

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, September 19, 1972

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

ABSENCE OF CLERK ASSISTANT

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that, in accordance with Standing Order 31, I have appointed Mr. J. W. Hull (Second Clerk Assistant) to act as Clerk Assistant and Sergeant-at-Arms during the temporary absence on account of illness of Mr. A. F. R. Dodd (Clerk Assistant and Sergeant-at-Arms).

QUESTIONS**FILM CLASSIFICATION**

Mr. COUMBE: In the temporary absence of the Attorney-General, will the Premier give me information about the operation of the legislation passed during the last session regarding film classification? Several complaints have been made to me regarding the operation of the R film classification, particularly as it affects drive-in theatres. A perusal of the daily advertisements for these theatres indicates immediately that many such metropolitan theatres have at least one R film showing, with the result, I consider, that the legislation is defective in its operation, because many young couples cannot take their young children to these theatres. I therefore ask the Premier to obtain a report on the proportion of R classification films to the total number being shown and on whether a method can be developed to solve this problem, because I firmly believe that this situation is causing hardship to many young couples throughout this State.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will refer the matter to my colleague and get a report for the honourable member.

SOUTH-EAST WATER RESOURCES

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Works say what is the nature of the investigation into underground water supplies in the South-East directed from the new Mines Department office at Naracoorte? Much interest is centred on information concerning underground water supplies in the South-East, and it is acknowledged that far too little is known about this matter. As the work has been stepped up, landholders are interested to know what type of survey is being conducted, the nature of the examination of the underground aquifers, and the loss to the aquifer because of the

run-off caused by drainage of the top water, which could otherwise be used for recharging. This survey is important not only to the South-East but also to South Australia generally.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the honourable member is aware, the programme to investigate the total water resources of the South-East was stepped up dramatically last year, to the extent that about 650 bores over a three-mile grid have been sunk or listed (some bores were already in existence), and all these bores will be subject to measurement control, from which data will be obtained over a period. To measure surface water, 20 gauging stations have been set up throughout the South-East, although sufficient data will not be available from this source until two years after the project commences. This will give a better idea of the total resources. I have stated on several occasions that there is not the unlimited supply of water in the South-East some people think there is. True, there are indications that the South-East could support a population of at least 250,000 with the present known water resources, but it will probably be 10 years before we have obtained sufficient data to assess accurately the total quantity of water held in the underground basins in that area and on the surface. The honourable member will be aware that the office of the Mines Department that was recently opened at Naracoorte is the nerve centre of this whole operation. The Mines Department, in conjunction with the Engineering and Water Supply Department, is responsible for this survey, and the new office will co-ordinate the information obtained through the survey. It has already been pointed out by another committee, which I set up about 12 months ago to examine the pollution of underground waters in the South-East (it is just as important to know the quality as it is to know the quantity), that protection against pollution is necessary in the Mount Gambier area. That area was closely examined by the committee, although its work will eventually cover the whole of the South-East. The committee believes there is a need for protection, and it has accordingly recommended to me that the area should come under the Underground Waters Preservation Act. As this is the responsibility of the Premier as Minister of Mines, I have written to him recently asking him to consider implementing the recommendation made to me by that committee, headed by Mr. Johnston, the former Chief Chemist of the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Concern was expressed also at the quantity of water being drawn off from underground sources in the Padthaway area, and as it is believed that this has just about reached its limit, a decision will have to be made shortly whether to control this water. The honourable member will appreciate that the Underground Waters Preservation Act in the main determines the number and location of bores and the method of construction (they must be properly constructed, etc). If I have not covered all the points raised by the honourable member, I shall be pleased to obtain any further information that he requires.

PARTY MEMBERSHIP

Mr. JENNINGS: I ask a question of you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that all members on this side are feeling for you greatly today, because of the difficulties you have in working out who represents what Party in this Chamber following the further disintegration of members on the other side. Can you say whether you have worked out whether now you can distinguish members by their ties?

Members interjecting:

Mr. JENNINGS: Members on this side are wearing ties with an insignia on them that establishes—

Mr. Gunn: You are commenting.

Mr. JENNINGS: —their membership of the Labor Party.

Mr. Venning: What's the question?

Mr. JENNINGS: The member for Flinders is wearing the new Liberal Movement tie.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is giving information, not asking his question.

Mr. JENNINGS: I ask leave to quote, from the *Eyre Peninsula Tribune*, a letter from Mr. Lindsay Graham (Secretary of the Rocky River L.C.L. District Committee) which states:

I would like to draw to the attention of the electors of Flinders (particularly the members of the L.C.L. in the area) the action of your member of Parliament, Mr. John Carnie, who saw fit to campaign in the electorate of Rocky River on Wednesday, August 30, for the Liberal Movement candidate for the L.C.L. presidency, Mr. Alan Perryman.

Apparently, it was a double double-cross, as we have found out from the Leader of the Liberal Movement—

Mr. Venning: What's your question?

Mr. JENNINGS: —because someone—

The SPEAKER: Order! "Question" has been called. I will examine the honourable member's question.

Mr. Jennings: Thank you, Sir.

The SPEAKER: However, I have had considerable difficulty in trying to ascertain just what the point was.

Mr. Jennings: I was only trying—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Jennings: —to help you by pointing out—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Jennings: —the way you could distinguish them.

The SPEAKER: Order!

STUART CASE

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say what is the basis for his statements on television and in the press that the Chairman of the Parole Board (Sir Roderic Chamberlain) is not a fit man to hear a parole application from convicted murderer Rupert Max Stuart? I am disturbed to read in today's press the statement attributed to the Premier that Sir Roderic Chamberlain should disqualify himself from any hearing of a parole application from Rupert Max Stuart, who is now serving a life sentence at Yatala for the murder of a child in 1958. On page 5 of today's newspaper the following report appears:

Mr. Dunstan said he did not think Sir Roderic should sit on the Parole Board when an application for parole by Stuart was being considered.

I am disappointed that the Premier has again attempted to bring the legal system in South Australia into disrepute by alleging that Sir Roderic could not give an impartial opinion in this matter. The Premier's attacks on law and order are becoming so commonplace that we have come to expect these types of statement from him, even though in most other instances, as a legal man himself, he would no doubt defend most vocally the ability of a judge or magistrate to act impartially. The Premier has made the point that Sir Roderic should disqualify himself from consideration of any future parole application by Stuart. The point I make is this: why should there be a need for Sir Roderic to act any differently in this instance from his action in any other parole application which may come before him and with which he may have had previous involvement during his earlier legal and judicial career? As he has risen to his present position through his ability to act honestly and impartially, there is no reason to think that he could not treat this case with any lesser degree of professional impartiality. What then makes the Premier consider Sir Roderic unfit to hear any parole application from Stuart?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In the course of explaining his question, the Leader has suggested that I am constantly making attacks on law and order. I completely refute that allegation. The basis of my objections in this matter arise from a cardinal principle of the law, and that is that justice should not only be done but be seen to be done. In this matter, apparently the Leader has not seen all the comments that have been made by Sir Roderic Chamberlain. I suggest that the Leader examine the full transcript of what Sir Roderic saw fit to say on television. What he had to say cannot give anyone the view that he could view an application by Stuart without emotional and personal involvement. That was obvious from what he said on television. Frankly, for anyone claiming impartiality, what he said was extraordinary.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I thought it was all right.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am referring to fair-minded people; I know what the honourable member thinks. In addition, Sir Roderic's personal involvement not only with the Royal Commission but also with subsequent prosecutions in the matter and the statements he has made are such that I believe that the proper course for him to take would have been to disqualify himself from sitting on the Parole Board on the application.

Mr. Coumbe: On Stuart.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I am not referring to any other case: I am referring only to the case of Stuart. I have never suggested that Sir Roderic should not sit on any other case. In this matter, his public pronouncements are such that I believe he ought not to sit on the Parole Board.

Dr. Eastick: That's your opinion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I was asked for my opinion and I have given it.

Dr. Eastick: He can have an opinion, too.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Certainly he can, and I am not suggesting that he does not have an opinion; in fact, he has expressed it. However, as Leader of this Government, I have been called on to say whether we agree to the course he has taken, and the frank answer to that is, "No, we do not." We have no further recourse in law, as matters stand. Sir Roderic has the right in law to take the course he has taken, but I do not believe that as a Government we should take responsibility for something that we believe to have been Wrong. I do not agree with the course Sir Roderic has taken; I regret it, but it is his right to take that course as the law stands at present.

Further I cannot say, but I do believe that a basic principle in the law is that justice should not only be done but be seen to be done and that no-one in a judicial position in this community or in an administrative position where he has to judge fairly on some matter in relation of the law should be subject to an allegation, however fair or not he thinks that is, that as a result of his previous or current statements the public would not consider him to have been completely disinterested.

Sir Roderic has not only made the statements to which I have referred: he is in the course of publishing a book which he himself says will be a complete vindication of the prosecution attitude in the Stuart case. Sir Roderic having said this, and bearing in mind that this matter relates to the parole of Stuart, I do not think that that is a proper course for him to take, and I regret that he has seen fit to take that view.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier say whether he believes that justice seemed to be done when the Government decided to pay the court costs awarded against Mr. Dunford in the Kangaroo Island dispute? Because the Premier has said that it is a cardinal principle of the law that justice should not only be done but also appear to be done, I ask him whether he believes that justice appeared to be done when the Government decided to pay those court costs, when many members of the public believed that justice not only appeared not to be done but was not done.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. The only time the appearance was in any way blurred was as a result of misrepresentation by members opposite. In this matter, as I explained to the House at the time (and my statement could not be refuted, because I had plenty of precedents to cite to the House), the basis of payment of the costs was entirely in accordance with previous decisions and the payment of costs by Liberal Governments in the Commonwealth Parliament and in this State.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Not according to your Minister. He said it was quite distinct.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows well that there could be no reply, and there has been no reply, to the precedents that I cited in this House. Members opposite have told the people of South Australia that the Government paid a union secretary's fine, but those members know perfectly well that that is not true. The statement that we paid the fine of a union secretary

is deliberately untrue, but that does not matter to members opposite. If the truth is told, there is no question of justice not being done. Justice was done and, further, when the truth is seen, it appears to have been done.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. PAYNE: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry give the House information concerning the current unemployment figures in South Australia? I believe that this matter needs further explanation, as it is apparent to everyone in South Australia (and, in fact, throughout Australia) that a serious situation exists.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I will set out for the House in plain, unvarnished terms the position we have reached regarding unemployment in this State. I will not be making such hopeful statements about an early recovery following the latest Commonwealth Budget as have been made by Commonwealth Ministers who are, of course, naturally trying to put the best possible face on a situation of their own making. For South Australia (including the Northern Territory), the number of persons registered for employment at the end of August increased by 613 over the July figure to a total of 13,435 (2.49 per cent of the work force). The increase in the number of persons registered was accounted for by increased unemployment involving males, with the number of females registered falling. Both adult and junior males seeking employment increased in number (adult males by 477 and junior males by 231). The number of adult females registered fell by 55 whilst the number of junior females fell by 40.

The number of persons registered in the Adelaide metropolitan area increased by a margin of 557 over the July figure. Thus the increase in persons registered for employment in the State as a whole (613) came mainly from the Adelaide metropolitan area. In the non-metropolitan districts, falls in the numbers of persons registering for employment were recorded in Port Pirie (121), Mount Gambier (74), and Port Augusta (six). Increases in numbers of persons registered were recorded in the following districts: Whyalla 106, Alice Springs (which is included in the South Australian figures) 68, and Port Lincoln 41. By occupational groups the bulk of the increase was in the semi-skilled and unskilled manual groups, accounting for increases of 222 and 159 respectively. The number of persons receiving unemployment benefits in South Aus-

tralia at the end of August was 5,649, an increase of 93 since the previous month.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Premier say whether the Government will consider making money available to the Burnside, Marion, Meadows, and Mitcham councils, from the \$2,000,000 that has been provided to relieve the position concerning unemployment in the metropolitan area, for the purpose of implementing certain projects? They are as follows: (1) to regenerate the native shrub and tree plantations across the hills face zone; (2) to carry out a major attack on noxious weeds, particularly African daisy and salvation jane; and (3) to develop sites for compost pits to be established where householders could deposit unwanted lawn clippings and other vegetation. Regarding the first proposal, the southern hills face zone was denuded of its native plant life by the early settlers for agricultural purposes, with the result that in the summer months all that can be seen in these open-space areas is dry brown grass when the whole of the area could be an attractive green belt. If evergreens were used, there would be an increase in the amount of oxygen expelled, thereby helping to purify the air. Even on the slopes which have housing development, there is a great need for tree planting to occur and, even though the councils concerned have accepted this responsibility, there is still a big leeway to be caught up. The effect would not be appreciated in the short term, but 10 or 20 years hence the trees would tend to screen the houses on the slopes and further improve the backdrop to our magnificent city. The second proposal really needs little explanation, because we must all realize that, if the noxious weed problem in the Hills is to be solved, or at least reasonably controlled, it is necessary to first remove the infestations on the western slopes of the Hills. The prevailing winds from the west tend to take the seeds into the other areas and, if we undertake an intensive campaign to eradicate the weeds from the slopes in the council areas I have mentioned (and there may be other areas), that may help considerably. Regarding the third point, if compost pits were established, councils could use the resultant decomposed material as an organic fertilizer for parks, gardens and ovals, and there would be less likelihood of soil contamination from this type of fertilizer than from using the artificial types. The Premier has said that the money available should be spent on projects that are labour-intensive and

mainly of a permanent kind, and I submit that these three proposals are in this category.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Certainly, the first of the projects is within the guidelines laid down for consideration of council works to be submitted. Naturally, we must consider the councils' claims in relation to both the public value of the works that they submit and the number of registered unemployed in the council areas that will be engaged on those works. I suggest that the honourable member take up with the councils concerned the submissions along the lines he has suggested, and I assure him that, if the councils make such submissions, they will be considered.

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say why it is that unemployment figures seem to be higher in a State under a Labor Government than in a State under a Liberal Government? It seems that, where a Labor Government is in power, unemployment figures are higher and, although I am not allowed to comment, I may say that the position seems to be unusual, because I should have thought that these figures would be reversed. Can the Minister explain how this has happened?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I think it has been explained several times that this State becomes affected because of the nature of our industries and because of the population in the Eastern States that purchase our products. This situation has been emphasized several times by the Premier and other members of Cabinet. However, if we wish to talk about this State's unemployment figures, it seems to me that we have been through this situation about every three years when an economic down-turn occurs in the affairs of the Commonwealth because of the Budgets introduced by the Liberal Commonwealth Government. The present situation has been directly attributed to the Budget recently introduced by the Commonwealth Treasurer. The unemployment problem is common throughout the Commonwealth. It is not isolated to South Australia: it includes Western Australia and Tasmania. These three States are affected more, because the population is lower and because we have to rely on markets in other States in which to sell our products. Because of the general economic down-turn in these States, it seems that people cannot afford to buy our products. I do not think there is any other reason, apart from the general bungling of the country's economics by the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. SIMMONS: In view of the Premier's announcement of a payment of \$2,000,000 for a programme of labour-intensive projects of a worthwhile kind for the relief of unemployment, will the Minister of Education consider providing a grassed reticulated playing area for the Hindmarsh Primary School on land currently available for that purpose at Manton Street, Hindmarsh, as a suitable project? This long-established school suffers from all the disabilities attaching to schools in the inner-metropolitan area. The main school is squeezed on to a small block between the Port Road and Orsmond Street with a minimum of playing area. In fact, until last year the condition of the asphalt schoolyard was disgraceful, although it is now much better. Some months ago, a property facing Manton Street was purchased by the department and land next door belonging to the Highways Department was made available to provide a reasonable area which could be grassed and used for practising football or, more likely, soccer at which the school, with its large number of Greek and Italian children, excels. However, owing to lack of water and money, the possibilities of the block have not been realized, and it is at present covered with weeds. The expenditure of a small sum on loam, seed and piping and the application of considerable labour would transform the area and give this under-privileged school some of the facilities that are being provided as a matter of course in newer or more affluent schools.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to examine this matter. Although overall there needs to be a two-thirds labour content in respect of all projects and although this project may not involve a labour-intensive programme to the extent of certain others, it may still be possible to commence the project, which should certainly be commenced if it is possible to do so.

Mr. SIMMONS: As an unemployment relief measure, and as a considerable contribution to the welfare and safety of children living in Flinders Park and attending the Underdale High School, will the Minister of Roads and Transport consider erecting a footbridge over the Torrens River from Kanbara Street, Flinders Park, to near the north-west corner of that school? The school council has been pressing for many years for such a bridge to be erected, and in 1966 the Corporation of the City of Woodville investigated six proposals, costs ranging from \$10,000 to \$18,000, but the matter was left in

abeyance in preference to other ward and city works. In 1970, negotiations were in progress between the corporation and the Engineering and Water Supply Department in relation to the development of the Torrens River involving the possibility of realignment, and this was the cause of further delay. However, probably 200 children now have to travel up to 1½ miles to reach a school which is only 100yds. across the river and, in doing so, have to travel along Holbrook Road, which is an ever-increasingly busy main road. Others, unfortunately, cross the river downstream by a weir, access to which is down steep banks and which is extremely dangerous, particularly when the river is running high, as it is today. As I understand that employment is slack among bridge-building firms which have carried out work for the Highways Department (indeed, I spoke to the representative of one of these firms last Saturday evening), this project would contribute both to safety and to relieving unemployment along the lines indicated by the Premier.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the job conforms to the criterion of being labour-intensive and application is made by the council, the request will be fully considered.

SURREY DOWNS SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: The Minister of Education would know that in the Loan Estimates, under the heading "Major works to be commenced during 1972-73", an amount of \$57,000 was allocated for a major addition in Samcon construction at Surrey Downs Primary School. Will the Minister give me full details of this project?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will get the information for which the honourable member has asked.

POINTS DEMERIT SCHEME

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport consider introducing an amendment to the Road Traffic Act regarding the points demerit scheme so that transport drivers who lose their driver's licence when they accrue 12 demerit points may continue to drive in the transport industry and lose their licence only in respect of private driving? Some transport drivers lose their licence because, when they exceed the maximum speed limit set for commercial vehicles, they lose the number of points under the demerit scheme which costs them their licence for a time. It is common practice that transport drivers exceed the maximum speed limit, which is set

as a result of an unrealistic law. Indeed, it is impossible to carry on as a truck driver and observe the law on all occasions in areas where driving at a speed greater than the stipulated maximum speed is absolutely safe. Such drivers lose not only their licence but also their employment in the transport industry, with consequent detriment to the industry and to themselves.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Bragg, in explaining a Bill that had been introduced in the Legislative Council by Mr. DeGaris, referred to this matter last Wednesday. The question asked by the member for Heysen will be adequately answered to his satisfaction when I speak in the debate on the Bill, as that is the right and proper time for me to indicate the Government's policy on this matter.

MOUNT GAMBIER COURTHOUSE

Mr BURDON: Can the Minister of Works say when it is expected that tenders will be called for the construction of the new Mount Gambier courthouse?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It was originally expected that tenders would be called in August this year by speeding up certain work, but there has been a delay and it is now hoped that tenders will be called in November this year for the commencement of work. The expected date of completion is about April, 1974.

VENEREAL DISEASE

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Health, say what action is being taken to counter the increasing incidence of venereal disease recently reported in the press and whether this has caused overloading of facilities? This matter is frequently reported in the press and recent figures released show not only to me but to the community generally a large increase in the incidence of venereal disease. The prevention and cure of this disease is a job that the Public Health Department is doing well, but one wonders whether further steps should be taken.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain a reply from my colleague.

DARTMOUTH DAM

Mr, COUMBE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question concerning progress made on design and tendering for the Dartmouth dam?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The recent amendments to the River Murray Waters Act provide that the works for the Dartmouth

reservoir shall be constructed by the Government of Victoria. In implementation of this the Victorian State Rivers and Water Supply Commission is undertaking the work and, with the approval of the River Murray Commission, has contracted with the Snowy Mountains Engineering Corporation to undertake design and the preparation of specifications. A programme for the undertaking, prepared by the Snowy Mountains Engineering Corporation in July this year, provides for the tender for the diversion works to be let in May, 1973, and that for the main dam in May, 1974. As far as I am aware, it is intended that water storage will commence in 1976.

COUNTRY DENTIST

Mr. RODDA: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Health concerning the availability of dentists in the Bordertown area?

The Hon. L. J. KING: During the final school term for 1972, the Public Health Department will have only five mobile dental units available for all areas in the State not served by static clinics, and these units are committed to the areas at present being served. To ensure the maximum benefit from the use of these limited resources, it is necessary to locate the units in areas where children can be treated annually. The possibility of expansion of the service from mobile clinics in 1973 will depend on the number of dentists available, but on present indications it does not seem likely that a mobile unit will be available for the Keith-Bordertown area as all available units will be required for continuing dental care in areas where the service has been provided previously.

TERRORISM

Mr. CRIMES: Will the Attorney-General seek a public assurance from the Chief Secretary that every possible surveillance is being maintained by the South Australian Police Force over any right-wing element or other elements in South Australia which may have some alliance or sympathy with the groups that have introduced bomb terrorism to Sydney? Although there is full confidence in the South Australian Police Force, such an assurance could help calm any fears in the community that it may be only a matter of time before the horror of terrorism, which has spread through a large part of the western world and has now afflicted Sydney, will visit its evil on Adelaide.

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

COLEBROOK HOME

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say for what purpose the Colebrook Home property at Eden Hills is to be used?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I cannot answer that question at present. Colebrook Home and the children cared for have been moved to a site provided by the Community Welfare Department. The property was the subject of recommendations made by a committee that investigated the future of the home. As the situation in this area has changed rapidly, I am by no means satisfied that the recommendations made meet in all respects the current needs of the Aboriginal people. The property will be used for some purpose connected with the welfare of Aboriginal people, although precisely what this purpose will be I cannot say at present. The matter is still being considered.

UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister of Education supply figures concerning first-year drop-outs from both Adelaide University and Flinders University? Drop-out figures in respect of first-year students from the Australian National University, Canberra, were recently published, and the university authorities were reported as saying that they were amazed at the number of drop-outs in the first year. It would be of general interest to the community if figures relating to our own two universities were available.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to obtain what information I can from the universities on this matter. However, I can tell the honourable member that, since the introduction of the new Matriculation examination and the elimination of the situation where a student could enter a university on the basis of his certificate alone, there has been an improvement in the pass rates at the first-year level at both universities and a reduction in the drop-out rate.

GLENELG ESPLANADE

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say when work will recommence at the Glenelg North esplanade? Some weeks ago work on this esplanade ceased, but I understand that the Government has

now undertaken to complete the reconstruction at this site. Steps leading to the beach near Burns Street and Anderson Avenue are particularly dangerous and, with the warmer weather approaching, I hope that the Government intends to complete this contract and provide safer conditions for people using the beach in this area.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: We are as anxious as we can be to ensure that storm damage caused during the winter is repaired as quickly as possible. A slight complication has occurred in respect of the work to which the honourable member has referred, but I will ascertain what plans the department has for completing work in this area.

HALLETT COVE

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation reconsider his decision concerning the application for a boathaven to be built at Hallett Cove? I understand that the Government has acquired an extra 118 acres at Hallett Cove for further protection of the area of scientific interest. However, this land is some distance from the site of a boathaven which it was intended to build several months ago. If a storm should arise, it is necessary for boats to return to a haven and, as there are not many boathavens in this State, I ask the Minister to reconsider his decision in the interests of safety.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Government will not review its decision about the construction of a boathaven in that area. The honourable member may not be aware that the decision relating to the boathaven in that area was made because the requirements of the boathaven would have resulted in the loss of most of the beach. No work that would have to be undertaken would damage the site of scientific interest. The project, requiring structures to be built over the sandy beach, involved structural work on the foreshore that could have resulted in the entire loss of the use of the beach to people living in that area.

Mr. Mathwin: There is no beach.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It is a sandy beach around the bay at Hallett Cove. I remind the honourable member that the Government's views about a boathaven in that area were not related to the recent decision to acquire the site of scientific interest.

FIRE SERVICES

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether it is intended to make available to members the

report of the working party set up to inquire into and report on the re-organization of country fire services? Is it intended that this report shall be available to members before the debate on the Bush Fires Act Amendment Bill takes place?

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

SCHOOL BOOKS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Education say what is the present position concerning the supply of books to primary schools for the new mathematics course? I have been approached by members of the Tanunda Primary School Welfare Club who complain that, when the new mathematics course was introduced, two sets of books were sent to the school and teachers were allowed to decide which set was the more suitable. However, it seems that, following the decision about which set of books to use, half the pupils in a class are not equipped with the correct textbook. Members of the welfare club consider that it would be more satisfactory to have sent a copy of each book early enough to allow the teacher to select the book desired, as this would enable all pupils to have the same mathematics textbook.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will inquire into this matter for the honourable member.

SOCIOLOGICAL COMMITTEE

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say when members can expect to see the reports of the sociological committee concerning the problems associated with the underground water supply in the Virginia and Two Wells area? Several times I have sought information from the Premier about these reports, and he has announced that reports have been received by the Government and have been considered. Can the Premier say whether any aspects of those reports have been implemented and, if they have not been, when it is likely that some action will be taken as a result of the determinations of the committee and what further action is likely as a result of the suggestions made by the committee? We accept that this is a major problem in the area, where a reticulated water supply is not available and is not likely to become available in the foreseeable future.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will re-examine the matter and bring down a full

report for the Leader about the precise position with regard to the report on the sociological aspects of this problem. Since the committee that considered the sociological aspects reported some time ago, a reappraisal of the water basin in the Adelaide Plains immediately to the north of the settled metropolitan area has shown that previous estimates of what might be accomplished in the area were perhaps too optimistic.

