

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, September 15, 1964.

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

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

Cattle Compensation Act Amendment,
Fruit Fly (Compensation),
Public Purposes Loan,
Swine Compensation Act Amendment.

DEATH OF MR. H. L. TAPPING.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the House of Assembly express its deep regret at the death of Mr. Harold Leslie Tapping, member for Semaphore, and place on record its appreciation of his public services, and that as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased member the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

I think the death of our friend came as a great shock to every member. On coming here as a member, Harold Tapping quickly won the esteem and affection of everyone. He was forthright and honest, and he paid scrupulous attention to his public duties. He fulfilled all his obligations in a way that made us proud of him as a member. I know that I speak for all members when I express our deep regret at his passing and also our sympathy to his relatives. I previously expressed concern about his serious illness, and I again express to my friends opposite my sympathy in the loss of a person who must have been one of their most valued colleagues.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I join with the Premier in his expressions of sympathy to the relatives of the late member. We on this side accept the Premier's expressions of sympathy in the loss that we have sustained in the death of Harold Tapping. He was very close in every respect to his family and the families of his brother and sister. They were a tightly-knit family unit, and there was great loyalty and understanding between them. Having already expressed condolences to the members of those families at the loss of Harold, I can only repeat what I have already conveyed to them and join with the Premier in this motion of condolence.

The SPEAKER: As Speaker, I would also like to add a few remarks to those of the Premier and of the Leader of the Opposition.

The late honourable member suffered a long illness. I remember when Mr. Harold Tapping first came into this House as member for Semaphore. It was not long before every member learned to respect him, not only for his advocacy in the cause he represented as the member for Semaphore but for his sincere and personal approach. It was also soon evident that he intended to uphold the Standing Orders of this House; he conducted himself splendidly and upheld the dignity and decorum of the House at all times. He was also a great team man for the Party he represented. I am certain that his logical approach and down-to-earth common sense must have been valuable to members of the cause he represented, and indeed this was reflected every time he spoke in the House. I offer my sincere sympathy to the members of his family in their sad bereavement.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

(Sitting suspended from 2.9 to 2.30 p.m.)

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended June 30, 1964.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTIONS.**SUPERANNUATION.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Can the Premier say how many persons 80 years old and over receiving superannuation payments will receive the increased benefit recently announced by him; how many of the widows of those who retired prior to July, 1949, will receive the benefit; and why are increased benefits not being offered to those who retired between 1949 and 1957? The savings of these people have been severely reduced—more severely reduced than those of persons who have retired since 1957.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The action taken was as a result of the recommendation of the Superannuation Board. I shall get a report from the board on the matters referred to by the honourable Leader.

PENSIONER CONCESSIONS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the weekend I was approached by a neighbour and constituent of mine regarding his wife's pensioner concession pass on trains and buses. This man has been very sick and was in Daws Road Repatriation Hospital, but has since left. As a result, his repatriation pension has been increased substantially, but the corollary of that is that

his wife's pension has been decreased almost to the same extent so that they are not much better off. His wife has received a letter from the Municipal Tramways Trust to the effect that advice has been received that her pension has been withdrawn and in these circumstances the concession fare certificate issued to her will no longer operate. There is also a request that the certificate be returned. Therefore, the result is that whilst the husband's pension has been increased because he is worse, his wife's concession fare certificate has been withdrawn. As this seems to be an anomaly, will the Premier see what can be done to restore the certificate to this lady?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Concessions are made available to pensioners, which raises the problem that some non-pensioners are worse off financially than pensioners. Some people working and supporting a family receive less than a person who gets one type of pension or another. If I understand the honourable member's question correctly, the wife he refers to is still a pensioner. If that is so, I do not know why the concession should be withdrawn. If the honourable member will let me have the name of the person concerned, I shall take appropriate action.

HOUSING.

Mr. HUTCHENS: The Labor Party has committees that receive requests from various branches through the Party's head office, so Opposition members often ask questions on matters outside their districts. I wish to ask a question of this kind. In other States building societies receive a guarantee from the Government, although some societies are terminating whereas those in this State are permanent. Can the Premier say why guarantees are not made to building societies in South Australia?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Legislation in South Australia has never provided for guarantees by the State Treasury for terminating building societies, and, as far as I know, no terminating building societies exist in South Australia. The State guarantees the borrower and, under the Homes Act, any person wishing to build or buy a house can apply to an approved institution. The guarantee may be as much as 95 per cent of the purchase price if the guarantee does not exceed £3,000, or up to 85 per cent if the guarantee exceeds £3,000 but does not exceed £3,500. Since that legislation has been in force the average number of houses purchased under it is about three for every calendar day. The terms provided in this State are more liberal than those

provided by the legislation in other States, the interest rates are lower and, as far as I know, the sum advanced is more than that advanced in other States.

GIDGEALPA GAS.

Mr. COUMBE: Last week, the Premier accompanied by another Minister and by Dr. H. C. Coombs, Governor of the Reserve Bank of Australia, visited industrial cities and other areas in the north of this State. Can the Premier indicate the outcome of his talks with Dr. Coombs which may be of interest to the House and of benefit to this State?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The investigations, and the discussions I had with Dr. Coombs, were in the initial stages. If Gidgealpa and adjacent fields live up to their promise, South Australia will probably be able to obtain a substantial part of its fuel requirements from that source. However, Gidgealpa is 500 miles from the city and a pipeline would be a large project to be provided under a short-term arrangement. The question arises whether it should be done as a semi-governmental activity or as a private activity. Those were the main matters discussed with Dr. Coombs last week. I am sure he was impressed with the potential of the field, although the deposit has not been proved and no action can be taken until it is completely proved. Of interest to all members is the information that, at present, a Canadian authority is in South Australia. He has been made available to this State from Alberta, and he is visiting the field this week. He will be in South Australia for some weeks, investigating the problems associated with the gas supply.

BURIAL PLOTS.

Mr. RYAN: In 1960 a Select Committee was set up comprising members of this House to make a report on a merger between the Enfield Cemetery Trust and a private organization. At the time members of the committee expressed fears of some high-pressure salesmanship being practised in the sale of cemetery plots. It was pointed out that certain safeguards would be desirable in the agreement between the two bodies whereby the Minister could protect people who might be pressured into buying cemetery plots. Over the week-end I was approached by a constituent of mine who had been visited by a salesman of a certain private company (and, according to my constituent, other high-pressure salesmen would be novices compared to this gentleman). I am informed that representatives of a certain

organization are selling the cemetery plots and making statements to the effect that their activities have the Government's support. The plots are being sold at £55 for a single plot or £113 for a double on the basis of a £13 deposit and £3 3s. a month for three years. The person concerned was alarmed at this practice but admitted that he had fallen for the salesman's proposition. He had received legal advice to the effect that if he could get out of the agreement he should do so, thereby cutting his losses to the deposit of £13. Because the Government's name is being used by high-pressure salesmen to sell something that is sacred to most people, namely, a burial plot, will the Minister of Lands have the company investigated and, if it is found that that organization is acting as my constituent says it is, will he deal with this matter in the appropriate manner?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I have no knowledge of the matter raised by the honourable member, but I shall investigate and inform him later.

PENOLA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. HARDING: Can the Minister of Works say what progress is being made to provide a water reticulation scheme at Penola?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Engineer-in-Chief states:

Mainlaying has been completed, and the fixing of water services is in progress. There are just over 500 potential consumers in Penola and of these 205 have applied for services, of which 101 have been fixed to date. Sections of the two elevated steel tanks (each of 30,000 gallons capacity) have been delivered to Penola and it is anticipated that erection of the tanks will commence in three weeks' time and be completed in a further three or four weeks. Tenders have been received for the pumping plant and are at present being considered. However, delivery of the plant is not expected before early next year, but when the elevated tanks are complete it is proposed to install a temporary pumping plant so that a supply should be available in the town by the end of November.

PORT PIRIE TRADE SCHOOL.

Mr. McKEE: As the Minister of Education is aware, a full-time teacher in motor mechanics was provided at the Port Pirie Apprentice Trade School early this year. I understand provision was made to house the equipment required to train apprentices undertaking this course, and that the school council and the apprentice committee were promised by the Education Department a building to be established early in the school year. Will the

Minister of Education ascertain when that building will be provided?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to do so.

STURT HIGHWAY CROSSING.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Roads regarding the widening of a level crossing on the Sturt Highway?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, informs me that for departmental purposes the existing railway crossing width is adequate, and it is understood that the District Council of Berri requires the additional width to provide a pedestrian crossing for schoolchildren. The Highways Department, therefore, could not accept responsibility for the cost of this widening, which of necessity would be borne by the council.

LAND VALUES.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Premier more information on the findings of the Land Valuation Inquiry Committee?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The report of the committee, which, I hope, will be tabled tomorrow, calls for much attention and study, and I have not yet had much time to look at it. However, I believe that the honourable member will find it extremely useful and interesting, and I am certain that it will play an important part later in dealing with valuation problems that now confront us.

PARAFIELD GARDENS TRANSPORT.

Mr. CLARK: Prior to the Royal Show adjournment I addressed a question through the Minister of Works to the Minister of Railways regarding the establishment of a railway siding in the Parafield Gardens area. Has the Minister a report on this matter?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Railways, informs me that the need to provide additional stations between Dry Creek and Salisbury has been under consideration for some time, and there have been discussions with Housing Trust officers concerning the best locations for the stations. Following a recent survey of the development in the area, it was decided that the provision of a station in the Parafield Gardens district was not justified but that the matter would be reviewed at the beginning of 1965.

GOODWOOD ROAD INTERSECTION.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my question regarding the installation

of traffic lights at the intersection of Goodwood and Greenhill Roads, Wayville?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Minister of Roads informs me that the intersection in question is being considered for traffic lights in conjunction with the duplication of Park Terrace between Goodwood Road and the Keswick bridge. This reconstruction is expected to start next financial year and lights will probably be installed then.

GEORGES CORNER.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my question about Georges Corner?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Minister of Roads states that additional treatment in the form of rumble strips has recently been implemented at Georges Corner. The effect of this treatment is being closely watched before more expensive alterations are considered. The alternative to the existing geometric layout is a Y-junction. This type creates traffic hazards of a different nature, and is therefore undesirable.

ADULT EDUCATION.

Mr. RICHES: During the debate on the Festival Hall (City of Adelaide) Bill reference was made to the programme for adult education in South Australia and, if I understood him correctly, the Minister of Education interjected, saying that a hall was to be built at Gawler through the adult education centre and that progress was being made on planning an adult education centre at Port Augusta. If I am correct in my interpretation of his interjections, will the Minister say what progress has been made on the adult education centre at Port Augusta?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I made two interjections during that debate and the honourable member, as usual, heard me aright. A tender had been accepted for the erection of a new adult education centre at Gawler on the day before I made the interjection. Planning is progressing for a substantial centre at Port Augusta on land that was agreed to be allotted by the Port Augusta council when the honourable member and I had an interview with other people some time ago. I shall get up-to-date information about how far the programme has progressed, and I hope and believe it is well advanced.

SANDY CREEK WATER MAIN.

Mr. HALL: On August 20, the Minister of Works, in answer to a question, said that he would submit to Cabinet a proposal to enlarge

the Sandy Creek water main so that eventually users at Virginia and Two Wells could be supplied. Has the Minister further information on the outcome of his Cabinet submission?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I submitted the matter to Cabinet, which approved the expenditure of about £90,000 involved in this stage of the scheme. I have additional information in a report but the honourable member already has it and I shall not take up the time of the House by repeating it. If he wishes, the honourable member may peruse the report again.

PRESS REPORTING.

Mr. LAWN: Have you, Mr. Speaker, a report on the misreporting of proceedings by the press prior to the Royal Show adjournment?

The SPEAKER: I met members of the press gallery representing the *News*, *Advertiser* and the Australian Broadcasting Commission and some apprehension was expressed by these members. I soon put them at ease and the discussions were cordial. I believe it would be worth while on future occasions to talk to members of the press gallery because this talk produced much good, not only for this House but also concerning reporting for the State generally. I have a letter from which I shall read one or two paragraphs that will make the matter clear:

The choice of the word "qualifications" resulted from an attempt to paraphrase and condense a rather long and involved question in the House by Mr. Lawn on August 25 in which the words "medical degrees" and "treatment" were used in the one sentence—the *Hansard* report of which incidentally misspells Dr. Möler's name.

I would make this final point—namely, that the job of the comparatively small team of reporters from the *Advertiser* is rather more involved than the much bigger *Hansard* team—since we have not only to record what is said, but evaluate, precis and re-arrange in order of significance all Parliamentary occurrences and utterances.

For the sake of the electors, most of whom are our readers—and our own professional pride—we do our best to avoid mistakes, which we of course make from time to time and for which we apologize unconditionally.

I have treated your request for a written report informally and at some length, believing that in the process I am contributing—as you at our meeting also said you wish to do—to the understanding and good relations between members of the floor of the House and those of us in the press gallery.

GORGE ROAD.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I frequently use the Tea Tree Gully road leading to Gumeracha and I am interested in the completion date of

the Gorge Road. Can the Minister of Works say when the Gorge Road will be completed and available for public use?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I cannot give the honourable member an answer offhand. The Commissioner of Highways is handling the construction of the road for the Engineer-in-Chief, who was the constructing authority for the reservoir. However, I shall obtain a report from the Commissioner of Highways and also discuss the matter with the Engineer-in-Chief to see whether a date can yet be set for the completion of this road and its availability for public use.

EDIACARA ORE.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Premier, representing the Minister of Mines, a reply to my question regarding Ediacara ore?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Director of Mines states that the work of the Mines Department in the Ediacara area has shown the possible existence of 31,000,000 tons of ore carrying about one per cent Pb and one-third ounce of silver a ton. Some of the drill holes also indicated the presence of low-grade copper. Approximately one-third of the possible area of the deposit was tested. Although metallurgical work shows that it is possible to make a good recovery of lead and silver, the grade is too low for economic development. However, there is scope for much additional exploration, and the department has invited the interest of exploration companies to see if any is prepared to carry on the investigation of the area.

TUBED BUTTER.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: In the *Financial Review* of August 20 appeared a report about experiments being conducted on butter packed in aluminium tubes. In the interests of the dairy industry in South Australia, the Minister of Agriculture said he would inquire further. Has the Minister further information on this matter?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Chief Dairy Officer states:

No research on above is being or has been conducted in South Australia. Current developments are based on research initiated as far back as 1940-41 and aimed at producing a butterfat spread suitable for use in emergency rations under tropical conditions. The work was done by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization and the Queensland Butter Board and resulted in the product butter concentrate. The product is to be packed in one ounce squeeze tubes for both Australian and European armies by the Queensland Butter Board, which is the only manufacturer of butter

concentrate in the world. From the pack the butter concentrate can be squeezed like toothpaste. The pack thus enables butter to be provided in a convenient form for use in a soldier's ration pack in the field. It also has possibilities for use as an emergency food for underground strategic storage reserves in atomic warfare. The pack can be guaranteed for two years under all climatic conditions. Butter concentrate is in popular use in Central Australia, Northern Territory, New Guinea and other Pacific Islands. It is anticipated that the new developments could lead to disposals of up to 300-400 tons of butter concentrate annually in tubed form.

ADELAIDE RAILWAY YARD.

Mr. LAWN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the Adelaide railway yard?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Railways, informs me that presuming the honourable member refers to an area of railway land between North Terrace and the railway tracks, at present not occupied, this land is being progressively used and the Railways Commissioner does not doubt that the whole of it will eventually be required for departmental installations. In these circumstances, it would not be desirable to embark upon any comprehensive programme of tree planting. It is true that in certain parts of the area there is no likely use of the land for some considerable time. This is the case near the Children's Traffic Training Centre, and here the railways have already embarked upon a programme, a substantial number of trees having been planted this year. The stagnant pool to which the member refers is a necessary safeguard against pollution of the river waters until such time as the plant for the treatment of oily waste from the suburban railcar depot becomes fully operative. When this occurs the depression will be filled and graded. The Railways Commissioner states that displaced track materials are recovered periodically and disposed of after maintenance operations. It is quite uneconomical to attempt this on a small scale. In any case, the constant work required in order to maintain tracks and structures in the yard necessitates stock-piling of materials.

TAXATION.

Mr. RICHES: A press report last weekend of a statement by Mr. Bolte (Premier of Victoria) suggested the possibility of a reversion to dual income taxation in the States following the expiration of the present Financial Agreement. This matter is of grave concern to this State and Mr. Bolte's proposal would be opposed by most members of this House. Although other

leaders of State Governments and Treasurers made a statement, I understand that the Premier reserved his comments. Can he say whether he has considered the implications of this matter for this State and, if he has, will he give the House the benefit of his thoughts?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I read the press report of what Mr. Bolte said he would do, as well as many comments on his statement. At this stage his statement would be nebulous and in the clouds, and possibly Mr. Bolte is looking forward to a new agreement arranged in perhaps more advantageous terms than the old one.

Mr. Clark: He is flying a kite.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Probably, but it is not for me to comment on every kite flown by Premiers of other States. That is their business and I have no objection to their trying. These matters were fully dealt with when our Budget was presented. I said fully and plainly to the House that this year would be difficult because the Commonwealth Government had withdrawn the special subsidy and that, if a more suitable arrangement were not provided next year, this Government would have to consider applying to the Grants Commission. If the Government had intended to take other action it would have informed the House.

INSURANCE.

Mr. HARDING: A news item broadcast by the Australian Broadcasting Commission this morning stated:

The South Australian Police Department has just released a summary of road accidents in South Australia for the month of June. It discloses that during this month a total of two thousand one hundred and seventy accidents were reported. Just under eight hundred people were injured in the accidents involving casualties, and there were twenty-six fatalities during the month. Only four of the fatalities occurred in the country. Police listed the principal causes of deaths as pedestrians crossing the roadway carelessly, and inattentive driving. The accidents were mainly attributed to motorists' failure to yield right of way, with inattentive driving another contributing cause. I understand that major insurance companies have a "no-claim" form based on experience of accidents in various age groups. The no-claim benefit for the first year could be a reduction of 20 per cent; for the second year it could be 25 per cent; and for the third year it could be 33½ per cent, off premiums. Also, in the under 25 years driver age group a large percentage of accidents occurs, and because of this, a loading charge of 10 per cent may be made, and that this charge may be increased

to as much as 25 per cent on premiums. Has the Premier a report on this matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Sir Edgar Bean (Chairman of the Insurance Premiums Committee), has informed me that at present the committee is examining these and other matters associated with motor insurance. As honourable members know, a periodic survey is made of the rates, and that is taking place at present. Until I have a definite report, I cannot comment.

EGGS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Last year, in commenting on the marketing of eggs, the Auditor-General suggested that the most profitable market for producers was in South Australia, and he recommended that there should be more advertising during the flush season to increase local sales. I believe that the Minister of Agriculture has a reply to the question I asked on August 18 on this matter.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The report of the Chairman of the Egg Board, dated August 21, states:

The board is pursuing its normal policy of advertising where it considers best results accrue. That is the point of sale advertising, where the Sales Supervisor is continually working around all stores in the metropolitan and suburban areas. This is done through personal contact with the storekeepers, display cards and window displays. In addition, the board advertises regularly in five different journals: *S.A. Storekeepers' Journal*, *Angorichina Cookery Book*, *Southern Cross Cookery Book*, *Green and Gold Cookery Book*, *Homemaker*. At the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Show the board has a very extensive exhibit, in which the many uses of eggs are shown in cookery demonstrations, and also where some 20,000 recipe books are distributed each year at the show, and a further 10,000 among interested housewives. As a matter of comparison, the sales of eggs in the shell by the board for the years 1962-63 and 1963-64 show: 1962-63, 5,416,140 dozen; 1963-64, 5,992,308 dozen. This is an increase of 576,168 dozen, or equal to 10.64 per cent on the previous year.

