spent much time talking about the necessity of maintaining our relativity in respect to other States. However, what is important is not so much the way in which costs are trending as the relative trend of costs, compared with the trend in other States. It would have been very valuable to the House if the Leader had given us some idea of how our costs are moving relative to those of other States. Perhaps the Opposition is a little cautious about doing that, following publication of a book that has had considerable readership.

During the time of the Walsh-Dunstan Government between 1965 and 1968, at a time when Liberal members were complaining about how rising costs were destroying our relativity with respect to other States, in fact our revenues were rising rather less quickly than were revenues in the other States. Therefore, although there were increased costs in this

State, in fact our relativity was improving, rather than deteriorating. One wonders whether this is not the position now in this State; perhaps this is why we have not heard anything on this matter from the Opposition. Of course, there has been only one Opposition speaker on this Bill so far, and perhaps we will hear more as time goes on. I was interested when the Leader of the Opposition quoted statistics showing that people are still being born in this State! Believing that I have done my patriotic bit, I want to retire from that field. Ever since the Leader of the Opposition took office he has made a point that I must confess I cannot follow.

Mr. Gunn: That's not hard to understand.

Mr. HOPGOOD: Perhaps the point is too sophisticated for me and perhaps the honourable member will explain it when he speaks. This is how the Leader's argument runs: if a given portion of the revenue exceeds the estimate that the Government made for it in the Budget, somehow or other the people have been overtaxed. I think that is the point that the Leader has made from time to time, and he made it again this afternoon. The Leader claims that, if the aggregate from a type of taxation exceeds the estimate, the Government should not have set the tax at that level. I think he used the word "over-production". However, I would call it a windfall. When I first became a member of Parliament I was nauseated by the number of times members opposite said that they were able to achieve a surplus in the last Budget their Party presented. They said that Sir Glen Pearson was a great Treasurer because of the Budget surplus he achieved. I remind the Leader of the Opposition that that surplus was achieved because of a windfall in relation to grain movement. In the light of that, would the Leader suggest that the Administration that presented that Budget overtaxed the people?

I remind Opposition members that one should not assess the justice of revenue raising by considering the burden that falls on a broad section of the community: rather, one should consider the burden that falls on individuals and, if one can say that a given individual is being taxed beyond his capacity to pay, it is an unjust situation. To create a series of collectives such as the primary producers and the industrial community is to create mythical entities; they are the types of concept that political scientists and schoolteachers play with. If members opposite believe that we

are overtaxing, they should look at the effect of taxation on individuals.

The Budget is a means whereby income can be redistributed. Of course, the fundamental natural distribution of income in a community is usually very unjust. This is one of the reasons why Governments are actively involved in social welfare measures. It is not clear to me whether the Opposition is saying that the sum total of revenue raisings in this State is too great. Of course, it appears that the sum total of revenue raisings this financial year will fall short of the estimated expenditure; the estimated shortfall is about \$7,000,000. Is the Opposition suggesting that the shortfall should be much greater than that? Or, is the Opposition suggesting that we should cut down on expenditure?

I noticed that there was very little reference to expenditure in the Leader's comments; he chose to speak mainly about revenue raising. If there are areas where the Opposition believes there should be a reduction in expenditure, I should like to hear about those areas. The Government could then consider the points raised by the Opposition.

In dealing with the detailed aspects of the Budget, I refer to the expenditure on the Police Department: the amount voted last year was about \$13,000,000, the amount expended was about \$14,300,000, and the proposed amount this year is about \$16,000,000. It is important that there should be an increase in this department, because we are all concerned with law and order. A document is circulating in this State providing information about the trend of law and order in modern society, and it is a document that was referred to by the member for Eyre in an earlier debate. I think it would be worth while, when considering the vote for the Police Department and law and order in general, to have a brief look at this document, which appears by way of an editorial in the *Farmer and Grazier* of July 27, 1972, under the heading "Message from the Past". It states:

The following editorial sent in by a member appeared in the May issue of *Witness*, the Catholic paper for the Port Pirie diocese:

In May of 1919 at Dusseldorf, Germany, the allied forces obtained a copy of some of the rules for Communist revolution.

Then follow the nine rules. I have consulted people about this statement, and the best advice I have obtained is that it looks like a clumsy forgery on the level of the *Elders of the protocol of Zion*. However, a respectable

newspaper in this State has chosen to print the nine points in an editorial, so that obviously some people take this stuff seriously. Let us consider the points. The first one states:

Corrupt the young, get them interested in sex. Make them superficial; destroy their ruggedness.

The whole point is that the suggestion by those who are disseminating this information is that these things are happening now in our society: it is a Bolshevik plot in the background for these things to happen. If we consider modern western society and ask who are the pornographers and who are the purveyors of pornography, it is obvious that it is not the Communists but the Capitalists—those who are out to make a buck. I suggest that, if honourable members wish to get rid of pornography, the easiest way is to get rid of the profit motive. If people could not make money out of it there would not be much of it around. One or two things may be handed around at men's smoke socials (which I do not attend, because I do not smoke), but there would not be the incentive for people to get hold of this stuff, because they could not make any money out of it. The commercial motive would be gone.

I was interested to read the little purple book of the Liberal Movement in which we were promised all sorts of things by this group. Perhaps there was some political pornography in it, but one of the headings was "Censorship", and I read this part with much interest. Censorship is a problem in modern society and I thought I might learn something. However, to my amusement the whole problem of pornography had been swept under the carpet: it referred to some sort of secrecy in Government and to the movement's opposition to political censorship (I thought everyone opposed that these days), but not one reference to pornography, although that is the only area in which censorship is a present issue. However, I should not digress, and I return to discussing the document. Point No. 2 states:

Get control of all means of publicity, thereby get people's minds off their government by focusing their attention on athletics, sexy books and plays and other trivialities.

Again, I ask honourable members to consider just who controls the press in Australia at present.

Mr. Becker: The Labor Party.

Mr. HOPGOOD: That was the point made by—

Mr. Becker: And it's not far wrong, either.

Mr. HOPGOOD: —Dr. Jim Forbes, M.H.R., when he spoke in my district a short time ago, and said that the Labor Party had obtained complete control of the media in Australia. What an extraordinary statement from anyone! Point No. 3 states:

Divide the people into hostile groups by constantly harping on controversial matters of no importance.

The import of that statement escapes me, because what is important to one person may be trivial to another. The next point is interesting and revealing, because it states:

Destroy the people's faith in their natural leaders by holding them up to contempt and ridicule.

The problem is that people who swallow this stuff believe that there are natural leaders in the community, and that there are those who are born to rule. What is the point of talking about this, except that it could be linked with the general public's condemnation of the recent record of the Prime Minister, yet there are people who see him as a natural leader. Point No. 5 states:

Always preach true democracy, but seize power as fast and ruthlessly as possible.

I do not know who is planning to do that. The next point states:

By encouraging government extravagance, destroy its credit, produce fear of inflation with rising prices and general discontent.

That is good old stuff from the Weimar Republic days and people's fears about the destruction of the Deutschmark, but I cannot see its relevance in twentieth century Australia. Point No. 7 states:

Promote unnecessary strikes in vital industries, encourage civil disorders and foster a lenient and soft attitude on the part of the government towards such disorders.

This is the complete misconception of the industrial system that many people have, people who assume that somehow there is a political motive behind industrial dislocation, when almost invariably it arises from industrial and not political matters. Point No. 8 states:

By deceptive argument cause breakdown of the moral virtues, honesty, sobriety, chastity, faith in the pledged word.

Again, I remind honourable members of what I said earlier in relation to pornography. Point No. 9 is revealing indeed, and puts this stuff on the same level as the minute men in the United States of America and the John Birch society, because it states:

Cause the registration of all firearms on some pretext, with a view to confiscating them and leaving the population helpless.

This is the sort of thing put out by the gun lobby in the United States and perhaps by the gun lobby in this country. I believe that there should be much greater control of firearms for the safety of the public, and I do not look forward to some means whereby a small revolutionary minority can take over from an unarmed population. The concept of every man having his own gun to protect his property against his phantom enemies is one that is close to a Fascist society. It is a tragedy that people today swallow that sort of stuff. One reader (and probably many others) of the *Farmer and Grazier* was not prepared to do that. On August 10, he said:

Sir, regarding the editorial on July 27, 1972, what a load of old codswallop. The Communists don't have to do any of the things listed; the Capitalist does it for them. Who bombards us with sex to sell cars, cigarettes, etc., who makes money out of sexy films? Who owns newspapers and television stations and degrades some with advertising? As for destroying faith in leadership, perhaps leaders should earn respect!

If the Germans of 1930-40 had been a little more critical of leadership, perhaps we wouldn't have had the Second World War. If the Capitalist can raise prices and profits why is it criminal for the wage earner to withhold labour? When has the politician or businessman been honest?

I think he is being a little cynical there. He continues:

The monopolist can rob a whole community. Oil companies sell the same fuel at the same price, in spite of all the talk about free enterprise, competition, boron or tigers in tanks. The wonderful swindle that is our wool and livestock auction system. Then we gaoled some dotty housewife for taking \$10 worth of goods from Tom's!

Truly, the rapacious Capitalist is our worst enemy, in so far as he makes Communism seem a possible alternative to a system motivated by greed, vanity and self-interest. As for controversy, surely we should want damn good reasons to send our sons to war.

I cannot quite go along with what he now says, as follows:

The church with its nineteenth century outlook "we know best", and perpetual confidence trick is no help in getting a socially or economically just form of Capitalism.

Certainly that criticism could be levelled at certain spokesmen of the church, but not at all of them. I have taken an extensive circumlocution on the subject of law and order because I know that it is of some interest to honourable members. I now wish to refer to some other points in the Estimates. I was glad to see \$40,000 proposed for expenditure by the Murray New Town steering committee. We all hope that it will be possible to get this pro-

ject going as quickly as possible. I think that this is one of the most forward planning moves introduced by the Government. It is important, not only in the way of decentralization but also in the way of doing something for the old city, namely, making the old city livable in the 1980's by producing a new city.

At page 35 of the Estimates, provision is made for \$35,000 for the Committee of Inquiry into Health Services in South Australia. I imagine that this is a winding-down payment. We look forward before long to the result of this committee's deliberations. Health is one of the crying needs in modern society. It is most unjust that many people on low incomes should be put to much greater hardship because of the onset of illness and bereavement in their families. I believe that health and welfare services are a means whereby everyone can be put on a more equitable and just footing. I do not think that our Australian society has yet reached the stage where it is doing this nearly as equitably as it should be done. Provision is made to the Law Society of South Australia, towards the cost of legal assistance to poor persons, of \$150,000, whereas the sum provided last year was \$75,000. Of course, this is still probably not enough, but if we voted too much more we would get complaints from Opposition members about the turnover in the Budget, since I interpret what they say to mean that they do not like the amount we are raising by means of revenue.

Following my comments about health services, I point out that legal services are another important avenue that Commonwealth and State Governments should be exploring. It is unfair that a person should be put to hardship as a result of the onset of illness, and it is also most unfair that a person should be put to hardship as a result of some legal action. In some cases, people get themselves into a mess, but in other cases that is not so. I remember the sad case of Mr. Ray Maher, the former Speaker of the New South Wales Parliament. He was put to considerable expense as a result of a charge of which he was absolutely cleared. I believe he was able to sell a house so that he could meet his legal expenses, but most people in the community would simply not be in that position. I do not think we have really found the answer with regard to legal aid. We should be looking to some sort of "legi-care" system or some type of salaried system whereby people could put their problems before a solicitor. The real problem is that a person has to pay money to find out whether it is worth while going on with a case.

I believe that there should be some means whereby the Government would make available to people, at a nominal cost or free of charge, the sort of advice that could form the basis of their decision whether to take their case any further. That is the basic problem at present: one has to pay money to find out whether or not it is worth while going on with one's case.

At page 42, the Estimates provide for the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch. This is an extremely important arm of the Government these days. As this Government has extensively extended the charter of the Commissioner, it is only fit and proper that we should considerably increase the expenditure of that department. I think that I speak for all members when I say that we refer many problems to the branch, always finding that they are efficiently dealt with. We do not always get the solution that our constituents hope for, because sometimes the problems are simply insoluble. I believe that this arm of government more than justifies its existence by the service it gives to the people of South Australia. Harking back to my previous remarks, I point out that if we could give assistance in relation to legal matters similar to the assistance we give in relation to consumer affairs this would be another step towards a more just and humane society.