Dr. Eastick: There has been further deterioration.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. Despite the very wet year last year, there was not any marked recharging of the water basin. Apparently, water charging does not occur, because of the impervious nature of some of the soils and the rocky areas there. Generally speaking, it is a fairly bleak picture. I will bring down a full report for the Leader.

EYRE HIGHWAY PARK

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say what will be the size of the proposed new national park that has been announced soon to be established along the route of the Eyre Highway? Many questions have been asked about this new park, as people are interested in its size and in the reasons for acquiring this land.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: As we are still looking at the area to determine what the boundaries should be, I cannot give the honourable member details now. However, as soon as information is available I will inform him.

SEX BOOKLET

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Education give me some information about the booklet on sex and contraception that is being prepared for distribution to many schools? It has been suggested to me that the actual distribution of this booklet, which is not being prepared by the department, will be left to the discretion of the headmaster or headmistress of a school. Some parents have complained to me about this, saying that they want the right to decide whether their children should be given this booklet, rather than leaving that decision to headmasters or headmistresses. Will the Minister give an assurance that the rights of

parents, as I have just expressed them, will be honoured?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: First, I point out that I have not seen the booklet; no doubt the honourable member has not seen it, either. I am relying on what amounts to hearsay, as he is doing. I have certainly made clear that no approval has been given by me or by the department for the circulation of such a booklet. However, from information that has been given me I have little doubt that the students concerned will circulate it to headmasters and headmistresses of schools. I have every confidence, as I am sure the honourable member has, in the heads of the schools having the ability to exercise suitable discretion in the matter, recognizing completely the rights of parents. I do not think it is necessary for the department to issue a detailed directive on the matter to heads of schools. I am sure that the honourable member will also share my confidence in the ability of our heads to handle this kind of problem appropriately. If any headmaster or headmistress believes that this material is suitable and has been prepared satisfactorily, I am confident that, without a directive being issued, that head will distribute it only to the children of those parents who agree with this, and that those parents who regard this matter as purely within their own rights will have their attitude respected. I expect this to be an automatic attitude. As I do not believe in issuing directives all over the place, I do not intend to issue a directive in this case.

INTAKES AND STORAGES

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works detailed information about the current intakes and storages in our reservoirs?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The total storage yesterday was 33,453,000,000gall., compared to a storage on July 24 this year of only 23,244,000,000gall. However, at this time last year our reservoirs were almost full, the holdings totalling 41,268,000,000gall. From these figures, it can be seen that the recent cold, wet spell has appreciably improved the holdings. I ask leave to incorporate more detailed figures in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

RESERVOIR HOLDINGS

	Capacity m.g.	Storage at		18/9/71 m.g.
		18/9/72 m.g.	24/7/72 m.g.	
Mount Bold.....	10,440	10,248	5,591	10,440
Happy Valley.....	2,804	2,229	2,045	2,793
Clarendon Weir.....	72	68	71	69
Myponga.....	5,905	5,548	4,170	5,905
Millbrook.....	3,647	1,989	1,117	3,647
Kangaroo Creek.....	5,370	3,603	1,108	5,370
Hope Valley.....	765	603	533	765
Thorndon Park.....	142	126	111	130
Barossa	993	774	852	949
South Para	11,300	8,265	7,646	11,200
Total ..	41,438	33,453	23,244	41,268

SCHOOL CARETAKERS

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Education say what is the total value of property belonging to the Education Department and parents and friends associations that was lost at schools throughout the State, through fire, theft or general damage, in the 12 months from July 1, 1971, to June 30, 1972? During this period, there have been several thefts and breaking and entering offences at schools, as well as one or two fires. Bearing in mind that many people are unemployed, perhaps we should consider whether it might not be wiser to employ permanent caretakers at schools during the night, if it could be shown that the cost of such employment would be justified when compared to the total value of property lost in the ways to which I have referred.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will get the appropriate information for the honourable member, and I will also get him the cost of employing, I presume, resident caretakers throughout South Australia. I assure the honourable member that, from investigations I have carried out on the employment of resident caretakers, the total reaches a few million dollars a year very quickly.

LERP

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say what progress the department has made in controlling lerp, which infested parts of the State last year? The Minister, as well as the House generally, is well aware of the depredations made by this insect last year on eucalypts in areas throughout the South-East. Indeed, in some instances there were infestations farther south than has been the case hitherto. Although many of the affected eucalypts seem to have recovered somewhat, this pest is still ravaging red gums in

certain areas, and this is having an important bearing on the ecology of the district. In addition, the honey industry there, for example, relies on the prolific flowering of eucalypts. As this pest could destroy many gum trees in the area concerned, I should be interested to hear what progress the department has made since this matter was last raised.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member and his colleagues seem to be having much trouble with pests, and this is yet another instance. The honourable member asked a couple of questions about this matter last year when an outbreak of lerp was prevalent in certain areas of the State, and I recall that the Agriculture Department was asked to look into the matter. As I cannot recall receiving a final report on any recommendations made, I shall be pleased to ascertain whether any additional information is available for the honourable member.

GLENELG NORTH LIGHTS

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport have investigated the feasibility of installing traffic lights at the site of the Anderson Avenue bridge and at the junction of Military Road and Tapley Hill Road, Glenelg North? Since work began on reconstructing the King Street bridge, much traffic has been using the Anderson Avenue bridge, which is capable of taking only one lane of traffic at a time. During weekends and especially on warm days, motorists experience considerable delay at this point, and local residents are fearful of the position that may arise in the summer months, especially over the Christmas period. A similar situation exists where Military Road now joins Tapley Hill Road, that is, near the bridges over the Keswick and Brownhill creeks. Will the Minister examine whether, in each case, a system of traffic lights might be installed similar to the system operating on Sturt Road

(near Marion Road) at the bridge over the creek in that area?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: First, I do not know whether the honourable member has raised this matter with the council or whether the residents for whom he allegedly speaks have done so, which is, of course, the proper course. If the matter were raised with the Glenelg council, the council would request the Road Traffic Board to investigate it and make a recommendation. If this has been done, I shall be only too happy to ask the board to investigate the matter. However, I suggest that the honourable member, if he has not already done so, might first take up the matter with the council because, obviously, in this regard we need the council's authority and not that of the member for the district.

SCHOOL DAMAGE

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Education say to what extent schools have been damaged as a result of fire and vandalism occurring within the last 12 months?

The SPEAKER: Order! For the benefit of the member for Rocky River, I point out that the member for Fisher has asked this question earlier this afternoon.

COMMUNITY WELFARE CENTRES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply to my recent question about the provision of a community welfare centre in the Barossa Valley?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Community Welfare Department intends to establish a district office at Nuriootpa as soon as the necessary arrangements can be made. When established, the office will be staffed by social workers and support staff. At this stage, no planning has been undertaken for the eventual establishment of a full community welfare centre in the Barossa Valley.

SOCIAL SERVICE COUNCIL

Dr. TONKIN: Is the Minister of Community Welfare aware that the office of the South Australian Council of Social Service Incorporated is in danger of having to be closed down because of the lack of funds and that its executive officer, who is currently receiving medical treatment, should be receiving clerical assistance because of the amount of work involved in that office? Further, will the Minister take urgent steps to see what can be done to help financially in this matter?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will look into the matter.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say when legislation will be introduced to implement daylight saving in South Australia and whether the Government has considered allowing Eyre Peninsula not to adopt daylight saving? I have recently been approached by some of my constituents, in particular the local branch of the United Farmers and Graziers, to see whether it will be possible for Eyre Peninsula to "go it alone" and not adopt daylight saving. Will the Minister consider this request?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: When a decision has been made by the Government, the public will be informed so that they will know what the position is for this summer. Regarding the suggestion that the people on Eyre Peninsula apply their own time, I suggest to the honourable member that they can well do that, whether or not daylight saving is in operation: they can adjust their clocks and work an hour different from the rest of the State, if they so desire. I do not know what advantage it would be to the people in that area but, if everyone in that community decided to disregard daylight saving, adjusted their clocks accordingly, and applied a standard different from that which applied elsewhere in the State, they would be at liberty to do so.

BRUCELLOSIS

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, say what effect the Government's recent decision to cease payments for brucellosis vaccination is likely to have on the future export market for South Australian beef? It has been stated that for the year 1972-73 payments for the vaccination of cattle or calves against brucellosis, for which payments the Government has been responsible, have been stopped and that the funds available are being used specifically for tuberculosis control or determination. The national brucellosis and tuberculosis programme has been evolved around the demands of the overseas markets that the national herd be free from tuberculosis and brucellosis by 1975. That was the original statement. Whilst the suggestion here is that the tuberculosis programme be completed as quickly as possible, it seems it is being conducted at the expense of the brucellosis campaign, which was running parallel with the tuberculosis programme. If, in fact, overseas markets were lost as a result of the failure to free cattle in this State (or, for the matter, the national herd) from these two diseases, the situation could

be disastrous for the growing beef industry in this State, if not in the whole Commonwealth.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to examine the matter for the Leader. As I understand it, the decision made by the State Agriculture Department was forced on it by the Commonwealth.

Mr. Venning: Oh!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the member for Rocky River will wait, I will point out what has happened.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Rocky River is out of order.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Leader would know more about this matter than would the member for Rocky River. What I am saying has some foundation, as I am sure the Leader would acknowledge. The Minister of Agriculture and the Director of Agriculture made a statement on this matter yesterday. As I understand the position, the programme for the eradication of brucellosis in South Australia was stepped up markedly because the full sum made available by the Commons wealth was not used by other States, particularly Queensland, and advantage was taken of that by South Australia. Evidently, fresh instructions or something of that kind have been issued (I will get that clarified for the honourable member) indicating that the Commonwealth wants the tuberculosis programme stepped up considerably, and the money made available for brucellosis eradication has been transferred to that fund. That is a Commonwealth decision, and that is the point I make. As I understand it, this loss of subsidy will delay the programme, which I think was rightly embarked on, in this State for the eradication of brucellosis for some two to three years, but the Director of Agriculture has emphasized the need to continue that programme even though the subsidy will not be paid. I will examine the matter for the honourable member and, if it is necessary to enlarge on it, I will bring down a report from the Minister of Agriculture.

MARGARINE

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the Government intends to introduce legislation prohibiting the artificial colouring and flavouring of cooking margarine and ensuring that margarine is adequately and properly labelled so that the consumer will know exactly what he or she is buying? When this matter arose in another State last March,

the Minister said he had no intention of introducing legislation on the colouring but he sincerely believed that margarine should be properly labelled so that people would know just what they were buying. When will he take action on either of those matters?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to confer with my colleague and let the honourable member know his decision.

VAUGHAN HOUSE

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Attorney-General consider making some slight security alterations to the swimming pool area at Vaughan House to make it easier for the staff to control it and more difficult for the inmates to escape? Last Friday, with colleagues from both sides of the House, I inspected that property and saw that the swimming pool area was surrounded by low buildings, two of which are about 10ft. high, making it simple for the inmates to escape. The staff would find it most difficult to keep an eye on inmates in that area. A slight alteration such as an erection above the 10ft. level would be of great assistance to the staff and, I am sure, would help reduce the opportunities for the inmates to escape.

The Hon. L. J. KING: All the institutions are being examined to see whether any further measures can be taken to make them more secure and to make it more difficult for inmates who are minded to abscond to do so successfully. I shall have attention directed to the area mentioned by the honourable member to see whether any alterations would make it more secure.

TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD

Mr. BECKER: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary what safeguards are taken to prevent errors in the calculation and announcement of Totalizator Agency Board dividends? One of my constituents wrote to me as follows:

On Wednesday last the combination of 6 and 8 won the South Australian daily double at the Gawler races. Shortly after the race the results were given out by the T.A.B. service over the official T.A.B. wireless station 5DN, with a pay-out of \$3.55 for each unit of the winning combination. Next morning the *Advertiser* reported the pay-out as \$3.30 per unit. On presenting my ticket for collection at the agency where it was bought, I was paid \$9.90 for the three units. What caused my concern was that, when the assistant matched the ticket with the agency duplicate, I saw that the dividend had been calculated and written in on the duplicate ticket

as \$10.65 for the three units (\$3.55 per unit), . . . but later amended to \$3.30 per unit.

I ask what safeguards the public has from such errors and what safeguards the T.A.B. is using to ensure that there are no calculating errors.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I shall ask my colleague to obtain a report from the T.A.B. on this matter of consequence.

STUDENT ASSISTANCE

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Education say whether any machinery exists in his department for assisting a student from this State who wishes to study overseas, subject to the student's qualifications being suitable for his admission to a tertiary institution in the country where he wishes to study? I have been approached by the parents of a student who wishes to study nautical science. I believe that the only place where he can study that subject is the College of Fisheries and Navigational Engineering at St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada. Will the young man receive any assistance from this State to enable him to study at the college I have referred to?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No assistance is given by the South Australian Government or, to my knowledge, any State Government to enable that sort of thing to be done. Most American universities and some Canadian universities have scholarships available for open competition, and awards can be gained through the Rotary Club in South Australia. The student referred to would have to obtain that sort of assistance.

TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport ascertain how many accidents occurred during 1969, 1970, 1971 and 1972 at the junction of Waverley Ridge Road, Hill Street, Sheoak Road and the scenic route at Crafer's? Also, will the Minister ascertain how many persons were injured or killed in such accidents, and will he obtain details of any plans in hand to rectify the hazard that exists?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall attempt to get the information.

MOUNT LOFTY RANGES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice):

1. Is it intended to place any restriction on stock numbers in zone 2 declared in the by-laws of the Waterworks Act, in relation to water-sheds in the Mount Lofty Ranges?

2. What is the current position relating to the erection of farm buildings and stockyards in zone 2?

3. Is it intended to extend the boundaries of zone 1 farther into zone 2?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. There is no restriction to normal stock grazing in the watersheds, nor is there any restriction on dairies or poultry farms in zone 2, provided that reasonable water-pollution control requirements are met. However, the extension or establishment of piggeries, feedlots, and zoos are prohibited. These policies were confirmed in by-laws under the Waterworks Act and gazetted on December 9, 1971.

2. The erection or modification of farm buildings and stockyards in zone 2 is subject to the approval of the Minister of Works. Generally, approval is not refused, provided that the proposals meet conditions compatible with water-pollution control.

3. No proposals exist at present to extend the boundaries of zone 1 farther into zone 2.

ADDITIONAL LEAVE

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. How much will the extra day's leave recently granted to transport workers cost this State?

2. Why was it granted?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. The salaries and wages of all Municipal Tramways Trust and South Australian Railways officers and employees for one day would be about \$130,000. However, less than one-half of all officers and employees are occupying positions for which it would be essential to provide relief during their absence on this one additional day. Therefore, the additional cost of the extra day's leave is estimated at about \$65,000; that is about one-quarter of what the cockies would get three times a week.

2. During the time of the acute petrol shortage, M.T.T. and S.A.R. officers and employees worked under extreme pressures in an endeavour to cater for the needs of greatly increased numbers of travelling public. Many expressions of appreciation have been made by the fair-minded public (that does not include the member for Glenelg) concerning the efforts of these men.

Because of the special service given under very difficult conditions, the Government has recognized this service by the grant of an additional day's leave to be added to the normal annual leave entitlement.

WOOMERA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Is the water pumped to Woomera treated with chlorine so as to protect the residents in this town against amoebic meningitis?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Morgan-Whyalla main, which supplies water to Woomera, is now chlorinated at Morgan and Stirling North. Neither the Public Health Department nor the Amoebic Research Unit at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science has suggested that additional chlorination is necessary to protect the people of Woomera.

FLINDERS HIGHWAY

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. When will tenders be called for the sealing of the Flinders Highway between Talia and Streaky Bay?

2. Will work on this section be given a high priority because of its very poor condition?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. Tenders for the construction of earthworks and sub-base of the Flinders Highway between Talia and Streaky Bay will be called by the end of this month. Further contracts for the base course and sealing will be arranged when the earthworks and sub-base have progressed sufficiently to permit the base course and sealing to be completed without delays. It is expected that the sealing of this section of road will be completed early in 1975.

2. The priority of the work is commensurate with the availability of funds and other works throughout the State.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

FRUITGROWING INDUSTRY (ASSISTANCE) BILL

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to enable the Government of the State to enter into, carry out and generally give effect to an agreement with the Govern-

ment of the Commonwealth to provide certain assistance to the fruitgrowing industry, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill is intended to authorize the Government of this State to enter into an agreement with the Government of the Commonwealth to provide certain assistance to the fruitgrowing industry of this State. This agreement is still in the course of negotiation and, although these negotiations have reached an advanced stage, it is desirable that formal authority be given to the Government to enter into the agreement and for the Premier to execute the agreement on behalf of the State. It is also desirable that the Government be given statutory power to do what is necessary to carry out and give effect to the agreement.

In the terms of this Bill, a copy of the agreement will be tabled in this House as soon as practicable after it is made. I have given a copy of the agreement to the Leader. In summary, the agreement will provide for a scheme of assistance to the fruitgrowing industry by providing a payment to fruitgrowers for each tree they pull out. In this manner, it is hoped that the over-supply of certain fruit that appears endemic in the industry will, to some extent, be controlled. The moneys necessary to make these advances to growers will be provided by the Commonwealth by way of grant. However, this State will, out of its own resources, be required to bear the costs of the administration of the agreement.

I will now deal with the Bill in some detail. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 makes clear that the application of the Rural Assistance (Special Provisions) Act, 1971-1972, will not be affected by the operation of this Act. Clause 4 provides the definitions necessary for the purposes of this Act. Clause 5 formally authorizes the Government to enter into an agreement of the kind specified in subclause (1) of this clause, and at subclause (3) authorizes the Premier to execute the agreement on behalf of the State.

Clause 6 provides that the Government of the State may do all things necessary, convenient or expedient to carry out or give effect to the agreement and for the Minister to whom the administration of the measure is committed to be the "authority" for the purposes of the agreement. Clause 7 ensures that such moneys as are required for the purposes of giving

effect to the measure will, to the extent that they are not available from other sources, be payable out of moneys appropriated by Parliament. Clause 8 establishes a fund in the Treasury to be known as the Fruitgrowing Assistance Fund, and subclauses (2) and (3) provide for payments into and out of the fund. Clause 9 provides a usual exemption from stamp and other duties in respect of documents executed for the purposes of obtaining assistance under the measure. Clause 10 provides that a copy of the agreement and any amendment thereto will be laid on the table of this House.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 14. Page 1353.)

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): I support the second reading. This Budget reminds me of the Budget introduced in 1967 by a Labor Government—the last Budget that that Government introduced before the 1968 State election. I was not a member of the House then but, when the Liberal and Country League again took over the reins of Government after that election, at the end of the financial year we faced a deficit of about \$7,000,000. This was brought about by the fact that the Budget introduced by the Labor Government had been an election Budget, and the only taxation increase in that year was one in the gun licence fee.

The position is somewhat similar at present. We have before us a Budget that has been introduced just before an election and, as has been stated, although there is no significant increase in taxation in this Budget, nevertheless the taxpayer will pay an additional \$15,500,000 of State taxation in this financial year. I issue a note of warning regarding the finances for this year. On Thursday, December 2, last year the *Advertiser* contained a report about the increase in taxation in the 1971-72 Budget, and that report stated:

Consumer hard hit this year. Increased stamp duties which came into force in South Australia yesterday complete a bleak year for consumers hit by a series of higher taxes and charges. The higher stamp duties are payable on cheques (up 1c to 6c), new car registrations, conveyances, and credit arrangements and mortgages (on values above \$10,000).

Other increases of Government taxes and charges which became effective during 1971 are: higher succession duties; generally higher land tax (following new five-yearly assessment); payroll tax up from 2½ per cent to 3½ per cent (this was previously a Federal tax); higher

electricity charges (Electricity Trust of South Australia tariffs were increased following imposition of a 3 per cent charge on gross trust revenue); some higher bus and tram fares in February; a rise of about 12 per cent in suburban rail fares in April and up to 10 per cent on rail freight rates; rise in bookmakers' turnover tax from 1.8 per cent to 2 per cent; higher water and sewerage rates from July 1; a rise of about 20 per cent in motor vehicle registration fees in July; driver's licence fee up by \$1 to \$3; some rises in Companies Office fees; and higher Government hospital fees, rising by \$2 or \$2.50 a day for inpatients, effective from September 1.

That Budget was a tax slug, and that is why the Government has been able to say that there has been no significant increase in taxation this year. However, as I have said, the taxpayer will be paying an additional \$15,500,000 this year. I also issue a note of warning about the Cattle Compensation Fund. The Auditor-General's Report sets out the present position of the fund, and I think that gives cause for concern by those interested in the industry.

The balance in the fund at June 30, 1971, was \$277,394. Receipts in 1971-72 were \$67,971. I may add that this was a result of record slaughterings of cattle in South Australia during that year. This amount would have been much higher had not many cattle been transported from this State to the Eastern States for slaughter. Payments in 1972 amounted to \$198,731, which was about three times the sum received. The balance at June 30, 1972, was \$146,634 and, if the current year's receipts were added, it would be about \$200,000. However, if as many claims are made this year as were made last year, the fund will be practically exhausted at the end of the financial year. The heavy claims have been brought about as a result of the campaign being conducted in the Far North to eradicate tuberculosis and brucellosis. Good results are being achieved and relatively large numbers of infected cattle are being discovered, but a heavy drain on the fund has resulted. Some smaller cattle properties in the North have been cleared, and the first test conducted on stock there resulted in less than 1 per cent being found to be affected.

Those properties have been given a clean bill, but the large cattle holdings find it difficult to have a good muster, because in the second time around a high proportion of cattle is found to be infected with tuberculosis. If this rate continues it will have a serious effect on the fund this financial year. Last year the compensation rate was increased, and this is another contributing factor to the high rate of payments from the fund. On the other

hand, the Swine Compensation Fund continues to grow: in 1971-72 it increased from \$524,463 to \$571,811 (an increase of \$47,348), although the contribution rate has been reduced.

One matter that concerns me greatly is the education of children in the outback of the State. The Frome District, which I represent, contains a considerable number of outback children who have difficulty with their education. An organization has been formed in this State (although I understand it is Australia-wide) called the Isolated Childrens Parents Association. The organization, which originated in New South Wales, has now spread throughout the northern States of Australia. This body has set out to bring before the various Governments the difficulties associated with education in the outback, and a branch was formed at Yunta on September 10. The organization is asking for a grant of \$400 per family a year to assist in hiring outside help, whether for teaching or for domestic purposes. This is not an unreasonable request, because the Northern Territory fee, which is paid on this basis, is considerably greater than the amount that the association is seeking in this State.

At present, it costs \$307 a year to educate a child in our primary schools and, in country districts where school transport is provided, it costs an additional \$100 a year, so the sum could be put at about \$400 a year to educate children in country primary schools if school transport is provided. To ask for \$400 is reasonable, because there may be two or three children in a family and, if they had to be educated in the inside areas of the State at \$400 a year, the cost would be considerable. The I.C.P.A. is also asking for an allowance of \$600 for each secondary student to cover the boarding cost for a child to attend secondary school. If the child prefers to attend a private school it would not cost the department much, because it is now costing \$567 to educate a secondary student in a State school; added to that, \$100 for transport in the country would make a total of \$667. If an allowance of \$600 for a secondary student were granted, the department would be reasonably well off. At the commencement of this school year the Government introduced a rural secondary scholarship scheme which, over a full year, will cost about \$78,000 for 226 scholarships. There were 416 applicants for scholarships and, if they had all been successful, it would have cost the Government only \$154,000; that is not a large sum, compared

to the \$106,000,000 that is to be spent on education this year. In his Opening Speech, the Governor said:

The rural scholarship scheme will be extended this year so that students from outback areas will receive allowances as a matter of right.

We can assume that half of the 416 who applied this year but who did not receive scholarships will probably receive them next year. The Governor continued:

In addition, provision will be made for outback children to qualify for allowances in the later years of their primary education.

It is difficult for parents in outback areas to teach their children in the later years of primary education, because the education system these days is different from that which existed when the parents were educated. If scholarships could be arranged for children for the later years of their primary education, it would be of considerable benefit to the parents. It is gratifying to know that the department is making this provision. Although there is no specific provision in the Budget I believe that, toward the end of this financial year, decisions will be made that will come into operation at the commencement of the next school year. I appeal to the Minister to give as much consideration as possible to these children and parents in the outback to assist them, because of the difficulties of education in those areas.

When speaking in this debate last week the Leader of the Opposition referred to the Government's decision to close the Morgan dockyard and transfer it to Murray Bridge. I have also referred to this matter several times in the House. When I visited the dockyard a week or two ago with the Leader, we had a quick look over it and had a trip up the river on a houseboat. It is a pity that this dockyard, which is set in a beautiful site and which is surrounded by huge gum trees, is to be transferred to Murray Bridge. It is the only industry that this town has left, and, with its loss, the town will have no alternative but to encourage tourism in the district so as to maintain the town as a viable unit. Some of the dockyard employees will probably attempt to obtain local employment, because they all own their own houses in the town, but obtaining employment in a town of this kind will not be easy. In a recent letter published in the daily press the view was expressed that Morgan was an ideal site for a city and would be a better site than the proposed city near Murray Bridge. Several arguments were put forward, and I consider them to be reasonable.

