

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, September 22, 1964.

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

QUESTIONS.**PRICE CONTROL.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: A press report last Friday, as a result of certain matters that had been before the Prices Department relating to the control of soft drinks, stated:

Mr. Millhouse said, "The Prices Department did not give the soft drink companies the opportunity of putting their side of the case." Can the Premier say whether that is an accurate statement?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Prices Commissioner investigated various companies. The companies must have known that he was making that investigation and that the information he would receive would be supplied from them. I believe that Mr. Murphy followed the rule that he usually does in this matter and that he discussed with the companies the questions under discussion. Whether he discussed with the companies the specific question of bringing them under price control, I would not know, but I will find out and let the honourable Leader know soon. It may be that Mr. Murphy did not discuss that question, but he did discuss with them the cool drink prices, as he could not have obtained this information except from information given by them.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Did he report his findings to Cabinet?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: He reports to Cabinet as far as his Act will enable him to report. If honourable members look at the original Act, which has not been examined for some years by the House, they will realize that it continues the legislation provided by the Commonwealth Government early in the Second World War. Oaths of secrecy had to be taken by Mr. Murphy, and he would not be permitted to disclose to me some information. He discloses to me general information that enables me to know what the position is, and that general information has to be conveyed to Cabinet before a decision to recontrol prices can be made. Recontrol can be made only through Executive Council and therefore involves a Cabinet decision. I was able to satisfy Cabinet that sufficient information had been made available to me to make that recommendation, but whether Mr. Murphy specifically discussed the question of

recontrol with the firms I do not know. However, I want to make the position clear (and I have said this publicly before): the Government resents increases in prices which are blamed on any increases in margins made pursuant to arbitration awards and which are not justified. I repeat that I have said this publicly, namely, that if any firm took advantage of increased wages and unjustifiably increased prices, the Government would order a reduction or, if necessary, would recontrol the commodity, because such a practice is purely and simply an imposition on the public. If the firms claim that the increase in the price of a commodity is designed to give them a satisfactory profit, that is another matter. If it is claimed to be necessary to reimburse a firm as soon as a marginal increase is awarded, the Government will take sufficient action to see that any increases that are granted are fully justified.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What benefits are primary producers receiving which would not be possible without an extension of the Prices Act, 1948-1963?

2. What current trading conditions are so complex and so involved that many consumers find it difficult to make ends meet without assistance and guidance from the Prices Department?

3. What is the nature of the assistance and guidance given?

4. How many times has such assistance and guidance been given in the last 12 months?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The replies are:

1. Many commodities important to primary production are controlled or kept under review in the interest of maintaining fair prices.

2. Many commodities are now under control of trade associations which arrange, supply and fix prices.

3. Where necessary the Prices Commissioner fixes prices and orders reductions.

4. In some instances at the request of certain primary producers' organizations a review is made and a fair price recommended.

The supply of this information would require much research and the staff of the department is not adequate to compile these statistics at present.

MURRAY BRIDGE INDUSTRY.

Mr. BYWATERS: Persistent rumour has it that it is intended to establish an industry at Murray Bridge soon. The Premier is probably aware that some time ago a gentleman from Canberra expressed the belief that Murray Bridge could eventually have a population of

250,000. Is the Premier aware of any intention for an industry to be established at Murray Bridge and, if so, could he supply me with information on this matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not able to make any public statement regarding such an industry establishing at Murray Bridge. However, one industry already functioning at Murray Bridge carries on a fairly important engineering business and I have heard that a certain company was inclined to be interested in this activity with a view to expanding it. That was unofficial, however, and I cannot give it to the honourable member as anything definite. This information was reported to me by one of my officers, and I pass it on as the full extent of my knowledge in this matter. My comment at the time was that the officer could report that the Government would do everything it possibly could do to sponsor any such activity. I have heard that there was a possibility of an expansion of an existing industry; I hope that that is correct, and the honourable member has my assurance that I will do everything possible to further this expansion.

EGG MARKETING.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The Minister of Agriculture has stated in this House that he will not support the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities plan unless it is approved by a poll of egg producers. Can he say when such a poll will be held?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This matter is being considered at present. I wrote to the President of C.E.M.A. suggesting certain amendments to the scheme, and a letter I received a few days ago rejected those amendments. I am now considering the position in the light of that rejection. I suggested that the scheme would be more workable if C.E.M.A. was prepared to omit from the obligation to pay levies the owners of fewer than 100 birds, but this was rejected. I also asked whether, in putting the poll, it would be possible for a statement to be made regarding the size of the levy to be proclaimed in the first year, and to forecast at least what the levy might be in subsequent years, because apparently the levy is to be set annually. I received no answer to that inquiry, and, in fact, it was two months before I received a reply to my letter. Therefore, in the circumstances, I am now giving the matter rather urgent consideration. I cannot take the question further than that today.

MINERAL RESEARCH.

Mr. HUTCHENS: It was reported in the press late last year that the Government had taken steps to reserve the Sir Joseph Banks islands for mineral investigation. This was done following a find by schoolboys, I think from Scotch College. Can the Premier, representing the Minister of Mines, say whether investigations have disclosed minerals of any value in this group of islands?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As far as I know, the answer is "No". The discovery was of very great interest and could not be ruled out as being of no important economic value. The Mines Department made some investigations in these islands, but I believe that it has not discovered tonnages sufficient to warrant development. I will obtain a full report from the Director of Mines for the honourable member by about Thursday this week, if possible.

FREIGHT TRAINS.

Mr. HARDING: From time to time many suggestions and recommendations have been made about attempts to avoid collisions with freight trains at level crossings. Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, information on this matter?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague informs me that after careful consideration of the honourable member's suggestion, it has been concluded by the Railways Commissioner that it would not be practicable to have flashing lights attached to freight trains and operated by the engine driver.

OLARY ELECTRICITY SUPPLY.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, a reply to my recent question with regard to the power supply for railway cottages at Olary?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague states:

(1) As the Highways and Local Government camp is a temporary structure, it would not be advisable to arrange for an electricity supply from that source for domestic purposes. In any event, it will be necessary to negotiate for the supply of power at a rate which will enable domestic tariffs to conform with those at other stations on the Cockburn line.

(2) It would not be possible to supply power to Olary from the Agriculture Department's plant at Cockburn. If that department's plant were installed at Olary an expenditure greater than £3,000 would be necessary and the estimated annual loss would be approximately £150 for the electric energy sold. In view of this, the Railways Commissioner could not agree to such action.

BERRI FERRY.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, a report on the progress of the duplication of the ferry service at Berri, and can he say when it will be ready for operation?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will ask for a report.

GORGE ROAD.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my recent question concerning the opening of the Gorge Road?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague informs me that it is not practicable at present to set a definite date for the re-opening of the Gorge Road as this depends on the completion of the deviation by the contractor. Present indications are that the road will be opened at about the end of January.

WHYALLA LAND.

Mr. LOVEDAY: With respect to the new industrial area at Whyalla on the old aerodrome site, one lessee desires to extend his operations but is concerned at what he considers to be the high rents charged for those blocks. Has the Minister of Lands considered my questions concerning those blocks and has a decision been arrived at?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I discussed this matter with the Director of Lands today, but the question is not easy to answer. The reduction of a fixed rental value on land like this is being considered but, as yet, no decision has been arrived at.

STUDENT TEACHERS' ALLOWANCES.

Mr. CLARK: On September 17, the honourable member for Albert asked a question of the Minister of Education and referred to an article that had appeared in the *Australian* on the previous day. This article, as I said by way of interjection to the Minister, and as he agreed, was mainly a re-hash of an article that had appeared a few days before in the *South Australian Teachers Journal*, together with a few things I had said during the Budget debate. The *Australian* did not mention the journal or my remarks. The article was written in a rather semi-facetious manner. From the Minister's reply, I gather that further consideration of increased student teachers' allowances will be held in abeyance until the report of the special Commonwealth Committee on Tertiary Education is received and considered.

As this is an important matter, has the Minister any further information about when this report will be received?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: No. I very much regret that I cannot say. I have been anxiously awaiting this report for a long time. It has been promised many times, but for some mysterious reason that I cannot understand, it has been delayed interminably. The lack of receipt of this report is delaying many decisions on a variety of matters. I do not know how I can obtain any information, but as soon as I receive it, whether it is advance information or not, I shall be pleased to inform the honourable member. Dealing with the report in the *Australian*, what the honourable member said is correct. It gave this matter wide publicity throughout Australia in a rather facetious manner and not in the best of taste, but it did not see fit to publish any portion of my reply.

RENTAL HOUSES.

Mr. RICHES: It has been reported to me that at Whyalla the rental charged for Housing Trust rental houses is £3 12s. 6d. a week, whereas at Port Augusta it is £4 5s. a week. I believe that a different rate is charged at Port Pirie and in the metropolitan area. Will the Premier obtain a statement from the Housing Trust about rents charged for houses in the metropolitan area, Port Pirie, Whyalla and Port Augusta?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not sure whether the rental charges as stated by the honourable member are for the same type of house. As far as I know (and I stand to be corrected if I am wrong), the Housing Trust is not building double-unit houses at Port Augusta, whereas at Whyalla (again, the member for Whyalla can correct me if I am wrong) many rental houses being built are double-unit houses. That probably explains an apparent anomaly. I will have the matter investigated and obtain a report of the reasons for the differences. I believe that if houses are built with a common wall, as in a double-unit house, substantial savings in cost are made, and probably that is the reason for the difference in rentals.

Mr. LOVEDAY (on notice):

1. How many applications are outstanding for Housing Trust rental houses in Whyalla apart from those for allocation to migrants immediately upon arrival in Whyalla from overseas?

2. What is the present waiting period for such applications?

3. What proportion, if any, of rental houses becoming available in Whyalla is made available to and reserved for applicants other than migrants arriving from overseas?

4. What are the precise terms of the priority arrangements between the Housing Trust and the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited in respect of Housing Trust rental houses made available for these migrants?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Chairman, South Australian Housing Trust, reports:

1. 137.

2. (a) Little delay for specialists associated with Whyalla's expansion programme and for those employed in the building industry who are necessary for carrying out the trust's programme at Whyalla.

(b) At present there is a delay of from 6 to 9 months for non-specialist applicants. However, with the acceleration of the building rate the trust expects that, within the next three to four months the waiting time will reduce to something like three to six months from date of application.

3. Figures over the last six months are—
Overseas migrants 131
Others 127

As the building rate increases, the number of overseas migrants housed is not expected to increase to any great extent but the number of other applicants housed will increase appreciably.

4. The trust provides rental housing at Whyalla for specialists recruited from overseas by the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited up to an average of 25 families a month.

Since this answer was prepared, certain circumstances that have arisen regarding the supply of material in the northern part of the State could bear on those answers. I have not had time to ascertain whether corrections are necessary to the answers that I have given, but I shall do so. The honourable member will understand that these answers, supplied yesterday, are subject to any new circumstances that may arise.

WALLAROO WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: A letter received by my colleague, the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes), from the Corporation of the Town of Wallaroo, dated September 17, states:

As directed by the council I wish to draw your attention to the badly discoloured water distributed through the mains of the town. Complaints are being heard all around that it is almost too dirty to take a bath, and mains and hot water services are also being affected.

Will the Minister of Works obtain a report on this matter to see whether an improved and clear supply of water can be supplied to this district?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

KAPUNDA HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Last week I asked the Minister of Works when the plumbing work in the new science block at the Kapunda High School would be completed. Apart from the plumbing, the science block is complete and the Kapunda High School Council is anxious to use the facilities. Has the Minister received a reply on this matter?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, the Director of Public Buildings reports as follows:

Departmental tradesmen will commence plumbing installations in the new science block and craft centre at the end of this month. It could not be possible to arrange for a contractor to carry out the work at an earlier date.

MOUNT GAMBIER RAIL SERVICE.

Mr. BURDON: During the last 12 months I have often suggested the provision of an improved night rail service between Adelaide and Mount Gambier. The service particularly required is at least one air-conditioned carriage for passengers who require "sitting-up" accommodation. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Railways ascertain what plans the Railways Department has for improving this service?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

AERIAL SPRAYING.

Mr. RICHES: My question concerns the outbreak of fruit fly in Port Augusta about 12 months ago. Many growers in the area believe that to prevent is better than to cure. To that end they would like the Agriculture Department to consider aerial spraying over the comparatively small area at the appropriate time to prevent fruit fly. They believe that this might effect a saving in eradication measures that automatically follow an outbreak and that it would afford other advantages to the city as well. Will the Minister of Agriculture call for a report from his officers on the desirability and practicability of aerial spraying as a preventive measure?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes.

POTATO MARKETING.

Mr. SHANNON: Last week I directed a question to the Premier in the unavoidable absence of the Minister of Agriculture. I

now direct to the Minister of Agriculture the question relating to the failure of the Potato Board to grant a merchant's licence to the potato co-operative, which represents at least 230 growers. What reasons actuate the board when it denies these growers the right to market their product?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will take up the question with the Chairman of the Potato Board as soon as possible.

LAND VALUATION.

Mr. LAWN (on notice): What factors are taken into consideration by the Land Board in assessing values of properties compulsorily acquired?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: In making a valuation when requested, in connection with the compulsory acquisition of land, the Land Board takes into account the market value of the land and other factors as laid down in the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act, 1925-1959.

ARTERIOSCLEROSIS.

Mr. LAWN (on notice):

1. Will the Minister ascertain from the Commonwealth Minister of Health whether or not he is having investigated the West German method of treating arteriosclerosis patients by oxygen therapy?

2. Will the Minister ask that a copy of the report be made available to him when it is completed?

3. Will the report be made available to members if and when he receives same?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This matter has been taken up with the Commonwealth Minister of Health, and I will inform the honourable member when a reply is received.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PRICES.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. LAUCKE: It concerns an article that appeared in the *Sunday Mail* last weekend, and I wish to put the record straight. At no time have I questioned the fairness of Mr. Murphy in his recommendations as Prices Commissioner. In fact I mentioned that fact when asked to comment on the Commissioner's statement concerning Mr. Millhouse. What I said in reference to the statement was as follows:

It is unusual, but I must say that I have found Mr. Murphy a most conscientious, hard-working and competent officer. He has always

in my experience, brought a high degree of balance and fairness to his approaches and determinations.

I very much regret that Mr. Murphy thought that I questioned his integrity and fairness in any way.

PARLIAMENTARY BUSINESS.

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

That for the remainder of the session, Government business take precedence over all other business except questions.

I have had a request from the Leader of the Opposition for another day for private members' business. The whole of tomorrow afternoon will be devoted to such business, and Government business will be adjourned, if necessary.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the final report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Elizabeth West, Salisbury East and Christies Beach High Schools.

Ordered that report be printed.

THE BUDGET.

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

(Continued from September 17. Page 918.)

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 Supply.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): This is the first opportunity I have had since this House met last Thursday to raise in the place where it should be raised and discussed the comments that appeared in the various newspapers published since last Thursday about me and about other members of this Chamber and another place by Mr. E. A. Murphy (South Australian Prices Commissioner). I wish to discuss these comments briefly and to reply to them. Sir, there appeared first of all in the *Advertiser* of last Saturday comments by Mr. Murphy on a statement which I had made and which appeared in the *News* of the previous day; and if one examines (as I assure you, Mr. Speaker, I have examined) the comments made by Mr. Murphy on Saturday one finds that he makes three points against me personally. First of all he said:

Mr. Millhouse does not know the facts and he is talking a lot of rubbish.

In other words, he says I do not know the facts—that my information is wrong.

Mr. Casey: Isn't that what the Premier told you on Thursday?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think so. I did not discuss the matter with the Premier on Thursday at all.

Mr. Casey: You asked a question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I did not ask a question on Thursday about this subject; the Premier was not here then, so the member for Frome is himself mistaken on this occasion, I am afraid. The second point Mr. Murphy makes is that if he were to publish the figures (which, incidentally, I had seen before I spoke) I would run for cover. I presume that that is an allegation of cowardice against me.

Mr. Clark: Whose figures did you see?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I saw the Prices Commissioner's figures. Thirdly, Mr. Murphy said of me (and this is a particularly damaging remark to make of a member of the Liberal and Country League, as this Party presumes to represent all sections of the community):

Obviously, from his statements he represents sectional interests, whereas the Prices Department stands for a fair deal for all sections of the community.

Those are the three points that arise out of the first comment of Mr. Murphy on my statement. There was a report in the *News* of yesterday which is repeated, I think verbatim, in this morning's *Advertiser*, in which the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) and Mr. Potter, a member in another place, are included, apparently for having dared to make a comment on the first statement made by Mr. Murphy. This second statement of his, if I may say this with very great deliberation, shows a degree of personal emotional involvement that I find very perturbing. One wonders how a man who can express himself in public in the terms that Mr. Murphy has used will be able to exercise a cool and detached judgment on this or on any other matter.

These comments which have been made by Mr. Murphy on me raise two points to which I desire to speak briefly. The first point concerns the facts upon which I based my comment, and the second is the question of principle which I believe is involved in what has happened in the last few days. Before dealing with the facts as I know them, I point out that I did not in my statement (nor have I done so at any time since last Thursday) criticize the precise prices fixed, nor do I intend now to argue the rights or wrongs of either side. There will be an opportunity to

do that when the debate on the Prices Bill (which, incidentally, is before this Chamber now) is resumed, probably late this week or next week.

What are the facts? The facts are that I knew, as I think every honourable member on this side of the House knew, on Wednesday that price control was to be re-imposed on this and on one other line—pies and pasties, I think. I did nothing, of course, because that information was given to me in confidence. I received a telephone call between 2 p.m. and 3 p.m. when the House was sitting last Thursday and I was requested to introduce a deputation to the Prices Minister.

Mr. Clark: Why were you selected?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know, Mr. Speaker, but I can guess; and I cannot see that my selection reflects either one way or the other on me. During that telephone conversation I explained that the Premier was about to go on Government business to Western Australia, and I therefore arranged for the deputation to see the Minister of Works, who was willing and ready to see the deputation. I introduced that deputation to the Minister at four o'clock and, as a result of the deputation, the Minister arranged for the Prices Commissioner to see representatives of the soft drinks manufacturers on Friday morning, I believe. The report of my comments in the *News* on Friday was accurate, and if members study that report they will find that I did not in any part of that report mention Mr. Murphy by name, nor did I do other than put the responsibility where it rightly lies, namely, on the Government. This is how the report starts:

Government backbencher and solicitor—

That, of course, since my sacking (to use the member for Adelaide's picturesque description) is not quite accurate—

Mr. R. R. Millhouse, M.P., today accused the Government of taking an unjustified and unreasonable action on price control.

I should like to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, and to other members of this Chamber that I have never, so far as I am aware, mentioned Mr. Murphy by name in any speech I have made in this Chamber or outside on the question of price control. I have referred, of course, to the Prices Commissioner, which is the official office held by Mr. Murphy, but I have never referred to him by name—certainly not wittingly.