Mr. Evans: We have to make the laws a little bit easier for the person in the street to be able to understand.

Mr. HOPGOOD: I entirely agree. As politicians, that is something we can take direct action towards, but this still does not get over the problem of the cost of legal service that is often imposed on a person who has not sought a legal action. Someone has accused such a person of doing something that he knows he has not done, but he has to go to court to establish his innocence.

Mr. Evans: We want a body independent of the legal profession.

Mr. HOPGOOD: I do not think we can ever get a body completely independent of the legal profession to look at this matter, any more than we can ever get a body completely independent of doctors to look at health services, but I say that in each area the determining factor must be not what that profession wants but rather the standard and cost of service to the public: this must be what finally determines what is provided.

I note the increased sum provided for the Kindergarten Union. I tie this in with the announcement in the *Stop Press* of today's *News* that State Cabinet has approved subsidies

up to a total of \$176,000 for 22 new metropolitan and country kindergartens. These are the first subsidies given under the new State Government policy of providing capital assistance for pre-school education. We have a long way to go before we meet all the needs of pre-school education in this State. Although this policy of the Government has been a tremendous breakthrough, I believe that we will have to wait until a Commonwealth Labor Government sets up a pre-schools commission before we get the volume of finance in this area that we really need.

I also notice under this line that increased finance will go to the National Fitness Council. When I was at Raywood not long ago, I admired the facilities there. As I believe this council is doing an extremely good job, I welcome the increased allocation to it. I understand that this is not greatly in excess of what was paid last year, but it is considerably in excess of what was voted in the previous Budget. The allocation for the National Fitness Council last year was only \$66,500, whereas the amount actually expended was \$94,500, and \$95,000 is voted to be expended this year.

The vote for National Parks and Wildlife under the Environment and Conservation Department is \$403,362, for scientific, administrative, technical, clerical and general staff. This vote shows that conservation is becoming big business, and it is most important. It is also most important that we regard our reserves not simply as playgrounds but as centres for scientific research, and that we should make the manpower, money and technical know-how available so that the Minister of Environment and Conservation's department can do good and original research on the native flora and fauna in these areas that have been purchased with public money. The sum of \$18,000 has been allocated to the Committee on Environment in South Australia. I understand that I would be out of order in referring to the comments the member for Alexandra made two weeks ago when I was in another State when he spoke on the Bill to set up this committee. I was rather surprised by those comments because they included the words "balderdash" and "piffle", and all that the House did not hear was that it was a blatant blue duck. To me, that legislation was extremely good. It provided—

Mr. Mathwin: No teeth at all.

Mr. HOPGOOD: The teeth are provided through the various Government departments and the legislation carried by this State which

these Government departments administer. We really need a body in this State to investigate, do research, report and make clear to the Public Health Department, Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Department of the Minister of Environment and Conservation exactly what has to be done and just what legislation has to be passed. There is no substitute for knowing the facts before legislation is carried.

We see a healthy increase in the vote for fostering, the sum voted being increased from \$485,578 to \$586,200. This increase will be most acceptable to those public spirited people who take on the arduous task of fostering. Although this sum is not as much as we should be paying, this is a considerable increase and much has been achieved by increasing this sum in the last two years. I place on record my recognition of the work done by those people who take up the arduous and often heartbreaking task of fostering. I refer to the increased vote to the Service to Youth Council from \$6,400 to \$7,200. This is a vote that has been steadily increased over the years, and all honourable members are aware of the sterling job done by this body, which was begun by just three men. This council fills a gap in our welfare services, and it is an important gap that has to be filled. I am encouraged by the considerable support given by the community at large to this body, and I appeal to the people of South Australia to continue to give this sort of support. The vote through the Community Welfare Department for community facilities has been increased from \$100,000 to \$125,000. I imagine that this increase will be snapped up quickly by the various bodies in the community that are trying to provide these facilities. From the approaches I have received in my district during the last 12 months, I am aware that many people will be disappointed and will miss out because there is not sufficient money to go around unless grants are made so ridiculously small as not to be worth while. Therefore, an increase to \$125,000 is welcome and will help to provide some of these facilities. Indeed I was glad to see that the type of area described by the Minister in setting down the terms of reference for the grants fitted my district to a "T". It is a district in which there are many young people but where the facilities provided for them are only partly established.

Anything that this Government can do to promote the establishment of more and more of these facilities, especially in the outlying

suburban areas where there is also little commercial recreation for young people, is to be applauded. We should not ignore the importance of commercial facilities. Some honourable members may have read the Pelican paperback *An Australian New Town*, which is a survey of the Melbourne outer suburb of Sunshine. The point made by the two female researchers from Monash University in that publication is that young people prefer facilities provided by commercial enterprise in preference to the hand-out approach: they feel that if they can pay for their entertainment they are more adult and are standing more on their own two feet. Therefore, the more we can do to introduce commercial entertainment into these areas the better. However, where the population is sparse and scattered, people cannot make a profit from this sort of undertaking and little is done, and it is at this point that the Government must step in.

I began my remarks by saying that a Budget must be judged by the extent to which it made society a little more humane, a little more just and a little more egalitarian. The Treasurer has been quoted as saying that this is a welfare Budget, that \$11,300,000 was allocated to welfare spending, an increase of 30 per cent over last year's figure and 62 per cent on comparable spending in 1970-71. The money will go to people on relief, deserted wives, foster parents, unmarried mothers and Aboriginal people. If Governments are in business to make and unmake social conditions, these are the people for whom social conditions must be made. I believe that this Budget is doing its bit to bring a more humane standard of living to these sorts of people and for that reason it has my wholehearted support.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Burdon): The honourable Deputy member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I am the member for Mitcham.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will give the honourable member his title of Deputy Leader.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I appreciate your courtesy in giving me my full and proper title. I was going to begin by saying that this debate seems to fall annually into the same mould but you, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, have spoilt that by the call you have given me, because that is a call I have not had before. One other change is that of the Leader sitting on my right, but this debate seems to have fallen into the same mould at least in the last two or three years.

I seem to be the second speaker on this side and I always seem to begin just before dinner on the day on which the debate is resumed, and I seem always to follow the member for Mawson.

Mr. Hopgood: I thought I usually followed you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Not in this debate. The member for Mawson is usually one of the eager young members opposite and one of the first up, and he has been again this year. I must say (and I hope he will not mind my saying this) that again this year I started off with the best intentions in the world to note the points he made so that I could reply to them *seriatim*, only to find after 10 minutes that it became impossible for me to follow his line of thought.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: I suggest the honourable member get on with the Budget debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am, Sir. I am going to say some things about the speech made by the member for Mawson, but I will not be able to reply to all the points he made because I was not able to retain my attention when he was speaking. However, he began by talking on the Olympian theory of economics and likening the Premier to Apollo, but not to Zeus. Apparently, he has not seen the Premier in a bad temper.

Mr. Clark: Apollo used to get nasty at times.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I see the honourable member is sympathetic to the point I am making regarding the Premier.

Mr. Clark: Are you going to try to finish by 6 o'clock?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, but I will have finished with the member for Mawson by then.

Mr. Clark: In other words, you are filling in time and will start your speech after dinner.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I have started my speech already. I hope I can reply to the points made early in his speech by the member for Mawson. He suggested, and sensibly I think, that a 12-monthly budgetary period is not a satisfactory way of budgeting. Although I agree with this, I was disappointed that the honourable member did not seem able to suggest anything in its place, except that we should adopt more sophisticated procedures. What on earth he means by that, I do not know. They are good words, but they mean nothing. If the honourable member wants to do something about this, I believe

he should put forward a suggestion, because many people are looking for such a suggestion. The difficulty is to find something to take its place.

When Governments are confined to a period of three years between elections, their options are limited. We could perhaps go to the Tasmanian system and make it a five-year election. However, only Tasmania seems to want to do that. I certainly would not favour a five-year Parliament. Of course, in a Federation we are bound also by what the other partner in the Federation does and, unless the Commonwealth Government was willing to change its budgeting, it would be impossible for a State to make any sort of a change. Therefore, despite my misgivings and those of the member for Mawson and others, it appears that we are stuck with this system for as far ahead as I can see. The honourable member went on to pose the question how far this Budget satisfied the basic human needs of the people, and he was able to congratulate the Government and himself on having done that very well. I do not wish to detract from the point made by the honourable member. However, I point out to him, as he knows very well, that the area of manoeuvre of a State Government in matters of finance is very restricted indeed, and the increases in benefits that we see in this Budget are the direct result of the increased disbursements made to the State Government by the Commonwealth Government, a point which honourable members opposite are, for political reasons, notoriously unwilling to acknowledge and which honourable members on this side do their best, in the interests of fairness, to point out from time to time.

The honourable member then referred to the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition, and said that the Leader made no mention of the present relativity in costs between the States. He referred to the 1965-68 period and asserted, but did not go on to give evidence of it, that during that period Opposition members had complained about such matters. Having made that assertion without proving it, the honourable member then went on to say how wrong we were to do it. I suggest that he is not accurate in his assertion. Our complaints during that period were well founded. If the honourable member wants any information about the present period, I suggest that one good source would be the second chapter of the latest Grants Commission report.

It was at that stage that I lost the member for Mawson, or he lost me. I did manage to catch him again when he started to talk about the legal profession. When he was doing that, I could not help congratulating myself on having in 1968 introduced a Bill to amend the Poor Persons Legal Assistance Act. One of the provisions in that Bill was to abolish the office of Public Solicitor, which had lain dormant and unfilled for 40 years but for which there had remained statutory provision. During the Liberal Government's term of office, we discarded those provisions and deleted them from the Act precisely because we were afraid that thorough-going Socialists in the Labor Party (and I except the Premier on this score only, and I think I should in all fairness except the present Attorney-General) would suggest, as the member for Mawson did in his speech today, the socialization of the legal profession.

Mr. Hopgood: I didn't quite say that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member said the problem at present is that a person must pay money to ascertain his legal position and whether it is worth while going on with an action. He suggested the only way out of this was to have salaried solicitors—

Mr. Hopgood: Or a system of "legi-care".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not sure what the honourable member means by that.

Mr. Hopgood: The legal counterpart of "medi-care".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: How on earth such a system could be a practical proposition I do not know, and I do not believe the honourable member does, either. He certainly did not attempt to spell this out when he spoke. I am pleased that we cannot return to the Public Solicitor, because that is precisely what the honourable member was suggesting. I am pleased, too (and I say this in the presence of the Attorney-General), that the amount that is being granted to the Law Society for legal assistance has doubled. I only wish I had been able to do this when I was in office. The increased grant is certainly needed and, even with the doubling of the aid, the legal profession will not be reimbursed nearly adequately for its efforts in the large and increasing amount of work done under the scheme.

Those are the only things I can say about the member for Mawson's speech. As I have said on previous occasions, usually his speeches, which are well researched and prepared in contrast to many of the speeches made in this House, read better than they sound. I will certainly read what the honourable member

said and will be able to say something about it when we get on to the lines.

The most important consideration arising from the Treasurer's Financial Statement occurs to me immediately as it has on previous occasions : I refer to the utter financial dependence of the States upon the Commonwealth Government and the need to alter this position if our federal system is to survive. On looking through the reports of the debates, I find I have said this in the two previous sessions of this Parliament, and I do not intend to go through all the material that I have used before.

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Treasurer's speech in introducing the Budget was a statement from the point of view of an accountant. It was, of course, right but, because it is written from an accounting point of view, it does not canvass the wider question of which finance is only a part, even though it is an important part; and that wider question, as I said before the adjournment, is whether our federal system of Government is to survive or not. I have said that the thing which struck me most on reading the Treasurer's speech, as has been the case in past years, was the utter dependence of the State on the Commonwealth. One has only to look at some of the appendices to the statement to see how that dependence has grown over the years.