Indeed, I wonder what the Government's policy is on decentralization when it makes a decision that takes away the only industry of a small country town. Last week the Victorian Premier said in his Budget speech that Victoria intended to reduce pay-roll tax from 3½ per cent to 2½ per cent for all industries located outside the Melbourne metropolitan area to encourage decentralization in Victoria. I make that same suggestion to this Government: that, to encourage industries to go to the country, it reduce pay-roll tax for industries located in the country. I hope that it is not too late for the Minister and the Government to reverse the decision to transfer the Morgan dockyard to Murray Bridge, because I am sure that, if the Government did so, its present image would rise in Morgan, where its image is now low.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I support the second reading. I do not wish to take up much of the time of this House, because I have never regarded myself as having a great talent regarding finances, but I have several comments to make. The Government has been fortunate in receiving as much assistance as it has received. It goes without saying that it has been greatly assisted by the generous contributions made to it by the Commonwealth Government. I believe that the Commonwealth has been generous to this State, because this is the first time that the State's Budget has exceeded \$500,000,000. Expenditure in this State has risen rapidly in recent years. The member for Frome, the Leader and the member for Torrens have all spoken about increases in tax in this State, and *Hansard* contains details of all the increased taxes which the South Australian community has had to face as a result of the Government's increases in taxation in the last year. These increases have been considerable, especially as the Government claims to champion the cause of the people it represents (those receiving the basic wage or a little more), yet these increases have been a blow to the average worker in this State, and they have all been forced on him by the present Government.

The current unemployment situation and the wage rates being received are other matters that I find disturbing. I believe that unemployment is related to the increased demand by unions as well as to the fact that many Australians do not fully appreciate their obligation to give a fair day's work for a fair day's pay. Past prosperity in Australia has lulled us into believing that we are a prosperous

nation, that there is much money about, that the whole country is rolling along in a prosperous manner, and that while this is the case we can all make less effort because the country will run without diligent striving. Of course, this view is completely wrong, because the whole economics of the country has changed. The prosperity of five to 15 years ago is no longer with us, and this is easily evidenced in this country which is a large producer of rural goods. Because of slump conditions in rural areas, we have to face the fact that there is no longer as much money in this country as there was years ago and that we have moved from past prosperity into a period where we in Australia, and especially those people in rural areas, must look again at our financial affairs. Rural people have not as much money to spend as they had 15 years ago.

Mr. Venning: That is because of increased State taxation.

Mr. WARDLE: I made that point as the honourable member was on his way into the Chamber. Because there is not as much money circulating in the country, I believe that we should look again at our responsibility to make a greater effort and to work harder to get greater production from the production line. It grieves me to see the continual demands being made by unions and other groups on producers and manufacturers, especially as these demands are based largely on the apparent prosperity of Australia's largest industries, for example, the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, the oil companies, and perhaps even Elder Smith Goldsbrough Mort Limited, with its amazing profit. We must not accept the apparent prosperity of three or four of Australia's largest companies and expect to base our whole wage structure on that apparent prosperity. I therefore believe that workers, be they white collar workers or others, must take a fresh look at what we ought to be doing individually in order to increase production without expecting at this time any increase in return.

I am pleased to see that provision has been made to assist the firm of David Shearer Limited. I sincerely hope that the Government is doing all in its power to assist this company. It would be ironical if we expected to establish a new city within a few miles of the township of Mannum if we could not keep going an industry that was already there. It seems pointless, and certainly discouraging, if this firm is not kept viable and employing

a large proportion of the people of Mannum. I therefore urge the Government to do all it can to keep this firm producing the products which, by and large, it has produced over many years. I can foresee a tremendous problem if agriculturists, who have over the years been accustomed to buying the harvesting equipment made by this firm, because of the appointment of a receiver lose confidence, especially in relation to servicing and the availability of spare parts. There is no future in my mind—

Mr. Jennings: I do not think there is.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WARDLE: There is no future for firms that cannot service the machinery that people require. The competition in this field is becoming great, so it is important that the reputation of this firm should never be in doubt, particularly regarding whether it can supply spare parts and give service in future years. Otherwise, it would appear that this whole organization is destined to diversify in some other form. Of course, it is obvious that its tooling equipment generally and its skills are developed towards the production of machinery that it has produced for about the last 50 years.

I want briefly to refer to the section of the Budget that deals with welfare services. Like all members who represent centres of population in which many elderly people congregate, I congratulate the Government on its allocation for welfare services. I appreciate that there are in our community people in needy circumstances. Although sometimes this is the result of their own doing and their own foolishness, there are many genuine people who are in difficult circumstances through no fault of their own.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Deserted wives.

Mr. WARDLE: Especially deserted wives.

Mr. Venning: I've got deserted husbands in my district.

Mr. WARDLE: Although the member for Rocky River says that there are deserted husbands in his district, I find that these are few and far between.

Mr. Venning: I have a lot on my plate now.

Mr. WARDLE: I have not a high regard for some of my own sex in the community, because I find that in these cases more than nine times out of 10 the male has not accepted his responsibility, and often it is largely his fault that a marriage has broken up. There is no more deserving case in the community than a young wife, with three or

four small children, who is left with the responsibility of educating and raising her family, quite often after the family has been run into serious debt, when often the home, because of outstanding debts, has had to be given up and the woman has found herself in difficult circumstances. I therefore commend the Government for providing for these people.

I wish there were some way in which the Government could make the payments and obtain from the husband repayment of the allowance. Many of these payments are outstanding for a long time, and all sorts of weak excuses are made why men have not made payments to assist their families. I wish that this maintenance could be provided by the Government and then extracted later from the person responsible for making the payments. It seems a great hardship for women to have to go without money completely. Many members have referred to this aspect, including the member for Ross Smith and the member for Fisher. Other members have also referred to it as well as to the great hardship that is caused to mothers of young families because they are not receiving maintenance.

Mr. Evans: Does this mean the orders or warrants cannot be enforced?

Mr. WARDLE: I am not well versed in the administration, but it does not seem that the department wishes urgently to solve this problem, because this House has received many statements from it, and it is reluctant to move far from the accepted pattern that exists at present. I am pleased also to see that the payments to foster parents are to be increased. Provision is also to be made for subsidies on capital works for children's homes and I am pleased, too, about this.

I should like to say one or two things about the accommodation provided by the South Australian Housing Trust. I have a great admiration for the housing provided by the trust throughout the State and for those who work within the trust's administration. I pay a tribute to the trust, particularly in relation to its work in my district. Although it has an active housing programme, it seems it is not capable of meeting all the housing demands of a growing town, and the township of Murray Bridge, outside of Whyalla and Mount Gambier, would be accepted as one of the fastest-growing country centres in this State.

As a member of this House, I am concerned that the housing is not always provided for those who need it most. Many families, the husband and wife and several teenage

members of which are working, live in Housing Trust houses. I think the member for Mount Gambier said that a certain member of the House had stressed that all Housing Trust rentals should be increased. That was not a correct or fair assessment of the debate or the contribution that that honourable member (I think the member for Gouger) had made regarding the Housing Trust. I believe that, where occupiers are able to pay, a more realistic assessment of the cost and return should be made. People who can afford it should pay a rental equivalent to the investment that the trust has in the dwelling. I appreciate that many people are receiving the advantage of reduced rentals, whether they be age pensioners, invalid pensioners, or deserted wives, and it means much to these people. However, I believe that critical investigation should be made in cases where people have the capacity to pay normal rents and in which incomes from several sources are being received in that family's home.

Mr. Evans: A means test every four years?

Mr. WARDLE: Perhaps that may be too long, because the contributions by teenagers and others in the family could be lost in that four years. Although I have several questions that I shall raise in Committee, I support the second reading.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): In supporting the second reading, I shall comment on a statement made by the member for Murray who said he thought that one of the real problems that had helped to bring about the present unemployment situation was unreasonable demands by unions, and that unions should be willing to give a fair day's work for a fair day's pay. No-one would argue with the second proposition, but I suggest that the honourable member should consider that, as a percentage of the gross national product, the wages now received by the employee are considerably less than they were 10 years ago, and that the reduced percentage of the gross national product is spread over a greater work force. That situation indicates that the average percentage of real income the worker receives now is not as high as it was 10 years ago, so I do not know what the honourable member meant when he referred to unreasonable claims.

Contributions to the debate by Opposition members have reinforced my opinion that this is a good Budget. We have heard from them muted criticism of our revenue measures, but they have not criticized the proposed expenditure programme. A precis of the Opposition philosophy on Budgets would be that it was

acceptable to increase expenditure on services but not to increase taxation or expect increased contributions from the Commonwealth Government in order to finance those increased services.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: And you also have to balance the Budget.

Mr. KENEALLY: Yes. However, these are the economic theories that have been propounded by Opposition members. This would be a precis of the Opposition philosophy, as shown in *Hansard* reports of the debate, and one would realize that after reading the contributions of members opposite. Opposition members have approved of our expenditure: they consider that some expenditure could be increased, but they criticized, though not too loudly, the Government's revenue measures. They consider that the increases in taxation are too high. However, the member for Peake, who will be the next Government speaker in this debate, will probably point out to Opposition members how ridiculous is their argument. Perhaps Opposition members could wait until the member for Peake speaks before interjecting.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Don't set him up!

Mr. KENEALLY: If I did, the member for Peake would be competent enough to reply to any interjections that were made. The other general suggestion made by Opposition members is that the Commonwealth Government has been almost over-generous in its contributions to the States this year.

Mr. Venning: It has been very generous.

Mr. KENEALLY: In truth, the situation is that the expenditure programme is sound, with assistance being provided over a large area and particular emphasis being placed on the more needy sector. Taxation has been increased marginally, and, for the first time for many years, the Commonwealth Government's contributions to State finances bear some relationship to its responsibility. No doubt the Treasurer has been able to introduce such a satisfactory Budget in part because of the Commonwealth Government's contribution. However, if the Commonwealth can suddenly provide this extra finance, it means one of two things: first, it is an election year, and the Commonwealth Government is trying to win votes by providing more money to the States (and I am sure that the State Government would not object if, for whatever reason, the Commonwealth Government provided money); or, secondly, the Commonwealth Government has been short-changing the State Governments for many years.

Mr. Payne: I would be prepared to take the second position.

Mr. KENEALLY: I think that both apply. Because, for the first time, the Commonwealth Government has accepted, to a reasonable degree, its responsibility, Opposition members seem to think that it should be lauded. Conversely, if the Commonwealth does not provide us with adequate funds, Opposition members believe that we should not criticize it. How ridiculous can one get! For many years the Commonwealth has not met its obligations, and State Governments, of whatever political Party, have criticized the Commonwealth for the small amount of finance it has provided. Although the Commonwealth has now increased its contributions, it does not have to be praised. The State Governments will admit that the Commonwealth has contributed to a greater extent this year than it has contributed previously.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: But the Grants Commission recommendations were made by an independent authority.

Mr. KENEALLY: Yes, but I think the Commonwealth Government has provided more money this year. However, I wonder why Opposition members laud that action? Before being members of the Liberal Party they are South Australians, and their responsibility is to ensure that this State receives a fair go—

Mr. Goldsworthy: You don't bite the hand that feeds you.

Mr. KENEALLY: —and that finance is made available to this State. Perhaps this time next year members opposite will be able to ask Government members their views on the contributions made to State finances by the then Commonwealth Labor Government. If a Commonwealth Labor Government does not meet its responsibilities in contributing to State finances, then I trust that members on this side of the House will criticize it, and I can be assured absolutely that we will have the unanimous support of members opposite if we find it necessary to criticize a Labor Government in the Commonwealth sphere at this time next year.

Members interjecting:

Mr. KENEALLY: The interjections, although they are completely out of order, suggest that Government members here like to use the Commonwealth Government as a whipping boy. We on this side do not make the Commonwealth Government into a whipping boy. If, by its actions, the Commonwealth Government wishes to promote itself as a whipping boy, that

is not our fault. However, it is our duty to criticize it if this happens.

There are only a few things within the Budget on which I would like to comment. Since Opposition members have not been critical I will not be, either, but I, like them, will suggest some areas where I should like to have seen added finance provided. I would like to see the Government able to cater adequately for all the needs of the State but, unfortunately, under the system by which we operate, that is not possible. Increased contributions have been made to the Family Planning Association of South Australia, which has been allocated an amount of \$12,000, as compared with \$8,400 in the previous year. A contribution of \$2,000 is to be made to the Catholic Planning Centre. These contributions are made in conjunction with added assistance for unmarried mothers, deserted wives, and women in similar circumstances. No-one objects to money being spent in this area; everyone applauds it. However, I would like to see more money directed towards family planning clinics, because I believe that additional money spent in that area could result ultimately in less need for money to be spent in the assistance of deserted wives and unmarried mothers, and other areas of similar need. I have spoken previously in this House of the need for Governments to play a greater part in the provision of family planning centres.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Does this come under diversification?

Mr. KENEALLY: I will come to that in a moment. As I have pointed out, Mr. Speaker, I believe interjections are out of order; I believe, too, that this is an area that should be above politics. It is not an area where one political Party should take advantage of or sneer at another political Party. We are speaking of an area of great need. If honourable members opposite, whose names I shall not mention, do not share my view then I trust that at least they will not sneer at it. More assistance should be given where there is greater need. We should get at the grass roots, and that is the family planning centre, rather than have to spend much more to help unmarried mothers and deserted wives.

I read somewhere within the past week that the fact that we have more unmarried mothers in society is not really something of which we should be ashamed. It means that, generally speaking, there is a much more humane or tolerant view within society. Girls who now have children and who are not married are prepared to keep those children. Society is more likely to accept this state of affairs. They

should be assisted, and the Government has a responsibility to assist them.

Mr. Mathwin: Some of them don't wish to get married.

Mr. KENEALLY: Agreed; that is the point I intended to make. A young woman should not be denied the right or the pleasure of motherhood merely because she is unable to, or does not wish to, get herself a husband. That may be a strange thing for me to say, but I think it is vital that women who wish to be mothers should be able to become mothers. If they are not able to or do not wish to get married and if they become mothers despite that, then they require assistance. I think society generally is much more willing to accept these people, and I am very pleased that it is so.

I am pleased to see the increased contributions to community welfare. The amount to be provided this year is \$11,302,000 as compared to \$8,510,000 provided last year. This is an area of State finance that perhaps has lagged in contributions received as compared with what it is entitled to receive. A good system of social welfare can be implemented only if sufficient money is available. If the departments dealing with social and community welfare are restricted because of finance it is very difficult for them to determine the correct priorities. While they are contributing to one area of need an equivalent area is being neglected. Although the amount allocated this year will not overcome all our community welfare problems, it will certainly enable the department to recruit experienced and trained people and to train its own people, too. I was delighted to see that the Community Welfare Department intends to train a task force of Aborigines to work within the Aboriginal community. This can result only in good.

I congratulate the Government on its contribution of \$2,000,000 to assist in urban unemployment. This system could be extended. I understand and appreciate the problems of areas such as Port Pirie. That is a city with very real problems, and something certainly must be done there. I believe that the system and the financial assistance announced by the Treasurer in this area could be extended from Adelaide to Port Pirie and to Port Augusta. Because of the very nature of the city, Port Augusta has a great problem with transient people, Aboriginal people who congregate there, who are unemployed, and who receive unemployment benefits.

Through the Commonwealth and State Governments, we could set up project work at an area such as Port Augusta. People who were seeking unemployment benefits could then be told that work on projects (roads, dams, and so on) was available and that they should take this work if they wished to earn an income, as unemployment benefits would be paid only if excellent reasons existed for their payment. If this sort of project work was commenced, the Commonwealth would need to contribute, as a percentage of the wages paid, the sum that it now normally pays in unemployment benefits.

The real need for this work at Port Augusta is in the case of the Aboriginal community, as many unemployed Aborigines in this area are receiving social service payments. I do not believe that, in many of these cases, these payments assist Aborigines markedly to accept their normal position in the community. Under this system, they are not being encouraged to get a job, to pay their own way, and to provide a better living standard for their family. Many of these people (and what I am saying does not apply only to Aborigines) are content to live from one payment to the next, whether it be an unemployment benefit payment or a child endowment payment. These people have real problems, as they are unable to meet the normal rent and hire-purchase commitments that people have. They continually go back to the Community Welfare Department. One of the problems that arises out of these circumstances is the situation that we have seen so much about during the last two or three weeks on the channel 9 programme *Newsbeat*, and in the local newspaper at Port Augusta. This matter has been highlighted and probably given the type of publicity that does not help to solve the problem.

Unemployed Aborigines are causing a real problem at Port Augusta. Some people there believe that the Government, the Minister, and the local member are not concerned about the problem and that the Government will support Aborigines financially in any circumstances. They believe that anyone who takes an attitude that is against an Aboriginal will be said to have discriminated against him, but these beliefs have no foundation. One of the local publicans at Port Augusta has had a bad time over the last 18 months because of the activities of a certain group of Aborigines. Some resentment has arisen with regard to the Government's attitude towards the whole issue of Aborigines and their integration into the community. What people should

be made aware of is that no-one should be compelled in a hotel (and this applies to any other business premises) to serve an Aboriginal or a white man who is intoxicated, under age, or a known trouble-maker, or whose degree of hygiene could cause a loss of business.

If a publican were to refuse to serve an Aboriginal for any of the reasons that I have stated, he would have the right to expect the support of the police, and that support would be forthcoming. Only by conforming to reasonable standards of behaviour will Aborigines be readily accepted in the community. However, it is no good our applying these standards to Aborigines if we do not apply the same standards to white members of the community. There is the mistaken idea at Port Augusta that Governments go out of their way to provide great sums to assist Aborigines but are not willing to provide similar assistance to white people who are also in need, and as members of Parliament we know that many white people in the community are in need, because we have frequent contact with them.

Certainly we try to ensure that Aboriginal children receive an adequate education, with Aboriginal parents being given assistance to ensure that the children receive this education. Such an education must be the basis of any attempt we make to improve the living standard of this depressed minority. As I have said before in this place, the rate of increase of the Aboriginal population is twice the rate of increase of the European population. By the year 2000, Australia will have 300,000 Aborigines, so we must make sure that not only the Aborigines know what is expected of them but that members of the white community know what is expected of them, too.

Parliamentarians generally are reluctant to talk about the next point I intend to raise. I have looked closely at the Budget documents to see whether provision has been made for Ministers, senior public servants, and members of Parliament to travel to other States or overseas so that they can better equip themselves to perform their duties. Any business with a Budget of \$500,000,000 should ensure that the people who have the responsibility of spending that money are exposed to all types of idea and new development not only in other States but overseas as well. I believe that the Government could well consider sending a Government member and a nominated Opposition member to Toronto in Canada to look at the system for recovery of compensation, as this system is well known throughout the world.

It is standard procedure for people from all countries to go there.

I do not believe it is right for the Government to send one of its members on such a trip and not send a member of the Opposition, which is the alternative Government. Our Parliament must be exposed to these new ideas, and its members must be better educated. I realize that many members of this Parliament may have already seen these things. However, I do not think that people in the community should expect members to pay for their trips overseas to gain this experience. I believe members have a responsibility to further their education so that they can be better members of Parliament and represent the State more effectively. A member cannot enlarge his experience by staying in South Australia, nor can he do this by reading reports of public servants who have been overseas. I was pleased that recently the Government saw fit to send a Government member and an Opposition member to an environmental congress in Melbourne. I am not suggesting that members of Parliament should junket around the world. However, I believe that in areas involving education, health, industrial relations, etc., it is essential that the Parties select a representative (one should not merely say, "It's your turn to go overseas; someone else went last year"), who should be given an opportunity to acquaint himself better with what is going on overseas and who could report to his Party to this effect. I am not at all content with the system whereby these visits are undertaken mainly by public servants.

Mr. Coumbe: You're thinking of the system that applies in the Commonwealth Parliament?

Mr. KENEALLY: Yes; there is no such system in the State Parliaments. I believe that Ministers should be required to make frequent overseas trips. Members of Parliament are often reluctant to promote this idea because of the reaction from electors, who may say, "There he goes again around the world, enjoying himself." However, the same electors do not mind buying goods produced by certain wealthy industrial complexes, which would disappoint those electors if representatives of the undertakings concerned were not sent around the world in order to note what is going on elsewhere. Those electors do not mind, even though they pay indirectly for those trips in the same way as they would pay, through taxation, for a trip made by a Parliamentarian.

Mr. Mathwin: The Minister of Roads and Transport went overseas recently and closed

his eyes the whole time he was there. He came back and said there should not be any more freeways.

Mr. KENEALLY: The Minister undertook a comprehensive trip, which I think is to be supported by all members. I am only disappointed that the member for Glenelg could not be sent with the Minister, for he may have been able to learn something. However, I suspect that the honourable member is not the sort of person one would send, anyway, because the trip would probably be wasted on him.

Mr. Mathwin: I've fed you with a lot of information since I've been back.

Mr. KENEALLY: Another area to which I refer involves increased contributions to kindergartens. Indeed, education inequality starts at pre-school level, and I am convinced that the priorities existing in this regard could well be turned around so that more money could be spent in respect of pre-school and primary education, even to the extent of perhaps reducing the sum spent on tertiary education. A child's whole approach to education is formed at the pre-school and primary level, where any behavioural, physical or mental problems affecting him can be readily detected. This area requires certain expertise; indeed, the department provides certain expertise and I applaud the moves that have been made in this direction. I certainly applaud the moves to provide more finance for pre-school institutions.

Further, I applaud the Minister's direction that money should be made more readily available for pre-school institutions in those areas that have the greatest need, including Whyalla and Port Augusta. I am pleased to say that there is a pre-school committee at Port Augusta which has been able to obtain a subsidy for the moneys it has raised, and this has greatly encouraged people in my district. This situation will apply soon to Whyalla. I hope that pre-school education is eventually included in the overall education programme, when parents or committees are no longer required to raise the initial sum in order to attract subsidies dollar for dollar. I am awaiting the day when pre-school education is accepted as a responsibility of both the State and Commonwealth Governments.

I think it would be somewhat remiss of me if I did not comment on one or two statements made by members opposite. I refer briefly to the statement by the member for Eyre that the people of Coober Pedy were sick and tired of speaking to their Common-

wealth member and were, instead, referring matters to their Liberal Senator, with the result that their problems were being solved. I am sure that the honourable member had his tongue in his cheek when he said that, or that he made a mistake. He may have corrected *Hansard* subsequently, although I do not believe that *Hansard* incorrectly reported him, but I think the honourable member may have had another look at what he said. Having had contact with people at Coober Pedy and having been in the office of the member for Grey and been fortunate enough to see some of the correspondence that he has received from people in Coober Pedy, I suggest that, the next time the member for Eyre goes through Port Augusta, he should see Mr. Wallis and, as a result, the honourable member's views may change considerably.

It is rather amusing to hear the hypocritical statements made by members opposite, especially those who represent rural districts, including the member for Kavel, who complained that one of the reasons why people have insufficient money to maintain a decent standard of living is that the Government is interfering in too many areas and that this is the result of Socialism. What makes that statement worse is that it comes from a member who promotes the idea of rural subsidies and who really believes that more assistance should be given to the rural industry.

Mr. Gunn: Are you opposing that?

Mr. KENEALLY: Members opposite do not oppose Socialism when it applies to rural industry, but they do when it applies to any other area. As I have said previously, to capitalize their gains and socialize their losses seems to be their policy. Anything faintly resembling Socialism is, to their mind, to be abhorred, except when it applies to the rural industry, and then they cannot get enough of it. Socialism is the saviour of the rural industry, and members opposite want more and more of it, yet they say that nowhere else is the socialistic policy to be applied. The member for Kavel suggested that, when Governments took a greater interest in the welfare and living standards of people, those living standards (I think he referred especially to South Australia) dropped somewhat.

I wonder whether one of the factors contributing to the fact that people cannot buy goods at a price that will enable them to maintain a decent standard of living is the price they must pay for certain commodities. Who fixes the price of the commodities that I have

in mind? The Government does not fix them. The Government has an agency (the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch) whereby it tries to ensure that a reasonable price is paid for certain commodities, but that agency has no say in the prices charged by certain undertakings. Everyone knows that certain major industrial complexes in the country set the prices we have to pay and have a stranglehold on the community.

If unions wish to ensure a decent standard of living or share of the cake for their members, they are criticized, but we do not hear too much criticism from members opposite about the policies of certain major industries. If people cannot buy the goods they need in order to maintain a reasonable standard of living, they do not blame the Government. We try to implement socialistic policies that will benefit the people, whereas, whether or not they care to admit it, members opposite support certain interests that are not playing their part in this regard. This is a good Budget, which will help in many areas where a great need exists. Although any Government is unable to do all it would like to do concerning its Budget proposals, this Government has gone a long way towards solving many of the problems facing the people of this State. I wholeheartedly support the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I support the first line and what the member for Stuart said about overseas trips for the younger members of this House, because it is evident that they need overseas trips. As I have said previously, the younger members of this House do not develop as they should, and sending them overseas would be one way to help them develop. When I had the pleasure and honour of being the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association delegate to Malaysia last year, I received a first-class travel ticket. When I boarded the plane to leave Malaysia, who were the two delegates from two countries who entered the first-class section of it? They were the delegates from India and Australia. We were delegates from two of the poorer countries, but we were travelling first class while delegates from the wealthier countries were travelling tourist. If this practical course was taken, we could send more delegates overseas to benefit from such trips.

I thought the member for Stuart was going well in his speech today when he started talking about our parochial outlook. We see so much of it in this Parliament, some members being concerned only with rural production and

others being concerned only with urban problems—a purely parochial attitude when we should be looking at things from the point of view of how problems affect the whole State or the whole country. We hear talk of rural subsidies and things like that. Can anyone tell me of one person in Australia who is not subsidised in some way or another? At every meeting of the Commonwealth Arbitration Court a subsidy is given to the working people to assist them. Even the members of the Australian Medical Association, the strongest union in Australia today, subsidize themselves every now and again, and the legal profession subsidizes itself by fixing its own charges irrespective of what is happening elsewhere. The only interest I have had in a subsidy relates to a property that I sold, but at any stage in my life as a farmer I would have agreed to all subsidies being removed from every section of the community and all assistance given to industry, and I, as a primary producer, would have survived along with other primary producers; yet primary producers today are not in a position to face up to this situation. I support what the member for Stuart said about our parochial attitude and deplore any member of this Chamber talking parochially.