Mr. Shannon: That is a distinction without a difference.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Further, I have never (and perhaps the member for Onkaparinga will tell me if this is a distinction without a difference) so far as I know reflected on his personal administration of the Prices Department. If any member can show me where I have ever done that I shall be happy to retract what I have just said. I invite the member for Onkaparinga, as he has interjected, to do so. I have never reflected on Mr. Murphy personally, so far as I am aware. The responsibility for this move, as the responsibility for price control itself, rests fairly and squarely on the front bench in this place and in another, that is, upon the Government, and not upon Mr. Murphy personally. In that report I refer to the Government, I refer to the Prices Commissioner, and I refer to the Prices Department; I do not, I believe, in any way reflect personally upon Mr. Murphy. What I said in that report was based on what I have already told this Chamber and on a copy of the letter which was given to the Minister on Thursday afternoon (and a copy of which was given to me). I wish to quote two very brief paragraphs from the letter, and the first states:

On behalf of the South Australian Soft Drinks Manufacturers Association I was this morning (this letter is dated September 17) informed that price control of the soft drink industry will be re-introduced by Executive Council Order as from tomorrow, Friday, September 18.

That, surely, is sufficient to show that until Thursday morning those people did not know. This letter, incidentally, was signed by Mr. Colin Hall, President of the Soft Drinks Manufacturers Association.

Mr. Ryan: In what capacity was it written to you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was written to the Minister in charge of prices, and I have the permission of the author of the letter to quote it now. The other paragraph to which I referred, at the bottom of page 1, states:

It is emphatically believed by the members of my association that, at the very least, courtesy should have been shown to our association in discussing the question of price re-control with at least me or my members. I would remind the Minister that due notice was given the Prices Branch by our association of our intention to increase prices, and it is felt that the same courtesy should have been afforded to us.

Mr. Ryan: Is there any such thing as courtesy in putting prices up?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the honourable member listens to me he may be better informed and a little wiser. The background of this

is that the prices were raised at the beginning of August but I am told definitely that on or about July 23 the Prices Commissioner was informed that the rise was to take place and that no action occurred between those two dates at all. Since that rise I am informed (and I believe this to be accurate) that the only communication the soft drinks manufacturers had from the Prices Commissioner was a telephoned request for certain figures dealing with the sales of various sizes of their products in bottles. They were also asked for copies of their profit and loss accounts and their balance sheets for the last three years. That was the only communication, on my information, between the Prices Commissioner and his officers and the soft drinks manufacturers between the rise in prices at the beginning of August and the recommendation of price control last Thursday. That has not been denied by Mr. Murphy in his comments; the Premier said this and did not suggest anything else to the House this afternoon.

Mr. Riches: They have had plenty of time to consider a voluntary reduction.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: They have, but they were not asked to make one.

Mr. Riches: Do they have to be asked? Can't they be trusted to make reduction on their own?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: They believe that they were justified in raising prices at the beginning of August and surely even the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches), who I know is wedded to price control, would agree that fairness should be shown on both sides in a matter like this. I do not believe that he would think anything else.

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: Isn't that an allegation of unfairness against the Prices Commissioner?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is an allegation against the Minister, among others.

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: The honourable member just uttered an allegation against Mr. Murphy.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If that is so, I take it off Mr. Murphy's shoulders and put it on Cabinet because it is to the Premier that he is responsible.

Mr. Clark: You don't mention any specific Minister by name.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I picked out the Minister of Education because he interjected.

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: I accept the responsibility and I am prepared to contest it with the honourable member at any time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That suits me fine, and there will be an opportunity to do so in about 10 days' time when there is a debate on this matter. I do not want to debate the particulars of this case now, but I am prepared to deal with them later.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order in anticipating a debate in this Chamber.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I was pricked into it by the interjection of the Minister of Education. The reference to the facts that I have given the House this afternoon brought forth the comments to which I referred and it is not giving away anything to say that the comments made by Mr. Murphy against me did upset me. I would be less than human, I think, if I did not admit that, and no doubt that is precisely what Mr. Murphy meant to do because he said in his comments yesterday that anybody who criticized him could expect trouble with a capital T.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: There is an emotional involvement, then, on both sides.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My word there is. I have no hesitation in admitting it, and the Minister is aware of that in any case. Therefore, to that extent Mr. Murphy has succeeded in the comments he made about me. I realize that few, if any, members of this House agree with my views on price control but I have stated them time and again and I make three points on this.

First, I believe that the views I expressed on this subject in the House reflect those of the members of the Party to which I belong in the district I represent. I also believe they reflect the views of the electors in my district. Secondly, I am sure (and I do not think any member on this side of the House would deny this) that the views that I expressed on this subject are shared by a big fraction (and I use the term advisedly) of the total membership of the Liberal and Country League. Thirdly, I remind all honourable members, including those heckling me now, that in a democracy every minority is entitled to be heard and have somebody to speak for it. Those are the two things that I did on this occasion and I do not regret having said what I said. I will not be deterred from saying what I think on this subject or any other, or from doing what I believe to be my duty by comments made either inside or outside the House. That is all I wish to say.

Mr. Fred Walsh: You have said enough.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I believe that I have, but it would not matter if I were absolutely

wrong in what I have said or in speaking at all. In this matter a question of principle is involved. It would not matter if the soft drinks manufacturers had spent a week in Mr. Murphy's office going through every conceivable facet of this problem. A grave principle is involved in this. A personal attack was made in the press upon me as a member of Parliament. That is not unprecedented, but it is almost unprecedented. I suggest that what is unprecedented is that the attack should be made and renewed in such strong language and with such obvious bitterness.

Mr. Clark: Do you think Mr. Murphy would have answered you at all had you made this statement on the floor of the House?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know, but I do not believe it makes any difference to this question whether I said it on the floor of the House or outside the House. It is the role of the responsible Minister to answer criticism that is made of any Government department in the House and I do not believe that it is the role of a subordinate—a public servant—to make that answer in the press. That is the Minister's job and there is ample authority for that principle. I may say, by way of interpolation, that the present Minister in charge of prices, the Premier of this State, could far more effectively tear strips off me on this matter than could Mr. Murphy. I have not been a member in this Parliament and served under my Leader for nine years not to know that. Therefore, not only was it not as effective as it could have been but I believe that it was not proper for Mr. Murphy, as the Prices Commissioner, to have made the comments that he made. If we are going to proceed on any other principle than that it is the job of the responsible Minister to make these comments, then, of course, chaos will result. I believe that the sooner we get back and re-affirm that principle the better it will be. Having raised the question of principle, I conclude by asking three questions. I do not mind who answers them, but I think we are entitled to an answer to them. I should like to know first whether the Government instructed Mr. Murphy to say what he said, or whether it authorized what he said, and if not, whether the Government approved of what he said about the member for Barossa, Mr. Potter and me and of the terms in which it was couched; secondly, whether the Government intends to see that Government officers observe the time-honoured principle that Ministers and not public servants should make public statements on such matters as this; and thirdly, how, in view

of the statement that Mr. Murphy has already made on this matter, it intends to ensure that the soft drink manufacturers' case gets a fair hearing?

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I do not think it is desirable that only one on this side of the Chamber should speak on this matter. There are serious implications in the statements made by the member for Mitcham about this problem, and other members should take some part in the debate and express views about the propriety or otherwise of what has happened. I am one who has, in the past, supported the opposition of the member for Mitcham to price control. I do not need to be reminded of that because my memory is good and I remember having supported the abolition of price control. Like other members I have lived and learned. It is an unhappy state of affairs for the institution of Parliament that this controversy, should have arisen in the form in which it has. I, as no doubt do other members, recollect an occasion when an occurrence of this type occurred about the Police Department, a State department.

Mr. Ryan: I cannot see Mr. Millhouse rallying to that cause.

Mr. SHANNON: I recollect clearly that the Police Commissioner had to justify his department. That case had more important aspects than the present one because it applied to the liberty of the individual and not to a material matter. After all, what is being discussed now is a matter of profit and loss and whether the profit margin is too large or too small. The other matter had to do with the liberty of the subject, a much more important matter from every aspect. However, that incident passed without comment, as far as I can recollect, in this Chamber.

Mr. Ryan: You are right in this case, and that is the first time I can remember that you have been.

Mr. SHANNON: I shall be going when the honourable member is dead and buried.

Mr. Ryan: You won't last that long. You are half way there already.

Mr. SHANNON: I regret that the member for Mitcham has taken this method of justifying what was obviously a gauche remark he made about the Prices Department. It is a solecism (to put it politely) to say that he has never referred to the Prices Commissioner by name. We have no need to refer to people by name if they hold an office: their office is sufficient to describe the individual to whom we refer. I am surprised that the

member for Mitcham would stoop to suggesting that Mr. Murphy's name did not pass his lips. I regret to see this step taken by a man with a legal training. I do not think that the member for Mitcham will be proud that he dodges an issue by such a solecism that no man in his right senses would use.

Mr. Casey: That would not excuse him.

Mr. SHANNON: On the contrary, it convicts. It does not excuse: it convicts him out of his own mouth. He is not charging a civil servant, as Mr. Murphy made clear this morning. Mr. Murphy is doing a job for the Government. Why he has not received the rights of superannuation and other advantages is a matter upon which the Government can be attacked. I am not suggesting that the Opposition has nothing to talk about, but if it wanted to attack the Government on this matter it would have good grounds, because Mr. Murphy is justified in being given some status in the Public Service.

Mr. Ryan: He will get it next year.

Mr. SHANNON: He may not, but in Mr. Murphy's case I think it is justified. As members know (they twit me about it), I am in the position where I have axes to grind and have vested interests to look after. I make no bones about it, because I am the chairman of directors of a company that operates in a wide field, and many of the items with which it is concerned come under Mr. Murphy's review as Prices Commissioner. Mr. Murphy's department has wide control over the activities of the company I have the honour to represent, and I have never discovered in the whole of his investigations an occasion where I could say that the man was unfair, was unjust or did not listen to both sides of the case. I speak now in a narrow sense regarding the affairs of which I have a personal knowledge, in the company I represent. Outside of that, I have had occasion to take cases to the Minister controlling the Prices Department, the Premier. I refer to cases where it has appeared to me that an exorbitant charge has been made for a service rendered or a commodity supplied.

Mr. Jennings: We have all had to do that.

Mr. SHANNON: I have never yet discovered a case where the Prices Department has not given fair and just treatment to the case that I have referred to the Premier. In some cases no redress was forthcoming (and in some it was not justified), but in every case where redress was justified it was granted. In some cases the Prices Department has had nothing more than moral persuasion at its

disposal and certainly no legal power upon which to act, but its moral influence has been sufficient in nearly every case that I have experienced.

Mr. Ryan: I am pleased to hear you say that.

Mr. SHANNON: Other honourable members can tell us of their own experience if they like. This has worried me considerably because, after all, what the member for Mitcham said is quite true, namely, that a large percentage (and I think it would be less than half) support the liberal ways of life and are opposed to all controls. I must admit that I thought similarly years ago; I thought that as soon as we could get back to the old laws of supply and demand, all our troubles would be little ones. However, I have learned that justifications exist for what the Premier in his wisdom has continued in this State, which certain Governments in other States have not continued. Those Governments happen to be of a similar persuasion to members opposite.

Mr. Fred Walsh: They realize they missed the bus.

Mr. SHANNON: Well why do they not reinstate price control? They certainly have the chance to do so. The Premier has been charged with being the best Labor Premier that this State has ever seen. It is a common expression that has been applied to our Premier.

Mr. Ryan: Doesn't he lap that up!

Mr. SHANNON: I shall analyse this statement because it is interesting.

Mr. Ryan: It comes from the Liberal supporters.

Mr. SHANNON: No, it comes from everywhere. I have heard it from my good friend from Port Adelaide—

Mr. Ryan: You have never heard me say it.

Mr. SHANNON: I am not sure that I couldn't find the honourable member for Port Adelaide on record as having said it. I think the expression has been commonly accepted by the man in the street.

The SPEAKER: At this stage I draw the honourable member's attention to the clock.

Mr. SHANNON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I shall not be very long. The expression that "Tom Playford is the best Labor Premier South Australia has ever had" pin-points an outstanding feature of the Premier's character, for it shows him to be a fair man and one who can see both sides as well as understand how Acts of Parliament will affect the entire community. The Premier is charged with

being a "Labor Premier" because he can see the under-dog's side in every case.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Why don't you address your remarks to the member for Mitcham?

Mr. SHANNON: The Premier has retained price control, but if the Opposition were in power would it drop it like a hot cake?

Mr. Fred Walsh: No fear!

Mr. SHANNON: I know that the Opposition favours price control in this State. One thing that I persistently hear from the Labor Party is, "The Australian Labor Party has a policy and knows where it is. It is all of one mind. Our policy applies throughout the whole Commonwealth because we are an Australian Labor Party." Here, however, I find that one section of the great Australian Labor Party is not in step with other sections elsewhere.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): The member for Mitcham has raised this matter, as he has every right to do at this stage, and I believe that the questions that he raises should be discussed, as they are in the general interests of those administering Government departments, as well as of the smooth working of those departments. The administration of the departments is concerned on one side of the question and both the departments themselves and the House on the other. The matter arises out of some controversy that has been publicized in the press. Let me say at the outset that I was absent from the State when it arose but as soon as the member for Mitcham asked my colleague, the Deputy Leader of the Government at the time, to receive a deputation, that request was granted. It may have been granted somewhat unwillingly by my colleague because it was something about which he had little previous knowledge, but nevertheless he accepted the deputation and his report to me when I returned (and which was confirmed today) was that he listened to the deputation and arranged for the people concerned to have a discussion with the Prices Commissioner the following morning. My colleague thought the matter was put on the basis of its being thrashed out with the Commissioner to see whether he had made any conceivable mistake. That was where the Minister left it. Of course, Mr. Speaker, although the member for Mitcham states that he did not attack Mr. Murphy, if one looks at the report (I had not seen it until he gave it to me a few moments ago) one will see that a charge of unfairness is laid against the Prices Department. The Prices Department is mentioned,

not by the name of Mr. Murphy but by the name of "Prices Commissioner". Unfortunately, it can refer to only one person, as there is only one Prices Commissioner in the State.

The member for Mitcham is correct in his comments about the people who must take responsibility for this matter. In the first place, Parliament must take the responsibility for passing legislation that maintains price control, and to that extent my friends opposite have a mutual obligation, in the same way as the Government has, because they have supported it. Every year since the Commonwealth Government relinquished price control, Parliament has considered this matter specifically, and every year it has approved a continuation of the system. Therefore, the first responsibility regarding price control rests on every member of this Chamber. The second responsibility, Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly rests on me, for I am the Minister under the Act who has to make recommendations to Cabinet and who has to make Orders regarding prices.

I suggest not only to the member for Mitcham but to all honourable members that in the interests of good administration it is much better if any complaints are directed against the Minister who has to stand up in this place and answer and who can reply to any charge of unfairness that may be made, for in those circumstances one side is completely at liberty to make an attack and the other side has an equal opportunity to reply. I admit that the honourable member's charge was of a general nature, but nevertheless it was a charge against a department. The problem involved in such a charge is that the man in charge of the department immediately will rally to justify the action he has taken. I do not think any honourable member would suggest for one moment that a member of Parliament can attack a person outside who has acted in the exercise of a public duty and that that person should not have the right to reply. I know the member for Mitcham himself would not subscribe to that. It would be so easy for me to say that Mr. So-and-So is unfair (which is the word used in this case) and that he did not exercise his duties with scrupulous fairness as he did not give people an opportunity to present their case. It is so easy to say that if a person or a department that is accused cannot make some reply. We all stand for the interests of good administration, and I suggest that in those interests any attack that is to be made should be made not upon an officer but on the responsible

Minister. I assure honourable members that I have never run away and sheltered behind officers.

It is perfectly true that there has been for a long while a rule in the Government service that officers should not make public statements upon affairs of their department, and that they should not enter into any Government controversy. However, I ask honourable members: has that ever been held to stop a judge from making a decision and giving his reasons, or a magistrate from giving a judgment? Indeed, not infrequently a magistrate will comment on the law itself or (as has been referred to this afternoon) on an officer who has been carrying out the law.

Mr. Millhouse: That is his job.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No-one has suggested for one moment that in his duty as a magistrate he should not do that.

Mr. Millhouse: There is no comparison at all.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am pointing out to the honourable member that it is a comparison that he has missed in this case. If the honourable member will look at the basic law he will find that the Prices Commissioner is given the duty of making determinations, and surely he should therefore have the right to justify a determination that he may make. That is where I differ from the honourable member. Frequently the only public notification that the public has of a change in the price of an article is a statement issued by the Prices Commissioner. It is proper for him to make statements and he does so. I should think that every week a statement of some description comes from the Commissioner, for that is the method of informing the public what the determinations are. The Commissioner is making determinations and obviously he has to state them. In my opinion the Commissioner is not prevented (nor should he be prevented) from making a statement upon a matter on which he has to make a determination.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: That is an adjudication.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I thank my colleague for the word. I assure honourable members that I have the highest respect for Mr. Murphy. I have dealt with him as the Prices Commissioner for a long time, and I know his inherent fairness in looking at questions of increases in prices. On occasions Mr. Murphy has insisted on a price rise which I personally did not want to impose, but Mr. Murphy has said that it

was a fair increase, in accordance with the formula laid down, and therefore it should be made. In my experience Mr. Murphy has had to put up with much completely unjustified criticism. I receive insulting letters about prices and they are all passed on to him. I think it is fair occasionally that somebody should stand up in a public place and say that the Prices Commissioner has done a good job for South Australia in administering a difficult Act. I believe he has carried out those duties with scrupulous fairness. I suggest that if honourable members have any criticism of Government officers they make the criticism against the Minister in this Chamber, for I believe that in those circumstances we can see that a matter is properly discussed and rectified. It would be unfair for me to say to a Government officer, "You consider you have been attacked; you have to grin and bear it." I do not think any honourable member thinks that an officer who believes himself attacked should not be allowed the right to defend himself. Mr. Murphy did not ask me whether he had permission to reply and I have not heard from him since I returned from Western Australia. He made his reply of his own accord and if I were asked whether I would condemn an officer who believed himself attacked for making a reply to that attack, I would say that I would not. I believe that an officer has the right to defend himself if he believes that aspersions have been made on his character. That applies not only to this officer, but to all officers.

The Government will take the responsibility for the orders that are issued under the Prices Act. If any member wants these orders examined I have always been prepared to listen to an appeal against them and discuss the question. On occasions I have taken much trouble to completely assure myself that the prices order has been fair and proper. I do not know how long Mr. Murphy has been Prices Commissioner, but I have never had occasion to feel that he has been unfair in his approach to this problem either in protecting the public or in providing a fair return to the trader. I very much regret that this incident has occurred. However, the Government will take the responsibility for implementing the legislation that Parliament will no doubt pass in due course.

Motion carried.

In Committee of Supply.

THE LEGISLATURE.

Legislative Council, £15,452.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): In saying how sorry I am that so much time has been taken to reach this stage, I assure honourable members opposite that I do not care what they call me. I regret that my remarks will seem a somewhat unimportant anticlimax. When I asked that progress be reported last Thursday I had made a few remarks about decentralization in South Australia and pointed out that, by world standards, we had a small population and that we could not expect to have successful decentralization in every small town and village which many Opposition members would have us believe was possible. I pointed out that in South Australia there were remarkable examples of efficient decentralization because of a combination of natural resources and Government policy. I said that I believed that Murray Bridge had progressed and one Opposition member said that that was because of the excellent representation that the district had in Parliament. I agree with that: four members of another place have done a magnificent job in implementing Government policy in the District of Murray and, of course, the member of this place has implemented the policy enunciated by Government members in the attention he has given to the district.

Mr. Casey: You mean that the other place is a Party House?