PORT BROUGHTON SCHOOL.

Mr. HALL: Can the Minister of Education say what progress is being made on the Port Broughton schoolhouse?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes. When I replied to the honourable member on August 19 I said:

When tenders are called for an isolated building, the tenders are too high because sometimes local contractors are not keen to do the work.

On inquiring, I found that that was so. Tenders were called by the Housing Trust for the erection of a residence for the Headmaster

of the Port Broughton Area School, but the lowest tender was considered by Cabinet to be excessive. The Public Buildings Department then asked the Education Department to consider accepting a superior type of timber frame house, clad with asbestos sheeting. However, I do not consider that this type of house is befitting the status of a headmaster. Accordingly, I have asked the Director of Education to discuss with the General Manager of the Housing Trust and the Director of the Public Buildings Department the construction of a suitable solid construction house at a reasonable cost. I understand that discussions are now proceeding and, as soon as I receive satisfaction, I shall let the honourable member know.

CROP SOWING.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question regarding the advantages of culti-packing to prevent soil erosion?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Director of Agriculture reports:

Use of culti-packer on sand: There have been instances where rolling has helped in establishment of crops on sand, and there are reasons why culti-packing could give good results in some circumstances. If the soil is a coherent or loamy sand, packing will serve to keep it in place unless it gets too dry. However, the smooth surface will result in much higher surface wind velocities and higher blasting effect of any moving sand grains. A rough surface as left by a combine, results in lower surface velocities, but there is some loose sand on the tops of ridges. This tends to be blown off into the furrows and it will be some time before the surface is levelled off so that sand blasting starts. The worst condition in which to leave the ground is a loose, harrowed surface, which is both loose and smooth. Very few farmers in the mallee have culti-packers, and no trials have been carried out with them. The rough surface left by the combine is certainly far better than a harrowed one.

PHARMACY ACT.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it the intention of the Government to introduce, during the present session, amendments to the Pharmacy Act, 1935-1952?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No.

PRICES ACT.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Have there been any changes since November 12, 1963 in the goods and services declared pursuant to section 19 of the Prices Act, 1948-1963?

2. If so, what are they?

3. What orders, pursuant to section 21 of the said Act, are in force?

4. To which declared goods do they apply?
5. What is the maximum price fixed in each case for such declared goods?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Prices Commissioner reports as follows:

1. No.

2. *Vide* No. 1.

3. to 5. As regards these questions, the member for Mitcham virtually requires full details of the department's activities on all prices fixed. Even if it were permissible to give a complete answer, it would require the difficult task of extracting the information from the files of the department, as in many cases prices are issued to individual traders, for example, hundreds of differing country prices for bread, milk and cartage alone. Furthermore, many prices that are fixed on other than a retail basis are confidential other than to those directly concerned, and this fact precludes their publication.

FREIGHT REBATES.

Mr. FRED WALSH (on notice):

1. Is it the policy of the Railways Department to grant freight rebates to private firms as an incentive towards improvement in the volume of their exports?

2. If so, what are the names of the firms concerned?

3. What is the percentage rebate on freights that are granted?

4. What is the total amount of the rebate involved over the past three years?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Railways Commissioner reports:

1. Although it is the policy of the Railways Department to grant special freight rates to compete against other forms of transport, and this may result in providing an incentive towards improvement in the volume of exports, it could not be said that it is the policy of the department to grant rebates to private firms. A rebate is allowed on flour railed from country mills to either Mile End or Port Adelaide and, although this rebate is not restricted to export flour, a large proportion of the flour forwarded from country mills is in fact exported. Special rates also apply to various other products when, forwarded for export, namely, fruit (fresh, dried, preserved, or canned), wine, salt and solomit. The special rates granted vary from 10 per cent to about 30 per cent of the by-law rates.

2. and 3. *Vide* No. 1.

4. It is not possible to answer this question, as records are not available.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILIZATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SECOND-HAND DEALERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR.

The SPEAKER: Honourable members will have received my circular letter drawing attention to the fact that Mr. J. P. S. Taylor, B.A. (Cantab.), a Senior Clerk at the House of Commons, is visiting this Parliament. On behalf of honourable members, I extend to Mr. Taylor a warm and cordial welcome, and I hope that his stay with us will be beneficial and enjoyable.

JURIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Juries Act, 1927-1937.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

FAUNA CONSERVATION BILL.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to repeal the Animals and Birds Protection Act, 1919-1958 and to make more effective provision for the conservation and management of the fauna of South Australia and for matters incidental thereto.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

THE BUDGET.

(Continued from September 1. Page 696.)

In Committee of Supply.

The Estimates—Grand total, £112,568,000.

THE LEGISLATURE.

Legislative Council, £15,452.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): First, I should like to endorse the remarks of the Speaker when he extended a welcome to Mr. Taylor of the House of Commons staff. I am sure that all members would join in wishing Mr. Taylor every success during his stay in South Australia. This year we are to consider a Budget comprising revenue-raising of just over £110,000,000 and proposed payments totalling £112,600,000. Before dealing with the Budget detail I shall make a few remarks regarding the economic outlook for the State as a whole, because this should have a large impact on whether or not we can achieve our Budget objectives. As regards the prospects for the pastoral industry, the opening of the new season has been one of the best, and wherever one goes, from the Mid North through the Mount Lofty Ranges to the South-East, one finds that stock and pastures are in excellent condition. As late as last week, further falls of rain in the north improved the pastoral conditions in that area. In the agricultural districts, the growth of feed has tended to be slow but, nevertheless, sheep and cattle in these areas are in prime condition. Lambing has been heavy, stock markets are firm, and all good livestock is commanding high prices. The same satisfactory trend is apparent with agricultural products where the wheat, oats, and barley crops have germinated well following widespread and beneficial opening rains. The fruitgrowers have had reasonable returns from the last season and the prospects for the coming year are just as good. The secondary industries and retail trades also reflect the generally buoyant conditions, and there are only two indications that these buoyant conditions are not to continue. The first of these is that the Commonwealth Government has decreed that this State is to receive less this year than last year, irrespective of the increased population and prices, not to mention increased Government receipts by way of the removal of the 5 per cent rebate from all personal income tax. The second of those indications is that the State Government has increased substantially its rates of taxes and charges and proposes to increase them still further. I sincerely trust

that this is not to be another Government interruption of the prosperous expansion of our community.

As has become the practice in recent years, there were some very substantial variations between the estimated and the final result. On this occasion, however, the main variation has been in regard to the revenue raised, which was £2,689,000 in excess of the estimate, without any appreciable variation in the expenditure for the year. The bulk of the revenue variations were attributable to more than expected being raised from motor vehicle taxation, stamp duties and succession duties, with the result that total taxation receipts exceeded the estimate by slightly more than £1,000,000 and the increase in the receipts from public works and services exceeded the estimate by about £1,600,000. Even though the Government receipts in total last year were £2,689,000 more than was expected to be received, the Government is budgeting to raise this sum again, together with a further £4,573,000, making

total expected revenue receipts of slightly more than £110,000,000 during the current financial year. It is of interest to notice that since we have ceased to be a claimant State, our State taxes and charges have moved ahead in leaps and bounds, and it would indicate that the Treasurer did not do very well for this State in the negotiations in 1959 which culminated in our achieving the rather dubious title of being classified as a non-mendicant State. To me it does not seem to matter a scrap whether we are a claimant State or not so long as we receive a fair proportion of the increased revenue that the Commonwealth Government is continuing to reap off the taxpayer.

Let us examine State taxation receipts by the various lines for 1958-59 (that is the last year we were classified as a "claimant State") and compare them with what is proposed for 1964-65, as well as the Commonwealth grants for the corresponding periods, together with the relevant percentage increases in all cases:

State Taxation and Commonwealth Receipts on Consolidated Revenue Account

Item	Period		Percentage increase
	1958-59	1964-65 (Estimated)	
	£	£	
Land Tax	1,397,000	2,450,000	75
Motor Vehicles	3,940,000	5,600,000	42
Stamp Duties	1,739,000	4,245,000	144
Succession Duties	2,145,000	3,400,000	59
Publicans' Licences	180,000	520,000	189
Other Licences	816,000	903,000	11
Total Taxation	10,217,000	17,118,000	68
Commonwealth Reimbursement	£24,939,000	£39,704,000	59%

Two things are immediately apparent from this schedule: the first, and most important, is that reimbursement from the Commonwealth Government, since we have ceased to be a claimant State, has not kept pace with the increases that this Government has introduced in the State taxation field, because total State taxation has increased 68 per cent whereas Commonwealth reimbursements have increased only 59 per cent. If the increases in our taxes are justified, then so also is a further Commonwealth reimbursement of 10 per cent which would represent an additional grant of about £2,500,000.

The other matter is that there does not appear to be any uniform pattern regarding the increases that have been imposed, but instead stamp duties, which reveal an increase

of 144 per cent, and publicans' licences, which have increased by 189 per cent, have been singled out by the Government for special attention. These colossal increases which have occurred in the short span of six years since we ceased to be a claimant State are further emphasized and placed in their proper perspective when we consider that the basic wage and the average weekly earnings of all employees have increased by only about 20 per cent in the same period. Thus the increases in the State taxes have been out of all proportion to the increase in wages since we ceased to be a claimant State and the liquor industry has been singled out for the greatest imposition, having incurred an increase of 189 per cent in its State tax burden since 1958-59. I have two comments to make as regards stamp

duty. The first is that because of the 100 per cent increase in the taxation rate on contract notes for the transfer of shares, it has been intimated that transactions may be carried out on exchanges between States, in which case I should like to know how this Government is going to police this tax. The other comment concerns the 100 per cent increase in the duty chargeable on mortgage documents. Probably the Treasurer will be able to ascertain as this debate develops whether he can succeed to the extent he intends. I have always believed that the stability and basis of a community emanates from the establishment of a stable home life and one of the prime requirements for a stable family unit is the ability to obtain satisfactory housing accommodation. The backbone of the community is the persons who save sufficient money to serve as a deposit on a house and have sufficient confidence in the future potential of the State to borrow substantial sums in order to acquire a home. Of course, this balance of the purchase price is left on first and second mortgages, and those who will be the hardest hit by the new tax on mortgage documents are the persons who are least able to pay. The couples who are forced to have the biggest mortgages on their homes are those who are only able to raise the smallest deposit in the first place. Even at this late stage, I consider that the Government would be well advised, when introducing the enabling legislation, to re-examine these taxes with the object of introducing a nominal tax on the mortgage transactions up to, say, £3,500 to £4,000, when a house is being acquired for the purchaser or his family to live in.

I suggest that under the Government proposals this is another sectional tax. What is the Government's policy about the provision of £50-deposit houses? I do not object to that policy, but the Government should consider that the people most desirous of obtaining these houses are probably engaged in secondary industries, and the most important secondary industry in this State is the motor car industry. If this industry were lost to this State there would not be much secondary industry left. The £50-deposit houses are not being erected near the places of work of those engaged in the motor car industry. This means an added burden, not only with the proposed tax, but no public transport may be available from the houses to the places of employment of the occupiers. At Elizabeth most people are not employed in that town.

Many travel as far as Edwardstown and Tonsley for employment in the motor car industry, which is a most important industry to this State, and now the Government wishes to impose a further one per cent tax on this industry. To assist these people, there should be a special provision for stamp duty on houses costing from £3,500 to £4,500 although the figure is not important. No additional hardships should be imposed on people who are needed to develop this country. Home life is important, the family interest is important, and people living in their own houses with some equity in them are more contented when they know that they cannot be evicted.

The Treasurer stated that an increased yield of £250,000 was expected in hospital receipts, but he did not emphasize that, along with most other taxes and charges by the Government this year, they are to be increased. As an illustration, the following is a schedule of the charges payable in the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital during 1963-64 and what is being charged since August 10, 1964:

Class of Patient.	Charges a Day in Shillings	
	1963-1964	as from 10/8/64.
Public Ward:		
General	60	65
Maternity	65	70
Intermediate:		
General	75	80
Maternity	80	85
Private:		
General	85	100
Maternity	90	105

From this schedule, members can see that the increases are fairly substantial and, consequently, I do not agree with the Treasurer's assessment when he classifies these alterations as "recent small increases in the daily charges in public hospitals." Instead, they represent increases ranging from 5s. to 15s. a day, which will have to come out of the pocket of the wage earners, and I am strongly of the opinion that any person who is unfortunate enough to have to pay up to an additional 15s. a day whilst he is sick in hospital, will not agree with the Treasurer in his contention that it is a small increase. This increase is equivalent to £5 5s. a week which is more than one-third of the basic wage.

I may be wrong, but I know of no provision in the basic wage to pay increased medical and hospital charges. No comparison has apparently been made with the charges for treatment at either the Royal Adelaide Hospital, or the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I should be pleased

to receive further information on this matter if the Government can find a real solution to it, as the increases in hospital charges seem to be steep. The Treasurer attempted to be rather astute in announcing various increases in taxes and charges in dribs and drabs prior to his presentation of the general Budget. Another recent example in addition to those I have already given above are the increases which were placed on railway passenger and freight rates as from August 13, and which were ill-considered. The Railways Commissioner was one of the most surprised persons when he found recently that people were starting to use his railway system, but no doubt he is still confused as to why these same people stopped as soon as the fares were increased. When the Tramways Trust announced increases in passengers' fares there was a decided improvement (according to press statements) not so much in the railways but in the drift towards the railways service. Motor cars were parked in many places which the train passed through; people were prepared to drive their cars to the stations to patronize the railways rather than to pay increased bus fares. However, as soon as this happened rail fares went up. The only way to make such a transport system as the railways a paying proposition is not to increase fares but to attract people to use the railways. Surely the Government could afford to do this by reducing fares.

So far, I have confined my comments to some of the shortcomings apparent in the revenue side of the Budget, but I shall now turn my attention to some of the expenditure lines. Under Part II, "Chief Secretary and Minister of Health", the salaries, wages and contingencies provision for mental health services totals £1,978,000. I was pleased to see that Dr. Cramond was able to spend his full allocation last year on account of improvements to our mental health services, because I am sure no-one will deny that improvements are necessary and that the bulk of the increased expenditure is due to the belated attempt by the Government to improve an antiquated mental health system that it has neglected for many years. Another statement by the Treasurer that requires clarification is in relation to the Commonwealth social services benefits payable to mental health patients. For years, the Auditor-General has reported on the unfair treatment of these patients both in regard to social service pensions and hospital benefits payments. The attention of the Government has also been drawn to these anomalies by members on this side, and consequently it was with

some surprise that I read the following statement by the Treasurer in regard to this, namely:

Under existing Commonwealth legislation, patients in mental hospitals are not eligible to receive hospital benefits and if they are pensioners they are subject to some restriction of pension. The other States have supported my contention that the Commonwealth should provide for mentally-ill people the same social service benefits as are available to people physically ill.

It is not earth-shattering to be informed that matters that have been raised in this Chamber for years have at last reached the discussion level in Commonwealth discussions, but at least it is a step in the right direction. Whilst we are discussing this line, it may be a pertinent time for the Government to advise this Parliament how the plans are progressing for the establishment of mental health treatment centres at O'Halloran Hill and Northfield. Earlier in the year, members were informed by means of press announcements that the Government intended to spend several million pounds on these projects, but statements such as this are acquiring the reputation of old perennials and adding to the long list of Liberal promises that have not become practical realities. It is more than 10 years since our mental health system was severely censured by a Commonwealth committee of inquiry. Consequent upon the report of that committee, the State Grants (Mental Institutions) Act, 1955, was passed whereby this State was eligible for a grant of £895,000, but because this Government was not prepared to spend this sum of money on approved extensions to our mental hospitals, it was instrumental in losing more than £150,000 to this State.

As from July 1, the State Grants (Mental Health Institutions) Act, 1964, has superseded the old legislation and is to operate for three years, and therefore it is essential for this Government to get a move on because even though the plans for the Northfield centre have been submitted to the Public Works Committee, the present indications are that it will be well into next year before it will be possible to finalize tenders and commence actual construction work. It must be very frustrating to Dr. Cramond who spent his full Budget allocation last year and who has made a series of reorganizations as reflected in the present Budget figures which were not explained by the Treasurer, to be hamstrung by the indecision of the present Government. It is his aim to have modern and

reasonable accommodation for his patients as soon as possible and it would appear that the only thing lacking is a directive from the present Government to go ahead. The estimates included under "Chief Secretary, Miscellaneous" for grants and subsidies to hospitals and institutions, are also open to criticism as they have been for many years. In describing this allocation, the Treasurer said:

The Estimates include a record provision of £3,888,000 for grants and subsidies to hospitals and institutions operated by independent Boards of Management and towards other medical and health services. This appropriation towards both maintenance and capital projects exceeds last year's actual payments by £950,000. Let us see how this general description stands up in practice. Two years ago we authorized £36,000 as a grant to the Meningie Hospital, but not one penny was spent. Last year the Government placed this same hospital on the

Estimates for the same amount with exactly the same result as in the previous year. This year it is again included in the Estimates and the only difference is that the amount has been reduced to £10,000. It is easy for the Government to boast that so much additional expenditure has been included in this line if it has no intention of spending the money in accordance with the approval of this Parliament. I have prepared a list of hospitals that were placed on the Estimates last year for subsidies towards capital extensions where the money was not expended in accordance with the Estimates, and they are included in the Estimates this year for further substantial subsidies. The following is a table that shows the hospital concerned, the amount authorized last year compared with how much was actually spent, and the estimated expenditure for the coming financial year:

Hospital.	Expenditure.		1964-65. Estimated. £
	1963-64. Estimated. £	Actual. £	
Burnside War Memorial	17,600	243	17,741
Burra	9,577	3,559	12,917
Cleve	1,000	200	10,000
Kangaroo Island	1,779	599	48,000
Kimba	10,000	859	25,500
Mallala	7,344	427	10,583
Northern Community	20,400	9,162	31,942
Queen Victoria Maternity	28,000	Nil	300,000
Waikerie	10,267	88	42,744
Whyalla	140,000	76,623	280,000
	<u>£245,967</u>	<u>£91,760</u>	<u>£779,427</u>

Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture could give me some information about Kangaroo Island later. It can be seen that nothing was spent last year on the Queen Victoria Maternity Hospital, yet the estimate for this year is £300,000. Well, I am no good at jig-saw puzzles! I emphasize the big difference between the estimated expenditure for last year and the actual expenditure. We have heard much about the Totalizator Agency Board off-course betting system, but if the law today permitted me to do so I would be inclined to have a little investment that the Government will not spend any more this year than it did last year.

I would have members know that the list I quoted is not an exhaustive one but is merely an indication of some of the more glaring instances of where I consider the Government is using the Estimates as a publicity platform instead of presenting a true and fair picture

of what it considers will be the expenditure in the next 12 months. It makes one wonder for just how long the present Government can continue to beguile the people and retain dictatorial and executive control of the purse strings in this State. In our democracy the decision is in the hands of the people, and there is no doubt in my mind that the dissatisfaction with the present Government is becoming more prevalent all the time. Members on the front benches opposite are experiencing the build-up towards a rejection by the people at the next general elections. I believe we are witnessing the practical proof of the old adage that it is not possible to fool all the people all the time, and those remarks apply particularly to the estimates for hospital expenditure which I have just quoted.