Perhaps weeds in the Hills area is only a minor matter but the Minister of Works was so ashamed of the answer that the Minister of Agriculture supplied to a question I asked in the House that, instead of giving it to me in the House, he sent me a letter, which I think should be recorded in *Hansard* in view of the policy on weeds adopted in the Hills area. It is as follows:

With reference to your question in the House about weeds, I have been advised by my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture—I am sure he will go down in history as “African daisy Casey”—

that the intent of section 20 of the Weeds Act is to create noxious weed control activity when a council is inactive with respect to this Act. The cities of Bumside and Mitcham both employ qualified weeds officers and are active in meeting their obligation under the Act. Enforcement of the existing Weeds Act to control African daisy in these situations is neither economic nor in the best interests of noxious weed control in general, and certainly would not be in conformity with the spirit of the Act. It is hoped that proposed alterations to the Weeds Act and future research will help overcome the technical and financial problems associated with African daisy control.

Although we have a Weeds Act to control weeds, it is now said that in certain areas this Act does not apply, but it applies perhaps in

areas where there is rural production. Before this Government introduced the regulation that was disallowed by the efficient Subordinate Legislation Committee, African daisy was controllable in the foothills but, because of lax action in lifting control, it is now out of control. It is ridiculous to expect people to the east to accept seed blowing off the foothills to the other side. I wanted to read that letter because I am sure the Minister of Works was ashamed to read it to the House.

I join other members in supporting the additional grant for social welfare. At no time have I criticized that sort of payment, but the additional funds now available in this direction have been provided by the Commonwealth Government. Possibly in this last year the additional State taxes have assisted in some way, but I imagine that to a certain extent most of the State taxes were imposed to cover additional losses made through the various activities of the Government.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Rubbish!

Mr. McANANEY: The Minister of Education says "Rubbish", but in the financial year 1970-71, the first year of office for this State Government, the Commonwealth Government provided exactly the same sum (to the nearest \$500,000) as the sum spent by the Labor Government on education, hospitals and social amelioration. So in that year the Commonwealth Government provided—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do we put revenue into separate little tins, as a housewife does? You never did that as an accountant, did you?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Heysen is entitled to the utmost courtesy.

Mr. McANANEY: Additional funds were made available to achieve these figures and, if greater effort was made to see that the services provided by the Government were more efficient and made to pay their way, more money could be made available for such essential services as education, social amelioration and hospitals. At present too much money is being wasted. If members oppose question this, we can easily find out what these losses are. The field of education has grown considerably. As I understand it, in 1970-71 all the money was provided by the Commonwealth Government, and this year much of it was.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It is incredible that you make statements like that.

Mr. McANANEY: I read with great interest in the school post that the Commonwealth Government had increased its direct education grants to the State only by what was thought to be a

very small amount. Surely we must look at the total amount of additional money that has been given to the South Australian Government over the last two years. The *Australian*, an independent newspaper (if I may call it that), said that larger sums had been made available by the Commonwealth Government over the last two years than at any other time in the history of the Commonwealth. This is the reason why the State Government has been able to provide more educational facilities.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I will never believe that you were an accountant when you come out with such garbage.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McANANEY: Mr. Whitlam was a lawyer; that is why we did not want too many lawyers as delegates to the convention on the Commonwealth Constitution. As it is, there are to be two lawyers from the House of Assembly and two from the Legislative Council who will be going to the convention to represent this Parliament.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: But there is no-one from the Liberal Movement. Doesn't it deserve representation?

Mr. McANANEY: The Minister is avoiding the point I am trying to make about finance for education. In replying to a question from a student at a forum at the University of New South Wales on education, Mr. Whitlam was reported as saying:

It would cost an extra \$40,000,000 to establish pre-school centres for all children, and \$16,500,000 to abolish university fees. "We would use the increases in revenue that the Commonwealth regularly receives," Mr. Whitlam said. "Every seven years the Commonwealth's revenue doubles. There will be \$800,000,000 additional income next year."

Let us consider the situation in 1965, when Mr. Walsh, supported by the present Minister of Education, said that the Labor Party would win the election and would use the increases in revenue that would be regularly received, without increasing taxation. He said that, as a result of that kind of financing, there would be great advantages to South Australia. What happened? By October or November of that year the Labor Government inflicted severe taxation measures on this State at a time when we had the lowest unemployment rate in Australia. As a result, money was drained away from South Australia and within three or four months we had almost the highest unemployment rate in Australia. Let us remember that at present the rate of unemployment is highest in the three States with Labor Governments. In Western Australia 2.89 per

cent of the work force is unemployed; that State now has the highest rate of unemployment in Australia, whereas in some previous years, when there was a Liberal Government there, that State had the lowest unemployment rate.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What about comparing spending in this State by the Commonwealth Works Department with that department's spending in other States? This State has always been discriminated against in that respect.

Mr. McANANEY: That is ridiculous. For years, the Commonwealth Works Department spent a proportionately large sum in this State, although I admit that for two or three years its expenditure fell below that rate. In the year referred to, the Commonwealth Supply Department spent 27 per cent of its budget in South Australia. That figure was supplied in reply to a question by Mr. Whitlam in the Commonwealth Parliament. I hope the Minister of Education will tell Mr. Whitlam that the theory advocated by the Labor Party in 1965 does not work.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How many motions of dissent from your rulings were moved by members of the Liberal Movement at meetings of the Parliamentary Liberal Party?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. The honourable member for Heyden is entitled to respect. He has only 29 minutes to go, and I am certain he wants to say something about the railways. So, I wish members would not interrupt him.

Mr. McANANEY: Unfortunately, I was side-tracked while I was trying to educate the Minister of Education. Many years ago a mistake was made in connection with the financial arrangements of the Engineering and Water Supply Department; the mistake related to extensions to water supply systems in South Australia. The arrangements should have been based on the policy followed in connection with electricity services. A standing charge for a number of years should have paid for the capital cost; this would have benefited the State. During this period primary producers were getting sufficiently high prices to enable them to carry the manufacturing industries. If we had followed the principle I have referred to, the huge amount of unpaid debt would not have increased as much as it did, and the department could have been run more economically.

The Auditor-General's Report states that the deficit in connection with irrigation for 1971-72 was \$1,010,000 and the deficit in connection with South-Eastern drainage \$935,000. The deficit of the Marine and Harbors Department was the first deficit shown by that undertaking for 19 years. These activities must pay their way and become more efficient. The deficit of the Railways Department has increased by another \$3,000,000. I have received a pamphlet in this connection published by the Australian Railways Union. It is regrettable that such a pamphlet should be issued that is so basically inaccurate. Figures such as those in this pamphlet have also been issued by the Railways Commissioner himself, and they have been supported by the Minister of Roads and Transport. The pamphlet states:

Railways are efficient, safe and economic. I hope that they are safe, but I do not agree with the remainder of the description. The pamphlet continues:

Government money for transport should be spent on modernizing the rail system.

In some respects, I go along with that. Large sums will be required for improving the main routes in Australia. It will be interesting to see how long it takes before the Melbourne-Adelaide line is duplicated and made suitable for fast, modern services. I have read that millions of dollars is being lent to the Railways Department by the State Government to carry out such work to a limited degree. It would be more efficient if private transporters instead of the Railways Department provided the transport services now provided on many spur lines in South Australia; it is ridiculous to spend money on these lines when it is urgently needed for the main routes. This document states that the railways do pay. I do not know how the author works this out, because it is many years since the Railways Department has made an operating profit. To have the railways paying their way without having to pay interest is as much as we can expect. Our railways should be put on a businesslike basis, as the Bland report in Victoria has recommended. Charges for railway services should be made at cost and, if it is in the interests of the State to subsidize some lines so as to decentralize industry, that specific-purpose subsidy should be paid. The document also states:

In 1969-70 special grants made by the Commonwealth Government totalled \$517,000,000.

This shows that the Commonwealth Government made a grant for roads, from general taxpayers' money. However, those who used the roads paid much more than that amount (possibly another 75 per cent or 80 per cent) in petrol tax. Further, they paid sales tax on tyres and on vehicles and registration fees on vehicles. On the other hand, in the last seven or eight years the Railways Department has had its interest and depreciation paid for it, and about \$22,500,000 has been provided for the department this year. The Minister of Education speaks of having to take money from here or from there, but the money must come from someone. Is it fair and just to expect the Australian taxpayers to make up losses on the South Australian Railways? Surely those who use the railways should pay for them, and the South Australian Government has an obligation to see that the railways conduct their operations for the benefit of all. Another part of the document states:

An indispensable public service is now threatened by a financial crisis, which is not of its own making.

I consider that the railways are an indispensable service in certain areas. We have main lines and lines on which goods are carried more than 200 miles. Surely the railways must be the most economic way to carry these goods, and this indispensable public service should be maintained. However, the twisting spur lines that wander through the Hills on poor grades cannot compete with road transport. The document also states:

Railwaymen throughout the Commonwealth are taking various forms of action today to highlight the financial crisis created by an increasing interest burden.

The railways do not pay any interest: the taxpayers of Australia pay it for them. Another part of the document refers to nineteenth century accounting methods, but I will not speak on that matter. I just do not know the practice of the railways, but the sheaf of papers accompanying a small parcel being collected from the railways is often thicker than the article itself. Again, there is reference to restrictive operational policies, but I do not know how the railways are restricted. Road transport is restricted, because a person is not allowed to travel on the roads at a reasonable speed. More money is collected in taxation than is spent on the roads, yet the railways do not pay any taxation and are spoonfed with subsidies. The document also refers to lack of co-ordination between all modes of public

transport. I have covered that point. If the Government of the day considers that, in the interests of the State, an industry should have its transport subsidised, the Budget should specify that activity and give the reason for the subsidy. Further, any freight concessions should be stated so that the people of South Australia know the position. Another reference in the document states:

The Federal Government must immediately assume full financial responsibility for a nationally co-ordinated transport system.

The member for Stuart has spoken about the socialization of primary industry, but how is primary industry socialized? People, of their own free will, are engaging in co-operative marketing and marketing schemes. Marketing schemes have been unsuccessful only when primary producers have not had full control of them, and the Egg Board and the Citrus Organization Committee are examples of that. When primary producers have conducted their own marketing scheme, they have had the common sense to appoint experts to conduct the operations. I understand that the member for Rocky River is on the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited board, and that is a most efficient organization. The Wheat Board and other authorities are in the same category.

However, the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board is not a success, because the group of people on it is too wide. The board comprises a trade unionist, representatives of exporters, the retail trade, the Stock Salesmen's Association, and a small group of primary producers. I think we need a board comprising only three members, and I do not advocate that they necessarily should be all primary producers. If I had to decide, I would not mind putting the member for Florey at the head of the board. He is a fair-minded man and I think he would do a good job. I am thinking about whom else from the Government side I would put on the board, but my generous nature does not go further than that. The person who published this undesirable and inaccurate document was a witness before the Public Works Committee, and I think he then wrote in the union journal about how he "did the committee over". I will say no more than that.

The remarks made by the member for Mawson interested me. He commenced as though he was building up to deal with the Commonwealth Budget and the problems of Australia, and I thought he would explain how something better could be achieved. The

honourable member also referred to the Olympian theory of economics, and I thought he would tell us that he could show that what the Commonwealth Government was doing was wrong. However, the honourable member's speech completely blew out. No-one would deny that there is too much unemployment in Australia, but how can this be overcome? The South Australian Treasurer told us recently how he would solve Australia's problems by increasing some taxation, removing other taxation, and doing many contradictory things, as he said, to eradicate the hit-and-miss method we now have of keeping a balanced economy, but to me that was a ridiculous statement. There has not been the expected demand for goods in Australia because, for some reason or other, every few years people tend to lose confidence in the economy and the economy tends to slow down. Government members, and even some Opposition members, have said that the economic position will become worse and worse.

In the 1968 election, the then Leader of the Opposition said at Millicent that things would be bad within a few months and that, if a Liberal Government were elected, the position would deteriorate. He said that the State was having an early election, because he knew that the state of the economy would worsen. This ramming down people's throats that things are going to be bad tends to make people button up their pockets and refuse to spend their money. The Liberal and Country League won the election, and unemployment in South Australia decreased. Things went really well for two years, but unemployment is now rising more rapidly in this State than in any other Australian State.

It is this lack of confidence in the community, caused by the irrational statements made by politicians for their own political ends, that brings on a decline in the economy. There is the need (I have mentioned this over the last 20 years, but I still think it is the only approach) to adopt the only possible solution of this problem. It has been tried before by increasing or reducing taxation to see whether the problem could be solved and a balanced economy maintained, but this cannot be done by increasing or decreasing taxation, because people would not know whether they would have additional money to spend or whether it would be taken from them. The economic position can change overnight and, instead of giving boost, the opposite effect might be achieved.

Taxation rates should not be changed every now and then: a more scientific formula

is needed. If provisional tax were reduced it might not affect the amount of tax a person would pay for nine months, whereas at that stage just the opposite effect might be needed. Increasing or reducing taxation is not the way to go about trying to solve the problem. Lower interest rates are desirable, particularly at a time of demand inflation, but such action is not the solution to the problem, because interest rates in Australia are far too high now. However, if interest rates were reduced, there would not be the excessive flow of investment capital into Australia, although such investment can be made to work very well for the people of Australia. For example, I held debentures in Rootes Motors and received a regular interest cheque from that company, yet Chrysler has taken over that company (and I call to mind the Labor Party's reference to overseas monsters that drain the life blood of Australia) and the shares I hold in Chrysler have not paid any dividend. Every cent earned by that company goes into the economy of Australia, for the benefit of Australians. We must find a more scientific solution to the problem that currently exists.

It is expected that the Commonwealth Government will spend \$1,346,000,000 in the current financial year on capital works. This sum includes loans to the States and Commonwealth authorities such as the Snowy Mountains Engineering Corporation, and it is estimated that the Commonwealth Government will finish the financial year with a deficit of \$650,000,000. However, I believe the Commonwealth Budget should be split into two components. The first of these is day-to-day expenditure involving general revenue, social service payments and pensions. That part of the Budget should balance, and money spent on capital expenditure should be a separate area. According to the state of the economy at the time, proper adjustment should be made: for example, if there is unemployment and a lower demand for the goods that are available, more credit should be issued or loans normally raised from the public should be discontinued so that that spending power is not taken from the community. Modern methods of analysis and computers should be used to increase the degree of efficiency achieved in running national affairs.

I now criticize the Commonwealth Government on its activities of the past year and the way the economy has been allowed to run down. During the last financial year the demand for goods was not sufficient to meet

our capacity to produce them and the Commonwealth Government raised \$720,000,000 in loans. Instead of that money being available to boost the economy, that money was put into kitty, and \$567,000,000 was accumulated. That is where the Commonwealth Government broke down in its efforts to restore buoyancy to the economy because, if this money had been spent on some useful purpose (if the \$720,000,000 had not been taken from private industry), we would have stood a chance of achieving a balanced economy, and the present unemployment situation would not have resulted.

The planned attempt to reduce unemployment by providing country people with jobs is a waste of time and will not serve the purpose stated. However, by adopting scientific methods to run the national economy efficiently, by having two separate Budgets, and by having a more flexible approach to capital expenditure through a mixture of credit and raising loans or financing through Treasury Bills, we will achieve a situation where the demand for goods will be met and the unemployed will have more job opportunities. This problem cannot be alleviated by stop-go interference with taxation and interest rates, because these methods do not determine people's future reactions, how members of the community will handle their own finances and the like, and we must do better than we have done in the past.

It may be said that I am criticizing the policy of my own Party, but if the Commonwealth Opposition has a policy on these matters, other than being critical of all that is taking place, it will present constructive suggestions as to how these problems can be solved at the national level. I am a great believer in people having more education and I thought that, when the honourable member for Mawson spoke, he would provide information and suggestions on which we could talk, but I was disappointed.

On certain matters I will ask questions when we are in Committee, and I hope that we will get better replies than we did in the Loan Estimates debate. I sympathize with the Deputy Premier, who was left on his own to battle on and hold the fort on that occasion. I am pleased that the Workers Educational Association has received a grant of \$22,000—a satisfactory increase of \$12,000. This is a worthwhile organization and I shall be pleased to hear how this increased grant is to be used. Many adults have not had the educational opportunities they should have

had and people who are willing to make an effort in their later years should be given this opportunity.

I have referred to unemployment and I point out that in my own town I cannot have a television set repaired and that no plumber is available to undertake work. If people were trained to do these jobs, however, an area of shortage of labour would be removed. In supporting the second reading, I trust that members opposite will study my remarks so that we can progress towards a situation of full employment and better conditions for all concerned.

Mr. SIMMONS (Peake): I, too, support the second reading, and immediately I say that this is a good Budget. It has been interesting to hear the Opposition's attitude towards the Budget. The Leader was forced to agree that there have been no major taxation increases, but he might have said there was only one minor taxation increase relating to Lands Titles Office registration charges. Rather than give credit to the Treasurer, to whom credit is due, he chose to give credit to his colleagues in Canberra, who have brought Commonwealth-State financial relationships to an all-time low. True, there had been increases in some charges and in taxation earlier in this Government's life, but these were needed because of the parlous state of the finances of this State caused by the Prime Minister and Commonwealth Treasurer (or perhaps I should say Prime Ministers and Commonwealth Treasurers) who, like the member for Mitcham, give lip service to the idea of Federalism, but do their best to kill it.

Mr. Millhouse: Why do you say that I give lip service to Federalism, but that I try to kill it?

Mr. SIMMONS: I said that they give lip service to Federalism. If the honourable member cares to add the second part, I will not argue with him.

Mr. Millhouse: You applied it to me directly, and I ask why.

Mr. SIMMONS: I said, "Like the member for Mitcham, they give lip service to the idea of Federalism, but do their best to kill it."

Mr. Millhouse: You haven't answered my question. You said I did my best to kill it.

Mr. SIMMONS: The honourable member can apply just how much of it he wishes to himself. The Leader makes the ridiculous proposition that the State has been overtaxed. How can he maintain that in the light of comparisons with tax levels in Liberal-dominated standard States, or indeed in the

light of a deficit of \$7,500,000 that is budgeted for in these Estimates? If existing tax rates are to be reduced, would the Leader suggest that the deficit should be increased further? Of course he would love that, because it would give him something to complain about. Like most members of his Party, he is incurably addicted to the idea of balanced Budgets, a concept in public accounting which went out years ago and which his colleagues in Canberra do not adopt in practice. Would the Leader suggest that services should be cut? If we overtax presumably there would be less money available for various State services.

I ask the Leader which services should be cut: I read his speech carefully and I do not think that he listed any. Is it education? I doubt it, although he cavils at the rate of increase in expenditure claimed by the Government. Is it health? He is quiet on that issue. Is it community welfare, water supply, or conservation? Of course not. It takes no intelligence, courage, or a sense of responsibility to urge taxation reductions without saying where that expenditure is to be reduced. It takes all these qualities to produce a sensible and responsible Budget, and I congratulate the Treasurer on doing just that.

Perhaps the best indication that the Opposition is struggling to find something on which to attack the Budget was the contribution by the member for Torrens, normally one of the most rational and fair-minded members of the Opposition, who began by complaining that this was openly and blatantly an election Budget. Why? Were taxes reduced? Were there major increases in unnecessary expenditures? Of course not. The honourable member said that the increased expenditures were possible because of taxation increases, but he had to go back to 1970 to explain many of these increases. Another reason he cited was the massive Commonwealth Government assistance, the reason for which I have already given: that the Commonwealth Government had brought the States to an absolutely critical financial position and, at the last moment, in order to save its political skin, decided to give the States a bit of a go. Finally, the honourable member said that one reason for the improvement was the reduction in the bond rate from 7 per cent to 6 per cent. This is a most remarkable statement. One would think that the honourable member would have kept quiet about the mismanagement of our economy by the Commonwealth Treasurer that brought about a bond rate of 7 per cent or higher.

I congratulate the member for Heysen on his reference to high interest rates. I disagree with the Minister of Education and some of my colleagues, because I believe that occasionally the member for Heysen comes out with some sound economic pronouncements. The big difficulty is to find the wheat among the chaff. However, I still think that in the light of the experience of the Australian economy in the last few years, the honourable member may do better than many people who have temporarily occupied the position of Treasurer in Canberra. I cannot understand anyone failing to criticize a Commonwealth bond rate of 7 per cent which, as much as anything, has brought about the inflation from which we are suffering, has caused undue hardship in housing, and contributed greatly to the States' problems. Reverting to taxation the member for Torrens said that item 1 in the Revenue Statement showed an increase from \$56,453,000 in June 1970 to \$107,780,000 in June 1973, and he said:

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.

It is easy to make a case by comparing two dissimilar items. In the second instance \$34,000,000 out of the \$107,780,000 is accounted for by pay-roll tax, which was gouged out of the Commonwealth Treasurer by the States to give them at least one growth tax to ease their ever-deepening plight. All States immediately had to raise the rate from 2½ per cent to 3½ per cent, because of financial difficulties. The increase over three years in this item (that is, item 1), excluding pay-roll tax, was about \$17,000,000 or about 30 per cent of the figure for 1969-70, when the Opposition was in power. The attempt by the honourable member to show that the level of State tax had been almost doubled was dishonest and unworthy of him, and it merely serves as an indication of the trouble in which the Opposition is now placed.

I accept that there have been some increases in Commonwealth grants (some because of the pigheaded arrogance of a former Prime Minister), but I would not claim that all the increase in State taxation has been applied in one area. I notice that the estimated expenditure on education has risen from \$76,944,505, when the member for Torrens was Minister, to \$137,813,000 for this financial year. That is a rise of about \$61,000,000. The vote for the Education Department in the same time rose from \$54,774,977 to \$105,820,319, an increase

of about \$51,000,000 or more than 94 per cent. It is not surprising that there have been increases in State taxation. I am pleased to see that the member for Eyre has returned to the Chamber, because I wish to say a few words about his contribution to this debate.

Mr. Venning: You could learn quite a bit from him.

Mr. SIMMONS: The best part of the honourable member's contribution was his quotation from *Hansard* concerning my political beliefs. The honourable member complained that the Government was not doing enough for primary industry. However, this Government maintains an extensive and very efficient agricultural service. It supports an agricultural institute of world renown, subsidizes rail freights, allows concessions on succession duties, and so on, in addition to support on a mammoth scale by the Commonwealth Government, by which I mean eventually the tax-paying consumers, two-thirds of whom live in capital cities.

I have much sympathy for primary producers; I say that sincerely. I will explain shortly why I have that sympathy. However, I must say that our primary industries are the most cosseted and coddled in the Commonwealth. This is because of two main reasons, the first of which is political. The first is well known because, for historical reasons, the Country Party has maintained an influence out of all proportion to the number of farmers in this country. In the last Commonwealth elections, the Country Party throughout Australia gained only 8.56 per cent of the votes, but got 16 per cent of the seats. If the Country Party had gained 8.56 per cent of the seats, Australia would have had a Commonwealth Labor Government for the past three years, to the immense benefit of the primary producers.

In Queensland recently the Country Party, with only 19 per cent of the votes, managed to gain control of the State. That is the sort of political set-up under which the primary producers have been able to get the massive support from the Commonwealth Government to which I referred earlier.

Mr. Venning: Do you say we would have got a better go from the Labor Government?

Mr. SIMMONS: I have said the primary producers will get a better go from a Commonwealth Labor Government because I believe a Labor Government will come out with realistic policies that will be of value to the farmers. I will mention one of the main reasons why farmers are in their present mess.

Mr. Venning: What about the grain trade with China?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. SIMMONS: The grain trade with China has been lost because of the stupid attitude of the Commonwealth Government, in which the Country Party plays a major part.

Mr. Venning: That is nonsense, and you know it.

Mr. SIMMONS: It is not nonsense. The country that has taken a sensible attitude towards the Government of China is now sending massive quantities of wheat to China, recognizing a country with 20 per cent of the whole world's population. The quicker the farmers wake up, the better. That is one area alone in which a Commonwealth Labor Government will bring about a major improvement, in a very short time, in the position of the wheat farmers of this country. It is about time the Commonwealth Government accepted this situation.

The other reason why the primary industries are so protected by the Commonwealth Government is economic. Primary producers have been caught in a squeeze between falling prices, on the one hand, due to increased supplies without a rise in effective demand for primary foodstuffs and, on the other hand, the rise in costs and prices within Australia. Only the Commonwealth Government can be blamed for the rise in prices suffered in Australia over the past 23 years. I well remember Sir Robert Menzies getting into power in 1949 on a completely dishonest promise that he would put value back in the pound. I invite any reasonable person to see what has happened to the pound (or even to the dollar, since 1966) and to assess how effectively the Liberal Government in Canberra has put value back in our currency.

Primary producers have been among the main sufferers from this inflation, for which the responsibility must be placed fairly and squarely on the Commonwealth Liberal and Country Party Government. Unlike most sections of society (trade unions, for example, and manufacturers who are able to bring about increases in the nominal value of their earnings in order to offset price rises), the farmer is faced with prices which are determined outside the country, on a world market; these prices have not risen. It has been difficult indeed for the farmer to obtain increases in income to offset the price rises, inflation, and increase in costs which have plagued the whole of this country under a Liberal and Country Party Government.

Mr. Venning: Fair go!

Mr. SIMMONS: I do not know whether the honourable member disagrees with the argument, but I assure him it is true.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River is talking too much.

Mr. SIMMONS: The result is that many primary producers are becoming more and more impoverished and that has given me no satisfaction at all. I have much sympathy for primary producers because I do not like to see distress, heartbreak and ruin in any section of the population. That is why I am on this side of the House, a member of the Labor Party, because that Party is pledged to abolish those curses. For that reason I regret the present position of the farmers. It is a pity that the farmers themselves do not appreciate the causes of their trouble. It is a world-wide phenomenon that there has been an improvement in the output of primary production which has necessitated large numbers of people moving off the land and into the cities.