Mr. HALL: I do not imply that it is a Party House, but the honourable member can draw his own conclusion in that regard. I believe that members of another place, with his political beliefs would have it a Party House if they had the numbers. I am disappointed that a certain line that the Treasurer said that he would endeavour to have included in the Budget has not been included. I can understand his reasons for not including it this year and I do not criticize him for this, but I draw attention to the need for a line to be provided for beaches and foreshore development in a future Budget.

South Australia has quickly growing areas near beach districts that need to be developed to make them useful. St. Kilda and Port Broughton are in my district. St. Kilda is close to the metropolitan area and Port Broughton is on the other extremity of the district of Gouger. The Salisbury and Port Broughton councils desire to develop these beaches by the provision of holiday facilities to serve local residents and all South Australians. In each case the council desires to enter into an agreement on a pound-for-pound basis with the

Government for improving the foreshores of the beaches; it does not desire that the Government grant the entire subsidy for beach improvements in these areas. Both councils want to pay 50 per cent of the cost. This illustrates the sincere desire of the local residents to improve their surroundings. At St. Kilda beach it is desired to provide access, by way of an embankment, to deeper water so that those who desire to launch boats for fishing, water skiing, and other recreational pastimes, may be able to do so at any time of the day. Present tidal conditions along the eastern shores of the St. Vincent Gulf prevent the launching of craft at certain times. The provision of this facility will cost many thousands of pounds. If this comes to fruition, the embankment will be built over a number of years and will serve people who enjoy boating and who reside not only in the hinterland of St. Kilda, but in the northern areas of the city.

At Port Broughton, a country centre, great advances have been made during the last 10 years in the tourist facilities to the advantage of the district. The number of holiday houses and shacks has grown enormously. The caravan park amenities have been greatly developed and the council now has a scheme to provide an embankment of about 1,300ft. to impound a body of salt water that would provide an artificial lake that would enable all sorts of water sports to be carried on at any time of the day. This is an admirable scheme and, at an estimated cost of about £20,000, would provide recreation facilities that would favourably compare with other schemes. However, both projects at St. Kilda and Port Broughton, if they are to be successful, need the participation of the Government through a subsidy scheme. I hope the Premier will arrange a line on the Estimates for foreshore improvements so that money can be equitably distributed to district councils throughout the State for the development of these recreation areas. Recently the Lands Department increased the rentals for shack sites on foreshore areas. In many cases, this charge is resented because the money is collected and not returned for local improvements. If the local council requires rates it must add it to the department's charges and, in some cases, the total charges are about £12. At present, a shack site is subject to two charges—one by the Lands Department for £6 and the other, for those under the control of the council, for £12. The member for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson) is interested in this because in his

area are many hundreds of shacks under the control of councils and the Lands Department. He has suggested that to have a uniform charge the Lands Department should refund half the £6 to the councils as payment for the administration of the sites. This would be a good investment for the department and would meet the councils' objections to the present scheme. If this were done, the total charge would be £6 with half going to the council and half to the Lands Department, and would be uniform throughout the State.

Mr. Ryan: What would happen if the person became the freehold owner?

Mr. HALL: If he were the owner he would not pay rental, but would pay the normal council rates and land tax. I am referring to shack sites held on annual licence. The other night, when travelling to my home, I was confronted by a sign on a tree which apparently had been recently erected by followers of political thought opposite, and which read, "Houses at half the cost is social credit."

Mr. Ryan: If you are blaming us for putting that up, you would blame us for anything.

Mr. HALL: During this debate members opposite have asserted that they are ardent supporters of a system of social credit. Their comments are in *Hansard*, and I believe that the member for Hindmarsh said that he was a supporter of a system of social credit, and I believe that either he or his colleagues said that the system of loan borrowing should be abolished and the system of social credit should be substituted. Am I correct?

Mr. Hutchens: No, you are wrong.

Mr. HALL: I am sure one speaker said that. I wonder whether he is responsible for the sign on the tree. I hope that this is not going to be the policy of Labor members and that they will not suggest this scheme, which is a promise to people that they will get cheaper if they support members opposite. I am not saying that cheaper housing finance is not possible, but if it is, it will be possible because it is subsidized by the rest of the community not by any mysterious social credit system that is supposed to create goods for nothing. I believe that cheaper housing is possible. However, I shall see whether the name of the member for Port Adelaide is on the sign. I am sure that members opposite spoke about social credit, and as the election is getting closer they may be going to publicize their views. I hope they do not fix them to the trees in my district. The Liberal Party has followed a policy of cheaper housing, the latest demonstration of this being the Commonwealth

Government's housing subsidy of £250 given to young people who save. Although members opposite may decry a system of loan borrowing, there is no other method of obtaining goods and services except by saving. There may be different means of distributing them. I support the Budget, and trust that when members opposite consider the Budget next year they will support it, as most of them have, from the other side of this place.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I am not entirely in favour of all the proposals in the Budget, and I oppose the increased charges for stamp duties. I am sure many people who can ill-afford to pay additional taxation will be unduly harmed by these levies. I understand that the supply of free milk to schools is by a Commonwealth Government subsidy arrangement, and that the milk is available to schools only if it is in bottles and has been pasteurized. Many schools in this State are unable to have a supply of pasteurized milk. I know that what I am about to suggest has already been mentioned on several occasions previously, but I believe that, where milk is not readily available in a proscribed form, citrus juices (of which there is an abundance at present) could be substituted. This would ensure that children would receive the necessary vitamins contained in those juices, and I hope that the Minister concerned will note this suggestion and refer it to his Commonwealth colleagues who are responsible for the subsidies that we at present receive for milk distribution.

The member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) referred to succession duties that are now payable on deceased estates, and he described how the Labor Party was in favour of granting an exemption to the inheritors of a living area. The definition of a living area, which can be seen in the regulations under the War Service Land Settlement scheme is to the effect that it shall be capable of producing a certain income. Another matter that has been raised on numerous occasions by members of this side is the need for a public accounts committee. Indeed, I believe that this need is more apparent now than ever before, following the Auditor-General's Report and the leading article in the *News* on Wednesday, September 16, part of which states:

While Mr. Jeffery's report reveals no really glaring breaches of proper accounting and no flagrant wastage of the people's money in any one particular department, it does show a tendency to disregard the need for a constant check on costs in every possible direction. In efficient private business organizations a tight hold has to be maintained on superfluous spend-

ing, sensible economies continually practised, and costs kept to a minimum. In the public sector, the responsibility to watch costs with care is even greater. Laxity cannot be excused because a Government department does not have to show a healthy profit. The fact remains that it has more shareholders than any other kind of business—the taxpayers of this State—to account to.

I refer now to the wine grape surplus. On August 12 I read to members a letter I received from the Upper Murray Grapegrowers Association, and on August 27 I received a reply in the House from the Premier to a question I asked concerning that letter. The submissions made in the original letter from the association were to the effect that sultanans were being processed at a cheaper cost than true wine grapes were, which was the cause of the present surplus—or the substantial over-stocking of wine and spirits. The Treasurer on August 12 said he had discussed the matter with the Prices Commissioner but that a problem existed about which he did not then wish to speak. He added that he would have the contents of the letter specifically examined and would inform me of the results. I shall quote now figures taken from a report prepared by Mr. N. D. Honan of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics for the 1964 Convention of the Australian Wine Grape-growers held at Berri on July 27 to 30, in reference to the Prices Commissioner's report to the Treasurer. In the five years 1959 to 1963 inclusive the tonnages of sultanans processed were: 1959, 21,815 tons; 1960, 20,643; 1961, 30,198; 1962, 43,088 (which was the biggest tonnage of any variety of grapes crushed in that particular year); and 1963, 13,441. This brings the total to 128,000-odd tons which I am sure had a considerable effect on the build-up of stocks over that period and which thereby worked to the detriment of the other true wine-grape varieties. A letter in the *Advertiser* on Saturday, September 12, prepared by a former member of this Chamber, Mr. William Macgillivray of Barmera dealt with the same subject that I have been dealing with and was along exactly the same lines. Also, in the paper prepared and delivered by Mr. Honan the matter of acreages and the matter of varieties, bearing and non-bearing, was mentioned. Mr. Honan said:

In the last 10 years the bearing area of vines for wine has been remarkably stable. It has varied only between 54,300 and 57,000 acres. In 1962-63 the area was 54,750 acres. South Australia is, of course, the largest producing State, where the area has varied between 38,800 and 42,300 acres. New South Wales and Victoria at present have about

6,700 acres and 4,800 acres respectively of bearing vines for wine. The non-bearing area, on the other hand, increased substantially in recent years, from 2,500 acres in 1957-58 to 7,300 acres in 1962-63.

That is an indication that the production of wine grapes in the next few years will be considerably increased. Those are some very pertinent figures in relation to the wine-grape situation at present, and they indicate what we can expect will happen soon.

During the course of the debate on the Loan Estimates I addressed a question to the Treasurer regarding the proposed new buildings for an adult education centre at Renmark, and I quoted from a report that appeared in the *Murray Pioneer* (which is published in Renmark and which circulates in the Upper Murray) on Thursday, July 2 of this year. That report states:

Approval has been given for the erection of a block of buildings for the Upper Murray Adult Education Centre at Renmark. To be constructed on a site on the corner of Murtho and Eighteenth Streets, the buildings will include an administration block, comprising a principal's office, vice-principal's and secretary's offices, and staff room. A second block will comprise dressmaking and needlework centres and art room with pottery annexe. The principal of the A.E.C. (Mr. N. P. Smith) said yesterday that there also was to be a block of three classrooms, complete with stage. It is expected that building operations will commence shortly. It has been hoped that the premises would have been completed before June 30, but the actual date of commencement is believed to depend on finalization of negotiations for the acquisition of the land.

I have raised with the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General, the question of the acquisition of this land, negotiations for which apparently have been going on now for a considerable number of years. Following that I directed another question to the Treasurer during the discussion on the Loan Estimates, and I have inquired of him for information several times since. Unfortunately, the Treasurer is still unable to tell me anything about what is proposed for this centre at Renmark. The people in the Upper Murray have been told, apparently officially, that the buildings are to be proceeded with, and the question that has crossed my mind on several occasions is whether the stalling that is taking place is not (in the words of some honourable members opposite) an attempt to play politics with this proposal. It has crossed my mind that perhaps the final announcement and some activity may occur early in the New Year. When I

was in contact with the Principal (Mr. Smith) last week he told me that he had checked up with the Education Department and found that the approval that had been given for these buildings was still current. The buildings are No. 29 on the priority list of wooden buildings that were due for completion on June 30 last.

Another matter I wish to raise concerns the urgent need for renewal of the Sturt Highway between Blanchetown and Kingston, which section carries a considerable amount of heavy traffic at present. This section of road has many potholes and patches, and it is really getting to a dangerous state. I trust that the Minister of Roads will be able to do something about that matter soon. Renmark Avenue is the portion of the Sturt Highway from the railway crossing into the town of Renmark, and that road is in urgent need of duplication. It is a very narrow road, bordered on one side by the railway line with a dangerous fence which consists of steel rails as posts and barbed wire for keeping the railway line clear. I could not think of a more dangerous fence to have situated some 6ft. from a busy highway: it is just a matter of a little skid to avoid something and a car could be sliced in halves by the steel rail posts. This matter has been raised in another place by the member for another district who resides in the area and therefore is one of my constituents. The replies he has received in the other place from the Minister indicate that something could be done, but no indication has been given of when it can be done. It was the original plan of the settlement that that avenue would be a dual road, and ample ground is available. I trust that before long something can be done about this matter.

Mr. Riches: Perhaps the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Roads could have a conference about it!

Mr. CURREN: It would be a most enlightening conference, I should think. Another matter that is exercising the minds of the Local Government Association in my district (and no doubt this also applies to such associations in other districts) is the question of the registration of power boats. I have recently arranged for a deputation to wait on the Minister of Marine on this matter. This afternoon, in company with the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters), I had a discussion on this matter with representatives of the municipal associations and of the S.A. Boat Owners Association. I hope that the deputation

will be broadened sufficiently when it is presented to the Minister to bring about a change in Government opinion on this matter.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): I oppose the first line. I wish to deal with a matter that is near to my heart—the building industry. I hope that it will become more stable in the next few years. Since the Second World War, Australia has had a stop-and-go policy; first it had labour at a premium, and then unemployment. This has been especially noticeable in the building industry, which plays such an important role in the country's development. During the war years tradesmen were not available in the numbers required because they were either in the Armed Forces or engaged on war-time projects. Before the war large firms, such as Hansen and Yuncken and Wilckens & Burnside, employed tradesmen of all types such as bricklayers, carpenters, labourers, riggers and so on. Since the war, however, builders and contractors have not been the same. The set-up is entirely different and this has not helped the building trade in the last 20 years. At the end of the war many semi-skilled people had learned about the trades in their war-time occupations. They came back and were absorbed into industry. As times were good, employment was easy to obtain. I believe in full employment and semi-skilled labour is not required as it was. For many years after the war, the demand for labour continued with these semi-skilled workers being up-graded but they lacked the real knowledge. Such matters as the reading of plans were never learnt, but as long as a skilled man was on the site, they had no worries. Once this type of worker was given authority later, he either resigned or the work became inferior. In most buildings, if the foundations are not correct, the erection becomes out of plumb and finishes like the leaning tower of Pisa. Now a new mode of contracting by builders has become apparent, with most trades being sublet. Builders were getting their percentage, but the workmanship fell away; it was down to a certain price. The Housing Trust must take some blame for this occurring. Small partnerships came into being, and carpenters, bricklayers, and plasterers were all cutting in on each other, and thus inferior and cheap jobs were carried out.

Then occurred the recession in which many of these small partnerships could not carry on. Since then, the building industry has once again reached a peak. With house building, where even now subletting continues to grow, real estate firms or their subsidiaries are

cutting the prices of tradesmen. Therefore the process is continuing with tradesmen gradually losing all their privileges. Big contracts have been let recently, but the demand is so great that big builders are finding it hard to obtain skilled labour and are perturbed about the position.

Mr. Ryan: They cut prices and the quality too.

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes. Members have complained that workmanship in many houses is not as good as it should be and the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) recently quoted a case of bad workmanship in a home in his area.

Mr. Ryan: Do lending institutions supervise building sufficiently?

Mr. LANGLEY: If lending institutions lend money for houses they should look into the matter as carefully as possible. Many of these real estate agents buy a certain area and are virtually the builders and sellers of the house; this is not good for the building trade. At present, the big builder is returning to the field but, because of the small firms that mushroomed at one stage, the big builders are finding it difficult to find skilled men and this may affect the carrying out of large projects in the future.

Mr. Ryan: If the big builder comes back will he go in for big building without control?

Mr. LANGLEY: I think big builders would like to return to that situation and this would benefit the building industry. However, with the subletting that has taken place over the years the big builders will have difficulties. Big firms used to employ about 100 carpenters but I doubt whether they could have that many now. The only way they could get them would be by subletting. In Australia, we are perturbed about the number of skilled tradesmen needed. In 1963-64, 122,321 migrants came to Australia. The Minister for Immigration (Mr. Opperman) announced in August that 1963-64 had been a boom year for migrants. He said that this applied both to numbers and skill, that Australia had received 20 per cent more settlers than in the previous year, and that the intake of skilled workers had been boosted by over 31 per cent. This will be a big boost to the country. The building trade is short of skilled tradesmen at present. The employment of these people coming into the country should result in great benefits. Apprentices are the tradesmen of tomorrow, and the shortage of skilled tradesmen is largely due to the selfishness of employers in the building trade over the last decade.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Parents have had something to do with that.

Mr. LANGLEY: Before the recession that may have been so, but recently more applications have been made than can be accepted in the electrical trade.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: You said that if it had been done in the past we would be better off today, but parents were mainly to blame then.

Mr. LANGLEY: At the end of each year many young fellows have been looking for jobs and all could not be absorbed immediately. I stress that when the system of subletting was introduced, apprentices were considered unnecessary. Many awards provide for one in three to be apprentices, but employers did not wish to teach a trade to an apprentice. This happened in the building trade, and that is why we are so perturbed about the lack of skilled tradesmen. Something should have been done to boost the number of apprentices. The apprentice system is a good thing because a person is learning during his apprenticeship. There may be some advantage in raising the age at which people can start as apprentices, as older people learn more quickly.

Next year there will be a surplus of lads and, with the present situation in the building trade, employers will clamour for young people to learn this trade, and anyone wishing to become an apprentice will be accepted. Technical high schools have been written down by the press as being inferior to high schools. The standard of education is improving and many young lads, who can do things with their hands but are not good scholars, should be given a chance. It is necessary that a lad should reach Intermediate standard if he wants to be an apprentice. Many boys think that a high school education is better than that obtained at a technical high school, but technical high schools teach boys to use their hands. Many lads have the qualifications necessary to be apprentices. The period of training is five years with one day a fortnight and one night a week at lessons, and after his apprenticeship he is an efficient tradesman. During the apprenticeship, if the employer wishes to discontinue the indentures, or the lad is not studying, an application can be made to a court for the apprenticeship to be rescinded.

Mr. Ryan: There is not much difference between the standard at high schools and that at technical high schools, but most employers refuse to accept technical high school students.

Mr. LANGLEY: I consider that the boy from the technical high school is a better prospect because he has been trained in a certain way. The course at area schools in the country gives a boy the chance to use his hands more than that at a high school. If employers pay their just part in the future and accept as many apprentices as they should, both employers and the country will benefit. A member in another place said that if this had been done many years ago, we would not be in the position that we are in today with the lack of artisans in the building trade.

Mr. Ryan: Would this apply to all sections of the building trade, or to some more than others?

Mr. LANGLEY: In the building trade the lads who have had technical education are usually outstanding. In the electrical trade, if a person completes a three-year course with good results, he has the opportunity to study for another two years during which time he may learn electronics. We need the boy who is willing to go further with his studies, but many do not have the means to do this. Many others are satisfied to learn this trade without doing higher studies.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Should the apprenticeship period be shortened from five years?

Mr. LANGLEY: The apprentice can study for a four or five-year term. During the apprenticeship he is learning all the time, but he attends school for only three years, and in this period the employer receives no advantage from employing this boy. However, in the last two years, the person is able to work on his own and can be given jobs requiring higher qualifications, and during the extra two years, the employer receives some compensation for helping the boy during the first three years. Recently it was decided to install a tin-shanty type of toilet at the Goodwood Boys Technical High School, despite protests from the school council and me. It is not in the best interests of the Education Department and of the people of this State that this type of amenity should be provided. During the reconstruction there it was necessary for some toilets to be removed. Others are in poor shape. The state of those toilets is not in the best interests of hygiene, for the schoolchildren and the staff.

There is the further point that many adult education classes are held at the Goodwood Technical High School, which enjoys one of the biggest class attendances in the State. The Minister sent me a letter, for which I thank him, stating that these toilets would be proceeded with. I find that at this school

they intend building a new wing and incorporating the toilets in it. Reading through the correspondence, I see that no date is set for this: it is just for the time being—there is nothing definite about it. I protest strongly to the Minister and assert that something in solid construction should be erected at this school. The position is awkward and will be difficult, particularly at night when these adult education classes are held. It is not right that the students should have to endure this type of toilet. The only place where it should be seen is on a building block for use by workmen doing the building. These toilets are used all day by young people, who deserve a much better deal in this matter.

I thank the Minister for making a further grant to Suneden House, Killocoat Street, North Unley, for retarded children. This extra grant will greatly benefit the school and, I am sure, will help the teachers in running the school. The school is full and has a waiting list. The Retarded Children's Association has some land at Marion and is finding it difficult financially, even though it has the land, to erect a building to suit the requirements of these children. I hope that the Minister will be able to help in the construction of a building suitable for housing these unfortunate children since there are people in the association willing to help these children and to advise their mothers in teaching and training them for the future.

