

—HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, September 22, 1965.

The SPEAKER (Hon. L. G. Riches) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

HOUSING TRUST RENTS.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Works, as the Minister in charge of the House, a further reply to the question I asked yesterday about Housing Trust rentals? I ask the question again today because of the concern that has been expressed to me and to other people about the delay in making a decision on this matter.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I cannot add very much to what the Premier said yesterday. The matter is being considered by the Premier and by the Chairman of the Housing Trust. I understand that on the Premier's return late today the matter will be taken up and that Cabinet will be able to consider the matter and make a decision soon.

OBSERVATORY SITE.

Mr. CASEY: Some time last year I referred to observatory sites in the Far North. Two sites have been chosen by the Astronomical Society, one being Mount Serle and the other Mount McKinlay, both of which are about 30 to 40 miles east of Copley. Those sites have been recognized by the society as being possibly the best sites in Australia for an observatory. I believe that other sites in Australia are being manned now, as well as at least one site in Chile, and that the present experiments will determine the most suitable site for an observatory in the Southern Hemisphere. Will the Minister of Works refer this matter to the Premier to see whether information regarding these observatory sites has been brought to his notice? Will the Government consider meeting the requirements of the people who are manning these observatory sites in order to see that we in South Australia benefit from the experiments being carried out in that area?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As far as I know, Cabinet has not discussed this important matter. I assure the honourable member that, if any advantage is to be gained for South Australia, the Premier is always anxious to gain it. I shall refer the question to him and let the honourable member have a reply as soon as possible.

WARREN RESERVOIR.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked yesterday about the quantity of water held in the Warren reservoir?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The capacity of the reservoir, as stated by the honourable member yesterday, is 1,410,000,000 gallons; the present holding is 741,900,000 gallons; and the latest pumping is about 21,000,000 gallons a week.

MILLICENT SOUTH SCHOOL.

Mr. BURDON: On behalf of the member for Millicent I ask a question of the Minister of Works. Some time ago a contract was let for the construction of a new Millicent South Primary School. Some concern has been expressed recently by local residents that the commencement of the work may be delayed and that the new school, which is urgently required, may not be ready for occupation in 1967. Has the Minister a report on this project?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have spoken to the Director of Public Buildings about this, and the contract was let on August 13, 1965. Recently, however, the contractor told the authorities that excavations were difficult and dangerous to make at present because the water level was within 2ft. of the surface. If the excavations were continued they would create further cave-ins. After investigating the complaint, the department agreed that it was not the proper time to make the excavations. Officers of the department who are watching the situation assure me that the earliest possible start will be made so that the building will be finished and ready for occupation at the time originally stated.

SOUTH-EASTERN ELECTRICITY.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week about the erection of a substation at Keith?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The General Manager of the Electricity Trust reports that a contract has been let for earthworks for the Keith substation. A further contract to erect a new building for equipment will be let in about two months' time. The main equipment will be installed by the trust, and the new substation will be completed by June, 1966.

SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION.

The SPEAKER: I refer to questions asked me by the Leader of the Opposition last Thursday. In the interim I have had an opportunity to examine the relevant Joint Standing

Orders, and I have had the benefit of discussions with the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, the honourable member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee). The work of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation is governed by Joint Standing Orders 19-31. Joint Standing Order No. 28 makes it clear that any report from the committee must be presented to both Houses. Joint Standing Orders 25 and 27, in my view, are imperfectly expressed as to the time by which the committee shall complete its consideration of regulations, and also as to the time by which it shall report any recommended disallowance. The wording of these Joint Standing Orders might well engage the attention of the Standing Orders Committee of both Houses.

I believe that complexities have arisen in the past (as in the present cases mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition) which have made it understandably difficult on occasions for the committee to complete its consideration of a regulation prior to the expiration of the time allowed for giving notice in the House for its disallowance; and that, in such circumstances, the committee has safeguarded the position by giving a notice for disallowance before it has reached a decision on its attitude to the regulation in question. These exceptional cases must be acknowledged. However, I believe the committee will perform its functions most beneficially on behalf of honourable members if it gives notice of any intended disallowance of a regulation in both Houses, and if it reports thereon to both Houses before the expiry of the time for giving that notice, such action to be taken concurrently in both Houses.

Under the present practice the House is not informed when the committee has resolved that no action should be taken in respect of any regulation. I intend in future when such a decision is made by the committee that this fact should be suitably indicated against the relevant regulation on the House of Assembly Notice Paper for the information and guidance of honourable members. I am certain that members appreciate the valuable work that this committee performs.

M.T.T. FARES.

Mr. COUNBE (Torrens): I move:

That the by-law of the Municipal Tramways Trust, in respect of increases of fares, made on August 11, 1965, and laid on the table of this House on August 24, 1965, be disallowed.

This is to enable the matter of the recent bus fare increases determined by the Municipal Tramways Trust to be debated in the House, and to provide an opportunity for all honourable members to decide whether these increases are justified and necessary. When I first gave notice of this motion I was seeking information about such matters as the cost of awards, service pay and so on, and about how much increased revenue the increase in fares would bring to the Treasury and to the trust. I will admit that some of this data was given by the Premier in reply to a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition after I had given notice of my motion. However, only part of the information I require was given then.