In this Budget, of a total of receipts estimated at \$509,000,000-odd, \$201,000,000-odd will come directly from Commonwealth grants: that is, just under two-fifths (or just under 40 per cent) of the total revenues of the State will come directly from the Commonwealth. If we look at Appendix 6, we see how this dependence is increasing or has increased year by year. For example, in 1960-61 the total receipts of the State were about \$172,500,000 and, if we look at Appendix 1, we see that in that year the total contribution by the Commonwealth was nearly \$63,000,000, or 27 per cent of the total. Likewise, in 1966-67 (I pick these years out only at random) the total receipts were nearly \$259,000,000, and the total from the Commonwealth was just under \$96,000,000—again, according to my calculations, 27 per cent. Indeed, the total is up by nearly 40 per cent. In the last two years of this debate, and on a number of previous occasions since I became a member of this House, I have spoken about this. Constitutionally, there is no more important matter than finance, because finance is government and government is finance. There may be (indeed there are) other areas in which there

should be a readjustment and rearrangement of the powers between the Commonwealth and the States, but there is no doubt that financial powers are the key to the whole problem. Now, all the States are dependent on the Commonwealth for financial hand-outs, and what is known as the annual wrangle between the Premiers, the Commonwealth Treasurer and the Prime Minister at the Premiers' Conference and at the Loan Council meeting in July brings a loss of respect to all the Governments involved, and indeed to all those persons who take part in it. The Commonwealth always says it is being generous in the amounts of money it is making available to the States, and the States always say they are not getting enough.

People, of course, are not fools, and most people realize that much of the wrangling that goes on and the words that are spoken are for political purposes only. This is the more so when we have a Government of one political complexion in the Commonwealth Government sphere and of another political complexion in the States. Of course, it pays the present South Australian Government to attack the Commonwealth Government for being niggardly.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I thought your Leader had done that on occasions. I am thinking of an earlier occasion.

Mr. Payne: Which Leader?

Mr. Clark: He had every reason for doing that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am grateful to my dear old friend from Elizabeth for coming to my aid again.

Mr. Clark: I do not mind the "old" but I object to the "dear".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: They are terms of affection. We shall be losing the honourable member fairly soon; we must make the most of him while he is here. The Minister and the member for Mitchell by their interjections have anticipated what I was going to say. Let me start again and hope they will allow me to continue, because it is in line with their interjections. It pays the present South Australian Government politically in every way to attack the Commonwealth Government: it can blame the Commonwealth Government for its own shortcomings. It means that it may the next time get more money, and of course it helps its Commonwealth colleagues who are of the same political complexion. The present State Government hopes that the result of the Commonwealth election, probably in October or November, will go its way. Naturally it

attacks the Commonwealth Government and it would attack it on this score whatever amount of money it got. When we were in office, the opposite was true: we were by no means satisfied with the amount of money we got, and we had good reason for being dissatisfied.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: When things are different they are not the same!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the little Minister will give me a chance: I have not quite got to the point yet. He is so impatient. But naturally, because our Government was of the same political complexion as the Government in Canberra—

Mr. Clark: That is questionable, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —our criticism was muted and we were not able to be as forthright, or we thought we should not be as forthright, as we otherwise would be, because we were attacking our own colleagues. I am making no admissions that should not be perfectly obvious to the man in the street, and it would be the case whichever Party was in power in whichever sphere; and if, heaven forbid, there should be a Labor Government after the next election—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You know you are hoping for one.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —we will find that the present State Government, if it survives, which I doubt—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You know it will.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —will be as muted in its criticism as we were. If, on the other hand, there is a change of Government in both spheres, we in this sphere shall be critical of the Commonwealth Government in just the same way as the present State Government is critical of the present Commonwealth Government. Those things are perfectly plain. They are bad for the health of democratic government in Australia, because they bring that Government, at both levels, into disrespect. If they do that, they bring the institution which supports those Governments—that is, the Parliament of this country—into disrespect, too. In the short term, it may be that the wrangling is successful and that the States get much of what they think they are entitled to get. They can still complain, but they are still fairly well off. In fact, the States are (and this State certainly is) well off in the amount they have received from the Commonwealth in the present financial year. In the long term this is a dangerous thing for the institution of Parliament and, therefore, for our system of government. I believe in the federal system of government for three reasons.

First, for reasons of what we can call political philosophy, I do not believe in the concentration of power at any one centre or in the hands of any one group of people. Secondly, for reasons of history, we have a Federation because of the colonization of Australia by separate colonies (five or six of them, either originally or by a division, as in the case of Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland).

Thirdly, for reasons of geography, it is not accurate to say that the conditions in every part of this island continent are the same: there are differences between different parts of the country. For these three reasons, I believe that the federal system of government is still the system best suited to Australia's needs. We are not nearly ready for a unitary system of government in this country, and I doubt that we will be before the turn of the century; I do not try to look beyond that. Some have said to me that Australia is not suited to a federal system of government. For example, when I was in the United States about three years ago the U.S. Solicitor-General (Erwin Griswold) suggested to me that there were not sufficient units in Australia to make a viable federal system. He said, "You have only six States; that's not enough to make a Federation. You need far more than that." There are 11 Canadian Provinces, I think, and there are 50 States in the Union. It is a difficulty, perhaps; it is something that had not occurred to me, but we have to live with it. We have only six States here, and there is only the remotest of prospects that we will have any more.

But while this may be a weakness in our federal system (there may be others), I believe, for the reasons I have given, that we should retain that system during the foreseeable future (our lifetimes, anyway). I have heard members of the Commonwealth Parliament on our side of politics saying that the whole concept of federalism is that the central Government has a responsibility to see that the standard of services in every part of the country is broadly comparable, that this is achieved by managing the economy and the amounts available to the State Governments for their own purposes, and that this responsibility for the managing of the economy and for the amounts which the States are able to spend will be discharged by the central Government in its own way, irrespective of the wishes, advice or even the resistance of the States.

To me, that is a crude exposition of the federal system. I certainly do not agree with it; indeed, I think it is entirely wrong. It is

only part of the concept of federalism, and it denies altogether the idea of partnership between the central Government and the regional Governments which I believe is the essence of federalism. Some people on our side of politics at the Commonwealth level hold what I believe is an erroneous view of federalism. If one looks, however, at the views of the Party opposite, one finds that (in my belief, anyway) it does not believe in the federal system at all. If we look at the platform of the Australian Labor Party—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What's the A.L.P. platform got to do with the Budget?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This is part of the platform under the heading "Constitutional Matters"—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's the federal platform, and you're dealing with a State Budget.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is right, but it deals with the question of federalism and the attitude of the Party opposite to a federal system of Government, and that is the matter I am canvassing at present.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Why not speak to the Budget?

Mr. Coumbe: He is dealing with Commonwealth grants.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister knows that as well as anyone does: he is only trying to interrupt me and put me off.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You're learning a lot from reading that policy.

Mr. GUNN: On a point of order—

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Clause 2, under the heading "Constitutional Matters"—

Mr. GUNN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Standing Order 159 deals with the deliberate interruption by members while another member is on his feet.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The A.L.P. platform states:

(a) (i) to clothe the Parliament of Australia with such plenary powers as are necessary and desirable to achieve international co-operation—

whatever that means—

national planning and the Party's economic and social objectives.

Of course, any of those things (international co-operation, national planning, and the Party's economic and social objectives) could mean

anything or nothing; and, of course, we know that traditionally the Labor Party is a centralist Party: it has advocated consistently the abolition of the States and their replacement by regional bodies subordinate to the Commonwealth Parliament. The Labor Party also advocates the abolition of the Senate, and so on. In spite of the riders that have been put into the policy of members opposite, I do not believe that they have changed their attitude on this matter. I have looked at some of the writings of members opposite. I have looked especially at an address and articles written by the Treasurer when he was Leader of the Opposition a few years ago, and I cannot find much in those which helped me come to any conclusion regarding the attitudes of members opposite. For example, in an address the Treasurer gave to the Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science Conference in 1969, at page 9, he said:

I do not think that a restoration of part of the income-taxing process to the States under some such arrangements as now exist in Canada is required to resolve our present difficulties.

At another place in the same article, he suggests that the States and the Commonwealth must co-operate and get together. This is what the Treasurer says at the end of his address:

If we are to get an effective break-through here, then it will require administrative structures of a kind we have not really known before, where direct Commonwealth-State co-operation, rather than Commonwealth-State competition, develops.

That sounds pretty good, and no doubt we all want co-operation. The Treasurer said the same thing in an article in the *Australian Book Review* in February, 1970, but what he leaves unsaid is what happens if that co-operation is not forthcoming. Who has the final say in the matter? What if one side or the other is not willing to co-operate? What do we do then? This, of course, is the main question. It is all very well to talk about co-operation, but who has the final say if there is not to be co-operation? I suggest that, on the Labor side of politics, the decisive answer to that question is that it is the Commonwealth Government that has the final say, not the States. I have on other occasions referred to the case that was put by the Premiers in 1970 for a rearrangement of the financial relationships between the partners in the Federation. This is what was said (I will quote only a few sentences) at page 28 of that document:

We consider that the only adequate assurance for the financial viability of the States is that

they should again have direct access to income taxation. There is no contemplation of a return to pre-war arrangements where each State determined its own income tax system in a variety of differing details, including the definition of income, deductions, exemptions, allowances and rates. However, as shown by experience in Canada, it is practicable to operate a system of State income tax parallel with a Federal tax whilst adopting the one return, the one assessing and collecting authority, the one set of definitions, exemptions, etc., and the one basic tax schedule but with the one variant—relative rates. We should contemplate the Commonwealth continuing something approximating the present rates (though possibly with revised progressions of rates) as the “basic” rate schedule, but rebating its own imposts by an appropriate proportion so that the States may enter to much the same extent as the Commonwealth withdraws. However, each State should be permitted to fix its own specific proportion of the “basic” schedule and to vary that proportion (perhaps within agreed limits) in accordance with its own revenue and expenditure policies.

That is one solution, and it is the only solution that I know of that has any practicality in it. I very much regret that at their conference in Adelaide in February, 1970, the Premiers did not stick out for some such arrangement as that, but at least one of the Premiers sold out to the Commonwealth for a cash return, and that was the end of it. It was a very great pity.

Finally, I am glad that we are soon to have in this country an opportunity to discuss these matters not only in Parliament and on the public platform but also in a way that may perhaps (I do not put it any more strongly than this) give some promise of a solution; we will have an opportunity to discuss these matters at a constitutional convention. Two years ago, when I spoke during the first debate in the life of this Parliament on this matter, I referred to the move initiated by Mr. Galbally in Victoria for a constitutional convention. Although progress has been slow in the meantime, at least we are likely to see such a convention in Australia. I am very glad that there has been some progress.

I believe that we are soon to elect delegates from this House and another place to represent this State at the convention. Indeed, I believe that on October 5 there is to be a meeting of a steering committee for the convention. I hope that this move will lead to something; at least it will give the first opportunity since the turn of the century for those who are involved particularly in the constitutional workings of this country to come together and discuss financial and other matters. Involved in the discussions will be representatives of

the State Parliaments and also (I fervently hope) representatives of the Commonwealth Parliament; unless everyone is in this, there can be no hope of success. Even now, hopes are pretty slim of getting anywhere, but at least there is some chance of coming to some agreement on a rearrangement of powers between the central Government and the State Governments.

I will now leave the broader issues, which were the ones that particularly appealed to me when I read the Treasurer's Financial Statement. I shall not deal with any of the details, because we can do that when we reach the lines. I shall make only one comment on the Treasurer's detailed proposals; I wish to refer to the increase in fees for the registration of documents relating to transactions involving real and personal property. That increase will bring in an additional \$650,000 in a full year and an additional \$400,000 this year. The sums involved are not large, but I believe it is a step in the wrong direction. If anything, such fees should be reduced.

A suggestion has been made to me that I shall now pass on to the House; it is something well worth considering, and I hope it will be adopted as a policy of my Party and even a policy of the Government in due course, because I believe the suggestion will be beneficial; it is that no stamp duty should be payable by married people under 30 years of age who are buying their first matrimonial home. This would be a distinct encouragement to young married couples and would relieve them of some of the burden they now bear. Unfortunately, the Government has gone the other way, and these fees are to be increased. However, it is never too late to mend, even for a Labor Government. I hope the suggestion will be considered on both sides of the House, because I believe it would be a distinct help. When the lines are dealt with there will be an opportunity to debate other matters that I wish to raise.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I was interested to read the Treasurer's detailed explanation of the measures for this financial year and his review of the last financial year. When the member for Mawson spoke earlier today, I was expecting to hear him support the Treasurer but, instead, the honourable member gave what was almost an economics lecture.

Mr. Gunn: It was very difficult to follow.