This has happened in Australia. It is happening in South Australia, and that is why we have the present almost ludicrous warfare on the other side of the House between country interests and city interests. Over the past few years, outside the metropolitan area and the towns so ably represented by my colleagues the member for Whyalla and the member for Stuart, we have seen a fall in the population of South Australia. The political base, the economic base of the Country Party or of the country element of the Liberal and Country League has been steadily eroded, and this process will inevitably continue.

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

Mr. SIMMONS: Before the dinner adjournment I was speaking about the problems of the man on the land. I shall now quote from a recently published book entitled *Crisis on the Land*, by Ronald Anderson, which I heartily commend to members opposite as a sympathetic but sensible resume of the problems of the primary producer. This book indicates that Australian farmers are not alone in regard to being forced off the land. I will quote part of the book to prove the point, namely:

During the sixties, for example, while Australia's farm population was declining by 5.5 per cent, or 56,000 people, and our number of farmers was declining by an insignificant amount, the number of farmers in the European Economic Community fell by 30 per cent. This meant 4½ million farmers and their families moved off the land in the E.E.C.

in the decade and, if the E.E.C. planners have their way, the remaining 10,000,000 E.E.C. farmers will have their numbers halved by 1980, with 2,500,000 being retired because of age and another 2,500,000 being urged into jobs in secondary industry. And in the United States since 1955 there has been similar massive adjustment. The number of farms has declined from 4,600,000 to 2,800,000 and farm population from 19,100,000 to 9,700,000. That is a reduction of practically half. The passage continues:

Although Australia has a smaller proportion of its total work force in agriculture than many European countries, for example, our proportion is much higher than that of countries such as the United States, Britain and Belgium. In addition, Australia between 1955 and 1965 had one of the slowest rates of movement out of agriculture of all the world's developed nations. Our annual average exodus from the farm work force was a mere 0.9 per cent, compared with 1.8 per cent for Britain, 2.1 per cent for Canada, 3.7 per cent for the United States, 4.2 per cent for Denmark, Italy 4.6 per cent, Sweden 6.5 per cent, and tiny Luxembourg 7.4 per cent. Farmers may—and do—deplore this trend to fewer farmers, but it is essential if the survivors are to achieve acceptable incomes in relation to those of city dwellers.

This is a hard lesson which farmers will have to learn and accept, and it is basic to any proper readjustment of our rural industries that they recognize this. After all, it is much better if a planned withdrawal from the land can take place on reasonable terms than if farmers are forced off the land through bankruptcy and starvation. Why has there been this move from the land? I think the reason is that, although the population in the wealthier parts of the world is rising fast, agricultural production has tended to rise even faster, and I suggest that there are two reasons for this. First, there have been improved practices. I am sorry that no members representing primary producers are here at present to hear this, because—

Dr. Eastick: Fair go! What about the District of Light?

Mr. SIMMONS: —I am sure they will be gratified to hear me say that there have been some improved farming practices. This has been largely the result of greater efficiency, but it has been at least partly the result of improved types of grain and stock developed in research institutes. It is also the result of the increased production of farmers who are anxious to maintain incomes in the face of stationary or falling prices because of increased supplies and an inelastic demand for products. There is a big difference between effective demand and potential demand, and it is

unfortunately true that much of the world's population does not have an effective demand, that is, a demand that enables that population to satisfy its wants by purchasing goods. As a result, fewer farmers are necessary, not to feed the world (that would be ridiculous in the light of widespread starvation and malnutrition affecting many people today) but to meet the needs of those able to pay for food and clothing.

I believe (at least I hope) that the long-term future of Australian agriculture is sound. In the face of an expected doubling of the earth's population by the year 2000 (and that is in the lifetime of most members), it would be scandalous if quotas on the production of wheat and unsaleable mountains of eggs, for example, were still in existence within even 10 years. However, in an unplanned world economy based largely on private profit, it is hard to see the voluntary adjustment necessary to permit primary producers to sell all they can produce without knocking the bottom out of their markets. In any case, this adjustment in world attitudes would take some years, and in that time many of our primary producers, despite all the help and sympathy that can be given, will be ruined. This point is made in a Primary Industry Newsletter of January 5 containing a review of a book by the Senior Lecturer of the Department of Agricultural Economics and Business Management at the University of New England (Mr. Jack Makeham), entitled *Farm Management Economics*. I quote briefly from the review the following passage:

Under present prices and costs at least 12½ per cent of Australian farms are not viable. They have little hope of economic survival because their overhead costs, including interest and debt redemption, are too high in relation to their ability to earn income; they are either too small or have too low an equity, or both. Although the majority of the farms in trouble are under-sized, non-viability is certainly not confined to small units. As well, there is no ground for optimism about prices over the next five to seven years. On the other hand, we can reasonably predict that at least 60 per cent of farms in business today will still be very much in business in 20 years time because they have the capacity to adjust to change.

The same thing is covered by Anderson, who relates how in 1967 the then Director of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics (Mr. D. H. McKay) "astounded agricultural economists and the interested few by publishing a table setting out the number and percentage of farms in selected industries with net farm incomes of less than \$2,000 a year and less than \$1,000 a year". Anderson continues:

Mr. McKay's table was based on information obtained from B.A.E. farm surveys going

back as far as 1959-60 and none of them more recent than 1963-4.

His information refers to a situation already several years old, which, on all available evidence, has worsened steadily ever since. Nevertheless, even in the early 1960s (long before the wool price crash, which lasted until just a few weeks ago) 25 per cent of farmers in the sheep industry had net farm incomes of less than \$2,000 a year and 12 per cent, or more than 11,000 farmers, had incomes of less than \$1,000 (about \$20 a week). Anderson continues:

In the high rainfall zone of the industry—the zone one would expect to be most favourably situated—36 per cent of properties had incomes of under \$2,000 and 17 per cent recorded less than \$1,000. The position was much less serious in the wheat industry, where only 7 per cent of growers failed to achieve incomes of \$2,000 or more and only 4 per cent—or just under 1,300—fell into the under-\$1,000 bracket. But every other industry Mr. McKay looked at revealed a worse position. Among berry fruitgrowers 92 per cent failed to top the \$2,000 mark in net farm income and 75 per cent earned less than \$1,000. Banana-growers were only slightly better off, with 83 per cent having net farm incomes under \$2,000 a year and 52 per cent—just over 2,000 growers—failing to reach \$1,000 a year. In terms of number of farmers however, the rot had gone deepest in the dairy industry and, in particular, in its manufacturing sector. Mr. McKay found that of the nation's 61,845 dairy farmers 55 per cent had net farm incomes under \$2,000 and one in three—or 20,409 farmers—netted less than \$1,000—

that is, less than \$1,000 a year for a 365-day job as a dairy farmer. Anderson sums it up by saying:

Broadly speaking, in the early 1960s one Australian farmer in three had a net farm income of less than \$40 a week and roughly one in five had a farm income of less than \$20 a week. Thus, even in those early days, 40,000 farm families were in serious financial plight and at least another 30,000 were sliding downhill fast.

There is no indication that the position has improved in the last few years. I think the reason for this is fairly well summed up in a review published this last weekend of Anderson's book. The reviewer said:

Ronald Anderson spells it all out. He starts off with the under-informed and bewildered farmer who can't see where he went wrong—and in many cases he has not gone wrong; he has followed the normal reaction of a person confronted with a falling income, and has tried to produce more—

goes on to that vast mob of elderly cockies who have not entertained a new idea in a lifetime and call themselves the industry's leaders, and goes on to the Country Party

still hopelessly committed to McEwanism and unable to do the right thing, without admitting to doing the wrong thing for years. Keeping the vicious circle of hopeless ignorance going is a rural press, almost entirely locked into the Country Party, that refuses to criticize in any way and loudly leads the denunciation of anyone who suggests that the whole scene could be run a bit better than it is.

Mr. Gunn: What rubbish are you reading?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr. SIMMONS: If any proof was needed of the validity of that summary, I would refer members to the member for Eyre.

Mr. Gunn: What is your solution?

Mr. SIMMONS: When I entered, this House I believed that several members opposite—13 or so from the country—would know more about these things than I did; but, after two years, I think it is time someone spoke up and told them something about it.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Big landholders are not worried about the small farmer.

Mr. SIMMONS: That is right.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: I am interested particularly in the small farmer.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections.

Mr. SIMMONS: Obviously, in the interests both of these low-income farmers I have been talking about, battling for starvation wages against the natural hazards of their calling and uneconomic prices, and of the remainder, many of whom are marginally viable, something must be done to reduce the number of people on the land. This is impossible while the Commonwealth Government is kept in power by a small, backward, unintelligent group whose electoral survival depends on keeping people on the land. There is, after all, a limit to the most blatant gerrymander. Only, therefore, when the false representatives of the primary producers are swept from power in Canberra can a realistic view be taken of the matter.

Among the steps that a Commonwealth Labor Government can take to assist those whom the members for Eyre and Rocky River claim to represent are, first, a sound financial policy that will reduce inflation and high interest rates, thus reducing costs to the farmer; secondly, a realistic attitude towards what is potentially our biggest market for primary products—mainland China; and, thirdly, a sensible recognition that, in present world marketing conditions, a planned withdrawal from uneconomic or non-viable farm units is

absolutely essential. I suggest that those are practical and realizable ways in which a Commonwealth Labor Government can and will assist the primary producers.

I have spoken generally so far and on one particular aspect because the member for Eyre saw fit to raise it and I thought it was about time he was answered. I should like now, in the few minutes I have left, to deal with a few individual items in the Budget. There will be, of course, an opportunity of speaking on these matters when we are dealing with the lines but, if the debate on the Loan Estimates was any indication, a member would have to leave the Chamber for only a few minutes to let an item slip by. I should like to comment on one or two items, first of all under the Attorney-General's department. I am not saying these things because I am critical of the Budget as a whole, or even of individual parts of it, because obviously there is a limit to what can be done in any one year, given the money available. On the whole, as I have already said, this is a good Budget. However, this does not preclude one from indicating areas in which one would hope that more could be done, at least in the future. One or two lines in particular interest me. For example, I have already indicated just how big the increase in expenditure on education has been under the present Minister.

In the last three years it has almost doubled. In the field of pre-school education, grants to the Kindergarten Union have risen from \$627,000 in the last year before this Government took office to \$1,400,000 this year—an increase of well over 100 per cent. This, coupled with the recent announcement that the Government was making available subsidies of \$8,000 to each of 22 kindergartens, shows just how much the Government and the Minister are concerned about this important area of pre-school education. It is encouraging that, in the last allocation at least, particular emphasis has been given to providing this type of education in areas not so well served at present. I trust that in the future it will be possible for even more money to be devoted to Kindergarten Union grants, and that in particular money will be made available to the less affluent area of Peake, which at the moment is shockingly served by pre-school education.

The grant to the Family Planning Association last year was \$8,400, and it was increased in March of this year to \$12,000, that amount being maintained in the current Budget. However, I trust it will be possible this year for a

much bigger grant to be made to this worthy association because, partly as a result of Government encouragement in March, its activities have recently expanded enormously. Consequently, it is unable to meet all the requests for speakers that have come from high schools, parents associations, teachers organizations, etc. I am sure that the allocation will be supported by members on both sides. One point that became apparent during the recent debate on the abortion legislation was that all members, irrespective of their attitude to that legislation, believed it was most desirable that more family planning facilities and advice should be available to the public, and I agree with those members.

In 1970-71 the sum voted for legal aid was \$44,750, last year it was \$75,000, and this year the sum has been doubled to \$150,000. This is a step in the right direction, and I am very pleased at the steps taken by the present Attorney-General to simplify the law. However, there is still a long way to go. On July 16 Dr. Paul Wilson delivered the Guest of Honour address for the Australian Broadcasting Commission. Dr. Wilson, a man obviously eminent in the field of law, is the Senior Lecturer in Sociology at the Queensland University. In his address he said:

In 1962 Professor Fred Rodell of the Yale University Law School wrote in a leading American law journal:

... while law is supposed to be a device to serve society, a civilized way of helping the wheels go round without too much friction, it is pretty hard to find a group less concerned with serving society and more concerned with serving themselves than the lawyers.

What Rodell wrote about the American lawyer in the 1960's applies very much to the Australian lawyer in the 1970's. Members of this exclusive profession are finding their rear-guard extremely vulnerable to criticism on at least three counts: first, that their costs in certain areas are excessively high; secondly, that the legal profession has failed to provide legal services within the reach of poorer sections of the community and therefore failed to give credence to the oft-quoted principle that "all men are equal before the law"; and, thirdly, that the legal profession has failed miserably to press for law reform on important socio-legal matters.

In relation to his second point, the point relevant to the allocation for legal aid, Dr. Wilson said:

My second major criticism of Australian lawyers relates to the scarcity of legal services offered to the poor and not so poor in this country. In fact, the record of Australian criminal legal aid is distinguished only by its inadequacy. All over the country accused persons still go unrepresented in criminal cases simply because they do not qualify for legal

aid and cannot afford their own lawyers. Explicit or implicit means tests do not allow legal services to be given to the very groups in most need of them—and I'm talking about men on the basic wage, deserted wives and working men with large families.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has one minute to go.

Mr. SIMMONS: Dr. Wilson continued:

If the legal profession and Governments are really concerned with the legal rights of the weaker, or indeed all, members of Australian society, then the limitations of Australian legal aid schemes will have to be recognized. Certainly, the neighbourhood law firms in the United States or the citizens advice bureaux in England could well be copied here in Australia, providing an inexpensive and accessible legal service in poorer areas. Both these overseas institutions have succeeded in securing Government finance as well as the idealism of young members of the profession. But in Australia the profession has yet to show the same idealism or ask for similar Government support.

I do not know how applicable Dr. Wilson's remarks are to South Australia, but I know that the allocation for legal aid has been increased from \$75,000 to \$150,000 this year, and that is a step in the right direction. Members opposite have called this Budget an election year Budget; they are merely making excuses in advance—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the second reading of the Bill. Of course, the total allocation of \$401,006,000 is only an estimate, but one thing is certain: this Government owes a great deal to the Commonwealth Government. The Socialist Government has soft-pedalled the question of taxation. In 1970 taxation amounted to less than \$56,000,000, but it has risen to more than \$107,000,000 in 1972-73, and that is not chicken feed. This year there has been an increase of \$15,500,000 in State taxation, but that increase has been soft-pedalled to hood-wink the public. The Treasurer said that there would be two minor taxation increases this year. One wonders whom on earth the Government thinks it is kidding.

I wish to refer to the question of freeways. Of course, we know that that is the wrong word to use in this House, according to the Minister of Roads and Transport; he prefers to use the term "high-speed corridors". The expenditure on acquisition of land for freeways totals \$2,780,000. In this connection the Auditor-General's Report refers to the Modbury Freeway, the North Adelaide connector, the Gillman Highway, the Foothills

Expressway, and the Hills Freeway. All those projects are parts of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan, yet the Minister always says that there is no such thing as the M.A.T.S. plan. He says that we are not going any further with that plan. Last year we saw the same sort of language; reference was made to the Hindmarsh interchange, the Noarlunga Freeway, the Modbury Freeway, the Salisbury Freeway, the Dry Creek Expressway, the South-Eastern Freeway, and the Foothills Expressway. These are all parts of the M.A.T.S. plan, yet the Minister always says that he does not know what we are talking about and that the M.A.T.S. plan is not being proceeded with. Yet last year \$2,780,000 was spent on acquiring land for freeways. If that is not misleading the public, I do not know what it is. The Breuning report, sometimes called the Breuning novel, refers to Glenelg trams. Dr. Breuning states that a determined sense of efficiency pervades the tall buildings around Victoria Square, tempered by the venerable Glenelg tram. He elaborates about graceful girls in minis waiting for their bus in front of stately town hall. Of course, this report cost us \$12,000.

Dr. Breuning also deals with other matters, particularly those that the Treasurer mentioned the other day: I refer to high density and the type of living that he considers people should be sympathetic towards. Little does the Treasurer realize that many people do not like that type of accommodation. Dr. Breuning spells out the position in no mean way. He says that high density is not the answer to the city sprawl. I am pleased to say that all of the Tramways Trust deficit of \$643,813 cannot be levelled at the Glenelg tram, because that is one of the few methods of public transport that is conducted efficiently, and it does a terrific job within a reasonable price range. Dr. Breuning's report, at page 10, states:

Summarizing the picture, some factors crystalize as crucial requirements to which the transportation system must respond:

1. Enhancing the beauty of the city and its setting.
2. Minimizing contributions to all forms of pollution.

Of course, we have this with the tram. The other factors that Dr. Breuning mentions are as follows:

3. Providing adequate access and circulation for industry and commerce and their continuing decentralization.
4. Supporting the viability of low-density housing.

The Treasurer does not follow that line of thinking at all: he prefers high-density housing. Regarding the Glenelg tram, yesterday I saw the renovated vehicle operating after it had been given a new lift. The tram is 43 years old, and perhaps one would have thought that they would put rubber wheels on it to make it different! Instead of being silver and aluminium with a red band around the bottom, the tram has been painted Tuscan red and rich cream; in other words, terra cotta brown and rich cream. Dr. Breuning says that we must liven the place up and make things around the city look decent and pleasant, particularly if we are to attract people to the transportation system, yet one tram was renovated at a cost of \$8,000 and the best colour scheme that those concerned could think of is terra cotta brown and rich cream!

Mr. Payne: What would you suggest?

Mr. MATHWIN: I suggest that that is pitiful. I suggest a bright colour, a lavender colour, or something like that. Some people say lavender or purple is blue with a touch of red, but I regard it as violet with sweet thoughts and pleasant endings. I do not understand why the experts in this field have painted the Glenelg tram as it is now. I also quote this statement about the tram:

The Glenelg trams were popular with regular travellers and had become a tourist draw, because they were unique in the world, running on more than five miles of private track.

Yet, brown and cream are the best colours they can do! If one looks farther afield to other places that operate this type of modern transport, one thinks of Rotterdam, Blackpool in the United Kingdom, and the many other cities that have extremely efficient trams. They run quietly and they are painted in bright colours, the primrose colours and the creams and off-whites, to make them more attractive and to encourage people to use them. We expect, I should imagine, to attract tourists to places near the city, and within a few miles of Adelaide we have Glenelg, the Mecca of the people, which I represent.

Mr. Langley: What about Victor Harbour?

Mr. MATHWIN: Glenelg has a good cricket team, as the member for Unley knows. I wonder whether, in continuing to upgrade the Glenelg trams and the service, the authorities will do anything about the uniforms of the conductors and drivers, or whether they will dress them in uniforms that are 43 years old. Dr. Breuning's report states:

The attractiveness of the automobile and the general failure to improve the attractiveness of public transport services have resulted

in a steady decline of public transport patronage.

This is a report for which we paid \$12,000, yet we do not take any notice of it! The small matter of painting a tram—

Mr. Langley: What difference does the colour of the paint make?

Mr. MATHWIN: It makes a big difference to the tourist potential. If the member for Unley was as keen on tourism as the Treasurer professes to be (which I am beginning to doubt), he would realize that these things were important to the tourist industry.

Mr. Langley: What do you say is a good colour?

Mr. MATHWIN: I have told the honourable member, but he does not listen. Unless I am speaking about cricket or football, he is not interested. One would have thought that what was in the report would be followed up quickly, because it was important. The report condemned the M.A.T.S. plan and the Minister said, "We will not bother with it: we are not interested in it. We can spend millions of dollars a year acquiring property, and we will build all the bridges and overpasses, but we will not go on with the M.A.T.S. plan." This report says much about the dial-a-bus system, and states:

Dial-a-bus is a special bus service in which a traveller calls a central switchboard, whereupon a bus is directed to pick up the traveller at a given time near his origin. Thus, the walk to a stop and the wait there are eliminated.

Here we have a recommendation for dial-a-bus, but what has happened? The member for Peake, in asking the Minister of Roads and Transport a question about dial-a-bus on August 4, 1971, stated:

Several inquiries into the system have been undertaken in the United States of America, and I believe that while the Minister was there he inquired into this matter. Furthermore, the Professor of Applied Mathematics at the Adelaide University (Prof. Potts) has advertised for a research scholar to do research work into a dial-a-bus project, I believe in the Elizabeth area. Can the Minister say whether the Government has taken any further action? In a speech I made in this House I said that the Minister of Roads and Transport went on a trip abroad to widen his experience, and I agree that it is a good thing that members do this. However, when members go on such trips, I think they keep their eyes shut when they are there or they forget what they have seen when they get back, and the trip becomes a complete waste of time.

Mr. Payne: Did you go to Denmark?

Mr. MATHWIN: I looked at this type of fiasco. The dial-a-bus system is the laughing stock of the world. Indeed, the system that is most like the dial-a-bus system brings the worst possible pollution: I refer to the taxi system operating in Istanbul, Turkey, where pollution is so bad that it is difficult to breathe. At the end of his long reply, the Minister said:

Without suggesting that there is any pressure on the committee in the form of a time table, I would like to think that well before Christmas a dial-a-bus system will be operating in South Australia.

That was in 1971—

Mr. Payne: Read on. What else did he say?

Mr. MATHWIN: He said nothing more and, if the honourable member wishes to check that reference, it is on page 540 of *Hansard* for August 4, 1971. Recently, in reply to a question asked by one of my colleagues, the Minister said: "You prove to me where I said that this thing would operate before Christmas".

Mr. Coumbe: It sounds like Father Christmas.

Mr. MATHWIN: That is right. This system is to operate in Elizabeth, and I hope that all the English people living there will be more than delighted to take full advantage of this scheme, whenever it comes before Christmas, so that they can enjoy it and suffer pollution problems from which they previously fled. Pollution is a serious problem and, if this suggestion is implemented, it will only aggravate the problem. I cannot understand how such a suggestion could be put to the Government?

I come now to a matter of deep concern to me: the acquisition of properties in the Brighton City Council area for the expansion of Brighton Boys Technical High School. I raise this matter not to upset the Minister of Education but to suggest to him that he should look again at the problem before he proceeds with what he has threatened to do. The Minister has said that he is prepared compulsorily to acquire properties in King Street and The Crescent at Brighton, immediately adjacent to the school, which is to become a co-educational school in conjunction with the Dover Gardens Girls Technical High School. The Minister has said that this is to cater only for about 100 pupils. The residents in these streets do not know what is going to happen to their properties because the threat is that, unless the Brighton City Council closes King George Avenue, or part of it, the Minister will acquire six properties in

King Street, and another two properties. A property owned by a Mr. Gregory has been in his family's possession for more than 100 years.

I know that the Minister is not supported in any way on this matter by either his constituents in that area or by the council. There is no doubt of this. The cost of acquiring the six good properties in King Street and another two properties has been estimated to be about \$300,000, yet this is to cater for only about 100 students. In the school grounds are located timber classrooms and other portable units, and I ask whether it would not be better, cheaper and fairer if these buildings were removed and a two-storey or even three-storey building were erected on the property to cater for the children involved. The cost of doing this would be less than the \$300,000.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why don't you agree to closing the road?

Mr. MATHWIN: I said earlier that I did not mean this to upset the Minister but that I was raising the matter just to put a case to him on a matter of economics.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why don't you agree to closing the road. You are suspected of playing politics on the Brighton City Council.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am not playing politics.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Well, you are. You said that you agreed to the closing of the road, but you won't vote for it.

Mr. MATHWIN: I said nothing of the sort.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You said you put up 11 years ago that it should be closed, and now you have reneged on it.

Mr. MATHWIN: I did not.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: If the Minister would curb his enthusiasm, he might understand what I am talking about. His conduct disgusts me, because I had a private conversation (which I thought was private) with the Minister outside the doors of this Chamber about three or four weeks ago. In that private conversation I said to him that had he waited a little longer until one of his Socialist friends had come back and he had received the support of another of his friends in the council, I might have considered the matter further. This was a private conversation but, as the Minister has seen fit to discuss it in the House, he can have it back. More than 11 years ago a council meeting discussed the widening of King George Avenue north of the Brighton High School. At about 1 a.m. the alderman for that area suggested widening the road, but many council members seemed to be

asleep. When I suggested that we should cut the road in half and block half of it off, the meeting came to life, and we had a spirited discussion.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You were utterly right, and I am proud of you for doing it!

Mr. MATHWIN: I am not proud of the Minister for speaking about what we said in confidence outside the doors of this Chamber and bringing that conversation into the House.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: If you want to play ducks and drakes—

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister should be ashamed of himself.

The SPEAKER: Order! This debate is on the Budget; the Loan Estimates have been disposed of for some time. I suggest to the honourable member that he concentrate on items of the Budget.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That Minister gets an armchair ride!

Mr. MATHWIN: As this is a matter of finance, I hope the Minister will look at it in that light, because that is how I placed it. A petition from about 152 residents of that area has been presented to the council, and one must take note of such an action. I was not present at the meeting at which the petition was presented, so I had nothing to do with it, but these residents have protested against the acquisition. I should have thought that such a petition was worth something. The Minister has acquired 14 blocks in Wattle Avenue near Townsend House and, therefore, he has obtained a large area. I understand that the acquisition is proceeding, and I compliment the Minister on this action: he has done well to take the opportunity to acquire this land. I suggest to the Minister that many classrooms are equipped in Townsend House and, although some renovations may be required (perhaps with the aid of Townsend House), I should imagine it is not beyond the realms of possibility for something to be done with this area. I hope that the Minister will have second thoughts on this matter before a vast amount of money and time is wasted, because it will take a long time if the department is to acquire all the properties.