Unley has a large proportion of old people. Other honourable members and I were delighted last year when the Government granted a subsidy of £3,000 on a pound-for-pound basis to old people's clubs in the area. This subsidy will greatly help the old people in the area. The Unley Elderly Citizens' Club intends to build, and the building will be open every day of the week. It is difficult for old people in this area to get the best things in life at their age. The people of Unley are proud of these clubs, which are helped by this subsidy. There are six such clubs in the area. We hope they will spend their £6,000 and improve their clubrooms.

Unley is an old district with many old schools in it. Sporting fields are practically non-existent. In fact, only one school has an oval of its own, and urgent maintenance is needed on any grounds used. The Parkside Primary School, one of the oldest schools in the area, has been hard hit by drainage. Recently a large sum (£750,000) was set aside for the paving and concreting of the school grounds. As the school is in a poor state of

repair, I hope that the authority concerned will do its best to complete this project as soon as possible, at least before next winter. The Unley Primary School and the Unley Girls Technical High School are situated together. Recently I headed a deputation to the Minister of Education about the removal of the Unley Girls Technical High School to another site. I assure the Minister that, if it goes to another site, it will greatly benefit its scholars. At present they have no oval that they can fully use and in all the competitions they enter they finish nearly last, largely because of the lack of amenities at the school. I hope the Minister will help in this matter.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): Like the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn), I cannot support the Budget. It is impossible for me to support it when it contains increased taxes and prices that will affect people already overburdened with financial problems in rearing their families and educating their children. I cannot support a Budget that gives a free hand to monopolies and hire-purchase companies to fleece the people through unfair interest charges, and allows private banks and other similar organizations to channel the people's money into unproductive avenues so that they can rake off high rates from the people's savings. High interest rates for hire-purchase are unfair and steps should be taken to protect the people who, through their various circumstances, are forced to use this method of trading to buy normal requirements for the furnishing of their homes and the clothing of their children.

Mr. Ryan: There is no difference between a poor man using hire-purchase and a big monopoly using a bank overdraft.

Mr. McKEE: No. The Government should make it possible for people to enter into hire-purchase by offering a reasonable rate of interest, which would force back to the field the finance companies and private banks which are today allowed to go merrily on their way making their own arrangements. After all, as the member for Port Adelaide pointed out a short while ago, it is the privilege of those who have good securities to borrow money at a reasonable rate of interest, while the not so fortunate people have to pay through the nose.

Mr. Ryan: Actually, they are getting it from the same source: the hire-purchase companies are only banks.

Mr. McKEE: Yes; it is channelled through various avenues. I have been approached by people with reasonably good securities wanting to build houses. They have gone to the banks,

but the banks have said, "We are sorry. Unfortunately our loan list is full up for the next 12 to 18 months. We suggest you go and see a certain finance company."

Mr. Ryan: Many hire-purchase companies are owned by banks.

Mr. McKEE: The money is channelled from the bank to the finance company, and it is available from it at 14 per cent interest. This sort of thing is strangling the growth of this country and interfering with the welfare of the people. It is time that a responsible Government took action to protect people from being fleeced, which I hope this Party will be able to do in the near future.

Mr. Ryan: The Labor Party has a policy to overcome this, hasn't it?

Mr. McKEE: It has. The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) has had much to say about prices recently. No doubt pressure was put on him by various supporters, and if he were a member of Cabinet he would try to abolish price control. However, he blamed the wrong man when he attacked the Prices Commissioner.

Mr. Casey: He was going against the policy of his own Party.

Mr. McKEE: I would not say that. The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) said that the Treasurer was the best Labor Premier and Treasurer the State had ever had, but I do not know that we would accept him. The member for Mitcham placed the blame on the wrong man, and the Treasurer was big enough to say that he accepted the responsibility. I admire the honourable member's courage; he did not get off too lightly from the Commissioner, and he had strips torn off him this afternoon by the Treasurer and the member for Onkaparinga. I do not think it will stop at this, however. There is a little room upstairs where the Treasurer's photograph is prominently displayed, and the next time the member for Mitcham is in this room will be an occasion that he is not likely to forget quickly.

Mr. Ryan: Members opposite do not have a Party meeting each week, you know!

Mr. McKEE: They will have one tomorrow, though.

Mr. Ryan: What provision has the Party opposite if one member wants to lay a charge against another? It has no rules.

Mr. McKEE: I think it has rules, and I think the member for Mitcham will find out about them tomorrow. Talking about trouble with a capital "T", he will have trouble with a man whose name begins with "T". He has

courage, however, and I think he will fight back.

Mr. Millhouse: I have had the stick before and I have survived.

Mr. McKEE: Nothing is as bad as it seems.

Mr. Millhouse: I am glad of your comfort!

Mr. McKEE: The Budget is normally looked upon as an important matter because it affects people in all walks of life in the State in that it indicates the terms on which they will live for the next 12 months.

Mr. Ryan: The imposition of a Liberal Budget always falls on one section, doesn't it?

Mr. McKEE: It does. The duty of a responsible Government—it would be its duty if we had one—is to guarantee that the people get a fair share of the State's prosperity. If workers and pensioners cannot be guaranteed security in times of prosperity, it is difficult to imagine when they can be guaranteed security. Although the Treasurer and members opposite have claimed that the State is bursting at the seams with prosperity, they have introduced a Budget that will cause financial hardship to the very people responsible for creating that prosperity. We hear much from members opposite about the prosperity of this State. The member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) explained that this was a Liberal and Country League Budget, and I could not agree with him more! The member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) pointed out that the L.C.L. was a minority Government and that the Budget was designed to benefit the minority. It is a case of the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer.

Mr. Ryan: There are no Robin Hoods opposite.

Mr. McKEE: No; they are Robin Hoods in reverse. This Budget is no different from previous L.C.L. Budgets, which have all been for the purpose of making sure that L.C.L. supporters are well catered for. For the reasons I have mentioned, I entirely oppose it. It is entirely unfair that the workers, who make a contribution to the welfare of this State, and small businesses are penalized by the imposition of increased hospital charges and various other forms of financial restrictions placed on them by this Government. Members opposite claimed that this State was bursting at its seams with prosperity and that this was one of the Treasurer's best Budgets, yet in the next breath they talked about problems they had in their districts. They have more complaints than one can find on the back of a Zam-buk tin! I have some problems, as does every person I represent.

When speaking to the Address in Reply the member for Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg) stressed the fact that urgent consideration should be given to developing the various ports in Spencer Gulf and on the West Coast. He said that we must expect larger ships calling at these ports. Naturally I am primarily concerned with Port Pirie, and I know that the Minister of Marine is well aware of the problems existing there in regard to the approach channel. Much money has been spent on this channel in the past and on wharf reconstruction, for which we are grateful. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe), who is a member of the Public Works Standing Committee, is also aware of the bad state of repair that existed at the Port Pirie wharf. It had to be repaired or it would have collapsed into the sea.

With the completion of the Broken Hill Associated Smelters wharf we shall have wharf facilities of a high standard, not forgetting the presence also of a high standard of wharf labour, which is important in attracting shipping to a particular port. Standardization will also attract shipping. We have one of the largest grain terminals in the State at Port Pirie but it is a pity that (although bulk grain facilities exist) it is unable to be fully exploited at present. The special committee on decentralization (of which I am happy to say the member for Stuart was a member) pointed out that the most effective way to bring about decentralization was for country centres to make every effort to develop their already established industries. This applies, of course, only when they are fortunate enough to have such industries. Port Pirie houses not only an important smelting works but is surrounded by good rural land and enjoys a first-class rail service to Western Australia and to sheep and cattle country in the north. I think that the member for Gawler thought I was also going to include the rail service from Adelaide to Port Pirie, but unfortunately I cannot do so—

Mr. Ryan: It is the most antique service in Australia.

Mr. McKee: Yes, I am inclined to agree with that. However, despite the advantages that I have mentioned, no effort has been made to decentralize or to assist Port Pirie in establishing another industry that would benefit the community. For some years the population there has not increased materially, which indicates that the community is not retaining its youth. This is a serious problem: I think that about 90 per cent of the town's youth is

forced to leave in search of employment elsewhere. An urgent need exists for a light industry such as that mentioned by my friend in relation to Whyalla. Indeed, this problem exists in many other country towns. Increased development cannot be brought about overnight, but on the other hand no attempt has been made to rectify this problem. Port Pirie is an important export centre and consequently provides much revenue to the State. The value of exports from Port Pirie represents 19 per cent of the entire overseas trade from South Australia. For the year ended 1962-63 rail freights to and from Port Pirie totalled 1,101,670 tons, earning £3,784,448. Naturally, rail freight and shipping will increase substantially with the advent of rail standardization.

Representatives of shipping companies who have visited the port have indicated that bulk carriers in the concentrates and bulk grain trade are inevitable soon for economic reasons. If Port Pirie is to develop and expand its shipping trade with the coming of standardization and the bulk grain trade, as well as with the expansion at the B.H.A.S., it will therefore be necessary urgently to consider the approach channel. I have made this request to the Government on several occasions, but I have been continually told by the Minister that the port is adequate to handle the size of ships that desired to work it. However, that is not the case: the approach channel to Port Pirie has always presented a problem, and while this problem exists there is little hope of the city's developing.

Under the present lay-out and depths, a vessel inward bound with cargoes from overseas and wishing to load a parcel of lead or concentrate (it is classed as "stiffening") which is necessary, I understand, if the vessel is to load wool or other lightweight cargo in the Eastern States for overseas, has to by-pass Port Pirie because, with her cargo already aboard, her draft is too deep to call at the port. That ship must first proceed to her other ports of discharge (and mostly her final port of discharge is Brisbane), and after discharge she must proceed back to Port Pirie as an empty vessel to load this stiffening that is required to carry these wool or other lightweight cargoes. She then must proceed back to Brisbane and commence loading her outward cargo. One can visualize the extra cost incurred and the loss of earnings as a result of this. This extra cost is then passed on by way of increased freight charges, and consequently it makes the cost of the goods that much higher on the

overseas markets. It is for these very important reasons that I urge the Government to seriously consider the deepening of this channel. I am sure that the completion of this deepening would contribute in a large measure to increased shipping. In addition, the handling costs of the various cargoes would be decreased if these facilities were provided. This in turn would provide more work for the waterfront; it would assist in decentralization, and it would contribute in no small way to the economy of the State.

As I pointed out earlier, Port Pirie is a very important shipping centre because of the grain facilities and lead smelting works, which we hope will expand soon. Therefore, it is necessary that we deepen the channel to take these big ships that will call there for bulk grain and concentrate. Until this channel is deepened, these ships will be unable to use the port. I urge the Government to seriously consider this matter.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): This debate on the first line obviously is getting to the stage where it is petering out. We have now had four speakers consecutively from this side of the Chamber, so there is not very much to answer—not that I think there would have been very much to answer even if some members opposite had taken the opportunity to address themselves to the first line. I make it clear that one of the primary reasons why I rose to speak was to make it clear that the Financial Statement, as it is presented to this Chamber, is not acceptable to me, therefore I oppose the motion for the adoption of the first line.

Mr. Ryan: It would not be acceptable to the public, either.

Mr. JENNINGS: The Financial Statement certainly was not rendered any more palatable to me by the Treasurer's opening sentence—that it was his 26th consecutive Budget.

Mr. Ryan: Thank goodness it is his last!

Mr. JENNINGS: If there was the remotest semblance of democracy in this State, the Treasurer would not have presented 26 Budgets either consecutively or in any other way, and certainly he would not have been the Treasurer to introduce the Budget we are considering. This is not the only reason why the Budget is unacceptable to me. The Budget obviously provides for a deficit this year of nearly £2,500,000, and this, Sir, is after the proposed taxation increases are levied and despite some benefit we are getting from the uranium project. It is just as well, I think, that we have accumulated surpluses of nearly

£2,000,000. However, our estimated net deficit will still be well over £500,000, despite taxation increases of £1,250,000. It is certainly fortunate, too, that £1,700,000 of Loan funds were unexpended last year and are thus available for use this year. Of course, it must be remembered that we must keep the Loan funds and our own Budget in two separate compartments. We realize that the only reason we have this surplus is because funds were not spent last year, although there was certainly plenty of scope to spend £1,700,000 during the year. One way to save money is not to spend it, as I think we all know. This surplus undoubtedly will help in the maintenance of employment and development generally in the State this year, but that certainly is no credit to the Treasurer, because it has nothing whatsoever to do with him.

I believe that one of the new taxes imposed this year is grossly unfair and extremely shortsighted. It is pretty obvious, I should imagine, by this time that I am referring to the duty on documents relating to new car registrations and the transfer of registrations. This is a flat-rate taxation increase which is objectionable in itself (to me, anyway) and that is superimposed on recent taxation increases on the motor industry. Why a State like ours which depends so much on the motor industry and its ancillary industries, not only for employment but for our State trade balances, should single out this industry for increased taxation I cannot conceive. I cannot even begin to understand why this State should single out the motoring industry as the milking cow for revenue when every other Government in Australia is doing the same thing to the same industry. It is not only this tax that is offensive to me: the way in which the Budget generally is presented is violently offensive. It is certainly most misleading. The Budget explanation by the Treasurer each year does not mention the great majority of taxation increases that have taken place over the year. Of course, we know that those increases must be shown in the accounts. Let us take, for example, the recent increases in taxation and Government service charges: rail fares, bus fares, hospital charges, and water charges. People would be pardoned for believing that these charges were not imposed at all, as they are not mentioned in the Treasurer's Financial Statement. Nevertheless, the payment of them is just as painful and this is certainly a sly and surreptitious way of increasing Government revenue.

I shall now refer to some remarks of members who have addressed themselves to the first line. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) said initially that the Budget Papers were so exhaustive that they were bewildering. (I appreciate, Sir, that as Acting Chairman of the Committee you are unable to reply to my remarks.) The honourable member then showed us that he was certainly bewildered by them. He said (and what analogy he was trying to draw here I do not know) that 26 years ago when the Treasurer introduced his first Budget, it was for £15,500,000. Since then, however, the basic wage has increased from £3 15s. a week to £15 3s. a week—almost exactly four times. If we multiply the £15,500,000 by four, the resultant figure is £62,000,000. However, instead of being for £62,000,000 the Budget is now for £113,000,000. What the member for Torrens completely overlooked was that wage margins have greatly increased in the meantime, that there is a much higher proportion of the general wage rate now for female workers and (what is surely the most obvious thing under the sun) that our population has increased from 595,000 in 1938 to 1,027,000 in 1964. Therefore, the figures given by the member for Torrens show only one thing—that he was talking through his hat. The member for Mitcham made a most extraordinary speech.

Mr. Ryan: He is a most extraordinary member.

Mr. Lawn: He is consistent in that respect.

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not know why the member for Mitcham bothered to speak at all, unless he felt that he had to keep faith with his public, but I think his public has been reduced very much lately. His speech was scarcely anything more than a lugubrious lament at progress. In his speech he said:

This all merely underlines the growing financial dependence of the States upon the Commonwealth . . . I believe that, accepting the current trend in Australia, this is inevitable. It is apparently in accord with the outlook of the Australian people.

Later he said:

It appears that most people in Australia now favour uniform taxation.

Then he said:

Ten years ago the climate of opinion in Australia would have favoured the handing back of income taxing powers to the States . . . Now, however, it seems that it is too late, that it is no longer a matter of practical politics.

What a saddening thing it is to see a young man so far behind the times and getting further behind. I am sure that we would

all like it (and, perhaps, the Prices Commissioner would also like it) if we could arrange for a private time machine for the member for Mitcham to transport him back to an era when his views were more acceptable than they are in the twentieth century.

Mr. Clark: I would suggest just before the industrial revolution.

Mr. JENNINGS: I think the member for Mitcham believes in slavery but, on the other hand, I believe he would be a kindly slave master. I think it would be impossible for me to speak in this debate without mentioning a debate that was held earlier today. I could have participated in that debate, but my name was down to speak in this debate and I therefore restrained myself.

Mr. Clark: With some difficulty.

Mr. JENNINGS: With considerable difficulty. I believe the member for Mitcham had a bit of a doing over today from other sources, so I do not want to rub salt into his wounds for much longer. However, what would have impelled me to participate in the earlier debate was that Mr. Murphy (and I am mentioning his name; I do not have to call him the Prices Commissioner because, as was pointed out several times today, there is only one Prices Commissioner and that is Mr. Murphy) was a constituent of mine when I was member for Prospect. I knew him well; his children went to the same primary school as mine did at that stage and I met him on many of the occasions when parents had to meet at school committees. I know what a splendid gentleman he is in every way. I am afraid that it must be the honourable member's almost pathological hatred of price control that has led him into the misjudgments and indiscretions that he has committed in this matter. He did his very best today to justify the action he took. I do not know how other members were affected by what he said. However, if I might put it in a rather colloquial way, let me assure the Committee that it left me cold.

Mr. Clark: Icily cold.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes. The honourable member said when referring to the first report of his statement:

Soft drink manufacturers had been absolutely taken by surprise and not given a chance to reduce their prices voluntarily.

Has anyone heard anything so palpably absurd as that? I know of no Statute, regulation or anything else that would prevent anyone from reducing a price voluntarily.

Mr. Clark: Have you heard of anyone that did?

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not think it has happened in recorded history. I realize that this has been an unfortunate situation, and I do not want to exploit it or capitalize on it in any way. Perhaps the Prices Commissioner considered that he was being unjustly reflected on and, consequently he was entitled to reply. Also, if he needed to be provoked more than he was, there was sufficient provocation in two series of Questions on Notice to the Prices Commissioner asked by the member for Mitcham. No man doing a job properly could possibly have got his staff to work out the answers to those questions. The questions were mischievous and frivolous, and if the Prices Commissioner had taken his staff away from the things they had been doing to work out, if they could, these answers for the benefit of the member for Mitcham, that might have needed him a bit.

I believe that all this is extremely unfortunate. I think that if a member of Parliament makes a statement at any time about any person, whether a departmental officer or not, he should expect to get something back. I have accused many people of many things at times, sometimes unjustifiably, too, sometimes on the spur of the moment, and I have got something back, but I have been prepared to take it. What we must understand is that the Prices Commissioner is in an unfortunate position, and for once I agree with the member for Mitcham, and not because he has walked in just now.

Mr. Millhouse: I came in especially to listen to you.

Mr. JENNINGS: The honourable member has missed the best part of it. The Prices Commissioner is in the unfortunate position that the Government does not give him any security in his employment. He is appointed for only one year at a time, although I do not doubt that if the Legislative Council refused to pass the Prices Act the Government would find another job for him.

Mr. Clark: I should hope so.

Mr. JENNINGS: Of course. The next Government will overcome this problem by making the Prices Act a permanent feature of our Statutes. It is unfortunate that both Mr. Murphy and his staff are placed in the unenviable position that they can only stay in their present jobs until December 31 next. I shall now depart from this topic.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: And talk about the Budget!

Mr. JENNINGS: I have been talking about the Budget all the time. I enjoyed the speech of the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney). Mystery never loses its allure.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Coumbe): I trust the honourable member will continue to address the Chair.

Mr. JENNINGS: I am addressing the Chair. Some time ago I read a book written by the member for Stirling.

Mr. Ryan: Was it published?