Mr. Clark: It would be very difficult for some members to follow it.

Mr. COUMBE: The speech of the member for Mawson was a dissertation on purely

theoretical grounds, and it was not until the last few minutes of his speech that the honourable member touched on some aspects of expenditure. When I studied the Budget documents I was at first confused because of the changes in the work of some Government departments and because some items of expenditure are under different headings this year. Having cleared up those matters, I concluded that this Budget had some extraordinary features. It is openly and blatantly an election Budget. The increased expenditure has been made possible because of taxation increases and massive Commonwealth assistance. Of course, past deficits will be wiped off. The Government has been helped as a result of the reduction in the bond rate from 7 per cent to 6 per cent. The result that has been achieved is a combination of three major factors: first, the savage increases in numerous items of State taxation imposed in the past two years, the impact of which is now being fully felt; secondly, the massive Commonwealth financial grants now being received on a hitherto unprecedented scale not only in magnitude but on a per capita basis; and thirdly, the solid contribution by the Grants Commission estimated to be about \$21,000,000. Undoubtedly, this financial position is made possible by the Commonwealth Government (and even the member for Ross Smith would be the first to admit that) and it will also enable the present State Government to let its head go on promises at the next State election, and there is no doubt about that.

The Budget refers to only two taxation increases this year: increased fees for registration of documents and transactions of real and personal property (to which the member for Mitcham has referred); and secondly, increases in the minimum charges and in the price of excess water, and the elimination of concession rates of certain annual values of property. Of course, in a pre-election year the Government has been careful not to refer to the host of taxation slugs that have been imposed on the long-suffering public in the last two years.

Mr. Jennings: You haven't been talking to Billy Snedden, have you?

Mr. COUMBE: I will refer to him soon if the honourable member will be patient. The full effect of these taxation measures that have been imposed in the past two years is now being felt for the first time. Startling and staggering increases have been made since Labor came into office in mid-1970. Let us

consider June 30, 1970, which is a month after Labor came into office, as the end of the financial year. Under the heading of that date the first item of four in the Revenue Statement shows a figure of State taxation as \$56,453,000: as at June 30, 1973, it is estimated that it will have risen to \$107,780,000. That is not a small increase: in other words, in three years under a Labor Government, the people of this State have had their State taxation under this item, this slug, actually doubled.

Under this heading this year the increase will be about \$15,500,000, or about 16 per cent; yet the Government has simply and quietly announced only two minor increases for this year. Regulations are introduced quietly into the House: they increase fees, which, with the effect of past taxation measures, indicates the reason for the upsurge in State taxation. The impression gained by the public (and given by this Government) is that this is a mild Budget which will not hurt anyone financially. To put the record straight, I will enumerate some of the increases which have been made by the present Government since it assumed office, but about which it is silent now, hoping, I suppose, that the public has only a short memory when it comes to an election. A surcharge of 3 per cent was imposed on the gross revenue of the Electricity Trust and this led, in turn, to the first increase in tariffs for about 15 years.

Mr. Evans: It had its first loss, too.

Mr. COUNBE: It is interesting to read the reports, tabled today, of the Electricity Trust and the Auditor-General, which indicate that last year the surcharge amounted to \$2,081,000 and the trust made a loss of \$334,000, the first loss for over 20 years. I recall the comments made (and I made some) when we spoke in the Loan Estimates debate about Loan funds allotted to the trust being juggled around. We now find a major undertaking having a tariff increase, yet making its first loss for more than 20 years.

Mr. Evans: Even though it is a monopoly.

Mr. COUNBE: In recent years there has been an increase in water rating, both in the price a thousand gallons of rebate water and in the assessed value of property. These increases occurred before this year's increase came into being, and I remind members that these valuations are often used by councils for assessment purposes, although they have the right to fix their own rate. Increases were also imposed on duties on conveyances of real estate property and marketable securities; increases on hire-

purchase and credit arrangements; increases, on rates of stamp duty; increases on rates on mortgages; increases in fees for the registration of motor vehicles; increases in the cost of driving licences; increases in succession duties; increases in land tax; increases in wharfage and harbour duties; two increases in hospital charges; increases in bus and tram fares; and increases in stamp duties on insurance. I could continue.

Mr. Evans: The only thing that has gone down is enthusiasm in the State.

Mr. COUNBE: The honourable member could not have said anything truer. I have enumerated some of the items of taxation which this Government has imposed on the people of the State and which are now reflected in the present Budget. These are items about which the people are now complaining, because they are groaning under the burden of State taxation at a level that has never been reached before. These increases, because of the returns to the Government, enable it to present such a favourable Budget now.

Mr. Clark: A while ago you said the Commonwealth Government was responsible.

Mr. COUNBE: I am dealing with one item of the Budget under the heading of State taxation, and I will return to the question of Commonwealth finance soon. Let us further consider the incidence of State taxation and its impact on the taxpayers of this State. When Labor came into office (and let us consider the date as June 30, 1970), according to the Commonwealth statistician the population of this State was 1,157,200 men, women and children, not all taxpayers. At that time, if we divided the amount of State taxation by the total population, the figure would be \$50.8 a head. The present proposal concluding on June 30, 1973 (and I have estimated the population on the scale that it has been increasing, not allowing for any decrease), will bring this figure to \$95 a head under this one heading. Therefore, that is what the people of the State have to thank the Labor Government for. In its three years of office, it will have almost doubled the burden on the taxpayer, increasing it by about \$45 a head, under this one heading.

I can see members opposite grinning. They should not forget that they have to pay this increase. Perhaps their constituents will not be grinning if they realize the true position as I have shown it. The type of increase to which I have referred does not stop there, but permeates throughout local government and semi-government instrumentalities and through all types of enterprise. Ultimately, the taxpayer

must pay so much more. As I have said, the Labor Government has almost doubled the incidence of State taxation. We should contrast this situation with the Commonwealth Government's decision in its Budget last month to reduce income tax, gift duty, and estate duty.

Mr. Clark: You should compare our position with that in other States.

Mr. Jennings: What about the deficit of \$600,000,000?

Mr. COUMBE: We are not talking about deficit Budgets.

Mr. Jennings: No, you're not.

Mr. COUMBE: Apparently, the honourable member would like me to get into an argument on that subject, but I do not intend to do so. At the start of my speech, I said that the Commonwealth had put this State in a very good financial position overall. In his speech, the Treasurer said clearly that, through Commonwealth grants, at the end of the year he would be able to balance his Budget and have a surplus. However, I have been talking about the actions of this Government, and not about the Commonwealth Government. I shall now deal with the position under the heading "Public Works and Services". Under the Labor Government, the total under this heading has increased from about \$150,000,000 at June 30, 1970, to almost \$197,000,000 this year, an increase of about 30 per cent. Again, that is not a bad increase. Incidentally some of these charges also rub off on the taxpayers, as honourable members will appreciate.

It is in the realm of Commonwealth grants and allocations from the Commonwealth Grants Commission that the spectacular increases have really occurred and, by way of interjection, members opposite have invited me to comment on this subject. The normal grants and special grants from the Commonwealth Government, and now allocations from the Grants Commission, have meant an increase from \$128,000,000 in 1970 to \$201,000,000 this year.

Mr. Clark: Whence does the Commonwealth get the money?

Mr. COUMBE: From you and me, as you know. The point I have been making is that on top of this the State Government has increased taxation.

Mr. Jennings: So have the other States.

Mr. COUMBE: The point I want to make is that people are now realizing the terrific increase in taxation imposed by this Government, which supposedly represents the ordinary people of the State. It is undoubtedly true that the massive Commonwealth grants have not

only permitted the Government to increase its expenditure on various items but also enabled it to balance its Budget and provide for a modest surplus, as the Treasurer has indicated in his Financial Statement. The last time I recall this happening was when the former Treasurer, Sir Thomas Playford, introduced his last Budget.

Mr. Clark: He had a different reason.

Mr. COUMBE: The honourable member was present at that time, when Sir Thomas was able to balance his Budget, squaring off past deficits and leaving a modest surplus of over \$1,000,000. I point out that he did this without the assistance of an allocation from the Grants Commission and without Commonwealth special grants on a scale such as we have seen this year.

Mr. Jennings: He lived off the Grants Commission for years.

Mr. COUMBE: The honourable member is living in the past. I was referring to the 1964-65 Budget of Sir Thomas Playford, and that was years after this State got away from the Grants Commission.

Mr. Jennings: He lived off it for years, and then gave it up to make himself a big fellow.

Mr. COUMBE: As usual, the honourable member is trying to twist words to his own advantage. All members will admit that the Commonwealth grants, as shown in the Revenue Account, are much greater than previously provided. In the "Public Works and Services" section of the Revenue Account, we find littered throughout additional Commonwealth assistance in the form of grants or subsidies in various fields, such as the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, agriculture, the Roseworthy Agricultural College, public relief, universities, advanced education, education services, hospitals, water resources, public health, and so on. I have read the statement made by the Treasurer about an estimated deficit for 1972-73. I agree with the note of caution that he has sounded. The allocation from the Grants Commission is as yet unknown, apart from the two components of the \$21,000,000 of which we know, and adjustments for wage and salary increases that have been allowed. Allowing for some caution, we could easily finish with a balanced Budget at the end of this financial year, unless the Government goes off the rails again in a mad spending splurge. What a wonderful position to be in! Frankly, I envy the Government. I only wish that, when my Party was last in office, we had had Commonwealth money in such magnitude.

Mr. Jennings: You envy our Treasurer.

Mr. CUMBE: I envy the position in which he finds himself. We must not forget the \$10,000,000 nest egg in the Loan Account that has been tucked away to cover future deficits. As I said previously, I recall being vehemently criticized when in Government by the then Leader of the Opposition (the Treasurer) for having the audacity to put away \$12,000,000 in the Loan Account. I agree that this money should be put aside, and I am pleased to note in the Treasurer's statement the reference made to two former Treasurers, Sir Glen Pearson and Mr. Steele Hall, regarding their determined approaches to the Commonwealth Government in 1969 and early 1970. I thank the Treasurer for that reference, because I believe that their efforts perhaps paved the way for some of the increased grants now being received from the Commonwealth Government by this State.

Regarding Commonwealth-State financial relations, I remember the Treasurer going to the June, 1972, conference in Canberra and muttering threats that, unless South Australia received increased Commonwealth assistance, he would be forced to impose further State taxation on the South Australian public. Even the Treasurer was pleasantly surprised at the result obtained from that conference and, although he did not exactly extol the Commonwealth Liberal Government's action, I believe that the financial statement before us this evening indicates that the Prime Minister (Mr. McMahon) and the Commonwealth Treasurer (Mr. Snedden) have acted this year in a realistic and responsible manner towards all the States, and in this respect this State owes much to the Commonwealth. The standard States of New South Wales and Victoria have been granted an increase in per capita grants from \$2 to \$3.50, and that increase will, of course, not only assist those States in the provision of services but also, in turn, affect the claimant States as they apply for assistance for services and future Grants Commission allocations. The Prime Minister has promised a further conference early next year to further review the position, and this indicates the serious thought being given to changing the basis of the various components which determine the allocations to the States under the Grants Commission, not only in respect of allocations from the Grants Commission but also in respect of general purpose grants from the Commonwealth Government.

Further, the tone of this year's Commonwealth Budget gives me heart in this direction

and I am delighted to read the report in today's press that the Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Whitlam) agrees with the Commonwealth Treasurer that next year or shortly afterwards will see increases in spending. Perhaps a formula can be derived which places greater emphasis on income tax as a basis or some other basis, but I believe that a constitutional review is now needed with special emphasis on the financial relations between the Commonwealth and the States. However, I welcome the proposed constitutional conference mooted for discussion between the Commonwealth and the States.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

Mr. CUMBE: I hope this conference will sort out many of the financial problems that are presently extant. Regarding expenditure items, I concur in the increased allocations to hospitals, education and social welfare. However, without detracting from these departments in any way, I should have preferred more emphasis to be placed on developmental departments. Although these expenditure items are tied up with the Loan Estimates that have previously been passed, I should have preferred greater expenditure to be made by the Mines Department, the Public Buildings Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department, all of which are connected with development and future expansion of this State. Unfortunately, however, we find that most of the modest increases for these departments are to be taken up by wage and salary increases, so there will not be much room for expansion. Increases have occurred in the Education Department with the restructuring of the department, the setting up of the Department of Further Education, and because more staff are required for the numerous new schools established to service our growing population. I wholeheartedly support these increases in expenditure. Apart from grants for the two South Australian universities and the South Australian Institute of Technology, we are to see, as from the next calendar year, a radical change in tertiary education: South Australian teachers colleges will become autonomous; the South Australian School of Arts is joining with the Torrens college; and we will have these additions to our system of colleges of advanced education. Although South Australia does not have the same number of units in this field as have some other States, I believe that this is a

move in the right direction and, having been deeply involved in this field of education, I sincerely welcome it.