Last year this Parliament was given to understand that negotiations for a £16,500,000 pulp mill project were practically finalized.

Subsequent events proved, however, that this was not to be the case, for in September last year a small item appeared in the press that Messrs. Macmillan, Bloedel & Powell River Company Limited had withdrawn from the negotiations into the proposed board and coarse paper mill in the South-East. Thus collapsed another promise from members opposite. However, since then we have returned a little more to the realities of life and Apcel Limited have decided to undertake an expansion programme near Millicent which will provide employment for about an additional 200 people in the area in the next two years. Further expansion is expected to provide employment for 525 persons in the next five years. In addition to the employment opportunities there are, of course, the opportunities for the disposal of additional timber from our softwood forests in the South-East, because I understand that Apcel Limited intends to increase its use of timber more than three-fold from its present 40,000,000 super feet a year to about 130,000,000 super feet a year by 1970. I sincerely trust that this target will be achieved, and that the output from the South-East forests, which I understand were established under a Labor Administration, will continue to be used to the greatest extent possible, and that the timber industry will continue to prosper.

Regarding education, the Treasurer said that in the first post-war year the State Government spent £1,728,000 (or 7½ per cent of the total Loan and Revenue Budget) on education, and that this year it is intended to spend Revenue and Loan funds totalling £24,553,000, or 16½ per cent of the total Government expenditure. Not once have I said that the Government is not spending colossal sums of money on education, but I have often said that the Government would not be able to achieve the programme it set itself, and this has turned out to be true year after year. Also, I have pointed out that the education costs a pupil instructed are far outstripping ordinary cost of living increases, and the improvements in our education system are not commensurate with the increased expenditure being incurred. It is of interest to know that the total Government expenditure on education is expected to be about £24,500,000 and also to bear in mind the niggardly approach of the Government recently in regard to power costs in school canteens. Probably I do not need to mention this today because my cheer-chasing friend, the Minister of Education, will agree with some things I have to say. I

have no doubt that the Minister will give more serious thought in the future before attempting to introduce such stupid economies.

However, to revert to the major expenditure of the department as the Treasurer has pointed out, more and more of the total Budget is being directed towards education, but as I have pointed out we are not receiving value for the colossal sums of expenditure. This is obvious because educationists point to inadequate accommodation and lack of teachers, and I have previously given illustrations of the costs per pupil instructed mounting so rapidly. I have drawn the attention of the Government to all these matters before, but apparently nothing has been done and the problems are becoming more acute all the time. I still maintain that a thorough investigation and a complete overhaul of our education system is required.

An article in yesterday's *Advertiser*, under the heading "Plea on S.A. Teaching", stated:

To overcome the unsatisfactory conditions in South Australian schools, massive re-training programmes for teachers should be started immediately, a teachers' research committee says in a report issued yesterday.

That report emanates from the South Australian Institute of Teachers. The press article goes on to say:

"During the 1950 period there was some lack of foresight, or, rather, lack of provision to meet what was foreseen," the reports says. "This must not be repeated."

The article then deals with the subject of unqualified teachers. I do not know what the Minister has to say about this; he has made a comment, and he indicated that he would be pleased to discuss things with the institute. That is not good enough these days; Parliament must receive this information so that it will know what is happening. It is no good the Minister's telling members that he has no report merely because the Director has the authority. I expect the Minister to be able to say where this State is heading on educational matters. I have often said that educational building programmes planned could not be carried out in the time specified, and here the institute is making certain criticisms. The Minister would say that 20 acres has been reserved at Bedford Park for a teachers college and that the accommodation at Wattle Park is now insufficient. Members are to attend the opening of the new building at the Adelaide Teachers College soon.

I have no staff to go to the Education Department to check up these matters: I am only a member of the Opposition. However,

members of the Opposition do a good job in drawing the attention of the public to these matters. Here we have the people in the industry (the South Australian Institute of Teachers) offering certain criticism. Are we to ignore such criticism? Surely the Government should not ignore it. Are we to get the Bedford Park college soon or is it a project for the far distant future? We did not object to building at Wattle Park because we were told an emergency existed. Now we are told that it is insufficient for the training of teachers. Where are we in regard to these matters?

I refer again to the measurements taken at the Forbes school. I tried to ascertain from the Institute of Teachers the reasonable accommodation for teachers, including student teachers. On August 20, the general secretary of the institute replied:

In most new schools, and many old ones, satisfactory provision has been made, but a few remain to be brought to a reasonable standard. Forbes is one of the unsatisfactory ones. The women's staff room, to which you made reference, has two tables 6ft. x 3ft. 6in. which have to be placed end to end giving 31ft. of edge to seat 19 people. Even if they were thin they could not fit in. There are two toilets for 26 women—totally inadequate when it is considered that they must be used during recess breaks. Even if a strict queue were observed it allows one minute each.

Mr. Coumbe: It is a matter of priority.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: The honourable member talks about priority but, as a member of the Public Works Committee, he could probably tell me when this new school is to be erected at Forbes and these teachers given reasonable facilities. The Minister has said in this place that a multi-storey building should be erected on this site. When that is done these teachers will probably not need to queue up. The Minister will not be smiling or cheer-chasing when these people have to queue up and have only one minute. The Public Works Committee should investigate this matter, and I could give the committee details of the measurements to which I have referred.

In the presentation of his Budget, I was glad to hear the Treasurer's reference to the efficiency of the Treasury staff. I have no doubt that these same Treasury officers will carry out their respective duties with the same willingness and with the same efficiency when we occupy the Treasury benches of this State. To elaborate a little further on the help Government members receive from public servants on the subjects they bring before Parliament, I would point out that it takes the

co-ordination of many efficient public servants in the various departments, as well as the Treasury officers, several months to prepare these Estimates incorporating Government directives, whereas we are given less than two weeks to examine them. A great help in this task, of course, would be the assistance of the Auditor-General's Report which has many pertinent comments to make whether both Revenue and Loan funds of the Government have been spent in the wisest manner and whether the expenditure has been properly recorded. As has been the case in past years, I received a copy of the report only an hour or so before I was due to reply on this large Budget. It seems a simple matter to me, and also a courteous gesture by the Government, to make sure that an advance copy of the Auditor-General's Report is available to the Leader of the Opposition at the same time that the Budget is tabled in this Committee, but no doubt this omission is aimed at retaining executive control of the pursestrings, for without this report the critical analysis of the Budget is made most difficult.

I received a copy of the Auditor-General's Report only an hour or so ago, and I notice that the rate of spending in some departments is not well organized. I gave proof of that a few moments ago. Examination of the Loan expenditure shows that 32 per cent of Loan Fund payments were made in the last two months of the financial year, and there was also a significant increase in payments from Consolidated Revenue in June. Why the hurry and rush? Is it because the work was commenced without proper consideration of the time and amount involved, or is the item placed on the Budget and after it is passed by Parliament, the Government pleases itself how and when it spends the money? The Auditor-General said that staff difficulties had been accentuated by the transfer of officers to other departments without suitable officers being available as replacements, and that this unavailability was partly because of a general shortage of trained officers.

The Auditor-General should have on his staff several juniors being trained to be efficient auditors. If this is not so, why is it not being done? With the standard of education today, people with high credentials should be used as much as possible. The Auditor-General's Report states:

A number of departments did not spend all the Loan funds allocated to them but additional advances were made to the State Bank.

Had this report been available to me two weeks ago, I should have had an opportunity to inquire about the amounts with which I was concerned. What I said earlier is more than justified by the Auditor-General's Report. Apparently, supervision is lacking in some quarters and things have gone wrong in departments, so that to get rid of the Loan Fund money it has been handed to the State Bank. Perhaps it could be used to overcome the lag in granting aid to people waiting for advances for houses. The important consideration, however, is that the Auditor-General's Report is not available in time for me to inquire into the matters raised by that report.

The mounting Interest and Sinking Fund commitment of the Government is a further indication of wasteful and extravagant expenditure. The total Interest and Sinking Fund payments of the Government 10 years ago, that is for the year 1954-55, was £9,784,000. Five years ago, they amounted to £17,928,000, and for the current year an expenditure of £25,907,000 is estimated. Members will notice that these figures differ from those included in the Estimates under "Special Acts", but there are several items included in the Expenditure Estimates under Part IV, "Treasurer—Miscellaneous", which are commitments for Interest and Sinking Fund payments, and I have included these figures in my calculations. When we raise this subject of mounting Interest and Sinking Fund charges, members opposite put forward several arguments, that the population is increasing, the Budget payments are increasing and therefore the public debt should be increasing, and, therefore, payments associated with this debt should also increase.

I recognize all these arguments, except that I maintain that if the public debt and the payments associated with it are increasing at a faster rate than are our total Budget payments, then I accuse the Government of committing future generations to the repayment of debts it is incurring to carry out present-day works, and that is the very thing that is occurring with the Interest and Sinking Fund payments under the Budget. In 1954-55 they represented 18.1 per cent of the total Budget payments, by 1959-60 they had increased to 22.2 per cent, and for the coming year they represent 23.1 per cent. Because of this unsatisfactory trend, we on this side sought the appointment of a public accounts committee, which would have for one of its duties the scrutinizing of Government expenditure to ensure that we receive value for the colossal expenditure

being incurred, but our recommendations were rejected by members opposite. We are aware that the Public Works Committee carries out efficient investigation into the majority of large public works prior to their being commenced, but an unsatisfactory feature is that the work may be altered after the investigation by the Public Works Committee and without any reference back to that committee.

Alterations such as these have been authorized by the Government in the past, and I have no doubt that similar alterations will be authorized in the future. We should establish a public accounts committee to ensure that all Government funds are spent in the most economical manner and this would result in the proportion of our Revenue Budget required to be committed for Interest and Sinking Fund charges being kept to a minimum instead of being allowed to increase as has been the practice in the past. A recommendation made by the Clerk of this House, Mr. G. D. Combe, as a result of his exchange duties with the House of Commons last year, states:

Each year the House of Commons Public Accounts Committee considers all the appropriation accounts and a number of other accounts audited by the Comptroller and Auditor-General and presented to Parliament. The committee also scrutinizes the causes which have led to any excesses over Parliamentary grants. The researches made by the committee and the publication of their reports ensure on behalf of the House of Commons that an effectual examination of the public accounts is being continually made. No special Parliamentary machinery exists in South Australia to enable proper consideration to be given to the Auditor-General's Report and an examination of the Government's expenditure to be undertaken. In my opinion, Parliamentary control of public finance will remain incomplete until the House of Assembly appoints a Committee with functions similar in principle to those of the Public Accounts Committee of the House of Commons.

Mr. Lawn: And also the Commonwealth Parliament of Australia!

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Quite so; I accept it. This pertinent recommendation was given by an unbiased and responsible officer of this Parliament who obtained first-hand practical experience of the operations of such a committee and perhaps now members opposite will be prepared to reconsider some of the arguments they used when rejecting the appointment of a similar committee by this Parliament.

Mr. Lawn: You would not expect members on the other side to eat their words would you?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: The day is not far distant when they will. Revenue and Loan expenditure is well over £100,000,000 a year and even if a committee was instrumental in saving only 1 per cent of this amount, it would represent a State saving of £1,000,000 each year and this must be a strong financial argument in favour of the appointment of a committee. From an overall examination of this Budget, it would appear that we have done worse under the arrangements made by the Treasurer five years ago in order for us to be classified as a non-claimant State than we were doing previously—

Mr. Jennings: We could have done better before.

Mr. FRANK WALSH:—and he is now forced to substantially increase State taxes and charges to meet his mounting expenditure irrespective of whether these taxes and charges are sectional and irrespective of whether the taxes and charges are becoming an onerous burden on individual taxpayers. I believe that I have introduced some pertinent facts associated with this Budget and I also believe that the proposed taxes that are to be imposed by the Government, particularly in relation to stamp duties (which will be the subject of a Bill later on), and those associated with the motor car industry, should be reviewed before any finality is reached in that regard. In addition, I hope that, when representatives of the South Australian Institute of Teachers meet to confer with the Minister of Education, some improvement can be achieved, thereby solving the problems referred to in the institute's report.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): It is with pleasure that I rise to support the adoption of the first line of these Estimates. This is the 26th consecutive Budget introduced by the present Treasurer of this State. Looking at the Budget Papers, one is impressed by the voluminous information therein, as well as by the size of the Budget Papers and the extensive and exhaustive way in which they have been prepared by the various Treasury officers for the information of members. In fact, so much information is contained that one at times becomes a little bewildered when trying to dissect the various items of information that one requires. However, much trouble has been taken in preparing these papers by those responsible, so that members on both sides (quite rightly) should have access to all the information they might require. We must admit that a State Budget these days is rather an anti-climax, as it is introduced shortly after the Commonwealth Budget each year,

when one has been looking for concessions or hand-outs or fearfully awaiting the imposition of increased taxation.

Mr. Millhouse: The Victorian Budget was an interesting example of that.

Mr. COUMBE: Our Budget was presented two weeks ago shortly after the Commonwealth Budget and it hardly caused a ripple. However, with some other members of this Chamber I was in Melbourne last week, the day after the Victorian Treasurer, Mr. Bolte, introduced his Budget, and that caused a big public ripple—quite a storm, in fact! I must say that it was a rather novel way to introduce increased taxation.

Mr. Dunstan: But he has not got an election next year!

Mr. COUMBE: The South Australian Budget, if we keep it along the lines adopted in previous years, does not cause much reaction from the public, unless one goes to extremes. I heard a comment made by the Leader of the Opposition just now that this Government had taxed the people last year and was substantially increasing the taxes this year also, but I point out that no major tax increases have occurred in this State's Budget for some years. There is no major increase this year, especially in relation to those items affecting the cost of living, but some minor increases have occurred almost entirely in the stamp duty field. We may or may not agree with some of those increases, but at least they are the only ones that have occurred. They are completely mild and innocuous compared with the somewhat savage increases we have seen in some other State Budgets. I do not suggest that we should have enormous increases, although I believe that we should progress and make adequate provision for our expansion. It is rather interesting to look at the Budget Papers and to briefly trace the growth in this State of the financial provisions that have had to be made. Not so long ago in the State's development, namely, 20 years ago, the Budget involved about £15,500,000. Today we are considering one that provides just under £113,000,000—an increase of nearly £100,000,000, which indicates not only that this State has grown through wise leadership but that the people of this State want to expand and are working to expand.

Mr. Loveday: The value of money has changed, too.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, and I point out that if one part of the State has benefited by expansion and development it is that of the

honourable member who has just interjected. He and I might like to see a greater sum introduced in the Budget, but we have to cut our clothes according to our cloth. The £100,000,000 increase in 20 years is hardly insignificant.

Mr. Clark: It just about reflects the difference in the value of money over 20 years.

Mr. CUMBE: I would not say that that much difference occurred. I do not think the honourable member could stretch it that far, although perhaps he is anticipating decimal currency.

Mr. Loveday: If the figure were divided by three the answer would be about correct.

Mr. CUMBE: Perhaps the honourable member could simplify that later. It is rather interesting to see the fluctuations in the Budget figures in the last two or three years. They have been rather marked and, fortunately, they have moved in the right direction. Any Treasurer could make an intelligent and comprehensive attempt to get close to the mark but he has to allow a certain margin, although he does not know whether the following year will bring about a drought or a bountiful season. However, the fluctuations are marked: in 1962-63 the Treasurer estimated for a deficit of about £603,000. Actually, the result was a surplus of about £297,000. In 1963-64, the year just completed, we budgeted for a deficit of some £492,000 and finished up with a surplus of £1,625,000. That is very good, and I am not complaining about it. I merely point out that it is difficult to get accurate estimates. Even so, I think that we in this State (and I think everyone would agree) are to some extent in the hands of nature and unexpected developments, because the figures show a variation last year of just over £2,000,000. It is just as well we had that surplus, when we consider what we have to do this year.

This year we are budgeting for an estimated deficit of about £570,000, after we have made adjustments in bringing in credits. It may well be that this time next year we may be talking about a greater deficit. We may be fortunate enough to have a surplus. I do not know whether the trend we have had over the last few years can be continued. It has been assisted, of course, by special grants from the Commonwealth. These marked fluctuations have taken place in recent years, and I point out that in this Parliament debating with any accuracy is a little difficult.

The position as I understand it (and I refer to page 3 of the Revenue Estimates) shows that last year there was a surplus of Consolidated Revenue of some £296,000. The Revenue surplus for the year gave a surplus on Consolidated Revenue at June 30, 1964, of about £1,922,000. We have an estimated Revenue deficit this year of about £2,492,000, giving an estimated deficit on the Consolidated Revenue Account next year of £569,902. These rather violent fluctuations in the past are fortunately variations in the right direction. However, we are at the mercy of unknown harvests, and unknown natural forces. To such an extent is this variation apparent that I take the opportunity of repeating what happened in 1963-64: the receipts side of the Treasurer's accounts totalled £105,500,000. That was 2½ per cent over the original estimate, which was £102,800,000, so our receipts were up by 2½ per cent, or just over £2,500,000, while on the other hand the payments, totalling £103,878,000, were up only ½ per cent, or £572,000. Where we had budgeted for a deficit, we found that our receipts had risen 2½ per cent and our payments had risen only ½ per cent. For several reasons I do not think these sets of circumstances could occur this year.

I am glad to hear that there is to be a review of the Commonwealth Grants Commission set-up. Without going into the merits one way or the other, I believe that a review is necessary now. The revenue from stamp duty will rise by about 50 per cent. There are, of course, some small gains from last year's introductions, and we will get a full year's benefit. However, they are only small fry. The question of stamp duty on share transactions that has been mentioned in the Treasurer's statement is the subject of a separate enabling Bill, and I will speak in detail on that matter. I merely say now that I do not want to see brokers who conduct much business in Adelaide finding that their business is being driven away from Adelaide, to the detriment not so much of the brokers but of this State, especially if we find some business going to the Canberra registry which pays no stamp duty.

It has been said that we have had a good season and a record rural production. When this happens we find that our finances are on the up-and-up and we get good results elsewhere. Whether we can expect that this year I do not know, nor does anybody else. Although we have had these revenue increases I suggest that this year we cannot expect to produce a surplus, because there are increased commitments over and above the normal

increased commitments that we may have expected last year. For instance, there is the loss of the special grants from the Commonwealth, which in the last three years have totalled £5,750,000. Those are not available now, so we have to make up that leeway. At the same time, the Commonwealth has initiated and encouraged, through the Commonwealth Bank, increases in interests rates. That may be all right for some purposes, but I suggest that for State budgetary purposes it is disastrous: it is penalizing our State as we have to pay more for the money we have to borrow to carry on the functions of State. In addition, this Budget has to provide for the increases flowing from the basic wage rise and the increased marginal award payments that have been authorized. It is interesting to see how much has to be found out of our normal State Budget to meet these increases. I do not comment in any way on the necessity to introduce the increases: I merely point out what has happened as the result of their being awarded.

As a result of the basic wage increase, it is estimated that our wage bill and the fringe increases that go with it will amount to £2,250,000 for a full year, in addition to which the marginal increases that have been awarded by the various tribunals and the adjustments that have been made will involve a further £500,000, making the total to be provided for, on this line alone, some £2,750,000. This does not provide for any increases due to development, increase of population, or expansion of any services: it is the sum which has to be provided in our ordinary Budget for the sole purpose of providing for this line of increased wage commitments and over which, I might say, this Government has no control whatever. They are increases that occur without the jurisdiction of this Government.