I want to give the House some information about the schedule of increases in fares that is contained in the by-law to which I have referred and for the disallowance of which I am now moving. The increase for the third section is from 1s. to 1s. 6d.; for the sixth section, from 1s. 6d. to 2s.; and for the tenth section, from 2s. to 2s. 6d. Pensioners and children will also pay double for certain section schedules. In fact, this represents a 50 per cent increase in some cases, and in my view appears to be extremely steep, sudden and severe. I have received many complaints both verbally and by letter, and the whole matter has been ventilated in both newspapers since the increases were announced and since I originally moved for the disallowance of this by-law. The letters I have received are in the form of protests against the severe imposts which have been made at the same time as so many other increases to which I referred in the debate last evening.

These increases, such as increases in water rates, council rates and Housing Trust rentals, have hit the average householder fairly severely. The increase in fares, of course, is the culmination of all increases and has come about only since the present Government took office. The third section increase, which particularly affects most of the constituents in my district, represents a 50 per cent rise over the previous fare. To get from the inner part of Prospect and Walkerville to the city (that is, from anywhere just north of Fitzroy Terrace or Robe Terrace, which is only about three miles from Parliament House) will now cost 3s. a day per person instead of 2s. For each week (and this concerns the average traveller) it will now cost 15s. instead of 10s. For a double journey to the city and back again, a worker will now pay 30s.

a week instead of £1 a week, which is a 50 per cent increase.

I assure honourable members that a feeling of unrest has been expressed to me candidly by people in my district; there is resentment at the rise and a certain fear of what charges are to come next. People believe the Labor Party has let down its own supporters on this occasion. In addition to the increases affecting adult fares, children's and pensioners' fares for six and seven sections will also be increased, even doubled. Is it suggested that these increases were made by the M.T.T. without informing the Government or that the Premier did not approve of these steep increases? I did not notice any motion of urgency moved by a member of the Government Party in respect of these increases in the same way as a motion was moved last week on rental increases. That matter was first ventilated by a member on this side, and subsequently a motion of urgency was moved by a member of the Government. I did not see any like moves by members of the Government when these bus fares were increased. We did not hear a single Government member voice even one word of protest against it, and that means that possibly the Government members approve of it. Again, it was left to a member of the Liberal Opposition to voice this protest and to speak up for the travelling public of South Australia. I submit that the action of the Government in supporting these increases and not objecting to them in any way is very strange and in marked contrast to earlier statements by Labor speakers, statements that were made before the last election. Of course, things are very different now from what they were then.

So that there will be no mistake as to what was actually said, I shall quote the actual words of the Premier in his election speech when he was Leader of the Opposition. He said it was the announced policy of his Party to encourage greater patronage of public transport. These are his words:

For instance, the capital investment by the Tramways Trust on its fleet of buses seems to be out of proportion when a comparison is made of the idle time the buses are in depot as against in use for the public, although it may be desirable to have such equipment in an emergency. However, the usage is also very important, and increased fares are not the answer. Concerning the use of buses, a job of work awaiting a Minister is to set a policy in motion to make use of the buses by encouraging people to travel by bus.

Mr. Millhouse: All that sounds pretty hollow now, doesn't it?

Mr. COUMBE: My word, it does. I emphasize the passage, "Usage is also very important and increased fares are not the answer." In reply to a question on this very subject by the member for Mitcham on August 19, the Premier said:

If this Government can do anything to encourage people to travel on this form of transport, it will leave no stone unturned.

Those are actual statements by the Leader of the Government regarding the trust's operations. He said plainly that increasing fares was not the answer to the need for greater patronage of the trust's bus services, and he went on to say that one thing the Minister of Transport must do was to plan to increase the patronage of public transport. These new charges that have been levied upon the working people of this State have already absorbed the service pay that has been awarded to Government employees. That amount has been absorbed in one fell swoop. The increases have certainly absorbed completely the 1½ per cent margins award that was recently made by the court. Therefore, in effect, the working man in this State travelling by bus is not only back where he started but behind scratch. In making these statements (and my statements and criticisms are levelled at this Government) I want to say one or two things about the M.T.T. and its administration, which I have admired over recent years because of its efficiency and the way it has been putting its programme of rehabilitation into practice. It has reduced its annual deficit each year for the last 11 years; it has been consistently reducing its capital obligation to the Treasury, and last year it repaid £74,000. Last year, in addition, no Loan funds were called up for use by the trust. The current value of assets last year rose by £166,000, and the value of the trust's fixed assets last year increased by £3,000, whereas its liability decreased by £34,000. The Auditor-General's Report (page 231) contains several rather pertinent comments concerning the trust's operations. It states:

Operations for the year resulted in a deficit of £53,000 before taking into account the Government grant of £10,000. This was an improvement of £65,000 compared with 1963-64, making the 11th year in succession in which a reduction had been effected in the trust's annual deficit.