The Treasurer has explained the changes in accountancy methods concerning the Revenue Account, although it is the Loan Account that will ultimately benefit from the establishment of colleges of advanced education. These colleges will attract future Commonwealth grants for capital works directly on a \$1 for \$1 basis, thus relieving South Australia of considerable future expenditure. We will then have a system including two universities and S.A.I.T., whereby the Commonwealth Government provides capital grants on a \$1 for \$1 basis and recurrent expenditure grants on the basis of \$1 from the State and a \$1.85 matching grant. This will have a significant effect on both the Loan Account and the Revenue Account. The Treasurer, in beginning his statement, paid a tribute to Mr. Gilbert Seaman, the Under Treasurer, and I join with him in that tribute. I have known Mr. Seaman for many years, when I have been a Minister and a member, and have come to know his worth to this State. I am sure all members will agree unhesitatingly that South Australia has indeed been fortunate in having a man of Mr. Seaman's calibre to advise and direct us on financial matters. Parliament will also be considering the Auditor-General's Report under the signature of Mr. D. E. Byrne. I am sure all honourable members would join with me in paying a tribute to the now retired Auditor-General, Mr. Jeffery, who has given outstanding service to this State, particularly on financial matters.

One aspect of Government financial responsibility concerns me greatly, and I believe that concern is shared by many other people. I refer to the charges being levied on local government, some of which are referred to in the Budget. First, there are the increased contributions expected of councils under the heading of hospital rates. Secondly (and I refer particularly to the metropolitan area), there are the contributions, which are to be greatly increased, for the maintenance of the Fire Brigade. Although this is not a Government department, the Government contributes towards it. Unfortunately, as a result of this increase many councils have had to raise their rates this year. I could not help noticing some trouble that occurred in the Tea Tree Gully area where protests were made about the increased rates being imposed. No doubt many items contributed towards that increase.

The two items to which I refer have caused substantial rate increases in many councils and, of course, the ratepayer and the taxpayer must foot the Bill. One council in my district has had to increase its rate by 1.3c in the dollar, as a result of these increases. One finds that the contribution from councils for hospitals will increase by 24 per cent this year. That is a substantial increase, which councils have had to pass on. Honourable members should note that, although these new costs are not apparent at first glance, they are nevertheless very real and were not referred to in the Treasurer's Financial Statement. The increase in Fire Brigade contributions, although not referred to in the statement, are even more staggering. I refer now to the position regarding three of the four councils in my district, the fourth (Adelaide City Council) being in a special category, although its increase is also fairly solid.

The contribution of the Prospect city council increased by \$8,955, or 195 per cent; that of Walkerville increased by \$4,604; and Enfield's contribution increased by \$27,187. These figures are causing grave concern to councils and their ratepayers. Under the Act, the fire insurance companies are obliged to contribute five-ninths of the board's costs, the Government two-ninths and councils the remaining two-ninths. A limit is placed on the Government's contribution. Of course, the Government has in the past come to the party with an *ex gratia* payment, which has been warmly accepted. These increases are causing much concern to councils, and it is time the whole matter of Fire Brigade contributions was reviewed.

I have heard comparisons made of the amounts paid by various metropolitan councils. The three councils to which I have referred contribute 2.8 per cent of their rate revenue in this respect. I cannot see, with respect to my friend from Glenelg, why his council's contribution is only 1.5 per cent of its rate revenue; nor can I see why the Marion council's contribution is only 1.5 per cent, or why the St. Peters council, in the Treasurer's district, contributes only 1.9 per cent of its rate revenue. It so happens that the area to which I am referring lost one of its Fire Brigade stations; it was taken from Prospect and resited at Gepps Cross. Although the area was always served from North Adelaide, which was only about a mile away, the whole district was rezoned and Prospect and Walkerville are now contributing to Gepps Cross, Ridgehaven and right down to Rosewater. This is a crazy idea, and I suggest

that the Government seriously consider reviewing the whole situation, perhaps basing it on an assessment or population basis. Although inquiries have been instituted, no answers have been forthcoming. I raise this matter because councils are concerned about it. I therefore hope the Government will examine it urgently. The Government has therefore introduced a Budget which features record levels of expenditure and revenue. It reveals the heavy load of State taxation on the people of South Australia—again, a record burden never before reached.

Mr. Mathwin: It hits even the small man on a farm.

Mr. CUMBE: That is correct. That man suffers, too. The Budget indicates the record level of Commonwealth assistance. The Commonwealth Government has really come to the party this year, enabling the State to increase its expenditure in many worthy fields and eventually to balance its Budget.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Be careful. You will have to say that it is a good Budget if you keep going.

Mr. CUMBE: The Minister was absent from the Chamber when I referred to certain items that I wholeheartedly approve. These grants are most timely for the State Government in a State election year and, of course, the Government will no doubt make the most of that situation. I bet my bottom dollar that it will not give an ounce of credit to the Commonwealth Government. It will merely say, "Look at the money we have got and what we are going to do with it." It will not tell the people that it can only do these things because of the massive grants made by the Commonwealth Government.

I believe that a breakthrough has been achieved in the financial relationship between the Commonwealth Government and the States. I am the first to admit, however, that there is still a long way to go. The Commonwealth Government has acted realistically and responsibly, and I look forward to the constitutional convention which is about to be organized. I believe it is imperative that not only the whole Constitution but also (and more particularly) the financial relationships of the States be reviewed, because this has been a matter of contention for more years than I like to recall. I hope this convention will settle these matters once and for all.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I rise to support the Bill. I was interested in what the member for Mawson said, that a Budget was not or should not be an instrument of making or

unmaking Governments but should be an instrument for improving the lot of many people. That is what I understood him to say. That reveals his humanitarian trait that in the time he has been in this House we have come to recognize. As he proceeded, he got off the track and said a few more things that tended to cancel that out. The Treasurer's Financial Statement is a survey of the State's present financial standing, reviewing what has happened in the past and stating what the Government proposes to do in this current financial year. The Treasurer presents a record Budget, which proposes to raise \$509,235,000, against payments of \$509,753,000, leaving a modest deficit of some \$158,000. The Treasurer, in true Rolf Harris style, then got his black paint on to the accounting canvas and said that this rosy picture was likely to take on a different hue with the expected wage rises that would come about in the ensuing year, costing about \$7,000,000, so that the final deficit could be \$7,518,000. The Treasurer stated:

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 of any supplementary Commonwealth grants which may arise from the promised review at a mid-year Premiers' Conference.

The operative word there is "may". We on this side of the House have become accustomed to the loud cries of base ingratitude from the Government benches about this "horrible Commonwealth Government"; but the Leader this afternoon very properly pointed out that accounts are to be brought to hand and it may well be that, by the action of a generous Commonwealth Treasurer, the projected deficit that the State Treasurer has pointed to will not eventuate.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: He may have thought there will be a change in the Commonwealth Treasurer.

Mr. RODDA: I appreciate the wishful thinking of the Minister. The Treasurer's story (and I do not blame him for this) could be described as a two-way take. It is a good story with a Commonwealth election in the offing; I suppose we could call it a push for Gough, but I have no doubt that the story will change once the Commonwealth election is over and we are approaching the time of the next State election, which we are all saying will be March, 1973. That will be a significant occasion in the lives of many of us.

I said a few years ago, when we were considering the Bill dealing with the redistribution of boundaries, that we all had our heads on the block. Perhaps some of us still have our heads on the block.

Mr. Payne: It is a double-headed axe on your side.

Mr. RODDA: History has a habit of repeating itself, and the block is always there. The Treasurer tells a revealing story: there is this record \$509,235,000 that the Government proposes to raise, of which no less than \$201,000,000 comes from Commonwealth sources. The House will do well to realize that this ground was prepared by the previous Liberal Government from the memorable meetings of the State Premiers that took place in Adelaide, when Mr. Steele Hall was the Premier and Sir Glen Pearson was the Treasurer of this State. It was unfortunate that the Hall Government did not run its full term of office and thus have the opportunity of enjoying the benefits of those negotiations, which well and truly laid the foundations of the position that this State Government now enjoys. I have heard it described today as "having money running out of its ears".

Mr. Keneally: Steele Hall's a bit of an idol with you.

Mr. RODDA: Yes; perhaps "pin-up boy" is a better way to describe him, but I will not go into that. However, at that time when the previous Government went out of office, industry was going ahead, but it seems to have slowed down somewhat. I know the Government will not agree with that statement, but when one talks to captains of industry, particularly the building industry, one finds they are not optimistic.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Do you think your leaders would prefer McMahon?

Mr. RODDA: I think they are concerned about what is going on in this State at present. They are responsible people from various industries who give due credence to the Government of the day.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I think they may have been attacking the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. RODDA: We go by the umpire's decision, the umpire being the people of the State, and they were not acknowledging the fact that the Dunstan Government had been returned with 27 members, a handsome majority.

Mr. Payne: And handsome members.

Mr. RODDA: I agree with Onlooker this week. Sometimes I find him hard to agree

with but, when he was looking to the future, he spoke so glowingly of the member for Florey that I thought he was doing the right thing. I thought that even hard-boiled people like myself could be charitable enough in the next Parliament if we saw the honourable member on the front bench opposite. I do not even know who Onlooker is, and I doubt whether the member for Florey does, either. He was making a well-placed judgment when he said those things.

A prominent builder has told me that we do not want to be dazzled by half a dozen cranes that adorn the city skyline. He referred to them as "gay deceivers". This is rather disturbing, when the Government has money running out of its ears, so to speak. The building industry is an interesting yardstick by which to consider the State's economy. I was interested to see in the Auditor-General's Report tabled this afternoon that certain sums of Government revenue were outstanding totalling more than \$13,000,000. It was interesting to see that included here was \$1,258,618 in succession duties, \$431,361 in land tax, and \$124,015 in gift duty. This is significant and also disturbing. For some reason or other, there was a rather heavy spate of deaths last year in the district that I represent, and an awful lot of my supporters are not with us any more.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What do you mean by an "awful lot"?

Mr. RODDA: I am not using it in the context that the Minister has in mind. However, when we consider the plight of rural industry, it is not surprising to see that these sums are outstanding. I use these figures with a view to drawing the Government's attention to the effect of capital taxation. Indeed, the sums in question are sizeable; the only sum exceeding those to which I have referred is the sum outstanding in respect of hospitals, namely, about \$3,324,735. I am sure that the Minister of Environment and Conservation appreciates the difficulty involved there. At this time last year about \$710,000 was outstanding in respect of succession duties, about \$169,000 in land tax, and about \$100,000 in gift duty.

The present outstanding sums represent considerable increases and emphasize the problem obtaining in rural industry today. On the other hand, more than \$137,000,000 is appropriated to education. I have no quarrel with this, for education is an important matter, and an educated community is the right community to have. About \$11,000,000 is appropriated to

community welfare and this, also, is worthwhile expenditure. Likewise, there is a large grant of about \$36,000,000 in respect of public works, although the increase is not as big as perhaps one would have liked to see. However, one then sees the votes in respect of the Cinderella departments: about \$5,900,000 in respect of the Lands Department and about \$6,900,000 in respect of the Agriculture Department. As a country member, I must protest at this, and I express my disgust at the treatment being received here by an important section of the community, the latter sum representing little more than 1 per cent of the total allocation. Although this is a record Budget, rural industry (the Cinderella industry) is shabbily treated by the Government. No less a person was in my district last week than Mr. A. J. Grassby, who is well known to members opposite, and who has lost none of his ability to stir and say certain things.

Mr. McRae: Is his flamboyance still there!

Mr. RODDA: He is as flamboyant as ever. Mr. Grassby talked about being an optimist and said that, although he was an optimist, his father-in-law was an even greater optimist: he is 82 years of age and was recently married again.

Mr. Mathwin: Will he have any children?