I was interested to read in the *Advertiser* this morning a statement by the Minister for Labour and National Service in the Commonwealth Parliament (Hon. W. McMahan), who said that we had now reached a state of overfull employment, which in effect means that there are more jobs available than there are people to fill them. Mr. McMahan made this bald statement and some people may agree while others do not. However, when this position does occur it may be difficult for the Government to spend all the money that has been voted to it. We find that happening in regard to the Loan Estimates, which were debated here not long ago. This reflects that the country is

developing and that people in all sections of the community have much confidence in Australia and its future. They have gained this confidence since Liberal Governments have been in power and it has swept over the country in the last 12 months. It was emphasized in the Commonwealth elections last year when the Liberal Government was returned to power and it was re-emphasized in Victoria this year when the Liberal Government was returned despite all the prophecies that had been made.

Mr. Millhouse: It will be re-emphasized here next March.

Mr. COURCE: This situation has arisen since Liberal Governments have been in power. That cannot be denied, and this confidence is with the people now and will remain.

Mr. Fred Walsh: What happened in Tasmania?

Mr. COURCE: I am not talking about places overseas. Tasmania is a law unto itself and I do not think there is any likelihood of a change in Government occurring in that State for some years. I am cognizant of the fact that a rather peculiar set of rules is observed there in elections. If the member for West Torrens wishes to mention the Labor Government in New South Wales I shall suggest to him that it will not be in power much longer. With the way things are going in New South Wales and with the way small shopkeepers are thinking about the bad and wicked Labor Government that is wielding the big stick, that Government will not remain for long.

Mr. Corcoran: I wonder what would happen to Mr. Bolte if there were an election tomorrow.

Mr. COURCE: I would only be guessing.

Mr. Corcoran: You are guessing about New South Wales.

Mr. COURCE: I suggest to the honourable member that there will not be a Labor Government there much longer.

Mr. Hutchens: Give us democracy and there would never be another Liberal Government in South Australia.

Mr. COURCE: The only thing I don't want from New South Wales is an opera house. I believe that there is a rather genuine and deliberate desire in this Budget to avoid any major increases in charges that would increase costs and charges in the community generally. If water and sewerage rates had been increased, this could have had serious effects on certain people in the community, especially on pensioners and those on fixed

incomes such as annuities and superannuation. Water rates in South Australia have been stable for some years.

Mr. Dunstan: All the Government does is increase the assessment.

Mr. CUMBE: I am not talking about assessments. The honourable member for Norwood knows as well as I do the difference between assessments and rates.

Mr. Dunstan: I know that people have to pay more. You can go on with all the gobbledegook you wish but that fact remains.

Mr. CUMBE: I will debate this question with the honourable member for as long as he wants outside the Chamber.

Mr. Lawn: What is the difference?

Mr. CUMBE: An assessment is based on the value of a property.

Mr. Lawn: What is the difference to the householder if he pays £20 because of an increased assessment?

Mr. CUMBE: That is entirely different. I pay rates as does the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) and I am concerned only with what has to come out of my pocket. What I am saying in this instance is that frequently in Budgets there are general increases in water and sewerage rates. The honourable member has seen this since he has been a member and so have I. However, in this Budget there is no suggestion of an increase. If there had been an increase it would have given a marked impetus to rising costs in the community. Many costs have risen as a direct result of the basic wage increase. This was dealt with in another debate and I cannot infringe on that now, but many of the rising costs experienced now are the direct result of the basic wage increase and of marginal adjustments over which the Government has no control whatever. If there had been a general increase in water rates this position would have been aggravated and a further increase in costs would have taken place. The Government appears to be setting an example and trying to stabilize the economy in so far as it is within its powers to do so. It is doing this within certain limits, through the Prices Department, which has the blessing of the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse)!

Mr. Millhouse: I think you are wrong.

Mr. CUMBE: The Leader made a lengthy speech this afternoon to which I listened with interest and I am sorry that he did not have more to criticize. He said that taxation had been increased substantially and that this would happen again next year. As a matter of interest, I endeavoured to find out what the

substantial increases were last year and I found that the only increase of any dimension was a modest increase in the liquor fees on hotel licences which brought in a total increase of the magnificent sum of £150,000 a year. That was a substantial increase, but the Leader forgot to mention that a concession was made in last year's Budget totalling £100,000 in succession duties.

During the last year we have had expansion in our services which we have rightly come to expect. In the information supplied to members today a substantial increase is provided for the Hospitals Department, including the mental health services. This is an increase I welcome, as do all other members, and it should be taken together with the increase provided under the Loan Estimates for work in the Hospitals Department. This applies particularly in the mental health services. Other departments are increasing expenditure, as may be expected, as our population increases by 5 per cent a year. Many departments are increasing numerically, for instance, in the Education Department, the number of wage and salary earners increased by 739 last year; in the Hospitals Department by 384; in the Highways Department by 141; in the Public Buildings Department by 128, and in the Engineering and Water Supply Department by 109. That illustrates how services are expanding. I am not suggesting that the Public Service has to increase its staff by 5 per cent, but the service departments are expanding as they should. The largest increase has occurred in the Education Department, and I am pleased to see this. I do not know the categories in which the increases occurred or how many are teachers and how many administrators. In an increase of 739 there would be a fair proportion of teachers or people engaged in instruction.

Wages and salaries paid last year in the Public Service totalled £51,367,000, an increase of £4,500,000 over the previous year. Because of increased numbers and because of wage adjustments and increases, the figure will be higher this year. This large sum affects the economy of the country. I notice only a modest increase in the Mines Department, and I would have been happy to see a large expansion in the staff of scientists, technologists, and technicians employed by this department. It receives valuable assistance from the Mineral Development Laboratories at Parkside and Thebarton, where much valuable work is done.

Recently, an upsurge of mineral exploration, particularly of oil exploration, has occurred. I do not know how many companies are operating in this State today, but probably there are many. As a service department, the Mines Department is an essential part of the State system and a department that, historically, has played a major part in the development of this State. Adequate assistance should be provided for the people doing the exploration work, whether it is done privately or by large or small companies. It is to the benefit of South Australia that this work be done. Provisions for assistance, supervision, research, and experimentation should be available, and advice on where to go and how to go about the work, and, if a find is made, how it should be exploited and developed, should be available for the benefit not only of these people but of the State.

The State is pursuing a vigorous policy of teacher training, and provision has been made for a large increase in this field. The new teachers training college at Kintore Avenue, which is to be opened next week and to which we have all been invited, provides for about 1,400 trainees: Bedford Park will provide for 1,200 trainees, and these are secondary training colleges. In addition, we have three primary training colleges. I am sure the Education Department is aware of the situation mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, stressed in the press, and the subject of a humorous cartoon in this morning's newspaper. The Minister has made public statements of his desire to increase, as soon as possible, the number of fully qualified teachers. I believe that the planning for the introduction and construction of new teachers colleges will be a major step forward in this programme. I am pleased to see expenditure made in my district, both last year and this year, on several major institutions. A large sum has been spent at the Children's Hospital, also at the Memorial, Calvary, McBride's and Northern Community Hospitals. These expenditures are welcome: these hospitals serve not only the people in my district but people in all parts of the State. The subsidies and grants made on both capital and service work are welcome, as are the grants being made to various societies.

The Kindergarten Union of S.A. (Inc.) in North Adelaide, the Royal Institution for the Blind Inc., the Oral School (of which the member for Burnside is President), the Helping Hand Centre at North Adelaide, and the Church of England Boys Home, have

received grants from this Government. I hope that Parliament will continue to support the grants made to these and similar institutions, many of which could not fulfil their functions without assistance from a Government such as this. I hope that the Government will maintain the system of subsidizing hospitals and of grants to needy societies, and, if need be, to expand it. I support the first line, because this Budget provides, as far as it can, for most of the expansion that can be foreseen in the State in the coming year. No worthwhile department whose undertaking in this State needs assistance at this moment is not getting it. I am not saying that it is getting all it can, but we would have to go more heavily into debt to provide more, and that may react next year. It is a deficit Budget, but I cannot say where we will finish up—

Mr. Lawn: I'll tell you where you will finish up. You will be in Opposition next year.

Mr. COURCELLE: That has to be seen. I am not going to forecast how the Budget will finish up, but I know how the member for Adelaide will finish up.

Mr. Lawn: You will be back here on this side of the House. You will probably be Deputy Leader of the Opposition next year; that is, if you are here.

Mr. COURCELLE: I am indebted to the member for Adelaide for his encouragement.

Mr. Lawn: Don't stutter about it!

Mr. COURCELLE: When I look at the member for Adelaide I am always affected. However, it is with much pleasure that I support the adoption of the first line of the Estimates.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): I thought that, when the Treasurer introduced his Budget, he had many qualms regarding the future of this State, not only for this year but for the years to come. Briefly, I shall analyse the main points of his Budget in regard to the total financial position of this State and see how the Treasurer arrived at his net deficit of £578,000. Although we generally had a good season for primary production last year, the Treasurer instanced an indicated shortage of revenue against expenditure of £4,500,000. He said that the increased revenue from the measures he intended to adopt to increase charges would produce £1,250,000, that surpluses which had been carried forward from prior years (which I might mention, will not recur) would yield £1,922,000, and that there was a special credit from the results of the Radium Hill undertaking representing a surplus of £680,000.

(Again, the latter situation will not recur.) This gave a total of £3,922,000 to offset against the indicated shortage of revenue of £4,500,000 and resulted in the net deficit indicated by the Treasurer of £578,000. This was calculated on the assumption that the season was reasonably good and that the metropolitan water pumping costs were reasonably low.

In other words, this situation is dependent upon such factors being quite favourable but it could be achieved only as a result of situations that were not likely to recur. The Treasurer mentioned that, fortunately, the matter of the Commonwealth General Purpose Grants would come up for review at the end of this year. I agree that this is fortunate, because the State will require much better consideration from the Commonwealth in the future if it is to progress satisfactorily. On every hand we see a demand for various sums of money to develop the State, which, of course, has been largely brought about by the migration programme which we are following and which is having an inflationary effect upon our development. There is not the slightest doubt that we are being asked to provide many things that are taxing our productive capacity. I think it is clear that the prospects of the State's revenue next year are far from bright, particularly in view of the use of the flexible interest policy as a counter-inflationary measure. There should be a totally new approach to the question of using a flexible interest policy in this manner which, as the member for Torrens has said, has a disastrous effect on budgetary provisions.

I cannot help but think that a totally different approach should be made in regard to interest rates in so far as Government works are concerned—works which are necessary for private enterprise to function and yet which, in themselves, are not productive and yield no profit from the actual financial investment. The Auditor-General's Report shows that quite clearly. We have many works that do not yield a financial profit in the usual sense, and yet they do not receive any special consideration by way of interest rates on Loan money. The only case I know of is the Housing Trust which obtains much of its Loan money at 1 per cent interest lower than the usual bond rate. However, it is not only a question of housing that should be considered in this manner. Private enterprise carefully keeps out of many undertakings because they might not be profitable and because only the State can handle them, yet those undertakings are essential for private enterprise to exist. I see no

reason why these Government works should be expected to come up to scratch the same as private enterprise has to in regard to the payment of interest rates. Special provision should be made by way of interest rates for these functions.

Mr. Coumbe: What would you suggest?

Mr. LOVEDAY: This is already being done in relation to housing. Something along the same lines should be considered in this case because, every time a Budget debate takes place in this Chamber, we have the same sort of speech and the same sort of tone about the difficulty of this State Government's meeting the legitimate requirements on hand. When we look at the interest bills of various Government departments it is obvious that many departments are extremely hampered by heavy interest commitments. I have not had time to thoroughly study the Auditor-General's Report that came to hand this afternoon, but I noticed one graph that showed the trend of expenditure, and it is interesting to see how Government expenditure and interest generally have been mounting steadily. I would say it was out of all proportion, considering that the Government departments have to do many things which, in themselves, cannot show a direct financial profit. Private industry could not exist without such services, but all these unprofitable undertakings are left for the Government.

Everybody, if he likes to be honest on this question, knows that all these things out of which private enterprise cannot make a profit are left for the Government to carry on. Of course, if the Government can undertake certain projects profitably, private enterprise endeavours to get them away from the Government as quickly as possible. We believe that the Government should be sharing in the profitable enterprises, and that it should not have all the unprofitable things relegated to it. Budget problems would not arise every year as they do if this were remedied. Members opposite hold up their hands in horror at the thought of private enterprise being deprived of any of this field of profitable work. It is only because of this attitude that we are faced with this situation every time we debate a Budget. I want to deal this afternoon particularly with the housing situation, because it is affected not only by the fact that interest rates have been raised and because the flexible interest policy is being used in this manner but also because the rents are a particularly heavy

burden upon every person in the State, especially upon the wage earners.

I interjected when the Treasurer was dealing with this subject and he pointed out that using a flexible interest rate policy with a view to counter-inflationary processes was bad for the State and its budgetary position, and he specifically mentioned houses. I said that a 1 per cent rise in the interest rate represented about 12s. a week on a £3,000 loan for a house. I think the Treasurer's rejoinder was that my figure was a little high, but if members care to work it out it is 11s. 6d. a week on a £3,000 housing loan. In other words, if we increase interest charges by 1 per cent it sharply affects the wage earner's position over the whole of the year. This is a far more important factor than many of the small increases in taxation about which there is a very loud howl. If £4,000 is involved in borrowing to build a house, a 1 per cent rise in the interest rate means an increase of about 15s. 4d. a week. In other words, the question of rents, which is so vital to the wage earner, is largely dependent upon the interest rate at the time.

There is not the slightest doubt that the fact that we get Loan money for housing at 1 per cent less than the bond rate indicates the realization that this is very important. That is why we should not allow this inflexible interest policy to be applied to housing loans. We hear from time to time from the Government members that they are doing everything possible to keep costs down in this State, for a number of reasons. Well, now, this is one instance in which the Government's own members in the Commonwealth sphere, as far as I can see, have done nothing to prevent this interest rise being reflected in rents.

I notice that the Auditor-General in his report draws attention to the fact that the Housing Trust has not raised rents on its rental houses for a considerable period and that it is now in the position where it is probable that this should be done soon. He draws attention to this without, as far as I know, mentioning the question of this rise in interest rates. Therefore, from his point of view, having surveyed the operations of the trust, there is a reason to raise rents even without the question of the effect this rise in interest rates will have on rents in South Australia. I regard this as a particularly serious position for the wage earner because, although we get expressions of opposition to an increase in taxation which may mean perhaps £1, £2 or £3 a year, the impact

of an increase in interest rates is not appreciated in the same manner; it is a sort of indirect form of taxation and is not noticed in the same way as a straightout increase in a particular tax on the wage earner himself.

I emphasize this point strongly, because it is having not only the effect of causing the wage earner's position to deteriorate considerably (and, of course, its effect has not been felt yet to the fullest extent, and will come during the course of the year), but other effects on the question of house-building. Two or three years ago the Treasurer told us that the Housing Trust was about to discontinue its policy of building double-unit houses. Upon being questioned, he said that this policy would be extended to country towns. We know that this has not been done. Admittedly, there has been, I believe, an expansion in the building of single units, but only recently tenders have been let for 920 double units in Whyalla. Of course, when one points out that this announced policy is not being followed, and single units are not being built in place of double units, one is met with the rejoinder, "Well, if we did build single units rents would be beyond the capacity of the wage earner." In other words, we have to submit to the continuation of double units because of the rents. Therefore, when we use a flexible interest policy to counter inflation we make it even more difficult to depart from the policy of building double units and to move over to the policy of building single units.

I have several times in this Chamber enlarged on the advantages of having single-unit houses which could be either rented or purchased, and I have pointed to the superior work of the Western Australian Housing Commission, which does not build any double units. However, unfortunately most of these suggestions seem to have fallen on deaf ears, and the only excuse that I have been given so far is that wage earners are not able to pay the rents of single-unit houses. In other words, we have to lower our standards and keep on the double-unit level all the time in order even to have houses. I think this is a most undesirable situation. It is also true that the Housing Trust has in Elizabeth produced something superior in appearance and general layout to its work in the countryside, and here again we are told that this is because of the high cost of building in the country. One can see a marked difference in the work of the trust in Elizabeth compared with that in the countryside. After all, if we are to encourage people to go to the

country, surely our building layouts and standards as carried out by our housing authorities should be at least on a par with what is done near the city.

The work of the Western Australian Housing Commission should be looked at by members when they have the opportunity to go to Western Australia. The finish of its houses leaves nothing to be desired. Only two or three years ago the Auditor-General in his report pointed out that the work of that commission in building a comparable three-bedroom house was slightly cheaper than the work being done by the South Australian Housing Trust at that time. I do not have the figures for the present year, but there is very little difference in the situation now. When I saw the work of this commission only last January, it was just as good as ever, and there is no reason to think that the position has altered. In other words, this job can be done at no greater expense than its cost in South Australia. It is a much better job from a housing point of view, and it has many advantages. I pointed out previously that, if a person goes into a house on a rental basis for the start and later decides that he wants to purchase that house and he is able to do so, he realizes then that he has no loss through selling such things as floor coverings, because that house is already fitted out in that regard. He no longer has to lose the work that he has done in gardening. That person has made up his mind to stay in that locality, and he realizes that he can stay there without loss if he wishes to move into a purchase house, because he is already in a house that he can purchase.

Surely this point should not have to be laboured, as it apparently has to be, for so many years without response, because it is so self-evident that this arrangement is being carried out with such success in another State. I apologize to members who have heard this before and agree with me, but nevertheless it seems to have to be repeated to drive home the point. There is no question that these houses are not as good. In fact, they all have tiled roofs, except for about 5 per cent that have corrugated asbestos roofs, and the finish is superior; it cannot be faulted either inside or outside. It is different in one respect: the building blocks are not so big. I think this is an advantage, because I believe that most people do not want a quarter of an acre on which to place a house. I think that normally an area slightly smaller than that is sufficient.

The depth of the blocks in Western Australia is slightly smaller. The frontage is the same as in South Australia and that commission seems to have done a fine job. I have seen nothing to better it in the work of the other Australian housing authorities. I have looked at them all and compared them to see whether I could make any suggestions for this State.

Differential interest rates should not apply only to housing: our Loan money interest rates for housing should not increase as a result of this policy of counter-inflation; it should apply also in other directions, for the reasons I have mentioned. The Treasurer said that this policy was being followed in order to curb private borrowing and private spending and to stimulate saving. I suggest that what is needed is a differential having regard to the whole question of why money is needed; in other words, some things obviously do not have the same priority in the community, from the point of view of borrowing or spending money, as other things do—and this is where the differential should occur. It is all right to use a flexible interest policy to counter inflation if it is applied in the direction of curbing spending where there is a low priority from the community point of view; but where there is a high priority, such as for housing, the differential should apply. This could be done by way of the Commonwealth Government and the Reserve Bank policy being applied in that manner. It has been applied in one direction; therefore, a precedent has been set. I see no fundamental reason why it cannot be applied in other directions so that spending and borrowing can be directed into the channels where it is most needed. After all, it should be our intention to use the interest rates positively to the communities advantage.