The councils within my district are pleased that different organizations have been set up and more money is to be spent on environment and the preservation of the beaches. Much work is being done at present on one section, but I hope within this Budget year that the Minister of Environment and Conservation will ensure that spinifex grass or similar grasses are planted

in order to protect the remaining sandhills within the metropolitan area. It is a pity that zoning regulations can be delayed for any time at the whim of the Government, because generally they are for the protection of rate-payers. When the Director of Planning presented the model by-laws to the councils, it was decided that unless the councils accepted them in their entirety they could present no alternative to the Director, nor would they be passed by this House. The Minister of Environment and Conservation is still delaying planning regulations for one council, because it will not rezone a particular area as it concerns the Railways Department. If these model zoning regulations (and one would have thought that, as they were model regulations, they would be a model) had been introduced as particular zoning regulations in the first place, many thousands of dollars would have been saved by councils. I now refer to hearings of the Juvenile Court and the rights of the press to be present at the hearings, which is a matter concerning the Attorney-General's Department.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is supposed to be speaking on the Budget.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am speaking on the Budget about the Attorney-General's Department, and I presume that the juvenile courts are under his jurisdiction.

The SPEAKER: The Loan Estimates debate has been concluded.

Mr. MATHWIN: The member for Peake rambled throughout the world: he was in China at one stage, but no-one said anything to him. Another member spoke about Russia, and the member for Stuart was all over the place, but it seems that I am to be stopped from discussing this matter. I should like, with your co-operation, Mr. Speaker, to refer to the Attorney-General's Department. It concerns the right of members of the press to be present at hearings in the juvenile Court. The Attorney-General must realize that the type of crimes being committed greatly concerns the public and the authorities, and he must realize how the public is being affected by the crimes. What is happening in this court is of great importance. I would not support in any way the identification of individuals appearing in the courts, because I believe this would have a detrimental effect on their rehabilitation within the community, but the public has a right to know and the press would be able to keep the public informed of what is going on in the community. I believe it is wrong that the reporting of some

proceedings is banned. I do not think reporting in these courts should be stifled. If it is the case, then it is wrong. The grave action taken by Mr. Wright, in the Elizabeth area, together with the publicity provided, has been effective in dealing with cases of drunken driving and similar charges in the Elizabeth area.

I support my friend the member for Hanson in his comments about welfare and the welfare State. I also support the increase in assistance and the priority given to helping deserted wives. This is a good measure, and I compliment the Government on its action in this regard, and also on its assistance to foster parents. However, I sound a warning that one must be most careful in any suggestion of a welfare State. It becomes difficult to handle; once things have been given to the public it is very difficult to take them away. I support the second reading.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I had not intended to speak in this debate, but in view of the remarks of the member for Glenelg about a matter which concerns him, as an alderman on the Brighton council, and me, as member for Brighton and Minister of Education, I must make my position quite clear so that the record is straight. The Brighton Boys Technical High School, in my district, is a school on a limited area of ground with space at present for one oval and one soccer pitch. At the moment the school caters for about 650 boys. We are currently negotiating with Townsend House for the purchase of an additional three acres of land to the west and over King George Avenue. It is true, too, that, in line with the general policy of the Government (a policy which I think honourable members opposite support) of developing our secondary schools as comprehensive and co-educational high schools, it will be necessary ultimately to redevelop Brighton Boys Technical High School as a fully co-educational school.

In these circumstances, if the school is confined to its existing site, even if the purchase of additional land from Townsend House goes through, the only way in which additional buildings could be provided would be by building on and encroaching on the existing oval area. Whether it is co-educational or not, the school needs a modern library centre that it has not got. It is not likely to get it for another five years or so. If the school becomes co-educational, it will need girls' craft facilities, additional science facilities, girls' change rooms and girls' toilets. So there is a requirement for

additional buildings on this site, and at present the school has run out of area on which to build.

Mr. Evans: I wonder whether we should consider underground rooms in cases like this where there is a shortage of space.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There is an underground water basin in that area.

Mr. Evans: At about 70ft., I think.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not sure that it is not less than that. Be that as it may, the cost involved would be considerable. Whether or not one likes it, in terms of our current method of operation the only way of providing these additional buildings without acquiring more land would be to encroach on the oval area available to the school and to the community. School ovals will be made available to the community, and the member for Glenelg would be aware that a joint arrangement has been reached between the Education Department and the Brighton council, since I have been Minister, for the joint development and use of land on Bowker Street, North Brighton.

Mr. Jennings: Do you think you will have the support of Simon Templar?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not know about that, but I hope he will be able to consider this in an unbiased way without taking account of local politics. Turning now to the petition, the background to this matter is that a house became available and the Education Department purchased it because, quite clearly, if ultimately the department had to take the house it would be unfair to allow someone to buy it, and then have the department come in with a compulsory acquisition notice. As a consequence of that purchase—

Mr. Mathwin: You got it for \$20,000 instead of \$25,000.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I would appreciate it if the member for Glenelg would listen, because he might learn something.

Mr. Mathwin: You were very rude to me.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Venning: You got away with murder.

The SPEAKER: The member for Rocky River is interjecting far too much. He will have his opportunity to speak presently.

Mr. Venning: I hope I get a fair go.

The SPEAKER: There is far too much crossfire and interjection across the Chamber. It must cease.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As a consequence of approaches from certain residents of King Street, Brighton, who were fearful

that the Education Department might ultimately acquire their houses, I asked officers of the department to investigate the possibility of redeveloping the school if the road between the existing school property and the land being purchased from Townsend House were closed, and, if that redevelopment took place, whether we would be able to guarantee the residents along King Street that we would not require their properties. The reply from the department was to the effect that we could give a guarantee. I then wrote to the Brighton council and put to it the following proposition: I would guarantee to those residents that their houses would not be acquired if the Brighton council would agree to close the portion of King George Avenue between Wattle Avenue and the northern entrance to Townsend House. I made it clear (and I had Cabinet approval for the statement) that if the council agreed to this the Education Department would meet the full cost of closing the road. It so happened that the meeting of the Brighton council took place on the night of the emergency sitting of Parliament brought about by the petrol crisis. I had a conversation with the member for Glenelg—

Mr. Mathwin: In private.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member is an alderman on the Brighton council, and in matters I have discussed with him involving the Brighton council and affecting my area I have hoped, I would have thought, and I naturally assumed that the attitudes he expressed to me would be those he would express in public. Apparently that is not the case, and, if it is not, I am dreadfully sorry that the honourable member feels I have breached a confidence. The honourable member was not able to attend the council meeting because of the sitting of Parliament, and at that meeting my proposition was ceremoniously thrown out by the council.

Mr. Mathwin: They had a petition—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The petition from the residents related to any further purchase of property by the Education Department. My proposition for the Brighton council was designed to avoid further purchase of property, and it involved closing a road. The honourable member, who is an alderman on the Brighton council in my area, said to me (and I presumed it was a public attitude) that he thought that, from the traffic point of view and from the point of view of the safety of

that area, parts of King George Avenue ought to be closed.

Mr. Mathwin: I said that 11 years ago.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The impression I gleaned, and I am dreadfully sorry if this is not the position—

Dr. Eastick: Has this anything to do with the Budget?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am replying to the remarks of the member for Glenelg.

Mr. Mathwin: You forced me to say—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member is now saying that the impression he created and that his attitude some years ago that parts of King George Avenue should be closed in order to secure greater traffic safety is no longer his attitude. The impression which he created that evening in the discussion I had with him and which I thought represented the attitude he would express in public was quite the contrary to that. It may be of interest to the member for Glenelg to know that I have since consulted with the Road Traffic Board on the matter and suggested that part of King George Avenue be closed in the interests of road safety. The honourable member will also be interested to know that the Road Traffic Board's reply is "Yes, it should be closed."

Mr. Mathwin: Perhaps you would care—

THE SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg has made his speech and his time has expired.

THE HON. HUGH HUDSON: The answer to this question is, I hope, that the Brighton council will reconsider the whole matter and agree to the closure of the road. That will be in the interests of road safety. I am willing to say, and I make public now, that I do not operate at one level in private and at another level in public. I will make public right now that we are willing to provide bicycle and pedestrian access through the property concerned, if the road is closed, in order to ensure that the students who travel to the Brighton High School do not have to use another route, and I point out again that we are considering the fact that the blind children from Townsend House who are of secondary school level should, if possible, be incorporated into a normal school environment. So far, it has been thought that, if this occurred, we would have to incorporate them in the Brighton High School but, if we redeveloped the Brighton Boys Technical High School as a fully comprehensive and coeducational sec-

ondary school, it would be a natural consequence that these children from Townsend House would come across the road to that school and, if the road were closed, there would be no traffic hazard for them.

The only inconvenience that would arise as a consequence of the closure of the road which, as I have said, means no further property acquisition, involves the few motorists who wish to travel along that part of the road. As the Road Traffic Board says, it involves a traffic hazard; indeed, the various intersections along King George Avenue represent some of the greatest traffic hazards in Adelaide, and the honourable member knows it. Virtually every intersection along King George Avenue is a traffic hazard and has had its share of accidents. Indeed, there was an accident yesterday at the corner of King George Avenue and Wattle Avenue, and that accident would not have taken place if the road had been closed.

It is no use the honourable member's trying to renege on the line he took some years ago, because he knows that the line he took then was correct and that the whole of King George Avenue represents one of the worst traffic hazards in the metropolitan area and certainly the worst traffic hazard in the Brighton council area.

Mr. Mathwin: You're going to put all the traffic around to Brighton Road.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Once the current work on Brighton Road is completed and traffic has had a chance to settle down, I am willing to test the situation by means of a traffic count in regard to that part of King George Avenue that we wish to close. In fact, we can even get the boys at Brighton Boys Technical High School to conduct a traffic count as an exercise and, if the number of cars in normal circumstances, when Brighton Road is operating even in its current condition, is greater than about one every five or six minutes over the whole period of the day, I shall be surprised. In four or five years time, when the whole redevelopment of Brighton Road is completed and its capacity to take traffic is increased immeasurably, car usage, which is the only matter in issue, on this part of King George Avenue will be reduced still further, and that degree of car usage creates a traffic hazard! That is how bad the intersections are. The situation is clear and I have made my stand public all the way: I do not wish to take over these houses; I do not wish to dispossess people of their houses

in any circumstances, but I have a responsibility to the school and to its students. While I am Minister, I am required to exercise that responsibility and I will so exercise it. The honourable member can do all he wishes within the Brighton council, but he will not get me to do other than exercise that responsibility.

Mr. Mathwin: You've got constituents, too.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: They are my constituents but, while I am Minister of Education, I have a greater responsibility in this issue than to my constituents: my responsibility to the State comes first, and I urge the honourable member not to forget that that responsibility comes first. I do not mind standing up in front of my constituents and saying that. If the honourable member wishes to debate with me in front of my constituents (he as an alderman for Brighton and I as the local member) I will debate it with him on any date and in any circumstances that he cares to name; he can stack the meeting with all his supporters, and I will still debate it with him.

Mr. Mathwin: Don't get nasty.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will state what the issues are.

Mr. Mathwin: I asked you simply—

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not Question Time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: All I ask is that the member for Glenelg, an alderman of the Brighton council, when he exercises his vote on the council, casts a vote in favour of closing that road in the interests of road safety and in the interests of those constituents of mine whose houses will not be required if the road is closed.

Dr. Eastick: Is this in the Budget?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No, it is not, but the Leader's colleague (half a colleague, because he is in the Liberal Movement) decided to raise the issue, and I am replying to him.

Mr. Mathwin: When I raised it, you should have been in here.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member chose to stir the pot a little.

Mr. Mathwin: I did not; I could have done it—

The SPEAKER: Order! When the member for Glenelg was speaking, I warned him on several occasions that he was speaking to the Loan Estimates rather than to the Budget. He gives the impression that one is trying to single him out; but he made certain statements

and, having let him make those statements, I point out that the Minister has the right to reply. I am not going to permit a cross-fire in the Chamber on this matter, and I ask the member for Glenelg to desist.

Mr. MATHWIN: On a point of order—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order.

Mr. MATHWIN: On a point of order, you allowed greater leeway when the Minister was speaking.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: And he came in half-way through what I was saying.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. He has not a point of order. He knows full well that a point of order must be taken at the time it arises. He is out of order and is not going to stand up and monopolize this Chamber. The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There is a simple solution to the problem which will ensure for all time that the residents of King Street will not have their houses acquired and will get a written guarantee from the Education Department that that will not happen, that the school will get the land necessary for its proper redevelopment in the interests of all the future generations of boys and girls who will attend that school and that it will be in the interests of road safety: that is, for the Brighton council, of which the member for Glenelg is a member, to agree to close that road. I ask him to so agree.

While I am on my feet, I will refer to one or two other matters. When speaking to the Budget, the member for Mitcham made some rather elementary mistakes in arithmetic that should be corrected. At page 1228 of *Hansard*, he pointed out that in the current Budget just under two-fifths (or just under 40 per cent) of the total revenues of the State would come directly from the Commonwealth. He said:

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.

I regret to inform the honourable member that the correct percentage figure is 36½, not 27. He continued:

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.

If he had done his arithmetic properly, he would have found that the 1966-67 figure was 37 per cent and that the Commonwealth grants as a percentage of the total revenue of the State had increased only marginally since 1960-61 and 1966-67.

I also refer to remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition about the percentage increase in the Education Department vote occurring in this year's Budget. In Education Department expenditure, much depends on the timing of award changes for teachers. The large award change that occurred recently took place on May 24, 1971, and the full impact of the 12 per cent or 13 per cent rise in salaries that occurred then was felt in the 1971-72 financial year. The Leader will recall also that at the end of 1970 there was the 6 per cent basic wage increase, the full impact of which flowed on to the teachers in the 1971-72 financial year. So that the extent of inflation of salaries and wages costs in the Education Department expenditure of 1971-72 was very large indeed: it was about 18 per cent to 20 per cent, by far the largest it has ever been. This year, in terms of our present knowledge of award changes (we may run into something else later in the year) the expected inflation of wages and salaries costs for the Education Department runs at between 3 per cent and 4 per cent greater for 1972-73 than for 1971-72.

Dr. Eastick: That does not explain 1970-71, though, does it?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: What do you mean?

Dr. Eastick: The sizable increase in 1970-71.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, but there was also a salary increase that occurred in September or October of 1969, which had a full year's impact in 1970-71, and the degree of inflation in 1970-71 was not as great as it was in 1971-72 but was greater than the prospective inflation now in 1972-73. In real terms (and this is my point) while the actual percentage money increase in the Education Department vote is smaller than it was last year and in 1970-71, in real terms the increase is slightly greater than in 1970-71 or last year. It is one of those situations where one's ability to produce a little increase that is a little greater than the increase of the previous year is enhanced by the lower rate of inflation from

wages and salaries costs, because there is not the same monetary increase.

Dr. Eastick: In other words, you encourage salary awards?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is largely a matter of the timing of the awards of the Teachers Salaries Board. It is normally the case that those awards by the South Australian Teachers Salaries Board tend to follow the changes in teachers' salaries in the Eastern States. So far as the general level of teachers' salaries is concerned, we do not lead—we follow. The criterion of comparisons with other States is a basic fact in the determinations by our Teachers Salaries Board. There has been a recent movement in teachers' salaries in Victoria, and there is a likelihood of a similar movement in New South Wales, so we could be confronted with a similar movement here, following those changes, but we do not know yet.

Dr. Eastick: Is that covered in the \$7,000,000 extra?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No. So far as the Government's approach to this matter is concerned, it is on the clear understanding that the award changes taking place during the year must be met automatically and they will not impinge on the real rate of expansion provided for in the Budget. So there is no question that the expansion and the changes provided for in the Education Department by this Budget will come unstuck because of a possible change in teachers' salaries that may take place during the year.

Dr. Eastick: Will that mean imposing bigger taxes on the people?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I hope it will mean a sympathetic attitude from the Opposition's colleagues in Canberra. While we have had the highest rate of increase in teachers' salaries, not only absolutely but also because of a raising of the status of teachers in this community by this Government, we have also had a faster rate of real improvement in educational standards than ever before. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition would acknowledge this real improvement in educational standards and hope for its continuance. I think this would be the attitude of the general community, and I certainly do not expect to run into any difficulty with the Leader on that point. I notice the Leader is silent now but, to assist his cogitation (I know the member for Rocky River is incapable of cogitating, but his Leader is and I want to assist him if I can), I point out that,

if one wants reduced taxes and a balanced Budget, one must cut down on rates of increase in expenditure. There is always a choice facing the community and its Government as to whether it will choose a faster rate of improvement in education, health and welfare standards or whether it will choose lower taxes. Any responsible Government has to make that choice. I know that the Leader feels irresponsibility on this matter at present because he does not expect to have to make that choice, at least for some years.

Dr. Eastick: That is not the way I concluded my remarks.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the Leader expects that he will have to make that choice responsibly, I suggest that he moderate the line he is taking on this matter, because it is no good getting up in public and saying, "We will balance the Budget; we will do better than the Government on education, health and welfare; and we will lower taxation." If the Leader says that, no-one will believe him. The Leader and his colleagues were trying to run this line; evidently, you are willing to contemplate increased taxation to maintain education, health and welfare standards.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister must address the Chair.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am sorry if I have offended, but it is an embarrassing point for the Leader.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am not going to permit the Minister to speak across the Chamber. The Minister must speak to the Budget, as must every other speaker in this debate.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I was endeavouring to get a greater degree of responsibility in the attitude of the Leader.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You will be sat down if you do not watch out.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member is more likely to run into trouble than I am. I am replying to the points raised by the Leader of the Opposition because he raised them in a relatively responsible way: I do not intend to reply to the points raised by the member for Kavel. I shall relate the history of grants to schools, because it may serve as a useful background. Prior to 1971, no grants were paid to school committees for maintaining school grounds, which were the entire responsibility of school committees and school councils. Maintenance grants were introduced for the first time in 1971 purely on an enrolment basis. For 1973 we propose to pay these grants on a combined enrolment-

area basis. The details will be announced soon. This will give a greater measure of justice to those schools with small enrolments but relatively large areas to look after. Adelaide Girls High School has a site of about two acres but it has almost no playing area at all and no means of providing a playing area. That school, with between 850 and 900 students, cannot be neglected altogether. So, a formula that combines enrolments and area is probably the fairest formula.

The main change in the subsidy system has been in relation to recurrent subsidies, as against capital subsidies. Instead of the old recurrent subsidy arrangement, grants are now made to school committees on a straight enrolment basis, although in the formula there is a constant amount that protects to some extent schools with small enrolments. The change in the subsidy arrangements means that the Government, on top of grounds maintenance grants, will be spending more than \$760,000 on subsidies, as against \$500,000 or \$550,000 over the last three years. So, there has been a substantial improvement in the financial position of school committees, on average. These are the main grants now made. There are still capital subsidies that apply in relation to tennis courts, gymnasiums, assembly halls, and the establishment of ovals for those schools built prior to 1967. Any school built since 1967 gets the necessary ovals provided as part of its basic establishment arrangement, but the subsidy arrangement for providing reticulation systems at schools established prior to 1967 still applies, and it still applies to tennis courts and basketball courts at such schools.

Dr. Eastick: It is no good spending capital without being able to maintain the capital improvements.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Prior to 1971 no assistance was given for maintenance; that was introduced in 1971, and the degree of assistance has been upgraded for 1972-73. In 1972 substantial assistance is being given for the first time to outback children through the introduction of rural scholarships, which have applied for this year for children in grade 5 in primary schools right through to children in the secondary level. I believe that this year only one outback child who applied for a scholarship was refused a scholarship. In addition to the basic boarding allowance of \$180, the allowance provides for a further sum of up to \$370. So, for most of the parents involved the total is a maximum of \$550. The aim is to cover the full boarding costs of a student attending a Government school in a town. Of course,

parents are free to send a student to a Government school or an independent school, but the determination of the scholarship sum has been based on the estimate that about \$14 a week for 40 weeks a year would be necessary to meet the boarding costs of a student living in a country town and attending a Government school.

Mr. Gunn: Is this only for secondary education?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No; it covers children in grade 5 at the primary level right through to children in the secondary level. From next year, rural secondary scholarships will still apply. So, an area school student whose school provides courses only to the fourth-year level will be eligible for assistance in connection with the fifth-year level. Further, an area school student whose school provides courses only to the third-year level will be eligible for assistance in connection with the fourth-year level and the fifth-year level. These scholarships will be awarded on merit. However, for isolated outback children it will not be a scholarship anymore: it will be an allowance as of right. The situation introduced for the first time in 1972 by this Government will become a matter of right for isolated children down to grade 5 at the primary level. All I point out to the honourable member is that this Government, which the honourable member is abusing up hill and down dale, accusing it of not giving a hoot for people who live in the outback, is doing more for isolated children to ensure their education than has any other Government in Australia.

Mr. Gunn: I haven't said that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Well, when the honourable member tells people about this allowance, I would appreciate his telling them that the additional amount of \$370 will be subject to a means test but that it will be a matter not of scholarship but of right.

Mr. Gunn: I'll send them a copy of your speech.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I thank the honourable member for that, because we want to ensure that everyone in the outback is aware of his entitlement in this matter and sees that his children take advantage of it. As a consequence of this—

Dr. Eastick: Do you think Mr. McTaggart—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think Mr. McTaggart now supports the policy. He took some time to understand it but, now that he does understand it, he supports it. I also hope that this policy will enable families to stay in the outback, whereas previously, in

certain circumstances, in order to provide for the education of their children, they moved from the outback, saying, "No matter how much we like the outback, we must look after our children. We cannot afford the cost of boarding them away, so we will have to move." That is the policy that has been adopted, and I hope that the member for Eyre, in his more helpful moments (which I believe he has occasionally)—

Mr. Clark: They are rare.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, but he has them occasionally. I have not yet heard the member for Eyre say that the reason why China is buying wheat from the United States is that Gough Whitlam went to China.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The remark is out of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am pleased to have your guidance on this matter. I hope the member for Eyre does the Government justice on this matter, even though, on matters like wheat, he tells the most outrageous stories that we have ever heard.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): As a matter of formality, I support the second reading, but this Budget is not unlike previous Budgets that this Government has introduced. It appears to be very mild, but we on this side have good memories of what takes place between Budgets and how expenditure and increased taxation slowly but surely takes place during the year. A Budget is only a way to try to pull the wool over the eyes of the people of this State. This afternoon and this evening it has been interesting to listen to the speeches made by members opposite. We certainly got a long way away from the subject and I hope that, if I transgress, you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will be as kind as the Speaker has been.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is dealing with the Budget.

Mr. VENNING: Nevertheless, this afternoon we had to listen to the member for Peake speaking on agriculture. He did not know much about the subject, and I could have helped him considerably, particularly when he spoke about members of the Labor Party in the Commonwealth Parliament. I say that because some of those members did assist agriculture, and the honourable member did not go far enough in his comments. I am speaking of Mr. Ben Chifley in this regard. I express my concern that this Government has increased expenditure on agriculture by only \$275,000, which is an increase of about 4 per cent on last year's expenditure.

Mr. Keneally: But you are selling all your wheat—

Mr. VENNING: This afternoon the member for Peake spoke of the poverty of the primary producer, but he was not quite right. At present, farm products are in great demand.

Mr. Evans: What about eggs?

Mr. VENNING: That is a minor matter. I am talking of major farm products. I do not know much about eggs and, therefore, will not say much about them, but they would serve a useful purpose in this House at times. This afternoon the member for Peake condemned farmers who were of some immensity. He said he was in sympathy with the small grower, but after a couple of minutes he was speaking of how the small farmer had to go out of business. Therefore, it was difficult to follow the arguments of members opposite.

We can look back at what this Government did about wheat quotas. Its contribution to aiding rural industry is nil and, through the committee it set up to handle wheat quotas, it handed out quotas for additional amounts of wheat to make certain growers viable, not because there was a reason why they should have an additional quota of wheat but because they had succession duty problems or other problems. I know of many farmers who had small quotas and appealed many times for larger quotas but, because they were viable with the quotas they had, they were unsuccessful in their attempts. Therefore, it can be said that the Government used wheat quotas to make viable the non-viable growers. This Government has contributed little, if anything, to the rural industry in this State.

I wish to put in correct perspective some matters relating to the rural industry. This afternoon the member for Peake said that things were at a very low ebb. I will deal with the main farm products: meat, wheat and wool. Wheat has been in great demand, although the honourable member's colleagues in the Commonwealth Parliament did much to damage the image of the Australian Wheat Board, to the extent that the board had to find additional markets. The board got into the Egyptian market but that market is not as lucrative as the China market, because of the need to give extended terms to Egypt. We wait to see what will happen in future regarding supplying more wheat to China.

The meat situation has improved considerably. Meat is in much demand, provided we get co-operation in the industrial area to allow not only primary producers but

also the people of South Australia, to benefit, because we all depend on the success of primary industry. With co-operation in the industrial field I believe that the community generally will be much better off. The problem confronting the wool industry has always been of great concern to me, especially as the demarcation line between a price that is too low and one that is too high is as fine as a razor's edge. However, the pleasing improvement in recent wool prices will provide greater employment on country stations.

Regarding the hours worked in the rural industry, I do not know how this Government or any other Socialist Government expects to live without the finances obtained from primary producers and those involved in private enterprise. Because of the importance of primary industry, I ask where this State would be without private enterprise. I should like to see the Government try to grow wheat on my property, because it would cost it three times as much as it costs me.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: We pay award rates.

Mr. VENNING: If primary production were run by other than private enterprise, we, like many Socialist countries, would be importing grain. The member for Mawson said:

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.

I do not say that I do not agree with that, but I point out that, if it were not for the way that private enterprise handled the important issue of finance for production, that which is currently being done could not be done. Appreciation must be expressed to those people in private enterprise on the land who, instead of working a 35-hour week over 41 days, probably work 60 hours spread over seven days. I remember when the Upper House was successful in pointing out to the Government that it had under estimated by at least \$400,000 the amount to be obtained from a

stamp duty that was to be imposed in a previous Budget. This clearly shows the effectiveness of the Upper House.

Mr. Simmons: How do the rates compare with those in other States?