Mr. JENNINGS: It was, at the honourable member's expense. I read it more as an act of penance than anything else. I could not understand it and found it as unilluminating as I found the honourable member's remarks last week, particularly his unique definition of Socialism. I know that my mystification about this is shared by most members.

Mr. Clark: Did you find out where the definition came from? I thought it was from Grimm's *Fairy Tales*.

Mr. JENNINGS: It was conjured up in the mind of the member for Stirling.

Mr. Millhouse: What was it?

Mr. McAnaney: It was taken from two dictionaries.

Mr. JENNINGS: I am rather haunted by the fear that I might be lacking in something, so I hope that the member for Stirling will continue, irregularly and infrequently, to make these learned comments.

Mr. McAnaney: What is your definition?

Mr. JENNINGS: It is not in accord with the views expressed by the member for Stirling, although I am glad to know that the honourable member does not regard the Electricity Trust as a monopoly merely because one does not have to be a user of electricity through the trust if one has a diesel tractor. I am sure this will result in a large increase in the sales of diesel tractors and will increase the number of disconnections from the trust. All I am afraid of is the effect it will have on my neighbours when I start my diesel tractor to use my electric shaving machine in the mornings.

Mr. McAnaney: Why not stick to the definition?

Mr. Ryan: That is impossible.

Mr. JENNINGS: I refer to important aspects of the Auditor-General's Report. It is unfortunate that the report was given to the Leader of the Opposition about two minutes before he spoke in the debate. However, some members have had more time to study it, and a few things would be rewarding for me to mention. I have often said that the house-building rate in South Australia has been

progressively declining over many years. I have never given figures without good authority for them and I have quoted from proper constitutional and statistical records available to members from the Parliamentary Library, but it may reinforce what I have said so frequently if I read page 4 of the report, which states:

During the year 2,858 houses and flats were constructed. This was the lowest number completed for 12 years.

Last year saw the lowest number for 12 years, despite our tremendously increasing population.

Mr. Lawn: Doesn't the Treasurer always deny that statement when it is made from this side?

Mr. JENNINGS: He skips over a few things. There is a reference on page 5 of the report to local government authorities, the number of inspections that the Auditor-General has had to make and some of the disappointing things he has had to do. This shows clearly the need for a public accounts committee in this State.

Mr. Clark: That is one thing about which the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) was correct.

Mr. JENNINGS: We know that in the Commonwealth sphere a public accounts committee operates satisfactorily. The Clerk of the House of Assembly (Mr. Combe) went overseas last year and on his return produced for the benefit of honourable members an excellent report in which he strongly advocated a public accounts committee, but no notice has been taken of his recommendations.

One of the most interesting things in the report appears at page 208. The Auditor-General has put this matter more succinctly than I can so I shall read it in full. It appears under the heading "The Commissioners of Charitable Funds" and the subheading "Royal Adelaide Hospital Account". It reads:

The excess of receipts over payments for 1963-64 was £56,094. Receipts for the year on this account were £68,391 including a contribution from the Royal Adelaide Hospital Auxiliary of £3,500. Payments were £12,297, of which £8,361 was for administrative expenses, maintenance, rates and taxes on city properties and £2,926 for supplies of drapery, bed linen, etc., from funds provided by the Royal Adelaide Hospital Auxiliary. The balance, £740, was spent on patients' comforts.

Over the past five years, excluding amounts provided by the Royal Adelaide Hospital Auxiliary, the Commissioners have spent £5,456 on patients' comforts. During that period the funds held by the Commissioners on account of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, excluding those contributed by the Auxiliary, have

increased by £368,122. Cash and investments now total £857,100. The market value of a number of the investments exceeds the book value. In addition the Martin Bequest includes Town Acre 86 with buildings thereon, the value of which is estimated at more than £500,000. Two bequests to the Commissioners are still held in securities by trustee companies, one of them having been so held for a number of years.

Here, the Auditor-General says:

I have questioned whether this accords with the terms of section 11 (2) of the Public Charities Funds Act, 1935-1940. If legal advice confirms my view that the Act is not being complied with, the securities held do not conform with section 14 of the above Act. I have previously reported that there does not appear to be any reason why considerably more of the funds held on account of the Royal Adelaide Hospital by the Commissioners should not be spent for the benefit of that hospital and its patients as envisaged by the Act. Funds and assets held on behalf of this institution are valued at more than £1,357,000; the income during 1963-64 (excluding Auxiliary funds) was nearly £65,000 but of this only £740 was spent on the Hospital.

I make so bold as to say, in concluding my remarks on the first line, that the fact that more than £1,300,000 here is kept out of use is not only blatantly immoral and dishonest but also patently absurd, because each year with increasing inflation that money is becoming worth less. Obviously the Royal Adelaide Hospital needs many things—anyone who has been within 100yds. of it knows that—yet here is £1,300,000 tied up and kept out of use. That, with all the other things I have mentioned, is why I oppose the adoption of this line.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I say at the outset I do not support the first line, because in my humble opinion it will impose extra burdens on the already heavily burdened wage-earner—and, after all, the wage-earner in this State (and in any other State, for that matter) is the person who keeps money in circulation, which, in turn, gives the impetus for more prosperity for the community as a whole. The increase in hospital charges concerns me greatly. People in many country towns who are already committed to their local hospitals on medical grounds are also committed to them to obtain dental treatment. The present lack of dentists in country areas in South Australia is, to say the least, deplorable. If one were to go beyond a 100-mile radius from Adelaide, particularly in the northern areas, with the exception of Port Augusta, one would find practically no dentists.

Mr. Riches: There is a shortage in Port Augusta.

Mr. CASEY: The shortage of dentists is not the fault of any particular Government because dentists are professional men and, if they are not available, there is no possibility of obtaining their services in country areas. But I take the stand that the Government should bear some measure of responsibility for seeing that people in country areas are catered for by the dental profession. Any time a matter of this nature arises, the Government always says, "Well, suggest something"; they cannot even think for themselves. I put it clearly to the Minister of Lands—

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Suggest something for Kangaroo Island and whatever you suggest I will get accepted.

Mr. CASEY: The Minister mentions Kangaroo Island. I did not have it in mind but it will do for a starting point. The only method of treating patients on Kangaroo Island and in the remote areas in this State is by the use of aircraft.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: We are doing that.

Mr. CASEY: It is possible for this method to be used not only on Kangaroo Island but also in many of the northern towns, such as Oodnadatta, Marree and even Leigh Creek. People from Leigh Creek must go to Port Augusta for dental treatment. Dental health is just as essential as medical health because if people have dental caries the whole structure of the body can be affected and medical treatment is necessary. Some people must go to dental surgeons for treatment. People in isolated areas, such as Leigh Creek, must go long distances for treatment. The train fare from Leigh Creek to Port Augusta and return is £4 0s. 6d. If a person has a toothache or his teeth need filling he must ring Port Augusta and make an appointment with a dentist. As the Minister of Lands knows, the maximum time allowed by a dentist for an appointment is 30 minutes.

Mr. Nankivell: How many weeks' notice must be given?

Mr. CASEY: I cannot say, but I know people who have gone from Leigh Creek to Port Augusta and have had only half the necessary work done, so they have had to go back in a fortnight. This has cost them another fare of £4 0s. 6d.

Mr. Bywaters: Can they return to Leigh Creek the same day?

Mr. CASEY: No, they must stay overnight.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: What have you in mind?

Mr. CASEY: I have suggested that an aerial dental service could be provided by the Government. If that is not practicable for some of the more closely settled country areas, a road service could be provided.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: The only flaw in your argument is that aeroplanes or motor vehicles could be provided but dentists could not.

Mr. CASEY: I have never heard that the Government has made any definite attempt to increase the numbers of dentists in this State. I know that 18 or 20 months ago only one dentist went through the University of Adelaide.

Mr. Nankivell: There is a full dental school now.

Mr. CASEY: That will help in coming years. This shortage of dentists has been apparent for years but the Government has done nothing to overcome it.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Albert can speak later.

Mr. CASEY: It is no fault of the Government that professional men decide to leave the country and go to the city. I am trying only to institute a move whereby the Government can do something to assist people in outback areas.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: You want two-way traffic. Dentists leave here and go to England; you want to bring others back here.

Mr. CASEY: I do not think dentists leave here and go to England. Dentists I know personally who have left country areas have not gone overseas; they have come to the metropolitan area to practise.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Many have gone to England.

Mr. Riches: Perhaps if we had a national health scheme dentists would come here.

Mr. CASEY: Dental arrangements can and should be instituted for outback areas. We have the Flying Doctor Service, and there could be an aerial dental service. Some of the larger country towns have no dentist. I shall now give an example of the increased costs imposed on people living in the country. If a person needs an extraction and he lives in a town that has no dentist, the only person qualified to remove teeth is the doctor, who does the extraction in the theatre of the hospital. The theatre fee is £5, and the patient must also pay the doctor's fee, and the cost of an anaesthetic if there is one. I know a person who had to pay £14 to have four teeth removed in hospital, and none of that was

refunded. This is a challenge to the Government, and I hope the Minister of Lands will take up the matter, as he lives in the country. I do not know whether there are any dentists in his town.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Yes, two.

Mr. CASEY: Then it is fortunate. If that town had no dentists, he would appreciate the difficulties experienced in towns further north. This places people at a financial disadvantage, and it already costs enough to live in the country without these extra charges. The Agricultural Graduates Land Settlement Act has been in operation since 1922, and I am horrified that it has never been implemented in any way. It seems to me that the Government takes extreme delight in introducing new Acts periodically to help people who are already covered by numerous Acts which could be but never have been applied.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: It has been applied.

Mr. CASEY: I did not see any mention of it in this year's Budget. Last year's Budget did not refer to it, either.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: It was before your time. How old is it?

Mr. CASEY: It was passed in 1922, and was last amended in 1938.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: It went out of operation.

Mr. Dunstan: Why should it go out of operation? It is still on the Statute Book.

Mr. CASEY: Section 4 (1) states:

Any person shall be eligible for the benefits of this Act—

(a) who has been awarded the college diploma of the Roseworthy Agricultural College after the passing of this Act and is, at the time he makes his application, over the age of 21 years, or who has been awarded the said college diploma before the passing of this Act and is over the age of 21 years and under the age of 30 years at the time he makes his first application under this Act; and

(b) who has satisfied the principal that he has had sufficient experience in the particular pursuit with respect to which his application is made to enable him to engage therein with a reasonable likelihood of success. Such experience may be had either before or after the said college diploma was awarded.

The Act describes the terms and conditions of a lease and agreements granted to graduates, and it also provides that the Minister may purchase land for individual agricultural graduates.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: That is the snag!

Mr. CASEY: Section 6 provides:

No land shall be so purchased unless the purchase is recommended by the Land Board and by the principal—

and that refers to the principal of the college—and the purchase of the land, together with all improvements, does not exceed the sum of £3,000.

Here is an Act that can be altered to suit people such as these.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: It would have to be for £50,000.

Mr. CASEY: I am surprised that the Minister should mention such a figure; it would not require anywhere near that sum. I refer to this Act because I know that Acts are on the Statute Book, whose existence is completely unknown to some members, including me. I happened to come across this particular Act only by accident.

Mr. Riches: All of our Acts need to be reprinted.

Mr. CASEY: Yes, the position is becoming something like the Local Government Act, about which we had assurances from the Premier last year and the year before that, that he would review the Act and condense it to a size and terms that would enable it to be understood. However, the matter goes on and on and it is a physical impossibility for anyone to absorb and understand the 900-odd sections of the Local Government Act.

I know that the Minister of Education is sympathetic towards adult education, which we find today is becoming increasingly popular not only in the metropolitan area but also in country districts. Tenders have been accepted for the erection of a large centre in the district of the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark). The member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) has an adult education centre in his district, and so has the member for Chaffey one in Renmark. Adult education centres are a necessity today; many adults never had the opportunities for education that the present generation has, and it is understandable that with children coming home and educating the parents on chemistry and physics, etc., the parents are placed on the outer. I believe they should be able to help with the homework and to show some interest in their children's schooling. Adults in Australia are becoming increasingly aware of the advantages of adult education. Centres are being established throughout this State but their administration is unfortunately being left to individual members of the community. In fairness to these people the Government should provide a full-time principal in the large centres, something with which I think the Minister of Education would agree. In Peterborough we have an

enrolment at the adult education centre of about 172 people wishing to take advantage of the scheme but unfortunately a full-time principal is denied them, and it is always a difficult task for an average working person to take on the extra responsibility of being secretary or president of the adult education centre and organizing its activities. The local communities would greatly benefit if full-time principals were appointed. I do not think that the Government should stipulate a limited number of enrolments before appointing a full-time principal. The adult education centre in the member for Murray's area has a full-time principal and I believe that enrolments multiplied by four times after the principal was appointed.

Mr. Bywaters: It increased ten-fold.

Mr. CASEY: I believe a similar thing happened in the district of the member for Chaffey. A full-time principal is certainly justified in Peterborough, because we have the biggest railway workshop outside Adelaide, with the exception of the Commonwealth workshops in Port Augusta, and a tremendous enrolment potential is just waiting to be tapped. This can be done only if a full-time principal is appointed. I cannot see why a minimum enrolment of 300 should be stipulated before we are allowed a principal. It does not make sense, bearing in mind the examples at Renmark, Murray Bridge and Port Augusta where, once a full-time principal has been appointed, enrolments have risen out of all proportion.

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

Mr. CASEY: It would be unfortunate if the Government at this stage were reluctant to foster adult education, which has become part of our society and which I think is an important adjunct to the adult people of this State.

I turn now to an important subject that was referred to earlier in this debate by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse). I agree entirely with some points the honourable member made regarding Citizen Military Forces training, not only in this State but throughout the Commonwealth. I also endorse his comment that everything possible should be done to encourage enlistments in the C.M.F., the Navy, and the Air Force. I read a report in the *News* of Wednesday, September 16 of comments made by Mr. John Nelson, the member for the Northern Territory. Mr. Nelson is a neighbour of mine, for our territories join on the South Australian

and Northern Territory borders. The honourable member is a very good representative of the people in the Northern Territory. He pointed out quite clearly and vividly that Indonesia is only about 200 miles from Australia, and while we have a certain amount of unrest in the South-East Asian area (to which Indonesia is contributing in no small part with her confrontation policy towards Malaysia) we should realize the significance this small distance of 200 miles can have for Australia.

In the *News* article to which I referred Mr. Nelson pointed out that in 1949 (only 15 years ago) there was a much larger naval establishment and an army camp of reasonable size in the Darwin area, and that the defence position had actually become worse since he entered the Commonwealth Parliament. As these statements come from a man who represents the northern areas of Australia, it is a wonder to me that the rest of this country is not taking a more definite attitude towards our defence. We hear from time to time that the Commonwealth Government contemplates building up defence for that area, and I only hope it does this as quickly as possible without continually side-tracking the issue. Here again, in dealing with the C.M.F. I differ from the member for Mitcham in so far as he claims that the C.M.F. is more or less a State responsibility. I think that it is a Commonwealth responsibility.

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

Mr. CASEY: The honourable member said that the State was more or less not coming to the party, so to speak, and was not fostering these enlistments for the C.M.F.

Mr. Millhouse: Only as an employer.

Mr. CASEY: All right, as an employer and with no loss of wages. Here I differ, as I think this is a Commonwealth matter. A member of the C.M.F. becomes part and parcel of the defence of Australia, and he is the responsibility of the Commonwealth. Many members of the community are members of the C.M.F. and the loss of pay, especially as it affects personnel in my district, is sometimes over £17. To the average working man today that is much money, especially when taken from a fortnightly pay, and it is a considerable sacrifice to a man undergoing Army training. Again we have a problem, and again I disagree with the member for Mitcham, but I agree with the Treasurer who replied to a question I asked earlier this year. The Treasurer pointed out that this matter was not so much one for the State, as was suggested by

the member for Mitcham, as one for the Commonwealth. I agree with that because I think that when a man joins the Armed Forces, whether Army, Navy or Air Force, he places himself under the protection of, and automatically becomes the responsibility of, the Commonwealth Government, as he serves directly under the Minister in the service for which he has volunteered.

Mr. Ryan: The State has no control over the individual once he enlists.

Mr. CASEY: That is correct. Although the Treasurer apparently did not misunderstand the question that I asked, he did give me an incorrect answer. I asked him to contact the Commonwealth authorities in this matter to see whether something could not be done to iron out the pay differences, but I understand that the Treasurer contacted the Commonwealth Railways Department rather than the Commonwealth authorities I had in mind. That was a legitimate mistake made at the time and I know that he will correct it soon. Enlistments in the C.M.F. are haphazard at present. If a conflict did occur, personnel would automatically become part of the national manpower, and some would not be permitted to continue as soldiers in the case of the C.M.F.

Mr. Ryan: They would be specialists.

Mr. CASEY: Yes. Prior to the Second World War some railway employees, who were members of the C.M.F., were one of the first contingents to go to England as what was termed the railway contingent. They took over the working of some of the railways in Great Britain. I do not think that will happen in the event of another conflict, because we shall then be directly concerned with South-East Asia.

Mr. Ryan: There are not too many railways there.

Mr. CASEY: That is so, and that is why I think men in the C.M.F. will not be called upon to serve in the forces if a conflict breaks out, but will be interested more in their own country. For this reason I believe that recruiting for the C.M.F. should be done at a Commonwealth level in co-operation with the States. The Government departments and other employers should ensure that the men enlisting will not be called upon to serve in the forces if we have another conflict. Therefore, I cannot agree with the points made by the member for Mitcham, with all due respect to him as a member of the C.M.F. It takes more than a couple of camps to season a man as a first-class soldier. I speak from experience

in the Second World War and I think that every member of the armed forces in that war will agree with what I have said.

Today the Armed Forces are becoming far more technical than was the case in the last two world wars. For that reason alone it must take much more time to train them to become sufficiently competent to take their places as front line soldiers. Therefore, much care must be exercised in the selection of personnel. Every avenue should be examined to try to devise a system whereby the number of members in the C.M.F. can be increased, so that, if called upon, they can enter into a conflict with a minimum of training.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE (Minister of Lands): It is not usual for a Minister to enter into this debate, but some matters have been raised that I cannot let pass. All Opposition members who have spoken have said that they do not support this Budget, primarily because it imposes new taxation. Not one of them has given any real alternative, apart from their Party policy, which was mentioned by the members for Gawler and Hindmarsh in particular. They mentioned succession duties, progressive land tax increases and State insurance.

The most difficult matter to understand was the reduction of holdings to a living area—whatever that means. If the implications behind these matters are considered the whole series is dangerous, and taken in order they mean the collective and progressive submission of rural areas. I want members opposite to know that if the Labor Party ever gets power in the Commonwealth sphere or in South Australia and it adopts that line it will destroy this country. There is no argument about that. France is a living example of it working the other way. France has been in political turmoil for, say, a hundred years, and even before that. Governments have risen and fallen: the same men have been appointed to different Governments and the Governments have come from the same groups, until now the only political regime available in France is a dictatorship. What saved France in the first place? It was the country life of France. It was the peasant people, who are the backbone and substance of any country. They maintained their sturdy individualism and application to the soil, in spite of whatever Government was in power. Above all others they saved France. I have an implacable opposition to anything that means the destruction of our country life, because it will bring about the downfall of Australia.

Mr. Riches: What will?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: The destruction of country life in this country.

Mr. Riches: We all agree on that.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Honourable members opposite do not agree. They would have exemption for succession duties up to £6,000.