Mr. RODDA: He bought a new house and insisted to the land agent when he bought it that it had to be near a school, so I think that answers the interjection. Mr. Grassby does not think that Agriculture Departments should be treated in the way that our Agriculture Department is being shabbily treated under this Budget, receiving a measly \$6,000,000, which is only little more than 1 per cent of the total allocation.

Mr. Payne: Tell us what he said about the Commonwealth wine tax!

Mr. RODDA: Mr. Grassby went on to say that South Australia, or Australia generally, was at the beginning of the greatest grain boom in 25 years, and he then proceeded to give the Commonwealth Government a lashing in regard to wheat quotas. I do not think his colleagues in this State are terribly interested in wheat quotas, bearing in mind the relatively small sum being provided here in respect of a most important part of the State's economy. Mr. Grassby had some rather gleeful things to say about the wool industry and generally laid it on the line that rural industry should be upgraded. Of course, he represents an important rural part of New South Wales, and we appreciate the reason for his sticking up for rural industry. In regard to the Agriculture

Department we find that about \$572,000 is provided in respect of "Administration", involving inspectors, etc.; about \$506,000 is provided in respect of research centres, and also (I do not want to be unfair to the Government) nearly \$187,000 is provided for operating and travelling expenses, etc.

I believe that this underlines the failure of the powers that be to recognize the great need for extension work in agriculture. One can go through the various headings but, as we will have a chance to discuss them in Committee, I will not weary the House, other than make a passing reference to some matters at this stage. However, I protest that, bearing in mind that this is a record Budget, the Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Forests can do little better than raise slightly more than 1 per cent of the total appropriation. I know that my other colleagues from the country will be expressing their concern at this hand-out that the rural sector is receiving from the Government. The New South Wales Government has just brought down a report on the statutory marketing of meat, and it underlines what that Government thinks about rural industries. I will quote what our Minister's counterpart in New South Wales thinks of this industry. Referring to the beef industry, the report states:

Until the end of the Second World War the Australian beef industry enjoyed a comparatively minor place on world markets, principally because of the great distances beef had to be shipped. This necessitated export beef being presented on world markets in frozen form while countries like the Argentine exported their products to the United Kingdom market in chilled form, thus giving that country an advantage in presentation. The cattle industry was, in such circumstances, somewhat unpredictable, depending principally on the home market for the sale of quality beef. As the American beef industry became more orientated towards the production of prime cattle, the production of manufacturing grades of beef declined. At the same time, owing to the high cost of prime beef to the American consumer and its increasing population, cheaper hamburger and manufacturing meats enjoyed a flourishing trade in that country. America did not produce sufficient quantities of manufacturing beef and was consequently compelled to import supplies from Australia and other countries.

In recent years there has also been an increasing demand for quality beef in markets such as Japan During this period Argentine beef herds suffered the ravages of foot and mouth disease, thereby excluding export to the North American and other export markets It must be borne in mind that there are features which could cause a temporary depressing effect on the beef industry.

Because of the depressed situation that the wool industry recently experienced, many wool producers changed to beef production; they paid high prices for female cattle that were not always of good quality, and the producers grazed them on country unsuitable for cattle raising. The report continues:

A high percentage of wool and lamb producers who appeared before the committee admitted that they were changing production to cattle, but the high cost of changing to cattle may dampen a transfer of enterprise to some degree. If the circumstances mentioned bring about excessive numbers of low quality cattle, there is a distinct possibility that, if such cattle are forced on to the market by drought, the slaughtering system could be overtaxed, resulting in a possible fall in values.

Similar comments apply to the mutton industry, the fat lamb industry, and the pig industry. The industries I have referred to require a great deal of research, and we will not get very far with the meagre allocation that has been made in the Budget. I support the second reading of the Bill.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I support the first line; I suppose I do that because there is little else that I can do. Tradition has it that we always support the first line of the Budget.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I presume that the honourable member is trying to inform the House that he supports the Bill.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker; I am very grateful for your explanation and clarification of that point.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is the duty of the Chair to point out members' mistakes.

Dr. TONKIN: Sir, this is too important an occasion to move a disallowance of your ruling, thereby wasting the time of the House. We are dealing with Estimates involving \$401,006,000. Of course, these are only estimates, and the money could well be spent quite differently from the way in which it has been earmarked. This large sum belongs to the community and, whether we like it or not, we have to support the first line of the Budget.

Mr. Jennings: I am glad you recognize that.

Dr. TONKIN: I am pleased to see that the honourable member is awake. South Australia is perhaps fortunate that, on a per capita basis, we get some of the money that people in other States have paid. However, that does not alter the fact that we are dealing with money that has belonged to members of the community, and it has become traditional that we support the first line of the Budget.

Mr. Clark: It will not get you anywhere, but you could oppose it.

Dr. TONKIN: I am very grateful to the honourable member for clarifying the situation, even more than you did, Sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair usually clarifies situations.

Dr. TONKIN: Apart from giving the opportunity to air one or two important matters, this debate is rather a farce.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: If that is so, why are you wasting our time?

Dr. TONKIN: I think it is time that someone did something about it. We have taken this matter for granted for too long. The Auditor-General's Report, which was made available today, shows that the Railways Department had a deficit of \$19,500,000 for the last financial year. The Auditor-General says that the volume of passenger patronage and freight tonnage declined during the year. The operations of the Municipal Tramways Trust resulted in a deficit for the last financial year of \$644,000. The number of passengers carried last year on the trust's services declined by 417,000, compared with 1970-71. Further, the number of passengers carried last year declined by 17,108,000, compared with 1961-62.

It is expected that receipts on Consolidated Revenue Account will increase. Revenue from motor vehicle registration fees and driver's licence fees has increased steeply since 1967-68; it has increased from \$13,000,000 in that year to \$19,500,000 last year. The revenue from those sources was \$4,000,000 greater in the last financial year than it was in 1970-71. I shall not deal in detail with the increases in State taxation that have occurred since the Labor Government came to office, but I hope the people of South Australia are now well aware of those increases and of the staggering amount that they now pay in increased charges, increased taxes and excess water fees.

The increased amount of money available to the State Government is to a significant degree a result of the treatment that the Commonwealth Government has given this State. When one looks at the receipts on Consolidated Revenue Account in the Auditor-General's Report one sees that the Commonwealth Government is coming to the party with an increase of \$11,500,000 over the amount it provided last year. There is no doubt that these figures mirror the current state of affairs. Although public transport is less and less successful and although the number of privately-owned vehicles is increasing, this Government is doing nothing whatever

to solve the pollution problems that will ultimately affect a considerable part of the State, choke our roads, and affect our economy. This Government is employing (and I was going to say "entertainers") noted television personalities to urge people to use public transport, but is doing nothing basically to help or encourage people to use public transport by making that system more attractive. We are becoming sick and tired of criticizing the Government and, in this case, the Minister of Roads and Transport. We criticize him, ask questions of him, and we probe, but he comes up with unsatisfactory replies and explanations that make no sense. I understand a considerable sum is budgeted for research in his department. The department is expanding, but we still have no tangible results and no improvement in our public transport system, as is shown by the comments of the Auditor-General in his report. I do not believe that Adelaide's transport problem is as difficult as all that: admittedly, several committees have been appointed to deal with it. We have had the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study and the Breuning Report, which *got the* Minister off the hook at that time. However, we still have nothing to show for it, and to the man on the street it is results that count. If his public transport system gets him to work or gets him where he wants to go more efficiently and quickly, he would use it with pleasure and be grateful to the Government that provided the system. As it is, he has no hope. I understand that the Minister (and I must be fair to him, as was the member for Victoria) has plans for the future, but I wish to goodness that he would let the people know about them instead of keeping them up his sleeve as an electioneering gimmick. I am sure that that is what he has in mind and that is why we are hearing so little from the Government. It is saving everything up. Words and promises come easily, but we should see some action: we have seen little action from the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Mr. Gunn: What about dial-a-bus?

Dr. TONKIN: I hesitate to raise that question, because it embarrasses the Minister and I hate to embarrass him. The idea of delaying for electioneering purposes is borne out, too, by the water situation in this State. Provision has been made for expenditure on pumping and maintenance and so on for the Murray Bridge to Onkaparinga main, and we have filtration planned. A large slice of the Engineering and Water Supply Department expenditure (and I think it is in the thousands,

from memory), at least four or five times last year's expenditure, has been provided for a working model which, I take it, is the filtration model that has been displayed at the show. Once again I protest, because the priorities of filtration in the E. and W.S. Department are not being applied as they should be. It is all very well to filter Adelaide's water supply, but I believe that filtration should have been planned first for the Morgan-Whyalla main, and I shall continue to say so. I hope I am proved wrong when I say that we may see the results of the failure to do this, and this would be one of the few times that I hope I am proved wrong. In a State where water is so important we should be taking more care (and I am sure the Minister of Environment and Conservation will agree with me) and not allow large quantities of good water to flow to sea from the Bolivar treatment works. It is about time—

Mr. Jennings: Keep that slogan up!

Dr. TONKIN: It seems to me that much lip service has been paid to what should have been done by the Government, but very little in the way of concrete results to show what it has been talking about. I shall be interested to find out what the proposed grants for the juvenile delinquency projects will be. There has been a significant increase in moneys budgeted for staff in the Community Welfare Department: I presume it represents an increase in the number of staff and not just an increase in salaries. The amount of \$485,000 was voted last year, \$538,000 was spent, and \$604,000 is proposed for this year. I am pleased to see this increase, but it is impossible to tell where the people will be employed. It is impossible to tell whether an increase in staff will be possible, because it is impossible to tell whether trained staff will be available. I think all honourable members know my views about the treatment of young offenders, and I look forward to the time when the present measures get a chance to prove their worth.

However, as we are not getting on with it quickly enough, we cannot come to a conclusion about the results of the programme that we accepted last session to treat juvenile offenders until the entire programme is co-ordinated and working as a whole. I am disappointed that there is no evidence at this stage of when the co-ordination of departments will come about: nothing has been shown that this will come within the foreseeable future. I hope I am wrong, and perhaps something is hidden in bits and pieces in this

Budget that will fall into a pattern like a jigsaw when the Treasurer or the Minister for Community Welfare snaps his fingers. I think the man in the street will be disappointed, because he is alarmed at the present trend. Something must be done, because the present disturbances occurring at Vaughan House, McNally Training Centre, and Windana Remand Home give every reason for concern.

We have to get moving and implement the changes we proposed in the Juvenile Courts Bill and the Community Welfare Bill, but there is not much evidence that this is happening. To return to my original theme, it was a great shame that the Auditor-General's Report was not available sooner. It is traditional that the Budget be introduced and then the debate is delayed for a week. Although tradition is sometimes a good thing, perhaps it is about time that we had a look at this one. I do not in any way criticize the Auditor-General, his staff, or members of the Government Printing Office but, if it was not possible to supply the Auditor-General's Report by the time that the Budget was presented, perhaps the Budget should have been delayed for a week. In the light of the easy (one might almost say superficial) legislative programme of the Government at present, which is all syrup and molasses, the Budget could have been delayed.

We should consider this whole method of bringing down a Budget. I realize that I am a new member and that many members have been in this place longer than I have been here. Some members are about to leave Parliament. Although I will miss them, I must be honest and say that if they are replaced by members of my Party I will not mind at all. I think that the member for Elizabeth may agree with what I am saying about the method of bringing down the Budget but that he may also say that nothing can be done about it.

Mr. Clark: I said what you are saying for nearly 20 years, when I sat on the side that you are now sitting on.

Dr. TONKIN: That is a good reason to support what I am saying now. I support the second reading of this Bill. Later, I shall deal with the queries I have with regard to hospitals and health. I believe that a deliberate attempt has been made to make this Budget as uncontroversial as possible, and that is what we expect in the last session before an election. I do not believe the Treasurer has paid sufficient tribute to the contribution made by the Commonwealth Government to this State. I believe that, in budgeting for a deficit, the Treasurer is obviously hoping that the Com-

monwealth Government will pick up the tab once again. Good luck to him. I think that the Commonwealth will probably pick up the tab, but I believe we should at least give credit where credit is due.