I now draw the attention of members to the Housing Trust allocations, particularly in Whyalla. I doubt whether this applies elsewhere to the same extent, because the problem would not be on all fours. It needs attention by the Government, to have a voice in Housing Trust policy. At present the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited has arrangements with the South Australian Housing Trust, the exact terms of which I shall be able to ascertain shortly by way of question; but it is a situation wherein a migrant gets a house immediately upon arrival whereas an applicant who is not in that position, irrespective of whether or not he has a large family, has to wait nine to 12 months. Yet his presence in the community is just as important as that of the newly-arrived migrant. There

seems to be no proper number of reserved allocations for this class of person. In other words, he has to take what is left. A migrant arrives, perhaps with just a wife and no family, yet he goes straight into a house, whereas a man with a wife and five or six children, living under substandard conditions, who may be essential to the community has to wait for nine to 12 months to get a house.

In these allocations one or two houses should be reserved in every 10 to meet this situation. The position should be defined properly and adequately so that the officers of the trust and the people concerned know precisely where they are when they come to a city like Whyalla, where a major development programme is proceeding. I make this point today because I want the Government to take particular notice of it. The problem could be overcome with justice to all concerned. I appreciate full well the position of the migrant coming here from overseas. Obviously, he has to be provided with satisfactory accommodation immediately on arrival, but that satisfactory accommodation need not necessarily be a new trust house when people in circumstances to which I have referred are waiting for houses.

I have been approached by the Combined Unions Council at Whyalla to raise again the question of the need of a light industry at Whyalla to employ females. It may be said, "Surely Whyalla has the most outstanding programme of decentralization development anywhere outside of the city." That, of course, would be true.

Mr. Clark: Why would that be the case?

Mr. LOVEDAY: Simply because the natural resources are there and the development is taking place by way of a steelworks that is using those resources. The ore is obtained cheaply and the economics surrounding a blast furnace and steelworks have changed radically over the years. It is now economic to have a steelworks and extend those operations near Whyalla. So this development is proceeding. Several things have emerged from this type of rapid development. One is that we get a preponderance of males in the population, particularly single males, many of whom will not stay after the construction programme has been completed. Where there is a city with no agricultural background, such as Whyalla, and with one main employer only, devoted to a heavy industry like steel and its associated industries, work for women is hard to find. It applies not only to work for younger females but also to people who come out from Europe to assist in this development. It is noticeable that a

much higher proportion of the women who come from Great Britain and Europe are used to working regularly than is the case with women in Australia. Consequently, they come looking for work and many young females leave the district to find work in the cities, sometimes against their parents' wishes or feelings. So some light industry is sorely needed in Whyalla. If one can be found it will be welcomed with open arms from the point of view not only of providing this additional employment but also of stemming the high labour turnover in the city. The Combined Unions Council at Whyalla points out:

Constant reference is made by our members to girls leaving the district to find employment in other centres, and the council sees the loss of these residents and their contribution to the economic and social life of the city as a factor hampering Whyalla's complete development. In addition to creating an unsettling atmosphere for family groups endeavouring to settle in Whyalla, this situation gives rise to many social problems. There is, of course, a very high labour turnover at Whyalla, and a high proportion of single men associated with the B.H.P. Company's work force. The current construction programme has attracted several major contracting interests to the Whyalla area, and these firms also employ much larger than normal proportions of single men. The council considers that a stable industry employing females would contribute materially to the assimilation of new family groups, and that the retention of girls and young women in the Whyalla area would in turn have its influence on the city's labour turnover generally.

I know that many country towns would welcome an industry of the type mentioned in this letter.

Mr. McKee: Port Pirie would!

Mr. LOVEDAY: Yes, and I suppose any city or town of any size outside Adelaide would. In bringing this matter to the Government's attention, which I have been requested to do, I do not suggest that it is an individual case. Much thought could be put into the matter with advantage to the State generally. The time has passed when people say that the place for a woman is in the home, and it is a good thing that it has passed.

In a recent broadcast I drew attention to the need for more use to be made of women justices in court work. I noticed with some pleasure that subsequently this matter was discussed by, I believe, an organization representing women justices, although I cannot remember its name. In many places it is difficult for court officials to get sufficient justices to do court work and the work falls far too heavily on one or two willing people, frequently to the detriment of

their business or work. It is becoming increasingly difficult to get employers to give employees who are justices of the peace time off to do this work. It is the duty of a justice to participate in court work, and I do not think we acquiesce in the appointment of justices just to have them sign forms; in other words, it should be possible for justices to do their fair share of court work. In most country towns there is not more than one woman justice, and she is called upon to deal only with adoption cases. I think this is a remnant of an old idea that women should not be employed in this work. In fact, this was admitted to me by the clerk of a court. We are far behind Great Britain in this respect, as women justices do general court work there.

There is not the slightest doubt that many women have far greater opportunities than many men to participate in this work, as they are not tied down to hours of employment and do not have employers who will not allow them to leave their employment. When I discussed this matter with the clerk of a court he said he could see no reason why women justices could not deal with much of the court work as adequately as men did, as he thought they were as efficient. Some policy should be laid down, as I believe conservatism is preventing this from taking place. More women justices should be appointed and they should be asked to participate in normal court work more than at present. This would relieve the situation in most places. It would certainly do so at Whyalla, where the conditions I have mentioned prevail, and I believe it would be beneficial in other parts of the State.

Recently the Minister of Works replied to a question I asked about a water supply for Coober Pedy. I appreciate the work being done by the Mines Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department to solve the problem of getting an adequate water supply there. However, when discussing this matter the Premier and others have said that the State regards the taxation it receives from opal miners as small and that the State considers expenditure on water supplies at opal fields must be looked at closely because the State gets very little return from those places. To throw a better light on this matter, from time to time I have mentioned how much is received from the opal fields in other directions. The production from the two fields in South Australia is still rising very considerably. From time to time small industries are held

up as being worthy of support because they produce exports valued at, say, £500,000 or £750,000. It is interesting to note from the preliminary bulletin on overseas trade for 1963-64 issued by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics that in that year unpolished opal to the value of £2,565,561 and cut and polished opal to the value of £304,512—a total of £2,870,073—was exported. From an export point of view, that is a valuable industry. Most of the exports go to Japan and Hong Kong, and Germany and the United States of America are next on the list. This figure was a considerable increase over exports in previous years. In 1962 the total value of exports was just over £2,000,000; in 1961 it was slightly less than £1,500,000; and in 1959 it was £674,948. It can be seen that year after year the value of opal exports is increasing—not gradually but dramatically. The two fields in this State are the outstanding fields in the Commonwealth. There is a small production in New South Wales and Queensland. The New South Wales production was worth only about £100,000 in 1962. Most of the opal production comes from the two South Australian fields. I have brought forward these figures because I think they should be remembered when we consider a water supply for the fields, on each of which about 1,000 people live. They are considerable communities.

I express my appreciation of the fact that shortly Tod water will be connected with the Pildappa and Chilpuddie area. I have been pursuing this matter for many years and have already received many letters from farmers in the area. The water will shortly be laid to an area that has been without it for so many years and has had to face up to much arduous water carting. In conclusion, I regard the question of the way in which the flexible interest rate policy is being used as one of the outstanding questions in relation to our budgetary situation and to the position of the wage earner who is renting a home. I do not think sufficient appreciation of this position is apparent. I know that the Treasurer referred to this and featured it in his speech but I hope the matter can be taken much further than it has been. It has far greater impact on the ordinary wage earner than has any other matter on which the Treasurer believes, justifiably, that he should budget. This matter needs a different approach in the future. I support the first line.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I congratulate all those who have had anything to

do with the compiling of this Budget. It is not easy to draw up a Budget and estimate what the revenue and expenditure will be at the end of the year. Many factors are concerned with whether the revenue will be up or down and it is hard to estimate the ultimate result. As the member for Torrens said, in the past two years we have budgeted for a deficit and finished with a surplus; and it could easily have been the other way. On this occasion, compiling the Budget has been made more difficult because the sum received from the Commonwealth Government has been reduced and the cost of the basic wage increase has to be met. It is good housekeeping to be able to face up to a £4,500,000 deficit by wiping off some of the past surpluses. By bringing forward surpluses of £1,922,000, the Government has been able to decrease the deficit to £2,500,000 and has in reserve the profit made at Radium Hill. This was a doubtful venture when the Government embarked on it and nobody knew then that a profit would be made. However, during the period Radium Hill operated it created work for many people and provided the State with credits overseas. Like most mining centres it has ultimately come to its end, but the State has in reserve, on an occasion such as this, £680,000 profit from that venture. Having written that off and with few increased taxes and an increased revenue of £1,250,000 the Government now budgets for a deficit of about £570,000.

I shall deal with the ways of getting this increased revenue outlined by the Government. The Leader of the Opposition was critical of them and seemed to think that they were increases in the wrong direction. However, I believe that the money that has to be raised is being raised from the people who will be hurt least—the people that can afford to pay. A slight increase is to be imposed on insurance licence fees, not including life insurance. That will not hurt these people. I was surprised to hear the Leader of the Opposition support remarks that have appeared in the press about brokers being hurt. He said he was frightened that some of the business might go to other States. I would have thought that the Leader of the Labor Party would have given less support to that section of the community than to any other, yet the Leader has condemned the Government for increasing the charges on this section of the community.

Mr. Clark: We are interested in all sections of the community.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, and later I shall point out how the Liberal and Country League

Government caters for all sections. However, I was surprised to hear the Leader take up the cudgels for this section of the community, for it is a section that does not produce anything and is made up of gamblers. These people are speculators purely and simply: they live by buying and selling shares. The people gambling in shares, not the brokers, will pay for the increase and the Leader of the Opposition supports them and criticizes the Liberal Government for imposing the increase. People like these will not be hurt, because they live off their wits and do not produce anything and if they can get money without working it will not hurt them to pay some of it to help with hospitals, education and so on.

Mr. Clark: Of the five measures specified by the Treasurer that is the only one to which your argument would apply.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, but the Leader of the Labor Party picked that one out of the five. He condemns the Government for imposing these increases on this section of the community.

(Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.)

Mr. HEASLIP: The cost of the proposed taxation has been evenly spread among people who can best afford to pay it. No-one would say that any essential services should be reduced: hospitals, education, children's welfare are services upon which extra expenditure has to be incurred if we are going to keep pace with the increasing population of this State, and if we are going to do our duty to the people. Last year the Engineering and Water Supply Department lost £1,051,000: to provide country water and sewerage, the loss was £2,101,000. In fact, country people in this State were provided with water at the expense of city people, as services in the metropolitan area showed a surplus, thus reducing the deficit in country areas so that the net loss was £1,051,000. It may be claimed that most people are in the metropolitan area and that the Government is imposing an unjust charge on working people in that area. However, that is not the position, because most revenue is received from big business—the people in Rundle and Hindley Streets, and large industries. These contribute most so that country people receive water at a cheaper rate: the distribution of cost is equitable. No-one would suggest that the cost of providing water at Whyalla should be increased. What is at Whyalla today? It is one of the major cities in this State.

Mr. Hutchens: And it has one of the best members, too.

Mr. HEASLIP: The member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) is a good member, and makes sound contributions to debates in this place. I am not disputing that. By way of interjection, it was suggested that raw materials had made Whyalla but, if the Liberal and Country League Government had not constructed a main from Morgan to Whyalla and if it were not for private enterprise, Whyalla would not be in the position it occupies today. It is not the natural resources alone that have made Whyalla what it is: if they had not been developed by private enterprise building steel mills, the city would not have progressed as it has. It is the actions of the Playford Government over the years it has been in office that have helped make Whyalla.

Mr. Corcoran: They would have been sadly lacking if they had not taken advantage of the natural resources, wouldn't they?

Mr. HEASLIP: I remember when there was grave doubt whether the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited would be allowed to carry on. After all that they had done at Whyalla (and they had done a lot at that time) they would have been kicked out if the Labor Party had had its way.

Mr. Corcoran: What would have happened if the B.H.P. Company had been taken over?

Mr. HEASLIP: I have seen so many capable undertakings which have cost the taxpayer a terrific sum but which, if left to private enterprise, would have returned a surplus.

Mr. McKee: What about the success of Radium Hill?

Mr. HEASLIP: When Radium Hill was started there was a world shortage of uranium, and the price that the South Australian Government got for uranium then was fantastic. Today they cannot carry on. There is still plenty of uranium at Radium Hill but it cannot be mined at a profit, whether it is operated by the Government or by private enterprise. It was fortunate that the Government of that day seized the opportunity to develop Radium Hill and they made profits from it, but if they had not developed it South Australia would have been much worse off.

Mr. McKee: Has Leigh Creek been a success?

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, but the honourable member is picking out only one from dozens.

Mr. Corcoran: Tell us one that has failed?

Mr. HEASLIP: If the honourable member means one that has not been profitable, what are the railways doing in South Australia? Have they been profitable?

Mr. McKee: The line between Broken Hill and Port Pirie has been very profitable.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, but that is because they have been carting material from private enterprise to private enterprise. but if private enterprise had not been there the railway would have been a dud. It would have shown a tremendous loss, as most railways do.

Mr. Corcoran: Do you think private enterprise could run the railways, charge the same freight rates as the Government charges and make a profit?

Mr. HEASLIP: If anyone got the subsidy of £4,000,000 that the Government is paying to the railways today, he could make a profit and probably reduce the subsidy if necessary, but do not forget that the taxpayers are subsidizing the railways by £4,000,000.

Mr. Corcoran: Do you think it would be a good idea to sell the railways?

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, but who would buy them? Do not forget that we are not getting cheaper transport because the Government owns the railways: the taxpayers are paying out £4,000,000 a year. Give private enterprise £4,000,000 a year and the money that taxpayers are finding at the same interest rate that the Government is getting it and private enterprise will be successful.

Mr. McKee: What price is the raw material mined?

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not think the price of iron ore is relevant at this stage, but I am trying to say that private enterprise, given the subsidies that the Government receives through the taxpayer at the same rate of interest, can more than compete with Government undertakings.

Mr. McKee: The B.H.P. Company gets plenty of Government assistance; it receives subsidies in respect of tankers built at Whyalla and it gets its iron ore for nothing.

Mr. HEASLIP: The case of subsidies for shipbuilding is another thing. I know that the Opposition is wholeheartedly in support of it because the shipbuilding industry employs so many people. Indeed, shipbuilding is of advantage to Australia generally, and because of that the subsidies are granted. If we did not subsidize the shipbuilding industry at Whyalla the ships would be constructed overseas and Australians would be out of work.

Mr. Shannon: Every shipyard in the Commonwealth enjoys that subsidy.

Mr. HEASLIP: Of course. If those subsidies were not made throughout the Commonwealth the ships would be built in Japan or some other country.

Mr. McKee: How much a ton royalty does the B.H.P. Company pay the Government?

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not want to get on to that question. I suggest that the member for Port Pirie broach that subject when he makes his speech.

Mr. Hutchens: A moment ago you said that the Labor Party had taken certain action and had asked the B.H.P. Company to do certain things. Has not the B.H.P. Company done better than our Party suggested?

Mr. HEASLIP: It was not a matter of doing better, but of taking over the company and kicking it out altogether.

Mr. Hutchens: We did not say that at all.

Mr. HEASLIP: I was here at the time and I know all about it. I know that the Opposition's policy is for Government-controlled industries, but members on this side do not stand for that. I refer now to another matter in which the Government has had to advance money and has consequently been forced to increase certain taxes, which the Leader of the Opposition mentioned. In regard to bulk handling the Government is liable for £500,000 guarantee in connection with the erection of barley silos this year. Is it worthwhile? Should the Government do it or not?

Mr. Fred Walsh: What is the Harbors Board up for in the way of wharf installations and other commitments?

Mr. HEASLIP: The board is doing all right. The Government is liable for £500,000 for barley silos throughout South Australia, and it naturally believes that the producers throughout the country form the backbone of the State. We believe that if they are not prosperous, neither are the people in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Jennings: The primary producers will have their own Party soon.

Mr. HEASLIP: If they can get a more sympathetic hearing or better representation than they have today, let them have it. It is essential that this £500,000 guarantee be provided for primary producers.

Mr. Casey: They will pay for it in the long run, the same as they did in regard to the bulk handling of wheat.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, but we guarantee it. We have to guarantee it. We have already guaranteed £1,200,000, and we are guaranteeing another £500,000 this year. However, those people are helping themselves. The 22,000 members of the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited have already contributed £4,500,000.

Mr. Casey: If we did not have bulk wheat we would not be able to sell it.

Mr. HEASLIP: That is another thing, and as a Liberal and Country League Government we believe in helping the people on the land.

Mr. Bywaters: You know that bulk handling has the full support of members on this side.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am glad to hear that, because I have heard some other views previously.

Mr. Jennings: I remember that you heard some opposite views from the member for Onkaparinga.

Mr. HEASLIP: I heard in a debate not long ago that we should protect the railways rather than the producer. Primary production is the backbone of this State, and indeed it is the backbone of all States. Last year we had a record cereal yield, with 55,500,000 bushels of wheat, 25,000,000 bushels of barley, and 9,000,000 bushels of oats, a total of 90,000,000 bushels. We were able to get a financial surplus, mainly because of the conditions in the country, instead of the deficit for which we had budgeted. This year it is difficult to get an estimate, but if the same conditions prevail (and they are very favourable today) it will be so much easier to overcome the deficit for which we are budgeting than if we have a crop failure. I hope we are going to achieve about the same mark this year as we achieved in last year's record season. With the rains that we have had over the last couple of months, the whole outlook has altered and there is every indication today that we can come within a measurable distance of the production we had last year. The people in South Australia have never had more money than they have today, nor more time in which to spend it. That includes all of us. The people have never been better off.

Mr. Jennings: I know at least one notable exception to that!

Mr. HEASLIP: The people have never been better off than they are today, and they have more holidays and more spare time in which to spend the money than they have ever had before. And all this has come after the 26th consecutive Budget of Sir Thomas Playford, the Treasurer, and the Premier in an L.C.L. Government. I support the first line.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): Mr. Acting Chairman, after hearing the glowing account given by the member for Rocky River I feel rather reticent about offering my humble remarks on the Budget. I cannot quite see the picture in as bright a light as did the honourable gentleman from Rocky River. The Treasurer began

his remarks by telling us, with a good deal of pride, I thought, that this was his 26th consecutive Budget. Personally, I think that is far too many for one man. Be that as it may, it made me remember that as I came here in 1952 this is the 12th consecutive Budget speech I have heard from the Treasurer in this place and, to be honest, I believe I have much more to be proud of in the fact that I have had the opportunity to be here because I have gained most of the votes of the people in my district. I can honestly claim that I have every right to be here representing the district of Gawler, whereas I doubt very much whether the Treasurer has much to be proud of, because, after all, for a number of years he has been here against the wishes of most of the people of South Australia. A Government is supposed to be elected on the democratic wishes of the people. If that happens in this State, this will be his last Budget speech as Treasurer.

I should like to give some idea of the picture put before us in this Budget and to read three or four lines of the Treasurer's opening remarks when he presented it. His words were:

I present my twenty-sixth consecutive Budget today in circumstances where the economic activity in the State, the earnings of its people, the extent of its employment, and the rate of its progress compare more than favourably with any other stage in its history.

Of course, the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) entirely agrees with that because, just before he sat down after making his remarks, he told us that the State had never been more prosperous, and I think he said that all the people had never had it better. Obviously he agrees with the glowing picture painted by the Treasurer in his opening remarks on the Budget. I suggest that anyone sitting in the gallery when he was delivering this Budget and hearing this first paragraph would have thought, "We have no worries at all. There will be no increased taxes in this Budget. Surely when the State is in such a happy position, when things have never been better and compare more than favourably with things in other years, we shall have a fairly kind and generous Budget."