Mr. Ryan: Anything wrong with that?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: No, not if we stop there, but a person will be allowed to inherit a living area without paying succession duties on estates of £6,000 and over. I think they were the words used by the member for Hindmarsh. If that is to be done, **land tax** on unimproved values will increase strongly. We must raise money, but it is suggested that succession duties be reduced to an absolute minimum. In other words, the big estates will be taxed down to living areas. I do not know what is a living area. Honourable members know that was said. I made a note of it at the time, and I cannot let it pass.

Mr. Loveday: I do not think that you are giving a correct interpretation.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I am sorry if I am not. I have looked through *Hansard* and have studiously avoided giving any extreme or intemperate appreciation of what was said. Take it further, and add to it the policy of one vote one value. That would mean having constituencies in Adelaide as close together as a picket fence, and huge areas in the country. That policy has been enunciated here, and the whole thing is full of danger. I am certain that members opposite are not fully aware of the implications of their policy. I want them to look at it from that angle.

Mr. Ryan: Why should you, as a Liberal, ask us to look at our policy?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Because the Opposition will ask the people of South Australia to look at it.

Mr. Ryan: We are asking the people, not the Liberals.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I am defending the people of South Australia against the Opposition policy.

Mr. McKee: If you are going to do that, I suggest you look at your own policy.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I accept the criticisms of the Labor Party against our policy.

Mr. Ryan: And you will get them!

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Very well; then I accept them. Opposition members say they will not accept this Budget because it imposes taxation, and the alternative given is the one I have mentioned here. I say it is dangerous,

and that the Labor Party does not realize just how dangerous it is.

Mr. Loveday: Succession duties today are aggregated into large quantities.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I know that. I realize that we must raise money, but I have never spoken in favour of succession duties. I know there is no alternative to it today, but to carry it any further is dangerous.

Mr. Ryan: Then why does the Government increase them?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Because it has no alternative for raising money. I want to put forward an alternative, which no honourable member opposite has done. Let us look at it in this way. Recently the basic wage was increased by £1 a week. That in itself does not amount to much in terms of cost. Let us take a business with 12 employees, like the one that I myself control. A pound a week means £600 a year. That does not mean much in that business but when we have purchased the goods used in the industry what is £600 when considered with the cumulative effect of the £1 in every organization from which we buy? Is it £600 or £2,000?

Mr. Ryan: You are taking only people who will supply your needs, price increase or no price increase.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: It is the cumulative effect of the £1 a week in that business. The immediate impact is £600; then, when the business purchases its requirements, the figure jumps astronomically, and therefore there is a demand for higher prices. That £1 a week was owing to the wage-earners at that particular time.

Mr. Ryan: We agree with that.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: They have got it, but the increases in prices have taken it from them. Is that wrong?

Mr. Ryan: Then take the prices down.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: That is exactly the problem which members opposite have to overcome and which not one of them has faced up to.

Mr. Riches: You should peg prices.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: It is necessary to have price-fixing or a Prices Commissioner in order to offset the banditry that occurs today with prices. I can see that price-fixing itself is no answer to the problem. How can it possibly be? That £1 a week had to be translated into prices and, cumulatively, it is translated into prices in a way beyond one's control.

Mr. Riches: The £1 increase was based on prices at the time. Both wages and prices should be pegged.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Neither can be pegged. This is the old attitude that no progress should be allowed; that it must be stultified by enactments that say that neither wages nor prices can increase.

Mr. Riches: There should be a review.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Even with a review people are still behind; when the matter is reviewed they are already behind. This is not the way to remedy things; these matters should be concurrent, and money should have the proper value in order to meet the costs. Price fixing is done judiciously, but it is not an answer in itself. It never can be an answer in itself; it is only one of those thrusts in the dark.

Mr. Riches: Prices have never been held to wages.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I know that. The whole system, which was operated by members opposite when they were in command and is operating still, is at stake. What is the position today? The Australian Council of Trade Unions will next February seek another 12s. a week increase in the basic wage. I concede that that is really wanted, but how is anyone going to stop that from being translated into costs?

Mr. Loveday: Do you know the answer?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Yes, I do.

Mr. Loveday: Then tell us.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I shall. The policy that we have today is foolish and useless, and it is stultifying the progress of this country. What happens? We want roads, we want water supplies, and we want everything to make this country progress, but the progress is too slow in relation to the danger that exists to the north of this country. Young people should have had placed before them alternatives to being counter jumpers in city stores. These young men should have had a chance to experience the thrill of life in building what is needed in this country. However, we cannot do this, or we are told that we cannot because we have not the money. I do not believe that. Recently someone asked the Governor of the Bank of Canada, Mr. Graham Powers, "Would you admit that anything physically possible and desirable could be made financially possible?" He said, "Certainly." He was then asked, "Why is it not done, then?" He said, "If our Parliament wants to change the form of operating the banking system, certainly that is within the power of Parliament."

Mr. Loveday: Whenever the Labor Party has wanted to do anything on those lines your Party has done everything possible to smash it. Those of us who are old enough to know the back history of the matter know that.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I know the back history as well as the honourable member does.

Mr. Ryan: But you have changed!

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I have not changed in the slightest degree on this matter and, what is more, if I could get the simple facts of the matter into the heads of members opposite their attitude might change from their insistent cry of, "Let us have Socialism." Repeatedly they say that Socialism is the answer. I point out, however, that Socialism is a dead hand upon any country that adopts it.

Mr. Ryan: That is only your opinion.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: It is certainly the opinion of anybody who reads the current history of the world. I shall advance the argument that I made at the beginning.

Mr. Riches: Socialistic countries have the highest standard of living in the world.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: They have the lowest standard. No socialistic country has yet learned to feed itself, for the simple reason that it applies to its economy the damn-fool system that members opposite advocate. Today we are exporting millions of bushels of wheat to Communist China and to Communist Russia.

Mr. Ryan: Terrible, isn't it!

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I do not object to it. Wherever people are hungry—I do not care what their ideology is—we should be able to send them food if they want it. I would not let them starve.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Are you aware of the difference between Russia as it was before the First World War and as it is today?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I give it every credit for that, the same as I give China credit for getting away from the general banditry that was rife before its present administration. We cannot order the primary production of a country just as we cannot set out a programme of making nuts and bolts. That is the lesson that has not been learnt. When I hear honourable member opposite advocating Socialism as an extreme system—and don't let them put it to me that the Electricity Trust is a socialistic concern—

Mr. Ryan: It is.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Of course it is, but do not tell me that that is the answer, that because that organization works Socialism itself would work. Look at Russia and China and see how Socialism works! Labor policy,

as I enunciated earlier, translated into Socialism would starve this country.

Mr. Jennings: I think you should address the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: That has been proved the world over.

Mr. Ryan: We have not starved countries in the past.

Mr. Riches: Socialism has the highest living standard in the world.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Where is it?

Mr. Riches: In Sweden.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Does the honourable member call that a socialistic country? I know the history of it. Take Holland, which produces four times as much food as the peninsula of India does! Holland has not a socialistic government—not in the terms that Labor wants it. Japan is another country that I could cite; it produces an enormous amount of food—much more than the whole continent of India produces.

Mr. McKee: Have you noticed the development in Egypt recently?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Yes, that development is primarily associated with a large scheme for damming the River Nile. Many years ago the Nile was the centre of the original civilization of ancient Egypt. Without the Nile that civilization would not have existed. The Nile's annual inundation was responsible for the production of sufficient food to maintain the civilization of Egypt—and to maintain it well. Now, however, it has become insufficient. Adequate supplies of water must be dammed up so that production can be increased. They must have two or three crops annually. What is happening there now? Much of the country is going out with black alkali, because having taken away the annual inundation, which kept the ground leached and which put sufficient water on it, the salt is rising. That is not a new problem: we have it on the River Murray, at Loxton, and we may have it anywhere. That is one of the problems in Egypt, and if they do not find an answer to it all the work they are doing there will be undone. The irrigation areas of India also have this problem. It is all very well to think that a big dam will be the answer, but I maintain that it definitely will not be the answer, because it takes much more wisdom than those people think is necessary before they can get full advantage of that dammed-up water.

Mr. Jennings: Before you sit down, can you tell us a little about Alberta?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I do not have to do that. The member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) said today that in passing down the road he saw a sign saying, "Cut your housing costs in two by Social Credit." Well, I would have been proud if I had originated the belief in that idea. Let us have a look at it. When a person borrows £4,000 to buy a house, at the end of a 40-year term it has cost him about £8,000. He has paid out this money on a house that he would have been able to get for £4,000. It is something that no member opposite has ever touched on, and I am certain very few of you understand it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister will address the Chair.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I beg your pardon, Sir; I am giving a lecture.

Mr. Ryan: To yourself, though, not to us.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Members opposite think that could not be done, but it is being done all the time.

Mr. Corcoran: What is? You said it can be done; what can be done?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: It need not cost more than the £4,000.

Mr. Corcoran: What over 40 years?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Yes, and a person could pay it in 20 years if it were done.

Mr. McKee: If he won a lottery!

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I am putting a proposition which would assist in the production of houses and give houses to the people, and all I have got from the self-styled representatives of the people is ridicule; they say it cannot be done.

Mr. Corcoran: I am waiting for you to tell me how it is done.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I said it was being done all the time. If there is a £600,000,000 trade credit in England, can honourable members tell me who has gone without his money over here for that trade balance to be built up? Can members opposite answer that? Where did the money come from to pay it?

Mr. Fred Walsh: Haven't we built it up ourselves?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I am saying that it has been built up, but it has been built up over there and not here. That £600,000,000 is for goods sent over there, and those goods have been paid for here. That balance is still over there, and from where did the money come to pay that? The same applies to the poorer wool.

Mr. Jennings: This is fantastic!

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: It is a fact. The honourable member may have forgotten something. In the Parliamentary Library is a paper called *Vital Speeches*. Some of the foremost leaders of contemporary thought have contributed to that paper. In *Vital Speeches* of June, 1959, appears an article written by Robert B. Anderson, Secretary of the United States Treasury, headed "There is no need for inflation". Members can read this and my accompanying interpolations in 1959 *Hansard*, at page 966, as follows:

The fact is that when the Government has to borrow from commercial banks, as is often the case in times of high business activity, such borrowing adds to the money supplied by the amount of the borrowing and so increases inflationary pressures. Continued deficits are bound to add to monetary inflation.

Why? It is because when there is a deficit it is made up with a Treasury Bill or some other means that is a direct manufacture of money. The speech continues:

The fact that fiscal matters are little understood—even by some rather prominent and otherwise well-informed people—was brought home to me one day when a visitor in my office remarked: "You talk of the dangers of monetization of the debt, Mr. Secretary. You know I just don't believe there is such a danger. Probably because I don't quite understand what monetization means." I said this to my visitor: "Now suppose I wanted to write cheques of 100,000,000 dollars starting tomorrow morning, but the Treasury was out of money. If I called up a bank and said 'Will you loan me 100,000,000 dollars at 3½ per cent for six months if I send you over a note to that effect?' the banker would probably say 'Yes, I will.' Where would he get the 100,000,000 with which to credit the account of the United States Treasury? Would he take it from the account of someone else? No, certainly not. He would merely create that much money, subject to reserve requirements."

That is being done every day.

Mr. McKee: There are blokes in gaol for doing that.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I ask honourable members to take this matter seriously because in it is not only the seed but the kernel of their problem.

Mr. Jennings: We will take it seriously if it is something new, but this is old hat.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Of course it is; so are all other things like this that have taken maybe 100 years to bring to fruition. What is happening today? The stock market is falling in New South Wales and all over Australia.

Mr. Jennings: And you are supporting a Government that would not do anything about financial reform.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I am doing it. It does not matter what the Government does; I have to put my views over to everybody, but I am having little success with members opposite. Why are the stocks in New South Wales falling? It is because this country has never devised a system that is able to withstand prosperity. As soon as there is extra prosperity here, there is an inflationary spiral, which must be checked.

Mr. McKee: They bring it about.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: They do nothing of the kind. It is part and parcel of the system. As soon as certain money is advanced to create that prosperity it is imperative to cancel it out, because just as important as bringing money into existence is cancelling out money in order to prevent inflation. It is the same when money is borrowed on overdraft: when it is put back it cancels that sum out of existence. Every loan by a savings bank is inflationary.—

Mr. Burden: You don't agree with that?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: It is inflationary. If a loan is made from the savings bank the total amount of the people's deposit remains there at call, but if £1,000 is taken from the savings bank and put into another bank, then £1,000 comes into existence. That is what causes inflation.

Mr. Jennings: You have cut your milk teeth on it.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Well, you have done nothing about it. All your Party did was to try to nationalize the banks and that would have achieved nothing except the centralization of the whole organization to make Australia worse off than it is today.

Mr. Loveday: What about the state of the £18,000,000 fiduciary issue that your Party fought to the death?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: He was right at that time.

Mr. Loveday: No, he was wrong at that time.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: He wanted to save the situation. He could not have gone—

Mr. Loveday: The Party you belonged to smashed it.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: It did not.

Mr. Loveday: It caused inflation like that in Germany.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Yes, they thought that, but many people on the honourable member's side thought that also. His Party knew very little about it in the last depression, because the Labor Party joined in the Premiers' Plan.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Not all of us.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: They did it, as they knew nothing about it at that time, and even I knew little about it then. Do not think I am blaming people, Mr. Chairman. I am saying that, if the ignorance of that time is here now, the ignorance of the whole of Australia is still with us to a large extent.

Mr. Loveday: Don't you think your lecture should be addressed to members sitting behind you?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: No.

Mr. Riches: The only hope is on this side.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: The point I am trying to bring home is that the Labor Party opposes this Budget. Members on the other side say that they will not vote for this Budget, allegedly because taxation has been increased. That increase is consequential on the £2,500,000 given here to relieve unemployment.

Mr. Ryan: Is there unemployment now?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: No. It cannot be taken away merely by building up something to keep people employed. That is the mistake, whoever is responsible for it. There is this £2,500,000 for the Government on the basic wage increase, plus consequential increases in all the other things the Government has to buy. In order to make the present system work it is imperative to have taxation. What alternative has been offered by members opposite?

Mr. Fred Walsh: Don't you think the Commonwealth Government is at fault?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Everybody is at fault.

Mr. Fred Walsh: That Government is the chief source of revenue.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I said that if it is responsible then it is at fault for taking away the £2,500,000. If that money is given to keep people in work, then they have to be kept in work.

Mr. Bywaters: The Commonwealth Government's revenue was about £104,000,000 more this year than last year.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Yes, and because of the £1 basic wage increase it will be more next year. Why not argue as to how to offset that? Taxation will be more, too. This is inherent in the system. With prosperity comes danger, and when in danger we start closing up. The Commonwealth Bank, which is looking after these things, reduces at once the amount of credit to be made available for expansion.

Mr. Riches: That is the cause of the whole trouble.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Of course it is.

Mr. Riches: Why does it do that?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: It is not this or any other Government. Everybody should know that the cause of depressions is a refusal to advance credit. The Commonwealth Government, which takes the people's savings and freezes them, freezes the liquidity of the banks so that they cannot advance credit. Two years ago the Commonwealth Government started to dribble it back, £17,500,000 at a time. Everybody remembers that occasion because the Commonwealth Government had gone a bit too far and it was necessary to release money so that the banks could increase their liquidity.

Mr. Loveday: If this is self-evident, why doesn't your Party do something about it?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I am doing it.

Mr. Loveday: There is nothing new in this idea.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: No, but because it is not new it does not mean that it is too old.

Mr. Loveday: We have heard it in the past.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: No good reason has been given by members opposite for opposing the Budget because of the taxation increases.

Mr. Riches: Isn't the Commonwealth squeeze the reason for the increased taxation and won't that increase prices?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Of course it will, but that doesn't add to it. An alternative has to be found. The member for Enfield says it is old hat, and so it is, but it is the only hat that will cure the recurring ills of this country that are coming closer and closer together.

Mr. Riches: The only hope of wearing it is on this side.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Nonsense! Members opposite have had it for so long that they do not know what it means.

Mr. Bywaters: You will admit that the Second World War was financed under this method.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Of course it was.

Mr. Bywaters: That was by a Labor Government.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: No member on the other side of the House has given me the impression that he knows anything about it.

Mr. Ryan: Wasn't the war financed by a good Government?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Rubbish! It was financed with money. Without reading it,

I refer to page 192 of the 1961 *Hansard*, where are set out replies of the Governor of the Commonwealth Bank of Australia to my questions. It is enough to show anybody who is a student of these things that it can be done. The head of the Canadian Bank, the equivalent of our Commonwealth Bank, says the same thing. What has to be done has to be implemented, and in order to implement it we have to get public opinion behind it. That applies to all Parties. We are only one in this. If everybody desires to bring this country to a condition and position in the scheme of things that will allow us to hold it, we cannot continue with the ridiculous system now operating here. All I plead for is that there shall be an expansion of ideas in order to allow the system I advocate to come into operation in such a way as to raise Australia to be a really great country. I want now to tell honourable members the way to handle price spirals.

Mr. Loveday: Will you elaborate on this in relation to the housing position?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: No, but I will deal with prices. Housing can be handled in the same way. It is just a matter of making money available for the houses on a basis that demands the repayment of the loans with only a 1 per cent interest charge.

Mr. Ryan: Why doesn't your Government do it?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: No Government has yet come into the picture anywhere in the world on that. I am not advocating it as against my Party or the Labor Party; I am giving it as the only way to do it.

Mr. Loveday: Do you know how long you have hammered that?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I am hammering it again. In conclusion, let me give the means of checking the price spiral. Price control will not do it. How can we check the price spiral without increasing costs? Rising costs create the spiral, and that has to be stopped. How is it stopped? Subsidy is the only way, but it must be related to the costs included. When there is a cost in something, money has been incurred in arriving at the cost. Let us take a bushel of wheat, which costs 14s. 7d. If that price goes up, the price of bread goes up, but if that cost of 14s. 7d. is subsidized to the extent of 3s. and it is kept there, we have something to play with all the time and we shall stabilize the price of the flour; but that 3s. must be on a costless basis. Immediately on being paid it would be cancelled out of existence.

Mr. Riches: Doesn't the Commonwealth Government do it with tea?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Yes.

Mr. Fred Walsh: What about sugar?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Yes. It is cancelled out of existence and does not cause inflation because it is used to pay the costs that have been incurred. It can be done all the time but we need the will to do it. If we do that, we remove the incentive for profit-making combines and organizations and we do it painlessly. We put money into the hands of the people without causing a spiral of inflation.

Mr. Fred Walsh: It was done with gold during the depression years.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I think honourable members will remember that it was gold that precipitated the scene in the Senate when somebody said, "You might have let the child live!" The export of gold to pay our overseas commitments, when someone said we were living above our means and burning our doors to keep our fires alive, precipitated that. It is most improbable that that sort of thing can happen again, but there will always be this rise and fall that ultimately does not land us anywhere except back where we were. We want thousands of houses for our people, and we will not get them out of love or taxation. We must arrange different means of housing the people, and we must also arrange different means of providing the water supplies, water mains, roads, and bridges that we need to develop this country. We shall never get this done with our present methods, so we must adopt others. Some members may accuse me of speaking against the Government in which I am a Minister. I am doing nothing of the sort; I am merely putting my ideas of this sort of economy to the people of South Australia.

Mr. Riches: Do you admit that the manipulation of money represents profit?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Of course it does.