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): I am rather shocked at the inattention and apparent lack of interest being shown by Government members. Apart from the Treasurer and the member for Mawson, no other Government member has shown sufficient interest in the Budget to speak in this debate. I wonder whether other Government members have even read it. Perhaps they are satisfied to know that it will be passed; perhaps they have been told that this is all there is to it. Obviously, apart from the Treasurer and the member for Mawson, no Government members intend to speak in this debate, and only a few of them are now present in the Chamber.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable member drawing attention to the state of this House?

Mr. CARNIE: No, I am calling attention to the inattention by Government members to the Budget.

Mr. Clark: There aren't many members present on your side.

Mr. CARNIE: Members on this side are speaking in this debate. This Budget is the last of this Fortieth Parliament. As previous speakers have said, this is obviously an election Budget. Each of the last two Budgets were secret documents which did not do what Budgets were traditionally supposed to do: they did not set out for the people of the State just how the Government intended to spend money in the coming year. On the surface, this Budget appears to be a reasonably innocuous document, but it is remarkable for the fact that, for the first time since I have been a member, in introducing it the Treasurer had something good to say about the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Payne: Probably it's the first time he's had reason to say something like that.

Mr. CARNIE: I do not agree, but at least the Treasurer admits on this occasion that there is a reason to say something good. I believe that there have been reasons in the past, but no credit has been given just the same. In his speech, the Treasurer stated:

At the Premiers' Conference of June, 1970, the Commonwealth 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.

The Treasurer then said that the Commonwealth had provided supplementary grants in 1970-71. He was again kind to the Commonwealth, when he said:

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 . . .

I refer to these statements, because it is so unusual for the Treasurer to give any credit to the Commonwealth Government. As the member for Bragg has said, obviously the Treasurer is counting on the fact that, if things get too bad, the Commonwealth will come to the aid of the State. This is shown, when the Treasurer states:

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.

Therefore, the Treasurer is obviously planning on the fact that the Commonwealth will again come to the aid of the State. Because of the particularly innocuous document that we are debating, I believe it is necessary to go back over the last three Budgets and consider especially revenue from taxation, from charges for Government services, and from receipts from Commonwealth grants.

Mr. Burdon: Why not go back over the two years before that?

Mr. CARNIE: I will be more interested in what the member for Mount Gambier has to say if he says it in a speech. Obviously he has done no work on the Budget, as he does not intend to speak in this debate. I believe that we should compare the revenue received for the three years from the three sources to which I have referred. In addition, I should like to compare those figures with the figures from the Budget of the last year of the Hall Government. In 1969-1970 (the last year of the Liberal and Country League Govern-

ment), receipts from taxation were \$56,066,000. In the following year receipts from taxation amounted to \$58,744,000, providing a comparatively modest increase of 4.8 per cent. In 1971-72, receipts from taxation paid by the public of South Australia jumped to \$92,276,000, an increase of 58.8 per cent. In this year, 1972-73, the Budget estimates that receipts from taxation will be \$107,780,750, an increase of 16.7 per cent over last year. The estimated revenue from taxation for the year 1972-73 compared with the actual receipts from taxation in the year 1969-70 shows an increase in excess of 92 per cent. True, of this amount, \$34,000,000 comes from pay-roll tax, which is a new tax for this State handed over by the Commonwealth Government last year and this is its first full year of operation but, even so, there is still an increase of \$17,000,000 in revenue from taxation during the last three years, an increase of 30 per cent.

The next major source of revenue is that obtained from public works, services and other receipts, and there we have the same kind of increase without having pay-roll tax, which can be taken off at the end. Receipts from the Liberal and Country League Government in the 1969-70 year from this source were \$143,407,000 and that figure increased in the next year by 12 per cent to \$160,836,000. Last year, a further 14.3 per cent increase was obtained to provide the figure of \$183,854,000. The estimated revenue from this source for the year 1972-73 will be \$196,886,000, an increase of 7 per cent over the last year. The figure shown in the Revenue Estimates for the year now under consideration is 37 per cent greater than that sum received in 1969-70. In these two items alone we have an increase of about 33 per cent, which is about 11 per cent annually, while inflation throughout Australia is running at about 7 per cent or 8 per cent. Although this is far too high, the situation is not helped when Government taxes and charges to the community are running in excess of 11 per cent annually. I cannot believe that this is helpful and I seriously believe that budgeting of this nature contributes to the inflation we are now experiencing. These two items to which I have referred, taxation and revenue from public works, etc., total \$104,000,000 annually more than in 1969-70, and therefore every person in South Australia is paying \$100 extra annually in taxes and charges which, as all members will agree, is a large increase for any person to pay.

The third major item of Government revenue is revenue obtained from the Commonwealth Government. In 1969-70, receipts from the Commonwealth Government totalled \$128,803,000. In 1970-71, first year of this Government's tenure, receipts from the Commonwealth Government were \$164,206,000, but the Budget of that year called for \$147,700,000 while the actual receipts were \$164,000,000. Again, the Commonwealth Government came to the aid of this Government's mismanagement and gave the Government about \$17,000,000 more in that year. In 1971-72, receipts from the Commonwealth Government were \$175,865,000. This year the estimated revenue from the Commonwealth Government is \$201,294,000, an increase of \$26,000,000 over the last year.

Comparing this year with the last year of the previous Liberal Government, the Commonwealth Government is now paying this State \$72,491,000 more than it paid then, an increase of 56 per cent. Considering the additional revenue that this State receives in cash terms, there is an increase from taxation receipts of \$51,000,000, public works and services and other receipts of \$53,000,000 and an additional \$72,000,000 in round figures from the Commonwealth Government. This represents an increase over the last three years of \$176,000,000, which is a considerable increase over three years. Many members opposite can remember bitterly criticizing the Government of the day, when they were in Opposition, for not doing enough financially for this State, yet one point must be remembered: in those days Budgets were balanced. We now have a situation where the Government has an income of \$176,000,000 in excess of that of earlier Liberal Governments, yet it still cannot balance its books.

The Hon. D. K. McKee: You are going back to the horse and buggy days. You'll get run over by a horse and dray in a minute.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. CARNIE: I find the interjection of the Minister very interesting. How long is it possible to run at a deficit? There must come a day of reckoning, and the honourable Minister would know this as well as anyone. After going along to the Commonwealth Government and saying that our books will not balance and that we want more money, this Government seems content. The deficit has to be made up somewhere, and for the honourable Minister to talk of the horse and buggy days shows the

irresponsibility of members of the front bench of this Government. The Government is receiving much more additional money than has been received in the past, especially by the previous Government. Yet, when we ask what this State is getting for that additional money, it is impossible to point to anything specific: the extra money seems to be swallowed up in general financial mismanagement to the extent of \$176,000,000.

Other speakers have referred to the Auditor-General's Report being received after the Budget is presented to the House, and I should also like to voice my protest on this matter. I accept what the Treasurer said today in reply to a question from the member for Mitcham. All the relevant figures must be submitted to the Auditor-General and, of course, they must be audited. Also, the physical process of printing is not an insignificant factor. Although the Treasurer said that this had been the common practice of Governments in the past, it is not good practice. It would make it much easier if members could study the Auditor-General's Report in conjunction with the Budget. We are now rapidly pressing on with the Budget debate, having received copies of the Auditor-General's Report only this afternoon. It appears that Government members do not intend to speak on the Budget.

Mr. Rodda: They want to get their money and go home.

Mr. CARNIE: I believe that is so. However, I do not intend to dwell on that point. I merely add my small protest and ask whether in future we could study the Auditor-General's Report and the Budget together. Government members will probably speak on the lines, although I should be surprised if that happens.

I should like briefly to comment on one or two items, the first of which arises most years: I refer to the increase in expenditure by the Department of the Premier and of Development. Although I do not intend to go into this matter in detail, I point out that in less than three years its expenditure has increased from about \$400,000 to about \$1,570,000, which is indeed a large increase. According to the Estimates now before members, the sum of \$1,456,128 was voted for this department in 1971-72, whereas, according to the Estimates for the year ended June 30, 1972, \$1,166,067 was the proposed expenditure. Somehow, this amount increased by about \$300,000, a matter which I intend to raise later.

I refer briefly to the road maintenance contribution tax. Earlier this session, I asked the Minister of Roads and Transport a question regarding the payment of this tax by farmers transporting goods between their own properties. In reply, the Minister said that an exemption was granted in respect of the carriage of stock or fodder but for no other purpose. I was referring (and I refer now) to the carriage of implements, superphosphate, seed and all items necessary in running a farm. I stress that I am not referring to the carriage of superphosphate from the works to the farm or of wheat from the farm to the silo. Any farmer would expect to pay the tax in relation to that type of cartage. I am referring only to the carriage of goods between a farmer's properties, be they one mile or 50 miles apart. To make their properties viable, many farmers often acquire more land. Indeed, they are encouraged to do so by the rural reconstruction scheme, under which money is made available for farm build-up to enable farmers to make smaller properties better business propositions. It is no help if a farmer, having enlarged his properties, must pay tax on the transport of goods between those properties. The road maintenance tax is indeed iniquitous, particularly from my point of view and that of the members for Eyre and Victoria.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Who put it on?

Mr. CARNIE: I am not arguing about who put it on. I am not blaming the present Government for imposing the tax: I am merely saying that, whoever imposed it, it is an iniquitous tax, about which the Minister of Works knows much. The point is that the farther one gets from the city, the greater is the impact of this tax. The people in my district, and those in Eyre and Victoria Districts, would realize this. The revenue raised from this tax (which is imposed on a ton-mile basis) is needed by this State to enable it to run its services. I am not at the moment advocating the abolition of this tax, although I have advocated that and will no doubt continue to advocate it in the future. I ask the Minister to examine this aspect of the tax and to widen the exemption in relation to a farmer carrying goods between his own properties.

I deal now with another aspect to which I have referred previously—the Government Produce Department at Port Lincoln, which was expected last year to lose \$136,000. I see from the Auditor-General's Report, which members have received only today, that it

actually lost \$110,424, which is slightly less than the budgeted loss. This year, the Government is budgeting for a loss of \$146,000. I hope that a similar situation will occur this financial year and that the loss will be less than the estimated loss. The operations of the Port Lincoln branch of the Government Produce Department are of great concern to everyone connected with primary production in the area, including the producers, operators and management of the works. Since entering this Chamber, I pressed for the setting up of a committee of inquiry into the operation of the Government Produce Department, with special reference to the Port Lincoln branch. When requesting this inquiry, I had in mind that a study would be made by a firm of management consultants, to get a study of the complete operations of the works. The Government set up a committee which was a little different from the committee I had in mind, but at least it was a committee of able men. It made a study of the entire operations of the Government Produce Department, with special reference to Port Lincoln. This report was finished some time ago and presented to the Minister but, like so many other reports presented to Ministers, nothing more has been heard of it.

Mr. Harrison: Name a few.

Mr. CARNIE: The Beerworth report for one, and there have been other reports, too.

Mr. Mathwin: That's shut them up.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CARNIE: The report on the Produce Department was received by the Minister some months ago. I have asked on several occasions whether he has finished studying it and whether he intends making it public, but I am still waiting for a reply to my last question on that. One wonders why this report is being suppressed, for it vitally concerns a large section of the community of this State.

I want now to quote briefly from the Auditor-General's Report where he deals with the losses incurred by the Produce Department. The Auditor-General gives five-yearly figures, but I will deal only with the figures for the last financial year, where for head office exports there was a profit of \$33,540, for the Light Square branch there was a profit of \$3,287, and for the Port Lincoln branch there was a loss of \$147,251. This all resulted in a total loss of \$110,424. 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. During the year under

review the loss at this branch was \$147,000, an improvement of \$170,000 when compared with the previous year.

This was something we were all pleased to see, for the loss of the previous year had been the frightening one of \$317,393. The Auditor-General continues:

This was mainly due to the increase in charges for and number of livestock treated by the branch.

He also mentions the report of the committee, and states:

Last year I reported that a committee had been set up by the Government to review, amongst other matters, the operations at Port Lincoln. The committee has completed its investigation and submitted its report to the Minister of Agriculture, who now has the matter under consideration.

The Minister has had this matter under consideration, I believe, since February. When will he make a decision on it?