Honourable members know how the Treasurer when answering a question or speaking in opposition to a matter has a habit of making us think for a few minutes that for once he will entirely agree with us; then by and by (and if we wait for it we always get it) comes that sinister word "but". Here we get it again: after that glowing picture he proceeded to impose increased taxation, in the main on a

completely sectional basis; yet he told us that the economic situation had never been better. Further on in his speech he proceeded to blame the Commonwealth authorities (he did not mention the Government) for some of the handicaps that we are apparently suffering in spite of our economic prosperity. One would think that the Commonwealth Government would not be popular with him, yet I am prepared to forecast confidently that when a Senate election eventuates soon the Prime Minister and the Treasurer of this State will be telling each other just what nice fellows they are. My friend the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) over the years has coined a particularly happy phrase to describe this situation. I do not intend to use it because I think he has the copyright of it, but it describes the situation as it will be before long. If this is the sort of Budget that we get when things are prosperous and a State election is in the offing next year, what are we likely to get in the entirely unlikely event that this Treasurer will be presenting his 27th consecutive Budget next year? I am afraid that, if that is allowed to take place, we can expect that the Treasurer will be doing a full-scale Bolte, as has just been done in our sister State.

Mr. Lawn: He has virtually said so in this Budget.

Mr. CLARK: I think if anyone reads between the lines (and one does not need very good eyesight to do that here) he will find that what the member for Adelaide has said is 100 per cent correct. What are these main increases? I want to give them as I see them. To do that, I shall quote from the part of the Treasurer's Budget speech where he lists what he calls the "main increases," so I suppose I am in order in considering them to be the main increases. He numbered them from 1 to 5. If it will give any satisfaction to the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip), I am not worried at all about the second item.

Mr. Heaslip: Your Leader was.

Mr. CLARK: I am only too happy to tax wholesale gambling such as that. However, I am chiefly concerned with the other items. The first item is insurance licence fees, about which the Treasurer said:

Licence fees payable by insurance companies which are calculated as a duty on net premiums will be increased from 1½ per cent to 5 per cent. This will apply to fire and general insurance but not to life insurance business.

That is a terrific impost and—mark my words, Mr. Chairman—you can be assured that despite

whatever good they do and whatever help and assistance they can be (at a price, of course) they are not in business as charitable organizations. We can be certain that these costs will be passed on to, shall I say, the consumers. I am not particularly interested about the second item; if other members are, they can read it themselves. Regarding the third item, the Treasurer said:

The duty on mortgage documents will be increased from 2s. 6d. a £100 to 5s. a £100. In other words, that is an increase of 100 per cent. I ask members if they think this will be carried by insurance companies, by people drawing up mortgage documents, or by people lending money. I do not think it will. About the fourth item of increase, the Treasurer said:

The 1 per cent duty at present payable on hire-purchase agreements will be extended to those contracts for repayment of loans to money-lenders required under the Money-Lenders Act, except insofar as they are separately secured by mortgage upon real property.

Here again I think we can be certain that hire-purchase companies will not pay the additional moneys. The Treasurer said this about the fifth item:

An *ad valorem* duty of 1 per cent will be levied on documents relating to new registrations and to transfers of registration of motor vehicles. This rate is equal to the present duty upon land transfer documents. He concluded this particular section of his speech by saying something that I ask members to mark, learn and inwardly digest:

The purpose will be to provide some recovery for the extensive police traffic, road safety, and ambulance services provided from Government revenues.

Surely not all these services are provided by Government revenue. Honourable members may care to take up this subject; I am not certain whether our services in these matters compare favourably with those provided in the other States.

Mr. Lawn: What ambulance services are provided by the Government?

Mr. CLARK: I have been wondering about that. I think it might well pay honourable members to find out what is provided in this State and compare it with the position in other States.

Mr. Hall: What alternative means have you in mind for raising revenue?

Mr. CLARK: I thank the honourable member for his interjection. I think we could well find the means. I suggest that possibly

the easiest means for the people of this State would be to change the Government, which I have no doubt they will do. If the Government were changed we would be able to demonstrate fully to the people in general, and to the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) in particular, how we would raise the money. I do not know that it would be wise for me to give away Party secrets to the member for Gouger. He might make use of them. However, let me suggest one method we would use because I know the honourable member has an inquiring mind and likes to be educated, wherever possible, by the right people. I suggest there is much opportunity for raising additional money if our succession duties were administered and levied in the way they should be. If the honourable member wishes to know the way in which I consider it should be done I should be glad to tell him at some other time, but I do not wish to interrupt my remarks now.

Mr. Riches: You would agree that this sort of situation is brought about not by bad seasons but by deliberate Government policy.

Mr. CLARK: That is obvious. The Treasurer has told us about the good season we have had and about our prosperity. The Committee knows very well that we have been told for years, and not just during this debate, that this is the most prosperous State in the Commonwealth.

Mr. Fred Walsh: And that all the other States are bankrupt.

Mr. CLARK: Virtually, that is so. I shall quote a few more remarks the Treasurer made in his Budget speech. Speaking of these increased taxes he said:

They will, in any case, still leave the taxes and licences of this State in relevant categories either below or no greater than comparable charges in other States. Taking an overall view, taxes and charges levied in South Australia will still remain the lowest in Australia.

According to the Treasurer, we have the highest and the best in everything else, but in these taxes we are the lowest.

Mr. Ryan: That is not true, is it?

Mr. CLARK: I would say that that statement by the Treasurer is open to very grave doubt but, after all, why shouldn't our taxes be lower than those of other States? We have been told over and over again that South Australia is the best governed State, the most prosperous, the fastest developing and so on *ad nauseam*. I believe that possibly that could be open to grave doubt also. If we are the most prosperous State in the Commonwealth, then surely our taxes should be the lowest by far. According to the Government, in every way this State is the most prosperous certainly

in the Commonwealth and possibly in the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Mr. Hutchens: Our average wage is £3 lower than the average wage in the Eastern States.

Mr. CLARK: I am not sure of the figure but I know that the wage is lower; that is common knowledge and we hear it when visiting other States. I believe that most of the increased taxes are unnecessary and unwarranted and I am opposing them entirely because I believe they are all sectional taxes. Surely it must be realized that stamp duties and similar taxes fall most heavily on the people who earn smaller incomes and who are less able to pay them. I am sure that, like myself, most Opposition members will be prepared to oppose the Budget, because the new taxes will fall most heavily on those not really in a position to pay them. The Committee should reject the Budget.

I wish to deal with one matter in connection with my district. Most members pass through it at times and know of the great development that has taken place. I do not take credit for all of this. Recently, Salisbury was proclaimed a city and Elizabeth is soon to be so proclaimed. I sincerely congratulate those areas on reaching city status. With great development comes great problems. One problem that has concerned me for many years, and has also concerned people living in that area, is the lighting in Elizabeth. Recently, we had good news. After months of discussions, proposals and counter proposals, the Minister of Highways and Local Government made a magnanimous proposal to the Elizabeth council about the cost of lighting the three intersections controlled (or supposed to be controlled) by traffic lights. They are on the Main North Road through Elizabeth. It was proposed that the Elizabeth council pay half the annual cost of the intersection lighting, a debit to it of £1,035 a year. The Elizabeth council was to pay the first half of the account, the other half to be paid by the Housing Trust. After much argument, the council, as might be expected, agreed to the proposal: it could not afford to do anything else.

I am pleased that someone is assisting the council, but I find it hard to believe that this is a function of the trust. I have been hoping, as no doubt others who drive through the area at night have been, that the whole area, which is virtually the main road through Elizabeth, would be completely lit. It is not particularly well lit now. When that is done, will the Housing Trust be expected to pay half

the cost? I hope not. The original legislation setting up the trust visualized for it a different function than a part-payer of lighting through the towns it built. I remind the Government that this is now a busy highway and I ask for assistance to light it. This is not an impossible task. I have ideas on what could be done and, if I am wrong, I am sure members will correct me, as they usually do. As I understand it, the Highways Act provides that the Commissioner of Highways may contribute to the cost of any main road which the Governor may proclaim. At present, only two main roads are so proclaimed, namely, Anzac Highway and Port Road. Previously a limit of £500 was provided in the Act as a contribution, but this has been amended and now no limit exists. I know that, generally speaking, the opinion of the Highways Department in the past has been that where Government grants are made towards the cost of lighting, this has the effect of reducing grants available for roads and other works. I understand that, if it is desired that the provisions of the Highways Act apply to this district, in particular to the Main North Road through Elizabeth, all that is necessary is for the Government to proclaim that the Main North Road shall be a roadway subject to provisions of subsidy. This, of course, might require a minor amendment to the Act; councils contributing must do so on the basis of one-third or 18 per cent of the rate of properties adjoining the roadway, whichever is the lesser. A difficulty exists at Elizabeth because many adjoining properties are only on service roads, but that could be overcome. The Commissioner of Highways has power to contribute to the cost of lighting intersections but, unfortunately, that is not much help to Elizabeth because that provision applies only to areas outside municipalities.

I am informed that the contribution by the Highways Department to the lighting of Anzac Highway and the Port Road has been on the basis of two-thirds of the cost being met by the department and one-third by the councils concerned. I understand, too, that the contributions by each council shall not exceed 18 per cent of the rate revenue from properties abutting the particular roadway and that such sum payable shall be not less than one-third of the total contribution. In 1961-62, the total cost of lighting the Port Road was £6,042, of which the Highways Department paid £4,028 and the Hindmarsh, Woodville and Port Adelaide councils paid £2,014. For the same period

the cost of lighting the Anzac Highway was £3,540, of which the Highways Department paid £2,360, and the West Torrens, Unley and Glenelg councils paid the other £1,180. These figures were quoted in the annual report of the Highways Department and it is obvious that the councils' contributions were purely nominal, especially in relation to the revenue of the councils. I believe that the traffic on this section of the road through one of the largest cities in South Australia warrants a proclamation of that road. I remind honourable members that most towns in South Australia are affected only by natural growth such as normal subdivision and development. Development in some cases is slow but in others it is fast, and here I point out that Elizabeth was deliberately sponsored and created by the Government, for which reason the Government should bear a greater degree of responsibility for this city and its people. We know only too well of the high incidence of accidents and resultant deaths in the area to which I refer.

I come now to several problems concerning education. The Treasurer's Budget speech, at page 11, states:

In the latter part of 1963 the Australian Universities Commission made its recommendations to the Commonwealth Government for grants to universities for the triennium 1964 to 1966, and those recommendations have been accepted by the Commonwealth and the appropriate legislation enacted. The arrangements continue the procedures of the previous three years whereby the recurrent expenses on universities are to be met to the extent of about two-thirds from State sources and one-third by the Commonwealth, while grants for buildings and special research purposes will be met one-half by the States and one-half by the Commonwealth. The commission's recommendations were for a total of almost £17,000,000 in grants and fees to be made available to the University of Adelaide and to the Institute of Technology for university level courses over the triennium 1964 to 1966. This, for three years, is about equivalent to the amount which was available to the two institutions for comparable purposes in the previous six years to December, 1963. The Government has accepted the building proposals in principle, has decided to consider budgets for recurrent expenditure annually in accordance with established practice, and has indicated that it will recommend to Parliament that the necessary funds be made available accordingly.

It can be seen that much assistance is rightly given to the universities in South Australia. I am concerned with this matter and have been for many years. I have discussed it on numerous occasions with senior officers of the Education Department who are also concerned.

On a recent trip to Melbourne with the Public Works Committee I had the chance to speak with gentlemen connected with education in Victoria who gave interesting and illuminating opinions on this aspect. I am concerned at the relationship existing between the university and the teachers college in South Australia: I am not happy with the situation. I will read portion of an article made available to honourable members because I realize that various journals and publications with information of this kind often remain unread as members do not have the time to read them. An editorial in the *Teachers' Journal*, the official journal of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, states:

The University of Adelaide was founded partly for the purpose of training teachers, and one condition of its financial support from the Government has been the free tuition of teachers. Generations of pedagogues have imbibed learning, sometimes even culture, within the grey walls—more latterly red brick, and now other things. Yet the subject of education is in decline so far as undergraduates are concerned. Spurned by the council narrowly rejected by the Senate (by dint of recall of scrutineers from the crypt), it lingers by exercise of Cabinet vote—one wonders for how much longer.

Expediency rather than principle seems to lie behind the changes. Pressed for room, the University has tended to concentrate on "pure" students rather than "applied" (except, of course, medicine and law), and to fail high percentages even of them. Even some of the engineers are half kicked out. Pressed for recruits, the Education Department has had to provide courses for students who could not measure up to the higher standards—although in the last year or two our entry levels have been higher, and maybe expected to rise sharply. Multiplication of colleges and students has naturally brought more administration control. The degree of freedom to experiment, and the measure of independence which remains, reflect the good sense of the director and his officers. The fact remains that the Principal of the Teachers College, once ranked as Director, slipped downhill to the level of a Superintendent, and now Principals are below the level of an Assistant Superintendent. Some have advocated making the best of a bad job and urge that teachers colleges become degree-granting institutions. Indeed, they are granting diplomas now. We call on an authority beyond the spray of the parish fountain to support a plea that education be not cast out as an undergraduate study from the university, and that a greater degree of independence be restored to the colleges . . . Quite obviously the Director of Education must control the numbers entering training and indicate the sort of output he will require. He, assisted by the teaching profession and the community generally, should also have means to make it known if the kind of training given is not appropriate to the needs of the schools. Certainly close co-operation with the

Education Department is necessary—if only for teaching practice and to keep the training staff themselves in touch with practice. Too direct and close control, however, is to be avoided. The university can help by retaining all its stakes in the training programme of undergraduate teachers.

The matter that has been concerning me is that I know that if teachers ultimately want to aspire to the highest positions in the Education Department they must have degrees, and I do not question that requirement for a moment. Nowadays some leave the Teachers College with academic degrees completed, but the greater proportion do not. Back in the old days (I refer to the time when I was teaching myself, if I may be allowed to remind members of this) the same thing would have applied. Very few, probably fewer than now, would have left the Teachers College with a degree, but they were given every opportunity, by correspondence courses and exemption from lectures and similar courses, to obtain their degrees. Very often this took a number of years, because when a man is doing one job all day it is not easy to sit down at night and study, particularly when teachers have the habit of getting married and children have a habit of coming along, which makes it more difficult. I know of hundreds of teachers who qualified after they left the Teachers College, and many of them have done extremely well in the service. Incidentally, the only diploma I ever managed to get I obtained by means of courses outside the university, with exemptions from lectures.

In the old days the university was most sympathetic to a student who wanted to complete a degree. Now, for various reasons, some of which were cited in the article I quoted, this is not so easy. It is particularly difficult for anyone wanting to complete a degree, particularly a science degree. It is virtually impossible for a student teaching in the country who wants to complete a science degree to have the opportunity from the university to do it at all. So, Sir, he must come back to the city, and even then it is not easy. I suggest that if money is granted to the university, and if the university is financed to a great extent by our Government, as I believe it should be, surely the university should be requested to regard teachers who are seeking to complete degrees as something better than rather poor and distant relations. I studied at the university myself and have a great deal of respect, naturally, for the university, and I regret that this situation seems to have arisen. During last week I had an opportunity of

having a long talk with the Principal of the Secondary Teachers College in Melbourne. In that State (and I like to think, as others do, that we are doing as well as other places) I was amazed to find much greater co-operation between its university and the teachers college. That is a good thing. I ask the Minister of Education and the Government whether they cannot see their way to make this request of the University of Adelaide. I should like to put on record that I make that request now. After all, we should remember that the quality of the students at the university depends largely on the quality of the teachers who instruct them before they reach it. I am not for a moment saying or even implying (because I do not believe it always to be so) that the best teachers have the best university degrees, but there is no question that degrees do help; and they help even more when they can be obtained and the studying done without the teaching of the teachers suffering to any large extent, because if that suffers the pupil suffers. I honestly believe that no teacher who is capable or desirous of obtaining a degree should be denied the opportunity.

Let me for a moment speak briefly of Teachers College students. All honourable members know that I was a teacher for many years until I fell from grace. I certainly did so in the eyes of some people and I may be accused at times of being biased in the matter. I have in the past been rather proud of this bias but I do endeavour not to be too biased. My colleagues on the Public Works Committee will grant me that when such matters as new schools or new teachers colleges are before the committee I try not to be biased. I admit that I may not have been quite so unbiased when the new adult education centre at Gawler came before the committee, but that could be pardoned. When parents of children attending the teachers college complain to me I cannot help giving them a kindly hearing. After all, I am in a position to remember the past. It may be fitting here if I say a word or two on this, because shortly we are going to the opening of the new teachers college at Kintore Avenue. I had the chance of inspecting this college only a week or so ago and naturally my thoughts went back to the days of my own training, because I did not train under quite such comfortable conditions—at least from the point of view of working, learning and being lectured to—as those attending the teachers college enjoy today.

When I was at college in 1926-27, the depression days were just around the corner.

Things were bad and there was no difficulty in getting student teachers. In those days it was the only way a poor man's son could get a university education. We did not have many material goods then. If my memory serves me right, we were earning the magnificent sum of £40 or £60 a year—I think it was £60. We had to pay for boarding accommodation and also for any vices we might have had. It was common practice to share packets of cigarettes. I can well remember two friends who shared the same pipe, and used it on alternate occasions. Fortunately neither could be classed as a wet smoker! In those days the college was at the rear of the Public Library. I think the buildings are now used for storing some of the books from the Children's Library. It was, to put it politely, a very ordinary place, but there was a good spirit. Even though we did not get much money, we must have been reasonably happy and contented in being young, because I can still remember some of the words of one of the songs we used to sing about the good old college where tons and tons of knowledge was rammed into our brains.

Mr. Lawn: You are not going to start singing, are you?

Mr. CLARK: No, I think that may be against Standing Orders, and one or two lines may not be fitting for the ears of members. We were poor, and the conditions under which we worked were bad, but it is interesting that most of the present senior officers of the Education Department trained in that era. In those days students were considered fortunate indeed if they managed to have two years at the Teachers College. Most stayed only one, so members can understand that most students who gained degrees or diplomas obtained them after leaving the college. Even today, when students of that era get together—and I think many children at school are like this—although often they were not particularly fond of their teachers, they now admit that after becoming men and women they discovered that their teachers were not bad fellows after all. There must be something in that because often young men and women—some of them are not so young now—come to me and remind me of the days when I did my best to teach them.

I think most of us who attended the college in that period look back with nostalgic affection to the lecturers we had there. Their names would not mean much to members of this Chamber, but to other teachers they would. Such people as Miss Phoebe Watson, the first

women's warden at the college, Howard Lushey, "Bunny" Edquist, Flossie Batchelor, Sam Robinson, and others were affectionately known by their Christian names; not to their faces, of course. The reason why I have drifted back into the past perhaps more than I should have done is that in those days lecturers did their jobs splendidly under appalling conditions. I believe the present lecturers are doing their work just as well, but they have the added assistance of conditions that are so much better. Members will see, if they have not had the chance to see it before, that this new college is a magnificent place. I do not think it is at all too good for the purpose for which it is provided.