Mr. VENNING: I am not interested in how they compare. Far too much is spoken about other States. We are an individual State with a different cost structure, and existing conditions in other States cannot be applied to South Australia. The Treasurer asked that this State be brought under the Grants Commission, and then he said he had been instructed to bring our taxation into line with taxation applying in other States. Tom Playford took no notice of such instructions. When told that he had to increase rail freights, he refused to do so. Instead, he reduced some freights. However, when a Labor Government came into office, there was an increase of 33 per cent. This is the sort of sympathy that persons living in the country have come to expect from a Labor Government.

Members opposite have lived in the shadows of tall city buildings and do not realize what conditions prevail in the country. Members opposite, in speaking on this Budget, and on previous Budgets, have finished up by giving the poor old Commonwealth Government a slam. When we were in Government we heard much about the crisis in education, but immediately the Labor Party came into office that was the end of hearing about the crisis. If the Australian people have the misfortune after the next Commonwealth election to have a change of Government, I should like to know what the scream will be then by Government members when they wish to slam the Commonwealth Government. As happened with the education crisis, the matter will die overnight. For the sake of the people of Australia I am willing to listen to Labor members criticize the Commonwealth Government, so long as it remains a Liberal Government. I do not intend to take up all the time available to me by speaking, but I would rather use some of the time for a minutes silence—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not continue in this vein.

Mr. VENNING: —in order to think about these things. However, as I have been ruled out of order, this action would not be permitted.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I warn the honourable member that he must heed the

Chair, and if he continues in this way I will have no hesitation in warning him.

Mr. VENNING: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It is interesting to see how income has increased from stamp duties, which is estimated to total about \$25,000,000 for this financial year. Succession duties, which have been a bugbear to rural people, have increased to about \$11,000,000. I do not know when the time will come when someone will take drastic action to do something about these matters. In his private members' Bill the member for Gouger referred to these taxes, but no resulting action is apparent. I am awaiting a reply from the Treasurer to a question about these duties, because eventually assistance may be given to those people conducting small businesses or who are on the land, by having a committee set up to inquire into the problems caused by these taxes.

Mr. Harrison: What about the small store-keepers?

Mr. VENNING: I have spoken about them, too.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Tell us about the small farmers who have been selling out for the last 10 years or 15 years.

Mr. VENNING: The Minister has finally got through to me, but he loves having a little jab. He knows that small farmers have been bought out in some areas (to their benefit), taken their money, and gone into other industries. This is the correct thing to do.

Mr. Clark: Down with the little bloke!

Mr. VENNING: Not at all. This afternoon a member said that holdings must be enlarged in order to be viable. We will not always be able to take wheat quotas from someone and give them to someone else. Last week the Deputy Premier advocated abolishing quotas. What will happen to the small grower if he cannot get someone else's quota?

Mr. Clark: You told us what you thought of the idea of quotas being abolished.

Mr. VENNING: I support abolishing wheat quotas for the individual, but a quota should remain for each State.

Mr. Gunn: To protect the small farmer.

Mr. VENNING: It would be in the interests of South Australian growers if State quotas were to remain. Western Australia and New South Wales have large areas of country still to be brought into production and, if quotas were lifted, they would produce so much wheat that the Wheat Board would be embarrassed. However, that is not the only part of the question. Two major factors affect the production of grain; perhaps Government members are not concerned about this matter,

although to primary producers they are important issues. Australia ranks third to America and Canada as being the major exporters of grain. Although we do not now have an International Grain Agreement, there is a gentleman's agreement between these countries about minimum prices. In America acre-production restrictions apply to producers, and in Canada the producer can deliver only so many bushels an acre of his holding.

If we allowed unlimited production in Australia, we would destroy the good relationship that has existed (and still exists) between the three major exporters of grain. In Australia we refer to about 300,000,000 to 500,000,000 bushels for export, but Canada and America refer to thousands of millions of bushels. If unlimited production existed in these three countries, America and Canada would be exporting to the world market at a price well below the Australian cost of production. This is one aspect of the wheat industry that Government members should learn something about in order to assist this industry, rather than drawing red herrings across the trail when speaking of rural industry. I notice that only a 4 per cent increase is provided for expenditure on agriculture. Rural Youth is an important section of our community, not only in rural areas but also in metropolitan Adelaide, and the Adelaide branch is an effective part of this organization. I know that Rural Youth is lacking in sufficient staff, but the few that are there are doing a magnificent job under adverse conditions. I am worried, because the Government has not given more assistance than it has. Some time ago Rural Youth wished to be placed under the control of the Education Department but, apparently, the Minister of Education considered that, because he had more than he could manage, Rural Youth should remain under the control of the Agriculture Department. The front bench is thin at present, but I ask the two Ministers present to convey to their colleagues the significance of the future of agriculture to our rural communities, and the hope that Rural Youth will receive sufficient money to promote the organization, which has meant so much to our growing community.

Time and time again we have approached the Minister of Education about certain work to be done in country schools. I am thinking particularly of the Port Broughton Area School, the Orroroo Area School, and the Laura Primary School and the playing areas that were

supposed to be sealed two or three years ago but are still unsealed. Only today I received a letter from the appropriate department giving certain reasons why the work has not been done. Group tenders are being called. This goes on for weeks and weeks, to the point where school committees get fairly fed up and want to know what is going on. We repeat the whole procedure, and again the answer comes back. I am sorry the Minister of Education is not present to hear my comments. I hope he will bring some pressure to bear on the authorities to bring some of these schools up to date.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: The Commonwealth Government?

Mr. VENNING: There is no State Government that has had so much money as the present Government, yet it is still damning the Commonwealth Government. I am amazed to know that the Commonwealth Government is willing to give what it has given so far, knowing the way it is being thrown around.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I call the attention of the honourable member to the fact that we are dealing with the Budget. The debate on the Loan Estimates has been completed and any reference to another debate in this session is out of order.

Mr. VENNING: I want to refer to the Jamestown High School and the single-teacher units there. If we could have found the right docket I believe the new units at Jamestown would have been built today. It is a job to find the finance.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have told the honourable member once that the matter before the House is the Budget, the receipt and expenditure of State finance. The Loan Estimates have already been adopted by the House, and Standing Orders prohibit any discussion on a matter that has been determined by the House during the current session. The honourable member for Rocky River must confine his remarks to the Budget.

Mr. VENNING: Finally, I refer to the Railways Department. We are waiting with great interest to see what the position will be when the committee finally decides details of standardization to connect Adelaide with the existing standard gauge railway from Perth to Sydney. The Minister was kind enough to give me some information only last week. I was very interested in the way he replied to my question; I thought he was quite polite, for a change. He endeavoured to give me a fairly complete reply to a reasonable question.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Probably the first reasonable question you have ever asked.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Which Minister is that?

Mr. VENNING: The Minister of Roads and Transport. The people of this State, particularly the northern part, have learnt from the Minister that standardization of the northern line is tied up with the standardization of the southern line. These people are wondering what is in the mind of the Minister and whether he is going to make compulsory the zoning of silos if his Government agrees to standardize the section of the railway between Gladstone and Wilmington. This is a matter of concern to primary producers in the northern part of the State. They are concerned, too, that the railway is being used as a money spinner for the Government when it comes to wheat freight. We read in the paper quite frequently that the finances of the State are buoyant because of the movement of grain. It is quite amazing to calculate the value of a train-load of wheat travelling from Gladstone to Port Pirie. The freight charge is in excess of \$2,000 over that short distance.

I view with concern the intention of the Government when the final policy on standardization is implemented in this State. I hope the Government will provide a service to the community and that the community will use it. The producer cannot be blamed for not using a facility if it is not convenient and economical. If the Railways Department provides a regular service the people will use it. There are areas, of course, where it is not possible to provide a service; in some districts the railway lines should be removed. However, there is still some cause for alarm in that if the railway is not there a monopoly is given to road transport. It concerns us all that this year the deficit in relation to operation of the railways is about \$22,000,000. Looking outside this House, seeing the activity that is taking place between Parliament House and the Adelaide Railway Station, and knowing that the Railways Department is being debited with the cost of much of the work being carried out, it is no wonder that the department is experiencing difficulties.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What do you mean by that?

Mr. VENNING: Perhaps the Minister does not know about it. It causes great concern to see the measures being undertaken. Looking at the Electricity Trust, we find a charge of about \$3,000,000 which must be met by the

consumer. All consumers are worried by this continual increase in costs. They thought that, with a Labor Government, the costs would be lower, but they are finding that costs today are becoming higher and higher. They are waiting for the opportunity at the next election, at the ballot box, to change this situation. I support the second reading.

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): I support the second reading and in so doing I propose, first, to examine some of the remarks made in this debate by members opposite. I have risen tonight in a charitable mood; I do not intend to disagree with the remarks of the speaker who has just resumed his seat.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Probably because you couldn't understand him.

Mr. PAYNE: As far as I could understand, he described himself as having been always woolly-minded, and I do not wish to disagree with him. I shall refer briefly to the remarks of the member for Glenelg, although after an earlier speaker on our side had commented there was not much left for me to refer to regarding the honourable member's remarks. Referring to the dial-a-bus system, he tried to show that this scheme was fanciful and unlikely ever to occur and, not satisfied with that, he said, "Well, it only brings about a lot of pollution anyway and, therefore, it would be undesirable."

Mr. Clark: He has a phobia about dial-a-bus.

Mr. PAYNE: I believe he has. I think he must have had a ride on one once and it did not have a non-smoking compartment.

Mr. Gunn: It's all very well for you to say that, but what about—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Eyre has spoken in this debate and is entirely out of order.

Mr. PAYNE: The member for Glenelg also told us that he went overseas, barged down the Rhine (I think that was one of his phrases), had his eyes opened when he was in Denmark (I think I know why he kept his eyes open there), and in general he told us that he had been around a fair bit. I can only suggest that while the member for Glenelg was in Holland he did not inspect the dial-a-bus system which is actually working there and which has been reported in traction journals throughout the world. True, when the system was first instituted it was slow to gain patronage. One of the problems in this respect is satisfying the people just how the system can and will work, but this should not be used

as a reason merely for deriding a project of this nature, without its being given a fair trial.

In relation to the pollution issue, it would be quite feasible for vehicles of this type to be operated on natural gas propellant and, in fact, it would not cost too much, if we could prevail on the Commonwealth Government to take off the recently suggested tax that it is now going to impose in this respect. In general, the aim of the remarks of members opposite was an endeavour to defend the Commonwealth Government against what they claim is an unfair and politically motivated State Government which, because of its political difference, is attacking the Commonwealth Government. First, let me assure members opposite that I do not blame them for trying to defend and bolster the Liberal Government in Canberra. In fact, their obvious recognition that that Government needs bolstering and defending is apparent to almost anyone in Australia.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: They're like the bloke with the wheelbarrow.

MR. PAYNE: I agree entirely: they have the job in front of them. Proof that the Commonwealth Government needs defending and bolstering can be seen in the reference to the headline in today's *Advertiser*, to which reference has already been made in the House during today's proceedings. The headline states "Jobless Most for 11 Years", and there are two things to note about it: first, it points out that the current unemployment situation is the worst for 11 years; secondly, the previous occasion was also an occasion when the Liberal Government was in power in Canberra. Therefore, twice in this period, we have had a situation of major unemployment in this country.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Are you sure you're right? Mr. McMahon said, according to today's *News*, that the unemployment figures had fallen.

MR. PAYNE: I think I should be willing to go along with the reporter concerned (Ian McKay), who went on to say, among other things, that the upsetting thing was that Mr. Lynch did not mention the worst aspect of the present situation, namely, that in August, 1971, the difference between unemployed and job vacancies in respect of the whole of the country was 27,175.

Mr. Keneally: They only issue statements about seasonal adjustments when it suits their argument.

THE SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitchell is making the speech, not the member for Stuart.

MR. PAYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I, too, was under that impression. I reiterate that the gap between the unemployed and the job vacancies in August, 1971, was 27,175, and in August, 1972, it was 68,647. All the mental agility, slide-rule tricks and juggling that Mr. McMahon and Mr. Snedden, etc., can employ does not alter the fact that there is a much wider gap, and that is what the reporter Ian McKay points out. This is a serious situation.

Members interjecting:

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

MR. PAYNE: The position to which I refer has been reached after 12 months of denials that this terrible situation exists, after all the platitudinous pronouncements we have heard to the effect, "I think next year will be better," and after hearing what Mr. Lynch said last January, namely, that he expected a marked improvement this year. I do not know in what direction he was speaking; it seemed he was referring to an increase in the unemployed, judging from the figures published.

THE SPEAKER: Order! I think that would best be left to the honourable member's colleagues in Canberra. It is the State Budget we are discussing.

MR. PAYNE: A statement was made by another disciple in this House (the Leader of the Opposition, although perhaps we might call him the Leader of the lost legion). However, we will leave it at that and see what happens.

Mr. Nankivell: To whom are you referring?

MR. PAYNE: To the Leader, who said on the radio today that he was confident of an improvement in the unemployment figures, but I am not sure in which direction he was speaking, either. Judging from the pronouncements of the Leader's Commonwealth colleagues and from subsequent results, it looks as though one cannot place too much reliance on that sort of statement. However, the people are saying, "When will there be an improvement? We want an improvement not next year but now." People in our districts are out of work, and there is only one organization which is responsible for this position: the Commonwealth Government. That Government has made continual announcements about what adjusted Budgets, mini-Budgets, and all sorts of other Budgets will do to the economy, but none of those announcements has altered the situation one whit, and no-one can deny that. The position is just getting worse and worse.

Mr. McAnaney: In the Labor States!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. PAYNE: I suggest that the member for Heysen have a closer look at the Commonwealth Grants Commission's report, which contains a complete outline of the situation in the various States, showing which State is disadvantaged compared with another, and illustrating what effect changes in the economy will have, as well as referring to tax bases and demographic factors, etc. I do not intend to go into all that this evening, but the information is all there for the honourable member to read, if he can read it. He should not ask such a silly question.

Mr. Clark: He knows that.

Mr. PAYNE: I agree he knows it, but he is trying to make political capital out of it. I said members opposite were trying to defend and bolster in their speeches this inept Government in Canberra—a Herculean task, if ever there was one! It has proved to be quite beyond them, as they have demonstrated by their efforts so far in this debate. Even the member for Mitcham fell down. Normally, he makes a reasonable fist of his speeches, particularly if we ignore their content, but he did not seem to get into his stride on this occasion. Even when he referred to the constitutional convention next year, he faltered a little. I wonder whether he had an inkling that he was not going to be a starter after all in the "Constitution stakes", by what he said.

I genuinely sympathize with him. How he could be left out of this topic with his obvious knowledge of constitutional law is quite beyond me. It absolutely defies comment. I hope the people of this State have taken due note of what the real motives in giving him the chop must be. I believe they have taken note of it and I suggest that his own comment in his speech (I agree I have taken it out of context, but it can be examined in *Hansard*) on another matter will suffice. He said:

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.

He was, of course, referring to State-Commonwealth relations, but it more aptly fits the present position of members opposite. In endeavouring to defend and bolster the Commonwealth Government, the Opposition opened its innings in this debate with a Trevor Bailey effort from the Leader: he certainly stayed there a long time; the ball met his bat often but he failed to score.

Dr. Eastick: That is your opinion.

Mr. PAYNE: You have had your turn and I shall not take as long as you did. An example of one over was when the Leader said, "When the State took over pay-roll tax the rate was 2½ per cent, but that was immediately increased by the Government to 3½ per cent." However, there were a number of other balls in that over that he did not play at all, and we must examine them. He did not mention that all States had increased the tax by 1 per cent; nor did he say it was in an effort to make up for the lack of further Commonwealth assistance at that time; nor did he suggest that the tax benefit had been offered by the Commonwealth only after the Victorian Liberal Government, in an endeavour to get a better deal from the Commonwealth, had challenged this matter in the High Court. Those were some of the other balls in the over that he failed to play at, and that puts another complexion on the matter.

Mr. Clark: He was stone-wallling a bit.

Mr. PAYNE: He did not score but he might have got a leg bye down to long leg. The Liberal Government in Victoria challenged this and the South Australian Government supported Victoria, so there is a lot more that the honourable member could have gone into. At that time (and it is still that way, as all members know) all States were struggling to stay afloat in a sea of financial difficulty.

Mr. McAnaney: Who put us there?

Mr. PAYNE: That interjection is timely; I was about to go into that, for the honourable member's benefit. If he keeps quiet, he will find out who put us in that position. There is in existence a document that was presented at or prior to the February, 1970, Premiers' Conference. It is entitled *The Financial Relationship of the Commonwealth and the States* and is signed by six Premiers of Australian States. I have looked at their names carefully, and they are Henry Bolte, Steele Hall, W. A. Bethune, D. Brand, J. Bjelke-Petersen, and R. W. Askin. They are all L.C.L. Premiers, members will note. This document was prepared by six Liberal Premiers. Let us examine the proposition being thrown up at us by the other side.

Dr. Eastick: Where does the L.C.L. come in?

Mr. PAYNE: I hope the Leader will be patient because I shall be able to enlighten him.

Mr. Clark: They have changed their name.

Mr. PAYNE: It must be confusing to members opposite when we refer to their Leader. They do not know to whom we are referring,

because there is more than one Leader. If a member opposite speaks of our Leader or Deputy Leader, he is in no difficulty because we have one Leader and one Deputy Leader, so I sympathize with the Leader of the Opposition sitting at the "river end" of the House (to use a cricketing term). Six Liberal Premiers have prepared a document that answers, amongst other things, referring to Commonwealth-State relationships, a question asked by the member for Heysen—"Who put us in this position?" I take it he was referring to South Australia. In the preface we see:

The outstanding feature of the financial relationships between the Commonwealth and the States in recent years has been the progressive deterioration in the financial position of the States under the Commonwealth-controlled system of uniform income taxation

... Although general purpose financial assistance or tax reimbursement grants have been made to the States since the Commonwealth assumed the sole power to levy income tax, the grants have failed to keep pace either with the growth in State obligations—

"State obligations", not hand-outs—

to maintain and develop essential community services—

note "essential community services"—

or with the growth in Commonwealth income tax receipts.

Mr. Crimes: Are you sure it is not a Labor Party statement?

Mr. PAYNE: No—it is six ex-Liberal Premiers, although it does not really matter: there will not be any of them much longer anyway, even if I get my tenses mixed. Surely, that disposes of the myth amongst members opposite that we have a go at the Commonwealth on these matters simply because the Commonwealth Government is of a different political persuasion. Here, we have a clear case of six State Premiers of the same political persuasion having a go at the Commonwealth Government for the same reason that we have advanced—the difficulties that the States are having in maintaining their financial obligations under the present financial set-up.

Mr. McAnaney: Why don't you set out the big hand-outs you have had since then? You have not put up a sensible case since.

Mr. PAYNE: I have read from this document, which I have stressed has nothing to do with the Australian Labor Party. I have pointed out what it says. It uses terms in accordance with and similar to those terms that we in this State, as a Labor Government, have used in endeavouring to get a better deal for the people of this State. Some Opposition

members, including the member for Heysen, do not seem to understand why the State Governments found something wrong with the Commonwealth Government. The reason is that the Commonwealth Government is inept, bungling and hopeless. Members should ask any officer in the Commonwealth Social Services Department what it is like to administer the social services scheme. The officer's reply would be a revelation. It takes up to 2½ times as long as it used to take to work out a pension computation, because of the way the Commonwealth Government has tacked alterations on to the scheme.

Mr. Evans: What about problems in connection with maintenance payments in the State Government's sphere?

Mr. PAYNE: I do not intend to take any notice of that red herring. One of the points made by the Liberal Premiers was that Commonwealth grants had not kept pace with income tax receipts. To illustrate that point, I draw attention to the 1971-72 Commonwealth Budget, which totalled \$8,500,000,000, whereas this year it totals \$10,000,000,000. I do not think any Opposition member will suggest that the States are getting proportionate increases. So, it is clear that there is something wrong with the financial relations between the Commonwealth and the States. The document further shows that, if the States had had available finance to afford increases in spending at the Commonwealth rate for a period as far back as 1967-68, \$150,000,000 more should have been spent by the States in that year alone for all services.

If Opposition members accept those figures, they will not be able to continue to advance the argument that the McMahon Government has been very generous toward the States. I will be the first to admit that there has been an improvement in this respect this year; the Treasurer referred to it, too. The Treasurer said that the Commonwealth Government had been somewhat more realistic; that is a fair statement of the position. The Treasurer also said that there had been a continuing search for solutions to the problems of Commonwealth-State financial relationships and for an equitable and workable distribution of that part of the nation's resources that Governments seek to use in providing services for their citizens; that is the heart of the matter.

The picture presented by members opposite is of a Commonwealth Government generously handing out its own hard-earned money, but that picture is phoney for several reasons, not the least of which is that the money does

not belong to the Commonwealth Government at all: it is the people's money. The Government is merely a temporary custodian, not the owner. A proper review of Commonwealth-State responsibilities and a better way of allocating finance are urgently needed. The Treasurer has referred on other occasions to the ridiculous pilgrimages that occur when the Premiers go to financial conferences in Canberra. To coin a phrase, it is time for a change in these matters, and it is time the people of Australia knew it. They will provide the trigger for this change at the coming election by electing a Labor Government, which will look to the needs of the people in connection with employment, education and social services.

Changes are also urgently needed in connection with financing public transport. Tables 68 and 70 under the heading "Commonwealth payments to or for the States" show that for the years 1969 to 1973 inclusive \$11,000,000 was allocated to railway projects, whereas in the same period \$97,000,000 was allocated to road projects. This sort of imbalance is no help to this State's efforts to improve public transport. The Minister of Roads and Transport recently highlighted this problem by pointing out that the Commonwealth Department of Shipping and Transport was providing a 45 per cent subsidy toward the cost of a new tanker; this is a gift of nearly \$7,000,000 to the oil companies.

Dr. Eastick: Will it provide employment?

Mr. PAYNE: I am not quarrelling about other aspects of the subsidy. If the Commonwealth Government can produce money to help oil companies, why can it not produce money to assist public transport projects? Most of Australia's population lives on the seaboard, and public transport is therefore most important. For nearly two years our Minister of Roads and Transport has been trying to get the Commonwealth Government to see this point, and the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport (Mr. Nixon) has finally said that he will have a look at the matter! In a press release the Minister of Roads and Transport recently said that the Commonwealth Bureau of Transport Economics—not an A.L.P. organization—had stated that there was an urgent need to inject at least \$500,000,000 into transport during the next five years. That reinforces the point I have been trying to get over to the Leader. I have mentioned that the total response by the Commonwealth Government so far has been a grudging offer to consider the matter. This is a start,

as it is something which the Minister of Roads and Transport has been able to get from that Government which no-one else could get previously.

Specific references to detail can best be made in the Committee stage: I know that other honourable members agree with me on this. However, I do not want to conclude my speech without mentioning the magnificent efforts of the Treasurer in the past two years and the efforts of the various Government officials who have assisted in managing the State's finances so well. The period concerned has been one of high wage increases and inflation throughout the whole country, yet the Treasurer has been able to finance operations in this State despite those factors. In the Budget he has submitted a blueprint for an even greater year in the history of this State in providing services for the people. These provisions are not what they ought to be but they are as good as the State can manage under the existing Commonwealth-States financial arrangements.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the first line. First, I will comment on some remarks made by the member for Mitchell. He said that it was the Commonwealth Government's fault that the unemployment figure was so high. He and his colleagues know that now (as well as 11 years ago) the world-wide unemployment is at a high level and that this country has one of the best records for full employment.

Mr. Crimes: Tell that to those who are unemployed and see how they feel.

Mr. EVANS: I know that the position does not please those who are unemployed, and I have such people in my district. At the same time, we expect members opposite to be completely honest. We have had a Liberal and Country Party coalition Government in this country for about 20 years and in that time this country has progressed as well as any other country has done. Our standard of living and way of life are as good as those anywhere else in the world, and people from other countries have said so.

Mr. Crimes: Some go back to where they came from.

Mr. EVANS: Some go back because they have learnt to live a life of bludging on others. That is one reason why they go back. In Australia they must contribute to the benefits that come forth. Some of those who have gone back have decided that Australia is still the best country to live in, and they have returned to live here. Whether we are Liberal

or Labor, if we are honest in our thinking we can be proud of the Liberal and Country Party coalition Commonwealth Government.

The member for Mitchell had the cheek to attack the Commonwealth Government for paying \$7,000,000 towards the cost of building a tanker in this country. As you know, Mr. Speaker, as member for the area where there is a shipbuilding yard, but for the subsidy that the Commonwealth pays towards shipbuilding, Whyalla and the Port Adelaide shipyards would be closed, with thousands of men and some women out of work. The member for Mitchell advocates that the Commonwealth Government should cease paying such a subsidy, but he knows that the people he represents would be out of work if his suggestion were adopted. He knows that the people he is supposed to represent would advocate that everyone else should go on strike to support their re-employment. He also knows that the Commonwealth Government pays a subsidy to keep the industry going.

Mr. Payne: I suggest you read what I said.

Mr. EVANS: He attacked the Commonwealth Government for making the subsidy available, and that is similar to saying that the subsidy should not be paid.

Mr. Payne: I referred to the oil industry.

Mr. EVANS: I apologize to the honourable member, who has said he referred to the oil industry. The honourable member knows that, if a subsidy were not paid so that the tanker could be built here, it would be built in another country at a lower cost. He is admitting that our cost structure is so high that we cannot compete. That type of thing will happen to a State like South Australia with the kind of Government we have at present. To follow up the argument of how industry in this country is protected, I point out that our shirts that have been brought from other countries have against them a 62½ per cent tariff payment, so industries that manufacture shirts in Australia are protected to the extent of 62½ per cent.

Regarding the motor car industry, we produce the iron ore here and then it is carted to Japan and made into motor cars. The biggest component part of a motor car is steel. That is manufactured in Japan, and is carted back to Australia as a vehicle for use on the road. The vehicle is equal in quality and performance to vehicles manufactured here, and the imported vehicle has a 40 per cent tariff impost added to it. The price of the imported vehicle is equal to, if not slightly lower than, that of our own vehicle. That is where the fault lies,

and that is the problem that this country faces.