Mr. Riches: And you are supporting this?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I support the profit motive. We must have profit. Even Russia has found that if there is no profit there is no incentive.

Mr. Riches: You do not have to hold Russia up to us as an example.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I know that, but even under Socialism it has been found that the profit motive produces incentive.

Mr. Loveday: Who says that? You are speaking as though that was our ideal.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I am not. The ultimate in Socialism is the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

Mr. Loveday: Who says so? We do not.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I am not accusing members opposite of Socialism. I have never done that, but Communism is the controlling organization in a Socialist country.

Mr. Riches: In one Socialist country.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: China is another. They are the two biggest, but their system will never work. They will still be dependent upon the outside world to feed them until they give their people an incentive, and that will apply here when we reach saturation point with our secondary industries. They are already approaching this stage, for they are asking us now, for instance, to buy another refrigerator from last year's supply. I do not agree with the sentiments expressed by members opposite. In replying to them I have resurrected what is called an "old hat". One is supposed to lose caste if one wears an old hat. I am prepared to wear an old hat, because I do not think there is any other way.

Mr. Riches: The old hat is over that side.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I do not care where I get it. We shall never develop this country in the way it should be developed in the urgency that now exists if we persist in doing what we are doing. I support the Budget.

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide): I think that tonight we have seen a spectacle that has not been witnessed in any other Parliament in Australia in recent years. We have seen a Minister speak in absolute opposition to his Party's policy—a policy that is not worth very much, we all admit.

Mrs. Steele: Do you think so?

Mr. RYAN: I do, and so do the majority of people in South Australia; 33 per cent of the population is not a majority, in my opinion. The only reason I can think of for the Minister rising—and he has worn so many guernseys that we do not know what colour he is now wearing; he has worn every guernsey possible in political football—is that possibly his pre-selection for the district of Burra is in jeopardy. I do not know what will happen in the District of Burra. If the Government is prepared to take the types of people that are available we shall always be in trouble. We have evidence of a split in the ranks now: instead of the Liberal and Country Party functioning as a whole we have a separate Country Party emerging.

Mrs. Steele: How silly can you get!

Mr. RYAN: In fact it is possible that the Government is that silly!

Mr. Freebairn: Determination counts!

Mr. RYAN: If determination is to elect the Liberals they will not be returned to power in the future. I remind the Minister of Lands that the Labor Party does not have to divulge its financial policy in debating the Budget. The Opposition can never divulge it whilst it remains in opposition, and the Minister knows it! It can only do this as a Government. The right and proper time for the Opposition to inform the public of its financial policy is at election time. The Liberals would admit that the financial policy we divulged prior to the last election was accepted by the electors of this State. Even the Minister would not have the audacity to deny that.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: I do!

Mr. RYAN: The Minister of Lands will always be the odd man out. He said that if Labor were in Government it would ruin this State and that the people would be faced with starvation.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: I said your policy would be responsible for that.

Mr. RYAN: The Minister admits that he said it. The amazing thing is that in New South Wales a Labor Government has been in power continuously for 23 years and in Tasmania for 30 years. Can the Minister say that those States are suffering from starvation?

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: They have not implemented your policy.

Mr. RYAN: They have implemented Labor policy. The Minister, as a member of this Party who was once expelled, knows it. There is no starvation in those States and New South Wales and Tasmania proportionately export just as many commodities as South Australia does, if not more. Yet the Minister says that the implementation of Labor policy would create starvation and stagnation in production and that we would lose our export markets! We heard more rot from the Minister tonight than we have heard in this Parliament for many years. The Minister was once proud to stand up and preach the policy of the Labor Party. He is proud now to preach the policy of the Liberal and Country Party. He wants the limelight because pre-selection time is drawing near. He has become even more of an odd man out tonight than ever before.

I entered this Chamber in 1959. Some members opposite may say that I have been here too long, but my rejoinder is that the Government has been here too long, against the wishes of the public. When I came here I thought

that what I had heard regarding the Liberal and Country League could not possibly be true, and that I would live and learn, but to my amazement I found that what I had heard was true. It was at that time that this State first became a nonclaimant State. In other words, we were no longer dependent on the Commonwealth Grants Commission. We were lauded by various people, including the Treasurer and his followers; and we were told that it was the greatest step forward in this State's history. The Treasurer, in delivering his 21st Budget in 1959, said:

However, whilst I was satisfied that to become a "non-claimant" State was a situation that South Australia should accept if possible, I was by no means satisfied that the basic grant proposed for 1959-60, derived from the grants payable in 1958-59, was an adequate starting point.

On that occasion members of the Opposition stated that in their opinion such a move was a retrograde step because we relied on Commonwealth finances and we would be in that position for several years more. Although I was only a new member, during the Budget debate that year I made the following comments:

The Treasurer has claimed that South Australia has been managed more economically than other States, but the people who rely solely on wages, and who are entitled to some consideration in respect of social services, have suffered to enable the State to be operated economically. This Government has not a good record since South Australia has become a non-claimant State. Almost since the day it was announced that we would no longer receive reimbursements through the Grants Commission, the costs of essential commodities and public services have increased. Water charges have been increased to meet additional pumping costs, but bus fares and railway fares, which are not affected by seasonal conditions, have also been increased. In all instances the Government has stated the reason for increased charges as the terrific increase in the basic wage.

That was in 1959, yet we were told by members of the Government during this present debate that there had been no major increases in taxation in this State for many long years. Each year some charges are increased and the money has to come out of the pocket of the wage earner. Some members have said that this is the first occasion that new avenues of taxation have been opened up to swell the funds of the Treasury of this State. Does it matter to the wage earner whether the increase is coming from new fields or from the old fields? What they are concerned about is the amount of taxation that they have to place to the credit of the State Treasury.

They are not concerned with whether it is new or old taxation. However, in 1959, the first year that this State became a non-claimant State, the increases were in existence. I distinctly remember that the Leader of the Opposition at that time (the late Mr. O'Halloran), in his remarks on the 1959 Loan Estimates and Budget, was very critical of the action taken by the Government in declaring the State independent of the Grants Commission. Once again the attitude and the action taken by the Opposition has been proved correct. Because of the uneconomical way in which this State, under the control of the Treasurer, was conducted in the years that it was under the Grants Commission, it is now in a position where it has to pay for the mistakes that were made then. I shall now refer to some of the remarks made in 1959 by members who have spoken in this debate. The member for Barossa (Mr. Laeue) said in that year:

I commend him (the Treasurer) for his unflinching efforts before the Grants Commission and at Loan Council meetings for the good of his State, and for having led this State to a position wherein we are now no longer among those who are regarded as mendicant States. It was a proud day for this State when we emerged from that position, and I have no doubt that this emergence has been due to the sound and purposeful direction of the finances of this State.

The Minister of Lands, who in those days was a so-called Independent member for Burra, has turned a complete somersault. His views of 1959 were quite different from those he has now as a Minister of the Government. At page 962 of *Hansard* of 1959 he is quoted as saying:

I have analysed things as they will continue henceforth and, quite frankly, all I can see is that the man who holds the whip has changed hands, and he only changed it from his left hand to his right hand. I do not think there are any major virtues of the new as against the old order.

His attitude tonight is completely different. Tonight he did something that has never been done before; he totally disagreed with the financial policy of the Government of which he is a member. I think that that is unprecedented in the Liberal Party. Other members of the Party are not happy with the statements he made.

When I was elected to this House in 1959 I was amazed that certain things happened. I was told at the time that the Liberal Party was a one-man band and that the Treasurer was more or less the dictator who decided what would happen. The 1964-65 Budget was

delivered by the Treasurer in this House at about 2.45 p.m. on Tuesday, September 1. At 1.50 p.m. on the same day I had a copy of the *News*. I had it at the time the Treasurer delivered his Budget speech. The *News* quoted the amount of the increases that were going to be charged by the Treasurer and the various aspects of taxation that were going to be increased. The avenues of taxation that were introduced by the Treasurer on that afternoon were, as some members mentioned, absolutely new in the taxation field.

Mr. Clark: We could have read about them while the Budget speech was being made.

Mr. RYAN: We could read about them before the speech was made. How did members of the press find out the new avenues of taxation that were going to be opened and the new increases made, prior to the delivery of the Budget speech? The Treasurer once again handed to the press a copy of his Budget speech before the Budget was introduced. It would never have appeared in the press had they not received it. They would not have had the effrontery to guess what was happening about increased taxation. The same thing happened in the Commonwealth Parliament, and the Prime Minister and the Commonwealth Treasurer were concerned with leakages in respect of Budget speeches, as some people gained advantages from the leaks that they would not otherwise have received. This happens in South Australia practically every day. I spoke about it once when the Auditor-General's Report was in the hands of the press at least 24 hours before Parliament received it. Because of that, we were assured by the Speaker that such a thing would not happen again, and I do not believe it has happened since. It is positive proof that unless Parliament voices its strongest disapproval and forces on the Treasurer its authority in this State, the press will have access to Parliamentary documents before they are tabled in Parliament.

This matter cannot be taken lightly. I hope that the Treasurer will note the critical comments made today. After he had introduced his 26th Budget, we listened to a lengthy eulogy by members of the Liberal Party, but they must agree that the Treasurer's run has ended, and that possibly in March next year

the will of the people will prevail, as it should. If one is Treasurer one can tell people anything provided they do not realize it is not true. The Treasurer, when introducing his Budget, said:

Taking an overall view taxes and charges levied in South Australia will remain the lowest in Australia. In the various categories the charges will be either below or no greater than comparable charges in other States.

If people are prepared to accept such falsehoods nothing can be done, but, fortunately in South Australia people in authoritative positions are prepared to prove that statements by the Treasurer are not always correct. Everyone will admit that the *Advertiser* is the propaganda sheet of the Liberal Party—

Mr. Curren: The boys up in the press gallery will get that down!

Mr. RYAN: They know it. With all respect to the press representatives here, they are employees. Fancy them going back to Sir Lloyd Dumas and saying that they wanted to publish the truth mentioned in the House of Assembly. They would be on the unemployed list referred to by the Minister of Lands for which £2,500,00 has been granted. I realize their position and they realize what is the truth on some occasions, but they are employees. If Sir Lloyd Dumas says that this is not the policy of the *Advertiser* as enunciated by the Liberal and Country League, then it will not be published, and we all know that. The *Advertiser* of September 8 stated:

South Australian car registration fees are the second highest in Australia. This was pointed out last week by the general manager of the Royal Automobile Association of South Australia (Mr. B. H. Boykett), who was commenting on a statement made earlier in the week by the Premier (Sir Thomas Playford).

Sir Thomas Playford said motor registration fees in South Australia were "generally rather lower" than in other States.

Mr. Boykett said: "A check shows that registration fees for three popular cars—Holden, Falcon and Valiant—are higher in South Australia than in any other State except Queensland. "Overall, South Australian tax levies on motorists through car registration fees are the highest in Australia with the exception of Queensland."

These comparative registration figures have been supplied by the Royal Automobile Association:

Car.	W.A.			S.A.			Qld.			Vic.			N.S.W.			Tas.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.									
Holden	11	5	0	11	10	0	13	4	0	9	18	0	11	0	0	9	13	6
Falcon	13	0	0	14	10	0	15	12	0	11	5	0	11	8	6	11	0	6
Valiant	13	5	0	14	10	0	15	18	0	11	14	0	12	6	6	11	14	0

No member on the Government side has tried to refute the remarks made by the General Manager of the R.A.A., so one can assume that on this occasion Mr. Boykett is correct. He has proved that the Treasurer on this aspect of taxation has not told the truth to the people of South Australia. It is good to see criticism levelled where it is necessary.

I now refer to the remarks of some Government members who apparently are prepared to speak with tongue in cheek. It has been said that we must remedy some of the financial ills in this State, and apparently many such ills exist. A study of the Auditor-General's Report, which covers many departments, indicates that the Auditor-General is critical of the financial policy of the Liberal Party. Only the Liberal Party can implement financial policy in this State. It is apparent that, although some members of that Party will support some planks of the Australian Labor Party, they often oppose their own principles and vote against the Opposition when it sponsors such legislation. Much has been said during this debate concerning the necessity of appointing a public accounts committee in this State. I have often mentioned this because once the Public Works Committee has brought down its recommendations that is the end of the proposition as far as the committee is concerned. It is also the end of it as far as Parliament is concerned because the rest is left to the Cabinet.

Mr. Clark: The functions of the Public Works Committee are entirely different from those of a public accounts committee.

Mr. RYAN: I am glad that my colleague said that because the Treasurer associates the work of the Public Works Committee with that of a public accounts committee. In 1959 the then Leader of the Opposition moved:

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that a public accounts committee be established.

Naturally the Treasurer opposed the motion because it was sponsored by the Opposition. He said:

The Auditor-General is not an officer of the Treasury but of Parliament, and he reports direct to Parliament.

That is identical with the criticism two years ago when the Auditor-General's Report was given to a body outside this Chamber. He continued:

I do not see his reports until they are tabled. He is a competent officer and is on the job all the time. He has a thoroughly trained staff who will quickly unearth any defects in State expenditure or the State's accounting

system. I suggest it would be unwise to take this matter any further. The motion should be defeated.

I am sorry that the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) is not a little more intent on what is being said now.

Mr. Coumbe: Why don't you speak up a bit?

Mr. RYAN: I do not think I could blast through that particular iron curtain even if I spoke my very loudest. Apparently members opposite are concerned not with matters of State but with matters of Liberal and Country League policy. When a division was held every member who voted against the proposal belonged to the Liberal and Country League. Their numbers included the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke, as he then was). A notable absentee at that time—he was usually absent when matters of importance were being discussed, especially if a vote was being taken—was the member for Ridley (Mr. Stott, as he then was). The voting was 19 "Noes", although there were 18 Liberal and Country League members. The number included the then member for Stirling (Mr. Jenkins). That may interest the present member for Stirling. There were the 18 Liberal and Country League members and the member for Burra, making 19. The "Ayes" numbered 17, which meant that the proposal was defeated by two. Two members were paired. Unfortunately, the late Mr. Tapping was away and was paired with the member for Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg) on that occasion. The amazing thing was that even the State press at that time did not support the Opposition more.

Neither of the newspapers is an Australian Labor Party publication; neither contributes towards the Australian Labor Party fighting or electioneering fund. One is the *News* and the other is the *Advertiser*. The *News* in its editorial demanded some action in the matter of a public accounts committee. The Liberal and Country League propaganda sheet the next morning, on Wednesday, September 16, admitted that there were blemishes in State administration. This was one of the few occasions on which the *Advertiser* has been critical of the policy of the Liberal Party. It does not matter what the Liberal Party puts forward, the *Advertiser* in its editorial is prepared to accept it as gospel. That paper admitted that action should be taken because of the blemishes that existed in the financial affairs of the State, which it said could be overcome to some extent by having a public

accounts committee. If the Labor Party introduced a Bill to set up such a committee, I am sure the member for Stirling would be one of the first to vote against it, despite the fact that he said in this House that such a committee was necessary. If it came to a vote, the guernsey allocated to him would be used in the political game and he would vote as the captain told him. When he first entered this House I told him that he was a member of a team and that he would have to do as the captain said.

Mr. McKee: He said that himself.

Mr. RYAN: He did. I think when he was elected he said, "I will put my viewpoint forward and represent the people of Stirling in the South Australian Parliament." Irrespective of what his views are, however, he is bound to the policy of the Party opposite and must vote accordingly. I respect a member for that. I believe in the policy of the Labor Party and will always vote for it, but I do not expound in this House something contrary to the platform of the Party of which I am a member. *Hansard* records how the previous member for Stirling voted. The life of the present Parliament is about four weeks, after which the will of the people will be expressed at the next election. I assure the member for Stirling that he will have an opportunity early in the new year to have a public accounts committee, as a measure providing for this will be introduced by the Labor Party.

Much has been said about democratic Socialism as laid down in the Australian Labor Party policy. If ever I have seen a complete somersault, I saw one a few moments ago when the Minister of Lands (the Hon. P. H. Quirke) said one minute that the Electricity Trust was not a socialistic enterprise and the next minute that it was. He was so confused that he had us all confused. I have heard it said that certain legislation in this State is not socialistic in its outlook or policy. If any member of the Liberal and Country League thinks that the Electricity Trust is not a socialistic project, he is apparently not of the same opinion as the Treasurer. On November 12, 1946, in giving the second reading explanation of the Electricity Trust of South Australia Act Amendment Bill, the Treasurer said, as reported on page 885 of *Hansard*:

When the Bill to take over the assets of the Adelaide Electric Supply Co. Ltd. was before this House I believed that the legislation was quite effective on the information which the Government then had before it, but I stated that if any matter arose which

required further attention the Government would not hesitate to bring it before the House. I made that statement because we were taking over one of the largest undertakings in the State.

The Treasurer made that statement—that the Government was taking over one of the largest undertakings in the State. Let us look at the Act that was passed on that occasion. It was an Act to establish a body to be known as the Electricity Trust of South Australia, to define the powers and duties of that trust and to vest in that trust the undertaking of the Adelaide Electric Supply Company, and for purposes incidental thereto. Section 15 of the Act provides that: the trust shall hold all assets for and on account of the Crown, yet Government members have the audacity to say that it is not a socialistic project. The Treasurer admitted that the Government was taking over a private concern. One section says that all assets of the trust shall be vested in the Crown. If that is not a socialistic project I do not know what is! The amazing part is that the Government members say it is not socialistic and therefore should not be held up as an example of Socialism in this State. Why is it that the Electricity Trust is always regarded as something other than a socialistic project? If ever a person wore the wrong political guernsey it is the member for Stirling. He believes in Labor policy but is prepared to vote against it, because he is wearing a guernsey of a different political colour. He said:

The late Ben Chifley tried to socialize the banking system, and as such a move would be depriving the individual citizen of his liberty that would be Socialism. But how can the Electricity Trust be called a socialistic concern when there is no compulsion on people to use its electricity and the trust itself uses private enterprise more and more to extend its various power lines and services?

That is the sort of thing we would expect to hear on ADS7 on a Wednesday night when the well-known comical show comes on. The member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) interjected:

It is quite obvious you haven't the faintest idea of what you are talking about.

The member for Stirling continued:

I agree that the trust, as a State-owned concern, has done a splendid job in many ways. We all agree with that. I then interjected:

Only since it has been a socialistic enterprise.

And the member for Stirling said:

Members opposite have said that the trust has been successful and that had it been a private enterprise it would not have been so successful.

I think we can all agree with that. If it were a private concern it would not have been successful. It would have had only the one aim which was outlined by the Minister of Lands tonight. It would have been interested only in the profit that it would receive from the production of each commodity. Why isn't the Electricity Trust a socialistic project? Why do Government members hide the fact that it is a Government concern? Let us look at the funds employed by the Electricity Trust. The Auditor-General, on page 213 of his report, said:

The total funds employed in the electricity undertaking at June 30, 1964, amounted to £127,556,000.

The criticism levelled at the trust by some Government members is that with the huge capital investment the profit should be greater than it is. It is all right for some members to manipulate figures to suit a particular argument, but when we have a look at the actual figures we find that they present a different picture altogether. The Auditor-General went on to say:

The significant features of the 1963-64 operations were: The surplus was £450,000 compared with £137,000 in the previous year.