It may be a truism, but it is a fact, that the influence of the teacher is second only to the influence of the parent. I invite members if they are interested—and they should be—to read an article in this month's *Teachers Journal* about the average college student. This deals in the main with a questionnaire and the results of a survey made by the South Australian Institute of Teachers into the financial position of 625 teachers college students. If honourable members read it they will find it most illuminating and might feel some shame because something is not being done about the situation. It is obvious that these young people, who will be teachers before long, are being paid what could be regarded as a pitiful pittance. I shall read one paragraph at the end of the article, which briefly outlines the conclusions that were made as a result of the survey. It said:

The survey was conducted to ascertain whether an increase in allowances was justified. Students have gained nothing from basic wage or margins increases since 1955. The results seem to show that both ordinary and boarding allowances ought to be lifted considerably. A rise of £100 in allowance and £100 in boarding allowance would do little more than restore the position as it was in 1955. This represents about £250,000 in a year—quite a substantial sum. It is about the amount that the S.A. public will be asked to pay for the increased price of one newspaper in a year.

I ask that consideration be given to the position of these young people, who are to be the teachers of our children, and I add my plea to the plea in the article (which I advise honourable members to read) that student teachers' allowances should be increased as soon as possible. I repeat that I cannot possibly agree with the Treasurer's new taxes because I am certain they hit hardest people who can least afford to pay them. For that reason I cannot possibly support the first line.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): I believe that the most interesting and illuminating comment made by the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) was his reference to the impost of certain taxes, and to succession duties being a means to cure all. I take it from his statement he believes that if succession duties were properly applied all our ills would be overcome.

Mr. Clark: The honourable member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) asked me about this and I mentioned succession duties as just one instance.

Mr. LAUCKE: If I have wrongly interpreted the honourable member's remarks I am happy, because I inferred from what he said that succession duties could be so wielded as to give the Treasurer increased income. If that were to be the case I would be bitterly opposed to that form of taxation because it would be most undesirable and would deaden any progress in the community. I believe that the lightest succession duties possible are necessary to give incentive to people to work in the knowledge that their work will be of benefit to those who follow them. Any person who works beyond a given age, particularly in a family organization, is working not for himself but for his family and their interests. There is no nastier tax that I can think of than vicious succession or probate duties. This Budget is one of which all South Australians should be proud. I shall make a few comparisons between the budgeting in South Australia and in New South Wales—a State that has been governed by the Labor Party.

Mr. Lawn: There is a dictatorship in South Australia!

Mr. LAUCKE: In New South Wales maybe, but not in South Australia. The fact that we have gone ahead in the way that we have in the last couple of decades indicates that the best brains, abilities and administration have been brought to bear on our finances. In 1939-40, when the present Treasurer introduced his first Budget—

Mr. Lawn: A black day for South Australia.

Mr. LAUCKE: A wonderful day for South Australia.

Mr. Lawn: You only want to get into the Ministry.

Mr. LAUCKE: That first Budget, for no more than £13,100,000—

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: He would not be the only one who wanted to get into the Ministry!

Mr. LAUCKE:—was presented at a time when the population of this State was 599,000—

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: I heard of one person who wanted to get there before he was elected!

Mr. LAUCKE:—and in the Treasurer's 26th Budget no less than £112,568,000 is involved. This is an increase in those 25 years of 858 per cent, with the population increasing in that period by about 400,000. Comparing these figures with the New South Wales figures in the same period, South Australia stands pre-eminent as the most progressive State of the two, hands down the winner, and, possibly on an all-States viewing, the best in Australia.

Mr. Ryan: Even after this Budget?

Mr. LAUCKE: This Budget will assist further progress and development in South Australia. It is a good Budget.

Mr. Ryan: That is wishful thinking.

Mr. LAUCKE: In 1939-40 the New South Wales Budget was for £58,742,588 and the population was 2,766,000. Last year the Budget was £214,471,000 and its population had increased in the 25 years to 4,048,000 an increase in the Budget in that period of only 365 per cent, 3.6 times the 1939-40 Budget, while South Australia's Budget was 8.5 times as large. The population increase was greater in New South Wales, but it was unable to match in parallel the Budget abilities of this State. Definitely, and without hesitation, I congratulate the Treasurer and his Ministers who administer the finances of this State. After all, I regard finance as government and government as finance.

Mr. Jennings: You are wasting this sweetness on the desert air. He is not here and he does not read *Hansard*. Perhaps you are only back-scratching.

Mr. LAUCKE: It is not back-scratching, and the honourable member knows it. The opposition to the Budget cannot be sincere because figures indicate the progress this State is making.

Mr. Ryan: Do you realize that this is his last Budget?

Mr. LAUCKE: It is not. It will be an ill day should that occur.

Mr. Ryan: The ill day is coming.

Mr. LAUCKE: New South Wales had all the benefits, 25 years ago, of heavily established industries. It had a first mortgage, as it were, on secondary industries in Australia. At that time, we were about to embark on decentralization of industry, as between States, but New South Wales was sitting pretty. That State had a background of great natural resources that we did not have. It had a great natural potential whereas South Australia was lacking

in natural resources. However, no other State has achieved as much as we have, and I agree with the following statement by the Treasurer when introducing his first Budget in 1939:

The honest way is for us to do our utmost to balance our accounts and to live within our means.

That is a good, sound approach to finance. Government financing is no different in my opinion from individual financing.

Mr. Hutchens: The deeper in debt the individual becomes, the better off he is?

Mr. LAUCKE: The member for Hindmarsh appears to forget that as interest charges have risen so has there been increased capital investment, and because the investment figure is large naturally the interest due appears large also. The facts are that, through capital expenditure being properly applied, our economy has achieved its present buoyant position. Water lines traverse the State; there is power reticulation over practically the whole of the State; development of natural resources has taken place where they have been discovered, and advantage has been taken of every chance of obtaining natural wealth.

Mr. Hutchens: Do you say that the population of every country town has increased?

Mr. LAUCKE: Does that apply only to South Australia? The honourable member knows that that is common to all States. Everything that can be done to decentralize efficiently, economically and soundly is being done in South Australia. I do not like to hear irresponsible condemnations of lack of decentralization. It is clearly known by those who make such statements that, without complete domination and control of individual rights and freedom, decentralization cannot ensue unless resources exist which can be economically developed. I am indeed proud to be a member of the Party which is providing the Government and which can produce such a Budget. In the last 18 years a deficit has occurred in 10 different years and surpluses in eight, but in the overall picture after 18 years we emerge with a credit of about £2,000,000. That is sound financing, and farmers, storekeepers and industrialists, because of the solid financial background in South Australia through the direction of its finances, have shown their confidence in the Government by way of investments. I am concerned about the welfare of the egg industry in this State.

Mr. McKee: I didn't think you had any problems at all.

Mr. LAUCKE: When we see room for improvement we endeavour to improve. Indeed, I notice that room for improvement exists in

egg trading in this State. I shall read an extract from the *Australian* of a few days ago. It refers to the increased sales of eggs in New South Wales through effective promotion of the product.

Mr. Ryan: I thought you said New South Wales didn't do anything praiseworthy.

Mr. LAUCKE: I am referring to an aspect of the egg industry, and New South Wales is evidently gaining from a certain approach. The extract said:

The sale of eggs on the local market in New South Wales during the year ended June 30 reached a new peak of 42,946,851 dozen. This represents an increase of almost 2,000,000 dozen on the sales by the New South Wales Egg Board in 1962-63, the board's Chairman, Mr. M. D. Whinfield, said in Sydney yesterday. An increase of 4½ per cent on last year's record sales is a very satisfactory result. A vigorous advertising and sales-promotion campaign during the year has once again paid dividends. By co-operating with the board, producers and retailers have assisted in achieving a result that would be attractive to any food marketing organization. Sales so far this year indicate another substantial increase.

I note with concern that in South Australia during the past financial year 5,510,000 dozen eggs were sold—2,435,000 dozen less than in the previous year.

Mr. Ryan: The hens in South Australia are not so liberal.

Mr. LAUCKE: This trading resulted in a loss of £118,200. Whereas I have been saying how much more buoyant has been the overall economy of this State than that of New South Wales in the last 20 years, in this matter I give marks to what the New South Wales Egg Board is doing, through a keen advertising campaign, to encourage the consumption of eggs. In that State we find a major increase in egg consumption, whereas here there has been a decrease. I consider that the time has come when we must pay greater attention, through our board, to promoting eggs as a food in South Australia, because export has practically gone: it has gone in eggs in shell, and the sales of egg pulp are giving us no financial gain at all. It is a dead loss so far as margins are concerned.

Mr. Ryan: And the Government of South Australia is a dead loss, too.

Mr. LAUCKE: On the contrary, this present Government is a complete gain. I was very pleased to note a small but important line in these Estimates allocating £250 to the South Australian Fly Fishers Association. In this present day and age, when it is necessary to have the facility for folk to get away from

the concentration of cities into rural settings, such a provision as this is most important. I pay a tribute to the Government, and particularly the Minister of Lands, for encouraging a land acquisition programme for open spaces that has not applied before in the State's history. The Fly Fishers Association, as a voluntary body, has done magnificent work in seeding our rivers and creeks in rural areas in the country with trout and other fish. This has been done at a cost of up to £500 a year out of the pockets of its members, and it has involved much voluntary labour. The result is that we have waterways such as the River Light (which runs through my district and the district of the member for Light) where we have excellent fishing for trout that were placed there initially by this association. This applies to many of our inland waterways, and it is opening up a new avenue of open-air relaxation to many people. I believe this interest should be encouraged more than it has been in the past. The line this year is a new one, for last year no line was provided. I understand that in the last financial year the association spent £460 of its own moneys, and if that were subsidized pound for pound and the association received an equal sum from Government funds it could do much more in liberating young fish into our waterways. The Government should further encourage the work of this association because of the undoubted good it does. I commend the Government for placing a special line on the Estimates to assist this splendid organization.

Under the Agriculture Department, I note a line "Farmers' experimental plots and seed certification." I take this opportunity to refer to the real need for seed certification of clean seed, be it cereal or pasture seed, because unless there is purity in the sowings there will be adverse results in the final crop taken from that land.

Mr. Shannon: We are getting foreign plants we do not want.

Mr. LAUCKE: Very bad foreign plants that could endanger the wellbeing of our rural industries. The ability to purchase completely clean seed is vital. We have two major foreign seeds that could harm our wheat industry: the star thistle (or saffron) and melilotus. I am happy to note a firm reference made by wheat farmers' organizations and the Wheat Board to the presence of thistle in our crop last year and the indication by overseas buyers that they would not have our wheat if it contained this seed. The reason is obvious to any person handling wheat in

milling. The saffron seed is about the same size and weight as wheat. This means that it cannot be sieved out in any sieving machine, be it a disc or the normal shaking sieve. No plant will do it, either sieving or air blasting, because, being the same weight as wheat, it cannot be blown out without wasting half the wheat. If this seed is present in the wheat sample, even though every effort is made by the miller who is using the wheat either in this country or overseas, he cannot remove it from the wheat and it goes through the mill and contaminates the resultant flour in a mysterious way. Perhaps it is not so mysterious, as the resultant flour has a bluish tinge, because of the pulverizing of the bran of the saffron, but the really dangerous aspect of this foreign seed in wheat is the deadening effect on the yeast in baking. Instead of having an aerated loaf, one has a damper. I am pleased to note the care being taken and the exhortations given to farmers that in the coming season they eliminate saffron from the wheat sample.

The other seed is melilotus. It can be screened, but if not screened perfectly on the farm the melilotus lies with the wheat in the silos. To a degree, it taints its neighbouring wheat in the silos and if it is not completely eradicated before the milling process, it gives a taint to the resultant flour and it gives to the bread a perfume very much akin to a nauseatingly sweet hair oil. When melilotus infested seed or wheat is used and it goes into the bakery or the baker's oven, one gets a noseful of what comes out—a beautiful smelling aroma! These seeds and wheat samples both for local consumption and for overseas export must be kept free from melilotus. As I shall have an opportunity of speaking to the lines in the Estimates, I shall not weary the Committee further at this stage. I have much pleasure in supporting the adoption of the first line.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): In rising to speak to the first line of the Estimates, I can only at the outset record my profound disagreement with the speaker who has just resumed his seat on the subject of the benefits to South Australians from this Budget. On this occasion the Budget proposes to increase charges upon a certain section of the South Australian people. It does so in a number of ways, the first of which is an increase in stamp duty of certain kinds. That stamp duty increase will for the most part fall heavily upon the poorer sections of the population. Quite clearly, the increase in charges in respect of

mortgages will most heavily affect those people who need to borrow to erect houses. The proposed new impost upon motor vehicles, not only new but also second-hand, will fall most heavily upon the working section of the people. These people are the heaviest buyers of used cars within the community, and also constitute a large proportion of those who purchase new cars.

The impost on personal loans, designed to catch the companies that are not now using hire-purchase agreements, will again fall upon those people who are involved in time-payment contracts. The proposal in the measure to see that the companies do not hand on this impost is simply useless: it is clear that this extra impost will be passed on to the people buying goods upon time payment. In every case except one minor one, these new stamp duties will fall heavily upon the working sections of the population in South Australia—and this within a tax structure which significantly within this State taxes the wealthy far less than does any other State of the Commonwealth. In this State the wealthy sections of the populace, the supporters of the Government, the people who pay the money for this Government Party to remain in office, for the present dictatorship that we have here to continue, are the people who reap benefits from the taxation proposals of this Government. The people who reap the benefit from this Budget are the wealthy sections. This Government acts as Robin Hood in reverse: it takes from the poor to give to the rich. The poorer people in the community are taxed not only in these new imposts for the benefit of the wealthier people of the community—because the wealthy pastoral interests and the large industrial enterprises in South Australia are the people who benefit from this Government's failure to tax them—but also in water rates, about which the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) had a word to say. He said that water rates had not been increased for some years. It is true that the rates have not been increased but, as the honourable member well knows, what happened was that this Government did not put up assessments at the time when increases in the value of land took place but it crept up the rate to a level far higher than was necessary on the existing assessment basis. It then proceeded to increase assessments. There have been wholesale increases in assessments. There is not a metropolitan member who has not had complaints from people in difficult circumstances faced with considerable increases in water and sewer rates.

Mr. Ryan: We are getting them this year as well.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes. Poor people in my district have said, "We are pensioners; how can we pay?" The money is going out of their pockets all right.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You know very well we have never been tough on any pensioners.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I know perfectly well that the Minister allows rates to be paid in instalments or in some cases to be accumulated upon the properties, but in some cases that still places a hardship upon the pensioners, some of whom are seeking to make some small provision for their dependants.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Why should they? They are only leaving something for someone who does not need it.

Mr. DUNSTAN: In some cases they do need it. I am surprised to hear the Minister say that after having heard a most moving plea from the honourable member who has just resumed his seat about enormous succession duties.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: That has nothing to do with the matter at all.

Mr. DUNSTAN: It has plenty to do with the matter. When invalid pensioners are involved and they have dependent children, it is quite proper for them to make some kind of provision in case they go before the children are fully independent.

Hon. G. G. Pearson: House properties alone are not subject to succession duties. That is so in practically all cases to which you are now referring.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Not in all cases.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: In practically all cases you are dealing with, it is.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I can tell the Minister of cases in the Public Trustee's Office now.

Mr. Lawn: The Minister said that to me one night, and I went over and convinced him he was wrong. He has now forgotten that.

Mr. DUNSTAN: The reason for the kind of budgeting, the imposition of taxation, and the pattern of taxation in this State is that this Government is completely unrepresentative. This Government and its predecessors on that side in politics have completely subverted the basis upon which the Constitution of this State was founded. In speaking to the first line, the Legislature, let me draw attention to the way in which the Constitution came to be founded.

Mr. Coumbe: What sort of taxation would you impose?

Mr. DUNSTAN: The honourable member will hear that in due course. He will no doubt have an opportunity to listen to us on the Bill relating to stamp duties. If he listens to what I shall say about the first line that provides for the Legislature no doubt he will hear something about which he will be sorry. At the time the Constitution was founded, it was considered not only in this State but in almost every State claiming any sort of pretensions to civilization that the basis of a democratic Constitution should be that the people of the State should have an equal and effective voice as between one another in their future government. That was so many years before South Australia was founded. For this I turn to the *Federalist Papers* of the United States of America and the Constitution upon which the Commonwealth Constitution later came to be modelled. As I shall show the House, several members of this Parliament at that time were involved in the Commonwealth Conventions that made that perfectly clear. What do the *Federalist Papers* say? Wilson, who was one of the members of the Constitutional Convention of the United States, said:

All elections ought to be equal. Elections are equal, when a given number of citizens, in one part of the state, choose as many representatives, as are chosen by the same number of citizens, in any other part of the state. In this manner, the proportion of the representatives and of the constituents will remain invariably the same. Madison said:

Numbers are not only the suitable way to represent wealth but in any event are the only proper scale of representation.

The papers went on, and this was quoted with approval by the United States Supreme Court in the recent decision of *Wesberry v. Sanders*:

Who are to be the electors of the Federal Representatives? Not the rich more than the poor; not the learned more than the ignorant; not the haughty heirs of distinguished names more than the humble sons of obscure and unpropitious fortune. The electors are to be the great body of the people of the United States.

In examining the United States Constitution, which was founded on that basis, in saying that the election of members to Congress should be on the basis of the numbers of the people of the various States, the United States Supreme Court in that decision said:

While it may not be possible to draw Congressional districts with mathematical precision, that is no excuse for ignoring our Constitution's plain objective of making equal representation for equal numbers of people the fundamental goal for the House of Representatives—

In that particular decision the United States Supreme Court laid down that the States of the United States, which are required in their State legislatures to draw the boundaries for Congressional districts, those State legislatures were required to draw districts which were substantially equal in numbers of voters and, if they failed to do so, then the election for the number of congressmen for that State was at large and the whole State voted for one district to ensure one vote one value in that State. Mr. Justice Black gave the opinion of the six man majority of the United States Supreme Court in that case and said:

As nearly as practicable one man's vote in a Congressional election is to be worth as much as another's.

However, the United States Supreme Court did not stop there. The States of the United States, the State Legislatures, had power to draw the boundaries of their districts for Upper and Lower Houses and, in the way in which I shall show it occurred here in South Australia too, numbers of these Legislatures failed in their constitutional responsibility to re-district their States so as to provide one vote one value in their States and in consequence nearly 40 of the States had Legislatures where, in both Houses, there was unequal representation. The Supreme Court of the United States said that this was completely contrary to the basis of the United States Constitution. It denied the equal protection clause of the Constitution which demanded that each person in the United States should have equal protection before the law and, in consequence, it was constitutionally invalid.

However, Mr. Justice Earl Warren, the Chief Justice, in delivering the majority judgment had a number of things to say which might well be listened to by members opposite. Most of them do not talk about this matter at all and I do not know whether they are too afraid or too ashamed, or what is the reason for this. Their voice is the Leader of the Government, the dictator of this State, who gives forth a bland assurance that nowhere in the world is there such a principle as one vote one value or one man one vote. Well, let him listen to what the Chief Justice of the United States said. I quote from the printed fascides of the decision of *Reynolds v. Sims*, and I am indebted to the United States Information Office for this copy:

The right to vote freely for the candidate of one's choice is of the essence of a democratic society and any restrictions on that right strike at the heart of representative Government. And the right of suffrage can be denied

by a debasement or dilution of the weight of a citizen's vote just as effectively as by wholly prohibiting the free exercise of the franchise

In *Gray v. Sanders* we held that the Georgia county unit system applicable in State wide primary elections, was unconstitutional since it resulted in a dilution of the weight of the votes of certain Georgia voters merely because of where they resided. After indicating that the Fifteenth and Nineteenth Amendments prohibit a State from overweighting or diluting votes on the basis of race or sex, we stated:

"How then can one person be given twice or ten times the voting power of another person in a State-wide election merely because he lives in a rural area or because he lives in the smallest rural county? Once the geographical unit for which a representative is to be chosen is designated, all who participate in the election are to have an equal vote—whatever their race, whatever their sex, whatever their occupation, whatever their income, and wherever their home may be in that geographical unit. This is required by the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The concept of 'we the people' under the Constitution visualizes no preferred class of voters but equality among those who meet the basic qualifications. The idea that every voter is equal to every other voter in his State, when he casts his ballot in favour of one of several competing candidates, underlies many of our decisions."