In conclusion, I raised this matter when speaking to the Address in Reply debate (and I will raise it again now), in connection with the Produce Department works in Port Lincoln in particular, and also the meatworks and killing works throughout South Australia generally, when I advocated during that debate that the time had come to consider phasing out the Gepps Cross abattoir and supplying the metropolitan area from our regional abattoirs, of which the abattoir at Port Lincoln is one. Regional abattoirs are strategically scattered throughout the State, and will be even more so when the one at Naracoorte is built in a year or so. There is no question that these killing works could supply the metropolitan area in addition to satisfying export requirements. In this regard, I say again that the Port Lincoln works should be upgraded to American beef export standard. The sum involved here is about \$500,000. This is not a large sum when one considers the revenue that could come to this State from exporting beef to the United States, because Eyre Peninsula is rapidly becoming a beef-producing area; the increase in beef cattle over the last 10 years has been about ten-fold and the number is still increasing rapidly. As I said before, the main debate on all Budgets centres on the lines. I have many queries I will raise then but at this stage I support the Bill.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I, too, support the Bill. Like other members on this side, I should like first to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on the manner in which he replied to the Treasurer's financial statement. I believe this is the first occasion on which he has had the

opportunity to reply to that statement, and on the next occasion when we are discussing the Budget it will be a Budget that he himself has delivered. We are all aware of the outstanding qualities of the Leader of the Opposition, and he has proved himself this afternoon by the way in which he has analysed the Treasurer's statement.

We must be realistic when talking about this document. One cannot level much criticism at the few proposed taxing measures which the Government intends to increase in this Budget, but what I do criticize is the fact that there are no decreases in taxation in areas at which the Government should be looking. We hear from time to time, particularly from the Government members, that we should be endeavouring to help people in need. I think most people in the State are aware that the primary industries in South Australia, and in Australia generally, are facing a most difficult period. I admit that we have reached the stage where perhaps we have got over the worst of the problem and are on the way back to getting a reasonable return for our endeavours. The Commonwealth Budget was presented by the Commonwealth Treasurer (Mr. Snedden) a few weeks ago, and it is only when we read both Budgets together that we realize that the State Budget is not so enlightening when compared with the Commonwealth Budget, because the Commonwealth Treasurer, aware of the problems facing the people of this country, made some concessions. The first concession he made to the country people—

The SPEAKER: Order! We are not debating the Commonwealth Budget.

Mr. GUNN: I shall be happy to link up my remarks with the State Budget. In this Budget, the Treasurer fails to appreciate the problems of succession duties and capital taxation in relation to primary producers and their position in South Australia. In the Commonwealth Budget, however, this matter was looked at closely and some relief was granted. If we want to continue to support the family farms and small business enterprises, this Government must face reality and, if not altogether, at least to a large degree dispense with rural taxation.

Mr. Simmons: Another rural subsidy!

Mr. GUNN: The member for Peake talks about rural subsidies. I am pleased he does so. One of his colleagues in another place recently made a statement which was reported in a newspaper, the *Farmer and Grazier*.

Mr. Simmons: What has that to do with the Budget?

Mr. Venning: Would you—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Rocky River is entirely out of order in interjecting when not in his seat. I have repeatedly called for order in this debate, and I strongly suggest that the honourable member contain himself.

Mr. VENNING: On a point of order—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must take his seat. He is entirely out of order, and I expect him to conduct himself in accordance with Standing Orders. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. VENNING: On a point of order—

The SPEAKER: The member for Rocky River is entirely out of order and, if he is going to waste the time of the House, I will have to deal with him in another manner. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: I was referring to remarks of a gentleman who belongs to the same Party as that of the member for Peake and who said that rural exports were the key to a sound economy. I understand that the member for Peake claims to be an economist. I know that a number of spokesmen for the Commonwealth Labor Party claim to speak for the primary producers of this country. We have Mr. Grassby saying one thing, Dr. Patterson saying another, and Mr. Whitlam saying something else. Those people have only one thing in common: their attitude is based on the narrow Socialist track that they follow with one goal in mind.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What's Dr. Patterson got to do with the State Budget? I didn't think he drew up the Budget.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am trying to follow the remarks of the member for Eyre and, if honourable members allow me, I will be in a better position to hear him. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: I thank you for your kind consideration, Mr. Speaker. I was trying to link up my remarks. If members opposite are not aware of the kind of money that the railways receive through the carriage of grain—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The primary producers receive much benefit from the railways.

Mr. GUNN: I was not criticizing the railways. We on this side appreciate what the railways do, and I am willing to admit that the railways opened up much of the farming area of this State.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You're always trying to run the railways down.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am afraid that I must clamp down on interjections. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Government has a responsibility to look, in a fair and reasonable light, at the taxing measures it has introduced, if it wishes to see rural industry in this State continue in the way in which I believe it should continue. I and all members on this side believe that the Government should look at these avenues of taxation realistically, because they are having a detrimental effect on our primary producers as well as on the small business people. It is no use having a Commonwealth rural reconstruction assistance scheme, under which money is spent on farm build-up and then, as soon as it reaches an economic size, a Government department pounces like an eagle on a lamb and takes the best part of the estate. One always remembers the obnoxious statement made by the member for Peake, although I do not know whether it is worth quoting again.

Mr. Mathwin: Read it again!

Mr. GUNN: We are aware of the member for Peake's regard for private industry and private property in this State. When speaking on the occasion in question, he was speaking, I believe, for all members opposite. He was dealing with the Companies Act and, as the Budget is a financial measure, I think it is appropriate to quote the remarks on this occasion. Indeed, my constituents love to hear this quote, and they are impressed by it. The honourable member said:

This country would be better served by a Socialist economic system, and I make no apology for saying that.

Mr. Simmons: Thank you for quoting me.

Mr. GUNN: I am confident that the people of this State and, indeed, of Australia would never accept a Socialist economic society. I believe the people of South Australia have already had a taste of what Socialism is like and that this will be the reason for the defeat of the Socialist Party at the next election. We have heard statements by the Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition to the detriment of our export industries, when he was referring to currency devaluation, although I understand that he was corrected on this matter.

Mr. Coumbe: What did Dr. Patterson say about that?

Mr. GUNN: He had quite a bit to say, as did Mr. Grassby, but I do not think I will refer to that at this stage. However, I should now like to comment on the opal-mining industry of this State. This is an important

area in which the State can do much more, and in which the Commonwealth should also assist. At present, the industry is facing many difficulties, perhaps the major one at this stage being that most miners work as individuals or as partners and often work for long periods, with little monetary gain. Unfortunately, if they happen to strike a reasonable parcel of opal, they are immediately faced with a large income tax bill to pay, and this has a crippling effect on their livelihood.

Both the State and Commonwealth Governments must examine a scheme that would allow these people to adopt an averaging system similar to that applying to primary producers, or a scheme that would provide for a flat royalty and an exemption from income tax, which I believe would be the better scheme, so that people would know how much they had to pay. If they were fortunate to strike a reasonable parcel of opal, they would not be penalized through paying income tax in the same way as they are penalized today.

Mr. Simmons: What's that got to do with this Budget?

Mr. GUNN: It is an important matter and, if the honourable member is not interested to see this important industry develop, I am interested, because the opal-mining industry in South Australia is unique. Individuals are trying to make a living, although we know that, as a Socialist, the member for Peake does not like individualists.

Mr. Simmons: What's exemption from income tax got to do with this Budget?

Mr. GUNN: I represent the people concerned, and they do not get any representation whatsoever from the Commonwealth Labor Party. While I represent these people in this place, I intend to speak on their behalf at every possible opportunity. These people are sick of talking to the Commonwealth member for Grey. Having referred their problems to their Liberal Senator, I am confident that I will receive a good answer for the benefit of these people. As I have said, the Labor Party is not concerned about them. At present a small band of criminals is operating at Coober Pedy.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Whew!

Mr. GUNN: The Minister may whistle, but I am willing to say that they are criminals and, through their activities, they are holding the opal miners to ransom. Last weekend, when I made one of my regular visits to the north of my district, I interviewed some opal miners, who all expressed grave concern about what is taking place there. I met members of

the opal miners executive; 14 opal miners were there, 10 of whom had had personal experience of threats involving physical violence.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must link his remarks with the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: I believe that the opal-mining industry is very important, because it provides valuable exports. Coober Pedy is one of the largest outlets for diesel fuel in South Australia.

Mr. Wright: Are you saying that the police are incompetent to catch the criminals?

Mr. GUNN: I did not say that at all.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am trying to ascertain whether the honourable member is linking his remarks with the Bill but, because there are so many interjections, I am finding it difficult to follow his remarks. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: The first case that I should like to refer to is that of a gentleman who has been working at Coober Pedy for some years. On two occasions his claim has been illegally mined; after the second occasion he found it necessary to sleep at his mine. The next case is of a person whose claim was illegally mined twice. The third person also has a claim that was illegally mined twice. The fourth case is of a person whose claim was illegally mined four times. The fifth case is of a person who was threatened that, if he took any action against the criminals, his dugout would be blown up with gelignite. The sixth case is of a person who has lost count of illegal actions against him.

Mr. Wright: Have you an affidavit to prove your statements?

Mr. GUNN: I have statements giving details of these cases. The seventh case is of a person whose claim was illegally mined four times; further, the padlock was cut off the cage. One of the criminals, on being taken to court, made the excuse that he was observing the geological strata of the area.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must link his remarks with the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: I should like to air this matter because there is much concern at Coober Pedy about what is taking place. When these criminals have been caught they have threatened the miners by saying, "If you take any action, we will get you." On one occasion an individual who was caught said that, rather than split on his mate, he would serve five years in gaol.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will be out of order if he continues in that strain.

Mr. GUNN: I am not in any way criticizing the police, who have a difficult task to perform. I should like to inform the member for Adelaide that I have interviewed senior police officers and I have conferred with the Minister, who has been most helpful.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot use this debate as an opportunity to make a personal explanation.

Mr. Wright: Do you know an opal miner named Lucas?

Mr. GUNN: One cannot fail to be impressed by the financial assistance that the Commonwealth Government has given to this State.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Ha, ha!

Mr. GUNN: The Minister has been one of the strongest critics of the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And I always will be while the rotten L.C.P. Government is in office.

Mr. GUNN: I do not want to debate the matter across the Chamber with the Minister. I should like to comment on the sums allocated to transport. I could not find anything in the Budget about a dial-a-bus scheme. Some time ago the Minister stated that there would be a dial-a-bus system before Christmas.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's a deliberate untruth.

Mr. GUNN: We always know when the Minister is on shaky ground, because he starts to yell.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I challenge you to show where I made the statement that you have alleged I made.

Mr. GUNN: We are aware that the Minister has put himself in a position that he cannot get out of. He has made so many statements about the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study and the dial-a-bus system that he does not know which way to turn. When will the dial-a-bus system begin to operate? The Minister has made many bland statements about the system.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You should stick to wombats on the West Coast; otherwise, Ernie Edwards will knock you off.

Mr. GUNN: A Minister of the Crown should be able to make far more intelligent statements than that. I am not surprised by anything the Minister says.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You won't be here much longer.

Mr. GUNN: I think I will be here for a long time. Members of the Liberal and

Country League represent their constituents directly and do not sign any obnoxious pledges, as do Labor Party members.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What about the rigging of the ballot for President of the L.C.L.?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I can appreciate that possibly some honourable members may think that they are assisting the honourable member for Eyre, but interjections must cease, because the honourable member is finding it difficult to continue. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: I am not finding it difficult to continue, although I do not reflect on your statement, Mr. Speaker, and I do not need assistance, particularly from the Minister of Roads and Transport. In the Governor's Speech he referred to the fact—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order in referring to a matter that has been disposed of in this House. The Address in Reply debate has been completed and the honourable member cannot speak about that.

Mr. GUNN: The Government said it intended to grant specific assistance to outback children. I was amazed when I read the Budget, because no specific allocation has been made for this purpose. I told some of my constituents that it seemed that the Government intended, in the near future, to make funds available to assist parents on low incomes living in outback areas who were finding it difficult to provide education facilities for their children. It is the right of every child in this State to receive an adequate education. Unfortunately, the Government has not seen fit to provide anything, although I do not know whether it will come out as an election promise. It may, because we can expect anything from the Government. I believe that this is an election Budget, and it is the first shot in the State election campaign. I criticize what the Budget has not done for the people of this State. Few increases in taxation have been made, but the Government should have taken positive action concerning many matters. The lead was given by an enlightened Commonwealth Government, but this Government has done nothing to assist. In these circumstances we are fortunate in having such a Commonwealth Government.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.22 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September, 13, at 2 p.m.