There was a surplus of nearly £500,000 on a capital outlay of £127,000,000. That sounds quite good if one is trying to prove that the trust is not acting in the way it should, but when one looks at the fact that the income of the trust was £20,000,000, and that it had increased by £1,732,000 (9.5 per cent) as a result of increased sales to all classes of consumers, one sees a different picture. What happens is that certain payments have to be made by the trust. Whereas the surplus was quoted as being nearly £500,000, that was only the actual surplus after the trust had been debited in respect of certain commitments. Whilst it is a Government undertaking, the interest on debentures and other things are debited against its activities. Let us compare that with the administration of other Government departments. Of course, the member for Stirling said that there is competition for the trust, inasmuch as people can operate a diesel engine to produce their electricity. How in the world could I have a diesel engine in my backyard? I would have to strike matches on my way home to find my way into my property. I have never heard members opposite criticize the fact that the Engineering and Water Supply Department is a socialistic department, and I have never heard them say that it is private enterprise.

Mr. Hutchens: And some people are in competition with that department.

Mr. RYAN: Yes. There is nothing to stop any individual, provided he gets a permit under legislation that was passed by this Parliament 18 months ago, from putting down a bore and so competing with the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Mr. Lawn: Members opposite would like to harness the air we breathe and give it to private enterprise.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, and claim the credit for it, too. There is competition for the Engineering and Water Supply Department, much against the grain of the individuals who have to compete because they do not have sewers. People with septic tanks would willingly pay anything to get the sewers connected to their properties, but at present they are competing with the Engineering and Water Supply Department. This department has employed total funds to June 30 of £114,000,000. There is no surplus in the running of that department, and I think members opposite would be the first to criticize the Government if that department was running at a terrific surplus. What actually happens? It is found that the income received from this Government's undertakings is eaten up in the payment of interest on the money lent to the various Government departments. The interest paid by the Government, a book entry, would be equivalent to interest paid if private shareholders owned these particular projects. They would be happy to be receiving a large dividend. If the Electricity Trust, with its net surplus of £500,000, had to make payments to shareholders, they would receive a large rate of interest.

Mr. Corcoran: What do you think of reductions in tariffs in the Electricity Trust?

Mr. RYAN: They would never have been in operation if it were not for the pressure brought by the Opposition over many years. I remember that at the first by-election in which I participated as a member of Parliament, in the district of Frome the Treasurer had to adopt Labor's policy because the Leader of the Opposition made a statement that the Labor Party, as a Government, would introduce a measure to have equality of tariffs in this State. The Treasurer was forced, as an election promise, to bring about a reduction in tariffs. At the last election the Leader of the Labor Party made a public statement that he would bring about an equality of tariffs for the supply of electric power and once again the Government had to follow the lead because it realized that the policy of the Labor Party would be

accepted by the people. So it has been this pressure all along the line that has made the Government implement the reductions that have occurred. My Party does not falsify the accounts submitted by it when we talk about an increase in water rates. The Government increases the assessment and the people concerned get a double-headed increase, because, whilst my Party admits there is no increase in water rates, the assessment can go up and people will have to pay increased amounts.

Mr. Corcoran: We moved a motion on that in this place on one occasion.

Mr. RYAN: Yes. If the water rates were increased they would have no effect on council rates, but the moment the assessment is increased the council accepts the increased assessment and the ratepayers' rates go up accordingly. Therefore, to satisfy its whims and wishes, the Government has not increased water rates and can tell the public this, but the ratepayers will have to pay double-headed increases.

I agree with members who have said that taxation has been increased this year. I hate to think what these tax increases might have been had there not been a State election pending on the prorogation of this Parliament. What Mr. Bolte did in Victoria would have been small in comparison with what would have happened here if we had just entered a new Parliament and the Liberal and Country League had been returned as the Government. The increases in taxation have been kept to an absolute minimum because of the political promises that are going to be made in the next few months. Probably some of these amazing promises will be heard on Thursday week in the Masonic Hall at Semaphore when the Treasurer goes to the lions' den. He will probably make some promises, otherwise there will be a rout down there.

Mr. Lawn: What about the Jervois bridge?

Mr. RYAN: Now, you have mentioned the Jervois bridge.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: The member for Port Adelaide should address the Chair.

Mr. RYAN: Some of my colleagues have been in Semaphore assisting the Labor candidate. They wanted to go over the Birkenhead bridge but I told them it was the long way round. They said that they would not travel over the Jervois bridge because they thought that there would be other by-elections if they went over it. The Jervois bridge project emphasizes the need for a public accounts committee. The building of this bridge was

recommended by the Public Works Committee many months ago, at a certain cost. The Government has dilly-dallied for a long time over this project, although the report said that it was urgent. The cost has increased probably two-fold from what it was when first recommended by the Public Works Committee. Why should the Government delay this project? Before I was a member of Parliament I heard of the need of a public accounts committee to consider the cost of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The original estimate for that building was about £3,000,000, the ultimate cost was about £9,000,000, but no criticism came from Government members.

Mr. Lawn: What about the Charitable Commissioners' Fund of £1,000,000, mentioned by the member for Enfield?

Mr. RYAN: People have come to me asking for charity, but there is no way of getting it. Recently, two pensioners in dire circumstances came to me to see whether they could get financial assistance from a hospital fund. I was told one fund only could assist them. The Auditor-General has criticized these matters. What action will the Government take? It will not have much time for any action!

Mr. Lawn: It has a dictatorship, why should it worry?

Mr. RYAN: The Minister of Lands said something about dictatorships overseas. He is only guernsey No. 5 in the dictatorship team, and is prepared to accept it.

Mr. Lawn: He is guernsey No. 8 in the Ministry and No. 5 in this House?

Mr. RYAN: A definite case has been submitted—

Mr. Lawn: For the resignation of the Government?

Mr. RYAN: No, let it run the full time.

Mr. Loveday: It has not long to run.

Mr. RYAN: It has a couple of Bills to introduce that will help it commit political suicide. We know its intentions. If one lets a Government go long enough and it tries to hoodwink the people long enough, it will commit political suicide, and after many years the Liberal and Country League will do it.

Mr. Lawn: The Minister of Lands will help it.

Mr. RYAN: The Minister of Lands may come to us and ask whether he can join our Party in Government. He has changed sides so often that he is likely to change again. I am sorry the Minister of Education is not in the Chamber now. I hope that it is a temporary absence, because it will be a permanent one shortly. I have heard much comment in my

district on the size of various classes in the Education Department, a matter referred to in the Auditor-General's Report. This state of affairs is obvious in infants schools. Some years ago the department had a system of training some teachers to a certain standard, not very high, and that course was completed in May of each year. The teachers concerned were then able to take classes of the new intake of infants in July.

We have been informed that for some reason or other the department has discontinued this scheme. The infants classes vary in size each year according to the intake. I shall never understand how this is worked out but the intake is on the first Monday after the fourth Saturday in June. This has created an anomaly and some parents are critical of it. For instance, in one year a child could be five years old on June 29 and could start school because the new intake would come in on June 30, on which day that child would be over five. The following year the same parents could have a child aged five on June 28 but that child would not be eligible to start school if the intake was on June 27. If the department ruled that all schoolchildren over five years of age on July 1 could start school, that would be a fair demarcation line because it would mean that those children born in the first six months of the year would be eligible to start school on July 1; but, under the present system, the instruction is that a child has to be over five years of age on the first Monday after the fourth Saturday in June. No additional teachers are made available to cope with the July intake of infants. If 50 additional infants (which is not a large number for a metropolitan school today) start school in the middle of the year and if there are only two first-year classes, it means there will be an additional 25 children in each class; so, if no additional teachers are made available, an additional burden is placed on the teachers because they will have to teach more children without a corresponding increase in their own number.

The various school committees in my district are greatly concerned about this. They believe that extra teachers should be made available because there are sufficient intakes in the average metropolitan schools in the middle of the year to warrant them. Under the system I have mentioned, it was not necessary for teachers to be trained to a high academic standard. That system could be reintroduced satisfactorily. Of course, the children themselves would not be greatly concerned because they would not be fully alive to the situation,

by reason of their tender age, but the school committees and parents are greatly alarmed about this. I trust that my criticisms will be brought to the notice of the Minister in the hope that this matter will be rectified.

Last year I had brought to my notice the case of two infant teachers who applied to become library assistants. There are no libraries in infants schools. However, so that infant teachers would not be at a disadvantage they were eligible to apply. Two infant teachers were promoted library assistants, but no further appointments were made to replace them as teachers when they were taken away from their schools before the May term began. When the influx occurred in July their schools were even further affected as regards staff because the size of the classes had increased and the number of teachers had decreased.

I am opposed to the introduction of the Budget outlined by the Treasurer, and I will make that opposition clear when a vote is taken. I believe that the Budget is a financial imposition on people not able to bear such penalties. It is not the duty of the Opposition to outline the financial policy that it would adopt, as such a course would be useless. We could not implement such a policy, but probably in March of next year our Leader will outline to the public of South Australia the policy of the Labor Party, and I have no doubt that the people of South Australia will accept that policy and return the Labor Party to office. We will then remedy the loss created over a long period by the Liberal Party.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): While I have listened with considerable interest to the latter part of the speech made by the member for Port Adelaide, I have seen the Treasurer change from Job to Jeremiah in the Book he is reading on the front bench. That is in keeping with the remarks of the honourable member on the Budget.

I will touch on certain aspects of general budgetary policy that have in a large measure influenced the Budget brought down by the Treasurer. The Treasurer reflected upon the prospects of this season and the Leader also mentioned those prospects. I trust that both are right in their estimates. Last season was a good one, and that is reflected in the Budget. Most speakers in this debate have mentioned this aspect and the extent to which it has affected expenditure in this last Budget. The Auditor-General's Report indicates that the season was a good one. There was a good grain harvest. This harvest was readily disposed of, as indicated by an increase of

£749,000 received by the Railways Department as revenue from this source. Wool prices have remained relatively high, and there was a record clip. Meat prices were good; the American market was maintained, and this state of affairs looks as though it will continue.

Beyond doubt the rural industries have had a good season. This is borne out by the fact that bank deposits from rural sources as at June 30 were £414,000,000, the highest of any sector in the economy. The advances made to this sector were such that there was a balance of £177,000 in favour of deposits. Towards the end of last financial year the employment position improved, and this was reflected in the change in the economy of the State. The Government sector of the economy as a result of movements was unable to spend its funds, and this State had a Revenue surplus of £1,625,000 and a Loan surplus of £1,698,000. This indicates that competition was so great that the public sector found difficulty in spending the moneys allocated.

This Budget provides for a deficit of £570,000. The deficit was estimated at £4,500,000, but with the transfer of previous balances it will be only £570,000. I disagree with the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) who said he did not think a Budget surplus would occur. I think this year the Government will be unable to spend the money provided in this Budget, as already shortages of basic raw materials are evident. If the Government cannot compete directly with the private sector for raw materials and labour, there must be a Budget surplus. I believe the Government will be unable to spend all the money provided in this Budget and that another surplus will occur.

Members opposite believe in centralizing financial policy. That policy was adopted with the introduction of uniform taxation, and it looked as though it would be destroyed when Mr. Bolte threw a spanner into the works. As a result, the Labor Party re-affirmed its belief in central banking and the control thereby of the economy of the country. The function of the Government is usually accepted as being that of taking up the slack in the economy; when the private sector is buoyant the public sector restrains its spending so as not to cause inflationary tendencies in the economy. When we had an unfortunate recession in 1961 temporary financial accommodation was provided by the Commonwealth Treasurer to assist State Governments—the public sector—to combat unemployment. Now we have a very good season, the economy is buoyant, the slack has been taken up, yet we are somewhat in a

dilemma. We have a state of affairs in which the States should withhold their spending, yet in a growing economy such as we have in this State and in the whole of Australia the public sector, because of the need to expand the vital services that the community demands, cannot withhold its spending. This is a difficult situation for which to budget. The Commonwealth Government has seen the situation as one in which to budget for a surplus, whereas this State and other States have seen it as one in which to budget for deficits to meet commitments. It is not easy to reconcile these views.

Mr. Riches: You do not agree that it is necessary to increase taxation?

Mr. NANKIVELL: An increase in taxation is a means of taking money out of the private sector. One of the reasons for the proposed taxation increases is the need to increase spending in certain spheres. The Government has to try to remedy what I have said is rather an unusual set of circumstances, where a conflict of ideas and policies exists. We are faced with a position where we must increase our spending and so must resort to increasing taxation, as outlined in the Budget, mostly in the form of increased stamp duties.

On June 9 the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission delivered its judgment on the basic wage case. The increase has been reflected in the Budget. I studied the judgment and discovered one important aspect to which I should like to refer. In a large measure the £1 a week marginal increase—and I shall not say whether I believe it was right or wrong—was made up of two factors; one was the 2s. cost of living increase over a certain period, and the other was the productivity factor which was responsible for an award of 18s.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Over what period was the increase in cost of living figure calculated?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Over the three year period.

Mr. Fred Walsh: A comparison was made over a longer period than that.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes. One case submitted by Mr. Hawke was based on 1958-59 figures, but the point I make is that the biggest contributing factor in this increase was that of productivity. When we look at the components making up the productivity factor we see that they are largely related to the ability of the rural industry to pay. We find that the buoyancy of the State in rural industry was regarded as being healthy. We had a considerable increase in our oversea credits, largely as the result of the sale of our primary

products, which represent about 87 per cent of our exports. Because of the money that had come into the country we had a high liquidity ratio in the banks. It was seen fit in the judgment to recognize the productivity factor which, as I say, was largely a result of the rural industry position. It was passed on to the general community. What concerns me is that at present the rural industries can pay, but when we look at them we find that, apart from those with stabilized prices, none is able to pass on its costs. The wool or meat producer is on the end of a chain reaction and he inevitably will suffer if there is a recession in the price of his commodity, or if the season is a bad one. This, of course, could cause some hardship.

A point of policy has been raised by members of the Opposition during this debate, and I should like to enter this argument. I refer to what the Labor Party has indicated as being its policy regarding land settlement. I recall that six years ago the then Leader of the Opposition (the late Mr. O'Halloran) spoke at some length on Labor's policy on agricultural settlement. The member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens), by way of a question, indicated the concept of "living area" being accepted as a concept of holdings for rural producers. In other words, it was a plank in the policy of the Opposition. I should like to point out that this concept of "living areas" is a very dangerous thing. It has never been defined. The definition of "living area" as outlined in the Acts in Queensland and New South Wales is a very nebulous thing. In fact, we have seen a classical example of what happens when we apply this concept to war service land settlement, in that the concept of a "living area" was an area that would return an income of £260 a year based on the 1947-48 level of prices and returns; in other words, a figure which is nothing more than the basic wage. This is the first time I have been able to get this figure. What was the so-called living area that this living wage was based on?

Mr. Corcoran: Was this applied in the South-East?

Mr. NANKIVELL: It supposedly applied in the whole policy of fixing areas, and the whole concept of land settlement was based on this basic factor.

Mr. Corcoran: But it was not carried out, was it?

Mr. NANKIVELL: It was, but it has not worked. It was a bad concept to have introduced, because it has meant that those farmers whose properties were estimated at

their full carrying capacity are now in trouble, whereas the ones whose properties were underestimated and had more potential production have come out very well. Therefore, we have this big disparity in settlement, principally because the original concept was not right. It has corrected itself by a misjudgment of the potential production of the country in question. I am concerned about this aspect, and I should like members of the Opposition, if they disagree with what I am saying (and if I am misinformed and incorrect) to clarify this position, because so far as I am aware, from reading what I can of Labor policy and listening to what has been said, this concept of a living area still applies.

Mr. Dunstan: Applies to what?

Mr. NANKIVELL: It applies as being a suitable unit for a person working or living in the country to live on. The honourable member is an expert in most matters, and perhaps he could clarify this point.

Mr. Riches: Where did you read this about the living area?

Mr. NANKIVELL: It is a concept we see quite frequently in the Opposition's policy.

Mr. Corcoran: Where is it?

Mr. NANKIVELL: The member for Hindmarsh stated that the Labor Party would be prepared to exempt from succession duties an area which is a living area. I mentioned this point only because I am concerned about what the concept of such an area might be.

Mr. Loveday: It was a question of people being sold up under existing circumstances; that was the only time it was ever introduced.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I believe that that might be so, but I am asking for some clarification because what concerns me is that the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) also said, by way of interjection, that one of the means by which we could get a more equitable distribution of State taxation was to increase succession duties. I can only say that if it is the intention to exempt certain areas from succession duties, then surely if we are to increase our revenue from that source the rate of tax must be increased very considerably on the balance. This is what I am concerned about: that the Opposition might have a policy (and I believe that it has) of looking upon farming as not being a big business and of not allowing it to expand so that it can develop along the same lines as any other business develops in order that it can get back enough to distribute its cost of production and still remain efficient.

Mr. Corcoran: Do you believe in the aggregation of small holdings to larger ones?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I do not believe in that, but I can see that under the present system, with the way in which costs are rising, unless we are to support every avenue of primary production we are going to have this unfortunate choice of allowing either the aggregation of land or persuading farmers to work collectively with their plant and equipment. That is because the overhead of capital is affecting their costs. The cost of overhead will increase as a reflection of the increase in costs of production that will come, even under price control with legitimate rises, but this increase must come as a result of the costs of production rising through the basic wage system.

Mr. Corcoran: This is not the fault of the system, but the fault of individuals.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The individual is a very independent person in the country and I do not think that anyone has been able to regiment him. The Russians found this difficult to do without mass murder of a big section of country people and the Chinese are not doing any better. Therefore individualism appears to be a fundamental part of the make-up of country people. That is why it is hard to get them into collective farms—a system that will be forced on them if agriculture is not allowed to exist on the same basis as other industries. I know that the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) is to speak in this debate and I feel sure that he will clarify these matters. In the *Advertiser* of September 5, in a commentary on A.L.P. policy, appeared this statement:

The Labor Party believes that, with the inevitable increase in the cost of government it could not promise you reduced taxation.

I think that is perfectly correct. The statement continues:

It, however, is prepared to promise you that government services shall be improved and that the incidence of taxation should be more appropriately applied throughout the community.

I wonder what was meant by the word "appropriately". As a farmer, I am a bit concerned. For six years in this House I have listened at various times to Opposition members speaking in debates on succession duties. The member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) said that a concession granted to primary producers is a sectional privilege. When the question of land tax exemptions was raised the argument there was, admittedly, that it was not applied to just one section and not the other but, at the same time, Opposition members objected to concessions in land tax. When the Motor

Vehicles Act was debated in this Chamber last year, the question of concessional registrations was raised and again (although I know that Labor Party policy in New South Wales does permit concessional registration which does not compare favourably with the concessions allowed in this State) there was a murmur from Opposition members that this was a sectional privilege.

The Opposition has gone quiet now because there is an election approaching. However, these are matters that effect farmers. The farming community is interested in this section of the Labor Party's policy. It wants to know what would happen to farmers under a Labor Government. Would farmers be allowed to be economic producers? What is the Labor Party's policy on concessions for land tax, registration and freights? So far no mention has been made of Labor policy on any of these aspects. I think Opposition members will keep quiet about these matters because they will try to woo people in country districts.

Mr. Ryan: Why do we have to tell you what is involved?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Members of my Party tell people what its policy is, and that policy is always in the open.

Mr. Ryan: Because you are the Government.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Honourable members opposite should tell people what the alternatives will be if they wish to become the Government.

Mr. Ryan: We told people three years ago and they returned us.

Mr. Corcoran: Don't worry, we will tell them.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I accept the assurance of the member for Millicent. I support the Budget.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

WORKMEN'S LIENS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL).

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.5 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 23, at 2 p.m.