And, finally, we concluded: "The conception of political equality from the Declaration of Independence, to Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, to the Fifteenth, Seventeenth and Nineteenth Amendments can mean only one thing—one person, one vote."

This is a principle that the Treasurer said does not exist anywhere in the world. Why is our State so different from the vision of democracy set forth by the United States Supreme Court so succinctly? In this State in many districts a voter has a say in this Parliament five or six times as great as that of a voter in another district. The member for Enfield represents more electors than does the Treasurer, the Minister of Lands, the Minister of Works, the Minister of Agriculture and you, Sir, combined.

Mr. Ryan: That is democracy!

Mr. Lawn: That is the Playford-Liberal Party democracy!

Mr. DUNSTAN: Again, the United States Supreme Court said:

"No right is more precious in a free country than that of having a voice in the election of those who make the laws under which, as good citizens, we must live. Other rights even the most basic are illusory if the right to vote is undermined. Our Constitution leaves no room for classification of people in a way that unnecessarily bridges this right." . . . Legislators represent people, not trees or acres.

Legislators are elected by voters, not farms or cities or economic interests.

The Treasurer would have us set up a system of representation based on economic interests, the people here to represent rural or non-rural interests, not voters at all.

Mr. Lawn: Stockyard confetti!

Mr. DUNSTAN: The Supreme Court statement continued:

As long as ours is a representative form of Government and our legislatures are those instruments of government elected directly by and directly representative of the people, the right to elect legislators in a free and unpaired fashion is a bedrock of our political system. It could hardly be gainsaid that a constitutional claim had been asserted by an allegation that certain otherwise qualified voters had been entirely prohibited from voting for members of their State legislature. And, if a State should provide that the votes of citizens in one part of the State should be given two times, or five times or 10 times the weight of votes of citizens in another part of the State, it could hardly be contended that the right to vote of those residing in the disfavoured areas had not been effectively diluted. It would appear extraordinary to suggest that a State could be constitutionally permitted to enact a law providing that certain of the State's voters could vote two, five, or 10 times for their legislative representatives, while voters living elsewhere could vote only once. And it is inconceivable that a State law to the effect that, in counting votes for legislators, the votes of citizens in one part of the State would be multiplied by two, five, or 10, while the votes of persons in another area would be counted only at face value, could be constitutionally sustainable. Of course, the effect of State legislative districting schemes which give the same number of representatives to unequal numbers of constituents is identical. Overweighting and overevaluating of the votes of those living here has the certain effect of dilution and undervaluation of the votes of those living there.

Mr. Lawn: Members opposite are hanging their heads in shame.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I hope they have some; I have not found much so far on this matter. I have found them utterly conscienceless. It continued:

The resulting discrimination against those individual voters living in disfavoured areas is easily demonstrable mathematically. Their right to vote is simply not the same right to vote as that of those living in a favoured part of the State. Two, five, or 10 of them must vote before the effect of their voting is equivalent to that of their favoured neighbour. Weighting the votes of citizens differently, by any method or means, merely because of where they happen to reside, hardly seems justifiable. One must be ever aware that the Constitution forbids "sophisticated as well as simple-minded modes of discrimination."

Then was quoted a previous decision with approval. Continuing:

"We do not believe that the framers of the Constitution intended to permit the same vote-diluting discrimination to be accomplished through the device of districts containing widely varied numbers of inhabitants. To say that a vote is worth more in one district than in another would . . . run counter to our fundamental ideas of democratic government . . . " Logically, in a society ostensibly grounded on representative government, it would seem reasonable that a majority of the people of a State could elect a majority of that State's legislators. To conclude differently, and to sanction minority control of State legislative bodies, would appear to deny majority rights in a way that far surpasses any possible denial of minority rights that might otherwise be thought to result. Since legislatures are responsible for enacting laws by which all citizens are to be governed, they should be bodies which are collectively responsive to the popular will. And the concept of equal protection has been traditionally viewed as requiring the uniform treatment of persons standing in the same relation to the governmental action questioned or challenged. With respect to the allocation of legislative representation, all the voters, as citizens of a State, stand in the same relation regardless of where they live. Any suggested criteria for the differentiation of citizens are insufficient to justify any discrimination, as to the weight of their votes, unless relevant to the permissible purposes of legislative apportionment. Since the achieving of fair and effective representation for all citizens is concededly the basic aim of legislative apportionment, we conclude that the Equal Protection Clause guarantees the opportunity for equal participation by all voters in the election of state legislators. Diluting the weight of votes because of place of residence impairs basic constitutional rights.

. . . Our constitutional system amply provides for the protection of minorities by means other than giving them majority control of state legislatures. And the democratic ideals of equality and majority rule, which have served this Nation so well in the past, are hardly of any less significance for the present and the future . . . To the extent that a citizen's right to vote is debased, he is that much less a citizen. The fact that an individual lives here or there is not a legitimate reason for overweighting or diluting the efficacy of his vote. The complexions of societies and civilizations change, often with amazing rapidity. A nation once primarily rural in character becomes predominantly urban.

That is what has happened here, Mr. Chairman. It goes on:

Representation schemes, once fair and equitable, become archaic and outdated. But the basic principal of representative Government remains, and must remain, unchanged. The weight of a citizen's vote cannot be made to depend on where he lives. Population is of necessity the starting point for consideration and the controlling criterion for judgment in

legislative apportionment controversies. A citizen, a qualified voter, is no more or no less so because he lives in the city or on the farm. This is the clear and strong command of our Constitution's Equal Protection Clause. This is an essential part of the concept of a Government of laws and not men. This is at the heart of Lincoln's vision of "government of the people, by the people, for the people." The Equal Protection Clause demands no less than substantially equal State legislative representation for all citizens, of all places as well as of all races.

The result has been that State Legislatures in the United States of America are required to re-district both houses of their State Legislatures to provide one man one vote and one vote one value. They are seeing to it that this sacred and inviolable principle in the United States Constitution is being enforced, and they consider it clearly an anachronism, and a vicious attack upon democracy, to try to get away from that basic principle.

This is nothing new to South Australia. What was the position here when our Constitution was founded? In South Australia the members of the Legislative Council, who were given the right to decide upon the State's Constitution, were, every single one of them, imbued with exactly the same principles as those enunciated by the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court and in the *Federalist Papers* in the United States and by the framers of the United States Constitution. We have, of course, no *Hansard* reports of that first Legislative Council and its deliberations upon the Constitution, but we have the *Constitutional History of South Australia*, written by the then Colonial Secretary, Mr. Boyle Travers Finniss who quotes verbatim from a number of the debates. Much of the debate was reported verbatim in the newspaper of the day. When the Bill (upon which our present Constitution was founded) was introduced it was met immediately by a series of amendments, as the Bill provided not for manhood suffrage for the Lower House at that stage but for a property suffrage for both Houses. Mr. G. S. Kingston, M.L.C., immediately suggested an amendment to the Bill, and he placed a motion on the Notice Paper to provide a number of things. It provided, first, for responsible Government; secondly, the extension of the election franchise to every male 21 years of age, untainted by crime, who had been resident in and registered six months in the district; thirdly, the Parliament to consist of two Chambers, both elective, the Upper House to consist of 12 and the Lower House of 36 members; fourthly, the election to the

Upper House to be by all the electors of the colony voting in one district (one man one vote and one vote one value in the Upper House); fifthly, the election to the Lower House to be by districts, for which purpose the colony should be divided into electoral districts, comprising as nearly as practicable equal numbers, with power of revision from time to time.

Mr. McKee: What happened to that?

Mr. DUNSTAN: When the Colonial Secretary spoke to Mr. Kingston's motion he went through the various proposals. He came to the proposal about the Lower House and on behalf of the Government-nominated members of the Legislative Council said:

The next proposition refers to the election to the Lower House to be by districts, for which purpose the colony shall be divided into electoral districts, comprising as nearly as practicable equal numbers with power of revision from time to time.

The Colonial Secretary, in the course of his speech, said:

Sir, that is a proposition which the honourable gentleman intends to move as an amendment, but it is so exactly in accordance with what the Bill itself provides, that I cannot possibly see how it is to be regarded as an amendment. Indeed, I must vote for the honourable member whilst the clause to which this refers is being considered in committee; there was certainly no necessity for thus laying down the law on the subject beforehand.

Everybody agreed to it. In fact, that motion of Mr. Kingston was withdrawn in the course of the debate but in the Committee stages of the Bill an amendment was moved by Mr. Baker, M.L.C.—later the Hon. Sir Richard Chaffey Baker, a gentleman whose portrait, like Mr. Kingston's, adorns the walls of this Parliament; a man who later became prominent in the legislative affairs of this colony and who was regarded in this colony as one of the foremost of the conservative members of this Parliament. *The South Australian Register* of December 8, 1855, reports:

Mr. Baker brought forward his amendment fixing the following electoral qualifications for the Upper House, namely: A freehold of the value of £50; a leasehold of the annual value of £25 having three years to run or including a right of pre-emption—such freehold or leasehold property to be registered six months before being placed upon the roll . . . The Lower House to be elected by ballot upon the principle of manhood suffrage, and in equal electoral districts based upon population.

A division was taken on the motion. The Colonial Secretary and other members of the Government, the nominated members, opposed Mr. Baker's motion because they disagreed with some of his proposals for the Upper House,

but they had no disagreement with the proposals for the Lower House. When the motion was put, every elected member of the Legislative Council voted in favour of it. The only opponents were the six nominated members who formed the Government. *The South Australian Register* then reports:

Mr. Baker asked the Colonial Secretary whether the Government would be willing to consider the amendment carried. If so, it might not be necessary to put the question: "that the words proposed to be inserted be so inserted," as the amendment was not at present drawn up in a formal manner and it would be better, perhaps, that it should not, in its present state, be sent out of the colony. The Colonial Secretary replied that the Government would consider that the opinion of the House had been arrived at, and would have clauses prepared for insertion, grounded upon the amendment.

That was the basis of the Constitution. Indeed, let me say what the *Register* in its editorial had to say upon the foundations of the Constitution as a result of that decision:

The main features of the new Constitution have now been determined on. We have two electoral Houses; one elected on the basis of a manhood suffrage, the other on the basis of a property qualification; the one to be elected by districts equal in population, the other by the whole colony voting as one district.

The Constitution was duly drawn up and, unfortunately for the people of South Australia, the way in which the proposals of the Legislative Council were devised was to provide in the Electoral Act at that date (not in the Constitution itself, but in the Electoral Act) for the districts of the Legislature; and in the first Legislature in 1857 there were in fact districts equal in numbers of population in proportion to the representatives which those districts returned. In other words, there was a quota that was equal to each representative elected. Each represented an approximately equal number of electors in South Australia in that first Parliament. There was only one departure from the principle and that was in a district where there was a particular difficulty in relation to communications at the time. But for the rest there was no departure: they were not 10 per cent outside the quota. What happened? There was no adequate provision, as the Constitution was later amended following some judgments of Mr. Justice Boothby, for periodical redistribution. As a result, after a while because of the drift in population the same situation followed as followed in the United States of America: that is, the Legislature became unrepresentative because the districts were no longer equal in numbers of population and the

Legislature set about seeing that it was made more unrepresentative and the substance of the original Constitution was thereby subverted.

Those were only beginnings. Early attempts were made to deprive the voters of Burra, Wallaroo and Port Adelaide of adequate representation in this place. They were early the districts where working men's organizations were coming to power. However, we did not see in this State until 1936, perpetrated by a Government of which our present dictator was a member, the complete subversion of the original ideas of the Constitution. That was purposeful and intentional: he intended to see to it, as he has proclaimed on a number of occasions, that the majority of people in this State would not elect the Government, and that there would be a majority of citizens in this State who would be considered second-class citizens in the very way that the United States Supreme Court has said would be a complete denial of democratic rights. Honourable members opposite plainly support this complete attack on the basis of democracy and members of their party elsewhere are doing the same kind of thing.

When the Federal Constitution came to be considered, the Federal Convention set up a drafting committee, which brought to the 1891 Convention a draft Bill for the Australian Constitution. That draft Bill provided for a House of Representatives and the clause was clearly based upon the same clause in the United States Constitution which gave rise to the United States Supreme Court's decision in *Wesberry v. Sanders*: That is, that the House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen over three years by the people of the respective States according to their respective numbers. Mr. Richard Baker drew attention to the fact that this was taken directly from the American Constitution. A debate ensued immediately on the question of whether they should not make certain in the Federal Constitution that there would be one man one vote and one vote one value at that time. In fact, the amendments moved to ensure that were not passed because most members thought that they were unnecessary, but numbers of members of the Legislature of South Australia who were members of that Convention spoke feelingly on the subject of one vote one value and the necessity to maintain it. Dr. Cockburn, a member of the Legislature of South Australia, was one of those members. The report states:

Dr. COCKBURN: I imagine that "the people of the several States" means without any restriction as to class interests.

Mr. MUNRO: Or as to sex!

Dr. COCKBURN: I do not think it is well to raise the question of sex at present; but I do think that, although the question of woman suffrage has not got far enough to be seriously debated in this Convention, the question of manhood suffrage has got far enough, and should, as a vital principle, be embodied in this Constitution: otherwise we might have a diversity, one roll obtaining in one State and another in another State. In one State the will of the people might be supreme, and in another you might have a property qualification. I think that is already recognized as one of the canons of the Constitution, and need not be argued; and therefore I have moved that the principle of manhood suffrage, and also the principle of one man one vote, be embodied in the Constitution.

This is the so-called principle which, according to the Treasurer, exists nowhere in anyone's mind or in the history of any Constitution whatever. The Treasurer's own grandfather on this occasion supported the proposition.

Mr. LAWN: That is about the only good thing he ever did, too!

Mr. DUNSTAN: A most moving address was given by Sir George Grey, a former Governor of this State and of New Zealand, who was representing New Zealand at the Australasian Convention. He said:

This is the most important question probably that we have to consider in this Bill. I think there can be no doubt whatever that a clear case can be made out for the absolute necessity of giving only one vote to each man, and giving every man a right to vote on the question of returning representatives to the central Parliament. If honourable gentlemen will reflect over the circumstances of the case, they will find that the original idea I believe in every one of these colonies was that there should only be one vote possessed by each man. That was the original conception. That undoubtedly was the conception in New Zealand. But it was soon found that the words used might possibly be so extended that a man could get a vote for each district. The first steps made in that direction were not contested, and people began by obtaining a qualification for a second district, and then a third district, and so it spread until what was really a great abuse came into existence. The colonies are all differently circumstanced. We had a hardy set of people to deal with in South Australia, who knew precisely what their rights were, and who were determined to get them; and they succeeded in obtaining, I believe, a more liberal Constitution than is possessed by any other part of Australasia.

He was referring to the original Constitution, and he gave much praise in the convention for the fact that South Australia was founded on a Constitution giving one man one vote and one vote one value. He went on to say the minority ruled the majority under plural voting. He said:

While most of the voters of the country have but one vote, the favoured few have many votes, one in each district, and they exercise a corresponding influence in Parliament, and that Parliament so elected virtually chooses the Upper House. The Upper House is not fairly chosen in this colony—

he was speaking about the place where the convention was held—

nor is it, to my mind, fairly chosen in Victoria. Therefore, it is proposed absolutely to cut off all freedom from us, and we are told it is to preserve the privileges of the States. What is the privilege? The privilege—

that is, the privilege of unequal voting—

is that the minority should oppress the majority if they please. That is what is comes to, and that is the onus from which we ought to relieve them.

That was the basis upon which the Commonwealth Constitution was founded. What do we find today? At the very time when the United States Supreme Court has made its historic decision reaffirming the cherished principles of democracy in that country, members opposite are trying to make a Constitution in South Australia under which a Government can be elected by no more than 30 per cent of the voters, and the rest can be ignored.

Mr. Lawn: They are not trying. They have done it.

Mr. DUNSTAN: They have not quite got to election by 30 per cent. That was their proposal which happily, owing to the numbers in this House, we defeated last February. However, it does not stop here. Members opposite have colleagues in the Commonwealth Parliament. The Prime Minister has now evinced a desire to do something of the same kind in the Commonwealth sphere. He has announced that he will amend the Electoral Act by requiring the redistribution commissioners in exercising their discretion to vary the normal electoral quota up or down to allow for variations between compact metropolitan seats and very much larger rural seats. In other words, the commissioners will be required not to try to get to the quota but to try to depart from it. They are to reverse the process in which they have engaged on every previous electoral redistribution; a weighted vote is to be given to country areas. What did the members of the Constitutional Review Committee have to say about this? They pointed out this matter very adequately in their report to the Commonwealth Parliament and this was signed by six members of the Government Party including Mr. Alick Downer whose father, in the Constitutional Convention, had pointed out the necessity for one man one vote and one vote one value.

Mr. Lawn: Did he support it?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes. Mr. Alick Downer was one of the signatories to the Constitutional Review Committee which pointed out that instead of maintaining in the Electoral Act a departure of one-fifth from the quota it should be reduced to a departure of only one-tenth from the quota because otherwise districts might be subjected to unscrupulous political manipulation. The unscrupulous political manipulation which those members accurately foresaw is now due to take place in the Commonwealth Parliament. The Prime Minister has announced his intention of gerrymandering the Commonwealth Parliament. He might not be able to do this because he might well be faced with a similar action before the High Court of Australia as the one taken in *Wesberry v. Sanders* in the U.S.A., but in any case he is going to try.

What of the situation in Victoria? That is a State to which the Treasurer does not refer when he speaks of the principle of one vote one value not existing in any part of the world. In Victoria, the Liberal Premier, Mr. Hollway, with the support of the Labor Party, introduced the policy of one vote one value to that State. He proposed two State districts for every Commonwealth district, to be realigned after every Commonwealth redistribution. As honourable members will see if they examine the Commonwealth Constitution it is quite clear, as I have already pointed out, that the House of Representatives districts are to be allotted on the basis of equality of population. Therefore, there was one vote one value in Victoria. Of course, Mr. Hollway was kicked out of the Liberal Party for this because the Liberals do not believe in democracy. Now that Mr. Bolte has managed to get an absolute majority in each House, he proposes to wreak on the people of Victoria the kind of thing that could happen to the people of South Australia if this Government manages to get in for another three years.

The South Australian Government is having some brake put on its depredations on the people by the fact that there is to be an election next March, but Mr. Bolte feels that he has his head at the moment because not only has he not got an election for three years, but he is going to realign the districts of the State Legislature of Victoria to provide a gerrymander there which will protect him from the people's wrath that he should properly be incurring for the measures he has just brought in. He will set out to stop the people of Victoria having the Government they want and having the right to reject the Government they don't want. I believe that every member here

has a duty of conscience to his electors, and if any member continues to deny those principles, which have been set forth so fully and adequately by the United States Supreme Court in the historic decisions which I have quoted for the Committee, then that member will be remembered with shame and execration by the people of this State, and justly so.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

MINES AND WORKS INSPECTION ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.53 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 16, at 2 p.m.