Mr. Payne: You don't think the profits are too high, by any chance?

Mr. EVANS: The honourable member would know, if he checked the profits, that the percentage return to the shareholder, after company tax and other charges were paid, would show that in most cases investment in the motor car industry was not as beneficial as investment at 8½ per cent in another industry. If the honourable member had money to invest, the last thing he would do would be invest it in the motor car industry.

Mr. Langley: Who started them off?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Unley must contain himself.

Mr. EVANS: The economic future of this State cannot be considered to be as bright as that of some of our sister States, unless we receive handouts that are considerably greater than our per capita entitlement from the Commonwealth Government. In New South Wales and Victoria, there are about 8,000,000 of the 12,000,000 people in this country. When the population of Australia is doubled (and that is about as far as we should look in relation to population, in my opinion), those two States will have 16,000,000 people, whilst we will have about 2,500,000. I believe that the brightest young people in this community will then see that the greatest opportunities for them are in the Eastern States and that there will be a brain drain of these people from this State to those States because of the lack of lucrative opportunities here.

Both Queensland and Western Australia have natural resources which leave those in this State for dead. Queensland's development was retarded for 30 years under a Labor Government, but it will now gain because of what it lost in that period. Western Australia, too, has found a lucrative source of natural resource in mineral ores, and we would be foolish to try to chase that State or others in this respect.

We should stabilize, as much as possible, in relation to future urban development. After attending a recent congress in Melbourne with the member for Mawson, I am convinced that we are wrong in developing towns outside those already in existence, because this still does not remove already existing problems. I believe that we would be wise to think in terms of developing our cities and redeveloping many areas as we are doing now in St. Peters, because in this way we may achieve a more satisfactory result for the State generally. The

member for Mitchell has said that the results of 23 years in office of the Commonwealth Government is something we should be ashamed of, but it is something about which we should be proud. It has been said that it is the people's money that is being spent by the Commonwealth Government. How weak! The people elected that Government and, if the Government does not spend the money wisely, the people will dispose of the Government. The current Liberal and Country Party coalition Government has been re-elected many times.

Mrs. Byrne: With half a million votes less.

Mr. EVANS: It has spent the money raised through taxation wisely and for the benefit of Australia. Indeed, if the Commonwealth makes greater allocations to the States it is spending less in the Commonwealth sphere, but this is still to the benefit of Australia. The inference from members opposite is that the Commonwealth has wasted money, yet the people of this State know that is not true. How can members opposite support that argument? How does this Labor Government justify giving away hundreds of thousands of dollars in handouts to people asked to work overtime and who are paid penalty rates during times of community crises? This handout is paid only to employees of Government departments, and I believe that the Government is doing an injustice to the State and to the community as a whole by continuing this practice. Certainly, no member can justify that sort of action when there is a demand for the acquisition of recreational areas. Does it matter if we purchase too much land at this stage? Any excess land would not be lost, because it is as good as money in the bank. I believe it would have been wiser to spend the \$120,000, \$150,000 or \$200,000 on land for recreation purposes than to give it to this group of employees.

The member for Mitchell referred to priorities in an election year. Is that why the State Government has made this allocation? Is it because it is an election year for State Parliament? Is the reason for a handout to the Government's mates to guarantee good union support in return for finance to fight the next State election?

Mr. Langley: Does private enterprise give you money? Don't you believe in unions? You hate unions, don't you?

Mr. EVANS: The member for Unley has never heard me say that I hate unions. The honourable member knows that many unionists

detest the situation where they are forced to contribute to the Australian Labor Party funds against their wishes.

Mr. Langley: They don't have to, and you know it.

Mr. EVANS: If they do not, they lose their jobs.

Mr. Mathwin: You know they can't—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows that he cannot interject.

Mr. EVANS: In this country in which we work and live, strikes have had a detrimental effect on our economy and we know that every time an hour of work is lost, at whatever level it may be performed, it is lost for all time and the country as a whole suffers.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: We lose more time through accidents than through strikes, but we don't hear you saying anything about that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr. EVANS: I will now refer to aspects of the Budget about which I am concerned. The sum of \$10,000,000 of Loan money has been kept in reserve: I refer to the Budget document in case you, Mr. Speaker, decide that I should not comment on this.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Fisher is quite in order in referring to the Budget.

Mr. EVANS: On page 5 of the Treasurer's statement reference is made to the \$10,000,000 of Loan money that will remain unspent. I believe that now is the time for us to accept that we must buy areas of natural bushland before they are destroyed.

Mr. Keneally: Why this sudden interest in the environment?

Mr. EVANS: If the honourable member reads my speech made about this time last year, he will realize that I made a similar comment. The member for Stuart has become aware that I have been interested in this matter for a long time, and I am particularly interested now, because water rates, land tax, and council rates on properties in the Hills area have increased to such an extent recently that much of the native bushland will be cleared or subdivided into small allotments. I am sure that the member for Stuart would also be concerned about the future of such land. I will give an example that has not been quoted before: three returned servicemen brothers bought 150 acres in 1945, and this property has not been touched in any way for

27 years. However, the charges are such now that that family has no alternative but to clear it and try to keep stock on the land, or hand it over to a developer at a considerable price.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: They have another alternative: they could have it declared as open space and have rural rates and taxes applied to it.

Mr. EVANS: True, but they have to keep the land in its natural state for others in the community to look at and enjoy. That is the point missed by the Minister. Why ask the minority to carry the burden for the majority?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What is the burden?

Mr. EVANS: To maintain it. With the pest problem in that area, it cannot be maintained for others to look at. If the Minister doubts me, I can tell him that, within the next 12 months, large areas of this section will be cleared or subdivided. About 2,500 acres on the western side of the Stirling council area is involved, and yet \$10,000,000 is sitting in kitty from Loan funds that is not to be used except for a rainy day. That rainy day is here, and we should spring to it this spring and buy the land. It need not all be bought and the purchase would not take \$10,000,000, but the better areas of native bushland should be acquired now. I remind the Minister that 150 acres on the eastern boundary of Belair National Park is still available for purchase at between \$110,000 and \$120,000. The land adjoins the national park and has a bore pumping 10,000gall. an hour that could irrigate the golf course, be used to reduce the fire hazard, and the animals that have been released in the area would have somewhere on which to graze on green pasture through the summer months. The Minister has the chance to prove that his Government is concerned by acquiring this land, but he should not blame anyone else later.

Mr. Langley: What did your Party do all the time it was in Government?

Mr. EVANS: For the information of the honourable member—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley will be speaking later.

Mr. EVANS: —I will give him some information.

Mr. Langley: I need plenty.

Mr. EVANS: In 1968, under the Liberal Government, there were 41 national parks in this State: when it left office there were 82 national parks either dedicated or being dedicated, a 100 per cent increase in two years.

The member for Unley should show how this figure has been increased by a Labor Government.

Mr. Langley: How much did it cost? Who spent more money on conservation, your Government or mine?

Mr. EVANS: I should like to refer to other Hills areas with which I am concerned and in which water rating is still a burden to the residents. In the past, during L.C.L. and Labor Government periods in office, we allowed the water rating system to continue as it was. I have said many times that this system was unjust, and I will continue to repeat that statement until it is changed. The present Government has received a report that must have contained some recommendations for change, but the Government has refused to make that report available to Parliament, and so to the people. Also, it has refused to state whether it would introduce any recommendations of that report, yet people in Blackwood are paying 20 per cent more for water and those in the Stirling district are paying 60 per cent more. I believe that, because it is unjust, the system will have to be changed.

The Public Buildings Department has caused concern to members, sometimes because of inefficiency, at other times because professional staff is not available when needed but, generally, because the department is too big to be administered effectively as one department. As an example, after the fire at the Blackwood High School last year, I questioned the rather bad positioning of fire hydrants at that school for effective fire-fighting by the volunteer fire-fighters who worked so hard to save the part of the school that was saved. As a result, officers of the Public Buildings Department, and no doubt the Education Department, inspected the site and decided to change the position of the fire hydrants, and that was done. On the Saturday evening before the fire of last Thursday evening at the same school someone tried to burn the wooden classrooms. Fortunately, the fire did not take, and the matter was reported to police and departmental authorities.

Would you believe it, Mr. Speaker, that at that time the fire hydrants were not connected to the water main! They had been installed but not connected. Would you believe, Mr. Speaker, that when the wooden classrooms were burnt down last Thursday evening, the hydrants were not connected! Would you believe, Mr. Speaker, that today, five days later, they are still not connected! Why?

Why do we take the risk of not only departmental property being burned but also school-children being burned, because the mains are not connected to the hydrants? I recognize that, because of the type of fire that occurred last Thursday evening, although two or three minutes were lost in running hoses across Shepherd Hill Road and Seymour Avenue, the building would not have been saved. It is timber framed, and the fire had such a strong hold before the firemen arrived that it would have been difficult to save much of the building, although it may have been possible to save a little. One can do nothing but congratulate the fire officers and men on the work they did in saving departmental property, at the same time condemning the person (and every indication is that someone had a "set" on the building destroyed) for the stupid arson that has cost the people of the State so much money. But how can we justify having fire hydrants alongside a departmental building but not connected to the water mains? I do not think we can. I had not intended to mention the matter either in this debate or at any other time in the House, but when the connection has not been made five days after the main fire I believe it is time for a comment.

Sometimes it is said that we should cut down expenditure in certain areas and decide on priorities. One area in which I would be prepared to cut expenditure, unless a better explanation is forthcoming from the Treasurer, is in the area of the performing arts. I would use the money instead to acquire land for recreational purposes. The amount allocated last year was \$268,820 and the actual payment was \$284,096, but the allocation this year is \$419,695, an increase of about 50 per cent. At a time when land is available this money could be spent more wisely. The performing arts are an essential part of society with cultural activities and development, but this is an area that could wait until some future time for the money. If I had to make a suggestion I believe this is one area in which there could have been a reduction.

Another precedent has been set in the Budget, this time in relation to education. I note for the first time, although it may have happened previously, that the Government has recognized the need for compensation for councils for unrated departmental property, and an allocation of \$300 is provided for that purpose. I do not know for what building or property it is allocated, but I am pleased that the Government has recognized the need to compensate local government for loss of revenue on Government-owned land that is

non-ratable. It will be an interesting exercise for the future to work upon increases for other areas where there is non-ratable property.

The agricultural allocation mentions a sum of money to be spent on the control of fruit fly and in compensation for fruit losses, also for the payment of inspectors to police the law in relation to interstate travellers bringing fruit into South Australia. It is time we had more research into the control of fruit fly by the sterile male method, and it is time we spent a considerable sum in this field; in the long term it would prove more economical and more beneficial for the State than the rat race we have every two or three years in stripping fruit trees in certain suburbs to try to keep down the infestation of fruit fly. If the sterile male method is used, as has been done in several areas, a satisfactory result could be achieved and the pest could be controlled at much less cost. For that reason I hope the Government will give some consideration to such an allocation.

I have had some interest in one aspect of the operation of the Housing Trust. I have mentioned it in this House previously, and I support the member for Murray in this matter. We need some form of means test to ascertain whether, after they have been there for a few years, people should be allowed to continue the occupancy of low-rental houses. The main reason is that people improve their positions and their employment, the wives go to work or, as the member for Murray said, the teenage children start work, and the family could well afford to pay the ruling rate for that type of house or else move out and let someone else have it. It is a disgrace, in a community such as ours, to have a waiting list of two or three years with many people waiting for houses and yet people earning \$10,000, \$11,000 or \$12,000 are renting homes at low rentals. This would justify the appointment of a Select Committee of this House to investigate the matter. Let us have the evidence to see who is renting these houses, what incomes they receive, and not only Government members but Opposition members and the community at large will be disgusted. I claim that people with incomes of more than \$20,000 are renting trust houses built with cheap money made available by the Commonwealth Government. They are allowed to live in these houses to the detriment—

Mr. Langley: How long has that been going on?

MR. EVANS: The member for Unley interjected on a previous occasion when I

mentioned this matter. It has been going on ever since the Housing Trust started.

Mr. Langley: That is right, and who started it?

MR. EVANS: I do not support this practice. I never have and never will. Whether I am a member of the Government or not, the honourable member can be assured I will not support such a practice. It is a misuse of public money. In reply to a question recently, the Minister informed me that the Housing Trust paid \$9,000 an acre to West Lakes Limited for 103 acres of open country without any service facilities at all. That land cost West Lakes Limited \$750 an acre, and no-one in this House could claim or prove that the cost of reclaiming the land was \$8,000 an acre; not in the wildest of dreams would it cost that amount. The people's money has been used to finance a private venture, a venture which I doubt will be a financial success. That is the sort of money that has been paid: \$9,000 an acre for land that cost \$750 an acre before reclamation.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the protection of the shopping centre?

MR. EVANS: The member for Mitchell made a sweeping reference to the Commonwealth welfare authorities in relation to the method of allocating pensions and the amount of work necessary to administer that aspect of the department. One thing has annoyed me and other members in this House in our own State welfare department. As honest and as dedicated as the officers may be, the delay in obtaining maintenance order satisfaction through that department for deserted wives is a disgrace to this society. There is one way we can overcome this so that women and children are not the ones to suffer. It is bad luck if the State has to suffer because of inefficiency or lack of evidence to apprehend a deserting husband. The only way to deal with this matter is for the State Government to accept the responsibility to pay maintenance, on a weekly or fortnightly basis, to a deserted wife and to track down the defendant and collect the necessary sum from him. Indeed, in the future this may apply not only to deserted husbands but also to deserted wives who may be on an equal footing in relation to earning a salary, and it may well be that, where the husband has custody of the children, the wife is committed to making payments.

However, when one has to wait until, under a maintenance order at \$16 a week, the sum reaches \$1,026 before the final warrant is issued for the arrest of the person concerned,

I think that is a disgrace, yet it is an example of what has happened within the department. In the main, departmental officers have an unenviable and difficult job in this area, but there is one way to ensure that a wife does not suffer, and that is to have the sum paid, say, weekly. We would then find that the Government of the day, whether it be Liberal or Labor, would not be so willing to let the husband wander off: the position would be similar to that where income tax or land tax, for example, is owing, and the person concerned would face the court and, indeed, gaol much more quickly if he did not find the necessary sum.

I am concerned about two other specific areas, to which I will refer in Committee. However, in closing, I point out that the cost structure in our State is now about equal to that of the other States, and any advantage which we have enjoyed in the past and which has been created by a responsible Liberal and Country League Government has been lost, so that the State is now disadvantaged. If any member doubts that, I ask him to name one State in Australia that has a better standard of housing than has South Australia, better roads, more houses connected to a reticulated water scheme, more houses connected to a sewerage system, or a better standard of school buildings than has South Australia, even though our school buildings may not be of the desired standard. Every member knows that these standards have been achieved through an L.C.L. Government in power for 35 years and that these standards were as high as those anywhere else in Australia or, indeed, the world. That is something of which this Party is proud.

However, because our cost structure has now caught up with that of the other States, the Treasurer may find greater difficulty in future in attracting to South Australia the type of industry that he is seeking to attract (the type of industry that will perhaps alleviate the unemployment situation). Let us remember that the greatest increase in unemployment in this country has occurred in the three States administered by Labor Governments. One asks why \$10,000,000 has been left in the Loan Fund and is being held back. Is it so that this Government can say that unemployment in our State has been increased because of the actions of the Commonwealth Government? Is it a political gimmick, and is the Government doing this deliberately and putting its own supporters in this State out of work?

I say that the Government is responsible here and merely blaming the Commonwealth Government, because I point out that the money is in kitty to spend now in order to create jobs. Areas in my district need sewerage now, yet no allocation has been made at all for this work, which would relieve unemployment. The Government keeps \$10,000,000 in kitty while people throughout the community are unemployed, and I say that the Government stands condemned by that sort of action. I believe that it is hypocritical to condemn the Commonwealth Government when this Government is not willing to spend \$10,000,000 in order to create employment. I support the second reading.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): I will have something to say, first, about the remarks of the member for Fisher, who certainly got carried away but who I think is one of the greatest stirrers of all time. When one examines the honourable member's speeches, one sees that he does not have much to say. I doubt that he knows to which Party he belongs, bearing in mind that there are now three Parties opposite (the Liberal and Country League, the Liberal and Country Party, and the Liberal Movement). However, we on this side have one Party, and what a Party it is! I assure members opposite that we are proud of the Bill and of the way in which it has been received by the public.

Although it may be termed an election Budget by members opposite, I do not think this matters at all, for the people generally are so disappointed in the Opposition that we will be on the Treasury benches for a long time, although I am not sure that certain members opposite will be with us after the next election (I do not necessarily refer here to the member for Fisher). We will continue to make significant progress, even though the member for Fisher says that anything we do is always wrong, but he can offer no constructive criticism.

Mr. Evans: Come up to my district and see for yourself!

Mr. LANGLEY: I was there recently and found that some people are not too happy about matters concerning the local environment and that not many people are on the honourable member's side. However, he apparently knows what is happening within the Stirling council and may have a better idea of the position than I have. But I am sure that the honourable member is not in

what I might term one of the safe seats. Politics is a funny game, and one is never sure of oneself. A member may be sure about what he says in the House, but often is not sure of the position when he is out among the people, where the votes are won. Indeed, I know that some of the things that the member for Fisher says outside are different from what he says in here.

Mr. Clark: He's obviously worried.

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes, but we will find out about that in future. The people are happy that the Treasurer and his Ministers have done a wonderful job concerning the Budget, which shows their interest in the public generally. Increased sums have been voted in respect of most departments, and this will benefit the people generally. No-one can but applaud the Treasurer for the amount of work he is doing regarding tourism in this State. Although there have been many knockers regarding the idea of having a first-class hotel or one of international standard in Victoria Square, we have noticed recently that other people have got into the act, and from now on we will find that South Australia will have one of the best tourist attractions in Australia.

Many people from other States visit the Flinders Range, and these people spread the message about the wonderful opportunities offering in South Australia. The Treasurer is second to none in Australia and, with the assistance of Mr. Seaman, who has been the doyen of Under Treasurers in Australia, South Australia has greatly benefited during our three years in Government, and I am sure this will be followed by another successful three years.

The Community Welfare Department helps people in areas where there is need; it helps deserted wives, single mothers, and many people who have had bad luck during their lives. It also finds foster homes for children. A Mr. and Mrs. Edwards, pensioners, who live in my district, can have four or five children in their home. They look after the children very well and, when they move out into the community, they are excellent citizens. I am sure that the help given by the Government now will spur on more people to help these unfortunate children.

In my district and the districts of the members for Bragg and Mitcham there are excellent officers of the Community Welfare Department. The members of Parliament for those

districts when they have their troubles will be helped as much as possible by those officers. There is one Aboriginal hostel in my area from which Aboriginal people can go out and work in different areas. The Budget will be a great help for the welfare of the people of South Australia. During this debate much has been said about the Commonwealth Government. I give the Treasurer full praise for going to the Grants Commission when he was not satisfied with the results of previous Premiers' Conferences. We have done very well at the Grants Commission and the Treasurer has always put up a good argument on our behalf. The member for Fisher said we had three Labor Governments in Australia and that unemployment in those three States was the worst of all time. It is not our fault.

Mr. Clark: It is not even true.

Mr. LANGLEY: The Labor Government of the State will remain after the next election. Having been to Queensland recently, I assure members there is no question of a Labor win there, because Sir Thomas Playford went over there and gave his colleagues advice on gerrymandering. Mr. Bjelke-Petersen got 18 per cent of the votes and he is in Government. Does anyone think that is fair? In New South Wales there is an excellent opportunity for a Labor victory. After the resounding success of Labor in Tasmania, I assure the member for Fisher that it will not be long before there are four Labor Governments in Australia, plus one Labor Commonwealth Government. After being in Queensland, I am sure that Mr. McMahon, the Prime Minister of the Liberal and Country Party coalition, will lose the next election.

The member for Fisher and other members have mentioned the petrol crisis in this State. During that crisis, the State Government acted responsibly; it won the support of the people of South Australia. Many people thought that rationing should have continued for longer than it did, but it did not continue for any longer than was thought necessary by the Government. The Government thinks it is now up to the people concerned with the industry to carry on, and I am sure the public will remember these things.

The member for Fisher spoke of bludgers in South Australia. I am sure that the people would not be happy about that. He spoke on many topics, including the country, but one thing we always notice about the Opposition is that many of its members, and especially

the member for Mitcham, do not like price control. We never hear from them that with price control must come the pegging of wages. If we had price control and the pegging of wages, the Commonwealth Government at some stage in its deliberations would bring it home to the people that that must happen, because anyone on a fixed income is in an impossible position to maintain his day-to-day livelihood in view of increased rates and the higher prices of the essential products they must buy.

The member for Fisher also touched on the motor car industry. Every member of this House should know that the Chifley Government was able to help General Motors-Holdens greatly in opening up a factory in South Australia. That has brought about an immense gain in employment in South Australia in this industry and in subsidiary industries. We must not lose sight of the fact that that firm, from Commonwealth Government funds, was able to start up the motor car industry in Australia, and it has done well from it. To say that its profits are not sent overseas is not true. We need General Motors-Holden's but it must at some stage realize that the people working for it should receive more pay for the work they do; they deserve more than they get in most cases.

For a long time I have heard members opposite say they are not opposed to unions. I do not know why they say that, because usually when unionism is referred to they are loath to say one good thing about it. I am waiting for a member opposite to say that he believes that it is right for a person who is not in a union to take a wage increase gained by the union. I never receive an answer from members opposite on that. I am sure I will one day. When the member for Fisher was speaking about the loss of time from strikes, the Minister of Environment and Conservation interjected about the time lost through industrial accidents. The member for Mitcham and the member for Fisher did not refute the suggestion that more time was lost through industrial accidents than through strikes. The Minister of Environment and Conservation, who was a member of a trade union, would know what he was talking about. He is a member of a Government that would help the workers and ensure they got the best they could from the Government, the employers, too, being considered.

The member for Fisher said that national parks had increased in number from 41 to 82 in the time of office of the Hall Government. The member for Fisher forgot to say that

during that time some of them were in the process of being obtained; he did not say how many had been paid for by the former Labor Government.

Mr. Venning: That always happens, though.

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes, but he forgot to say that. This Government may have been the first State Government to appoint a Minister of Environment and Conservation. The committees formed in connection with pollution problems have done a wonderful job, and the Labor Government has spent more than any Liberal Government spent in this connection. As a result of the Minister's good work, we are leading Australia in the control of pollution. For many years this State was in the doldrums, but it now has the most progressive Government in Australia.

For as long as I have been a member of this House I have urged Ministers of Education to ensure that young teachers are appointed to primary schools to supervise sporting activities. In earlier years primary school children used to participate on Friday afternoon in sporting competitions between their own school and other schools in their district. Those students in Grades VI and VII who were not in teams would spend the last hour of Friday afternoon on other recreational activities. The students always looked forward to their sport or recreation on Friday afternoons. However, nowadays that procedure is not followed. I could name schools in my district that do not now have sporting competitions of the kind I have referred to.

In earlier years teachers coached children in sporting activities after school hours. Under those conditions there was no spite in the sporting competitions: the main aim was to participate. The competition was keen, and the young people learnt how to win or lose. However, nowadays spite has crept into sport. League football clubs have taken over from school sport, and games are now played on Saturday mornings, when many parents attend, as do other people who urge the children to do things that they normally would not do. I point out to the Minister of Education that it is about time sporting competitions between primary schools were re-introduced on Friday afternoons. If that were done, the children would be of better physique and better character. The members for Kavel and Elizabeth know that teachers controlled sport very well on Friday afternoons; if a lad misbehaved, he was not allowed to play sport the following week.

Mr. Venning: Should teachers be paid an additional sum for supervising sport on Saturdays?

Mr. LANGLEY: Nowadays many teachers supervise sport simply to be with the boys and teach them the right thing. I am sure that the teachers of today would be only too willing to help in this way; if they did that, they would get better co-operation in the classroom. I hope that something will be done about this matter, because many young teachers are available for this purpose.

History was recently created in the Unley District when the Public Works Committee inspected a school there. The school in question, the Goodwood Primary School, had become rather dilapidated. The Education Department has done its best for old schools, but I hope that as time goes on old schools will be replaced. Finally, I believe that this is a Budget for the needy. The Government has kept increases in fees to a minimum and it has provided help for those who need it most. Schoolchildren, the sick, and the underprivileged are helped greatly, and I support the second reading.

Mr. CLARK (Elizabeth): I will speak for only a short time: I rise to speak only because during this debate I have had a feeling that I have not had before. Probably, I am getting old, but I feel sorry for the Opposition. I have looked back over the 21 Budget debates in this House since I became a member and have confirmed my feeling. The Opposition has told us that this is an election Budget but the Opposition has not told us that it will be taking part in that election. I do not blame Opposition members, because I know the facts of life regarding politics.

When I first became a member, the Leader of my Party (the late Mick O'Halloran) used to say that there were only three kinds of speech, namely, good, bad, and frightful. It seems that in this debate more speeches have been frightful and that most of those have come from one side. Because I do not want to be accused of political bias, I will not say which side that has been. However, it seems paradoxical that so many speeches have been designed to make something out of nothing. The Opposition has had a difficult time, and that is why I feel sorry for Opposition members. This is the best Budget that has been introduced in the 21 years that I have been a member. It does more for the people who need help than any other Budget has done,

as most of the people in the State agree. It has my complete and wholehearted support.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Schedule.

The CHAIRMAN: For the benefit of honourable members, I point out that we are now considering the financial schedule contained in

the Bill, and the items contained in the schedule on page 4 will be considered *seriatim*.

Legislative Council, \$62,045.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.36 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 20, at 2 p.m.