I believe full credit must be given to the trust for the way it has administered its affairs and the way it has achieved this result. A most significant part of the report states:

Patronage of the trust's services declined by 3.65 per cent, the loss of passengers being

2,137,000 in contrast to an increase of 532,000 (0.92 per cent) in the previous year.

These numbers that I mention, of course, represent passenger journeys. The report states that income was £213,000 above the previous year, despite a decline in patronage. Traffic receipts were £211,000 higher, mainly as a result of a modest fare adjustment on July 5, 1964. The working expenses in that time rose by £147,000. The report and balance-sheet dealt in some detail with the question of depreciation. The report states:

The provision for depreciation of wasting assets for the year, £290,000, was £3,000 above 1963-64.

However, the statement is made that no alteration during the year of stock of trams or buses was made, yet the figure for depreciation on wasting assets was £3,000 above that of the previous year. In fact, the fixed assets such as motor vehicles were reduced by £7,000 in that time. Naturally, anybody reading this report and seeing these provisions would have expected that this depreciation figure would have been reduced, but it has been increased. The only suggestion I can make is that the rolling stock, which has not been increased, is being depreciated at a much faster rate than is normal. The amortization provision for the cost of restoring roadways increased by £29,000. Years ago the trust ripped up the old tram tracks and replaced them with sealed ways, but this has been completed for many years. The reason for this large increase in the amortization provision is given in the Auditor-General's Report:

This followed a decision of the Municipal Tramways Trust to write off the remainder of the capitalized rehabilitation charges over a period of 10 years instead of the previous practice of amortizing at the rate of two per cent per annum.

The increased depreciation provisions and the greatly accelerated amortization charges suggest that the trust had a better financial year than the adjusted figures reveal. It seems that the trust is deliberately adjusting these amounts at the expense of the travelling public, and that is clear from the figures set out clearly and dispassionately by the Auditor-General.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It is a loaded balance sheet?

Mr. COUMBE: Yes. Why does the Government not advance to the trust from Revenue Account to subsidize the travelling public, as was done by the previous Government? This would be consistent with the Labor Party's election promises, which have now been broken.

If this step was not acceptable to the Government, it should have at least subsidized the cost of service payments to the trust's employees. Service pay seems to be one of the major factors in the wage increase to the trust, which is trying to provide for these adjustments by fare increases. I have not been able to find out how much is being provided to the trust for service payments, or if these payments have actually been made. This was discussed earlier this year, and an undertaking was given by the Government that service pay would be paid to Municipal Tramways Trust employees. From information given in an answer to a question by the Leader, I understood that the amount required for service payments would be partly offset by increases in fares. I would be interested to know what is happening about service pay.

I have suggested how these difficulties could be overcome and how severe increases could have been avoided. If the solution was not acceptable to the Government, a more realistic charge could have been made. If one criticizes an action one should suggest an alternative, and I have done that. If the Government was not prepared to accept the increase suggested, perhaps a modest increase in charges could have been made. This would have been a practical gesture by the Government to the public and would have kept costs within bounds. This gesture would have been appreciated by the general public, and would have led to greater patronage of public transport; instead, some people have been driven away from buses and trams. I emphasize the need to encourage greater use of our public transport system both from the financial aspect and from the point of view of traffic control and congestion. The public should be provided with as economical a means of transport as possible. Many eminent authorities on town planning have recommended the increased use of public transport systems to reduce the number of motor vehicles entering large cities and choking the roadways.

It is a symbol of our affluent society that more people are using motor cars instead of public transport. If public transport has to pay and congestion in the streets is to be avoided, we should encourage the use of public transport in our city. I should imagine that this idea would appeal to the Government, and more especially to the Attorney-General, as the administrator of town planning, to the Minister of Transport and to the Minister of Local Government. Usually an increase in fares results in a falling off in patronage and

an increase in the use of private vehicles. The drop last year of more than 3.65 per cent in passengers carried, representing 2,317,000 people journeys, should cause the Government grave concern. I quote from an authoritative source, the *Australian Economic Papers*, edited at the time by Mr. H. R. Hudson, the present member for Glenelg. The article, written by Mr. G. R. Webb of the University of Melbourne, deals with the transport system in Melbourne where both buses and trams run in city streets. I do not necessarily agree with that system. In Adelaide we have changed to buses except for the Glenelg service. The publication to which I have referred states:

Subsidization of public transport services also has been advocated recently in Melbourne as a solution to the city's transport problems. In a report on the future of traffic of Melbourne the Chief Engineer of the City Council emphasized that every endeavour should be made to attract people to the public transport systems, "even to the extent of subsidizing fares". In 1960 similar ideas were put forward by the President of the Melbourne Chamber of Commerce. He suggested that the policy of trying to make public transport self-supporting should be reconsidered and that it might be better to reduce fares and induce more people to make use of public transport instead of private transport. In this way traffic congestion and parking problems might be eased.

Then, dealing with the question of fare increases, the author makes this interesting comment:

Nevertheless, it is interesting to note the recent experience of the City of Ithaca in New York State. In an attempt to keep cars off the streets the city lowered bus fares and ran the services at a loss. This led to a steady increase in the number of persons using the buses and a reduction in the deficit.

Mr. Quirke: It was advocated somewhere recently that public transport be entirely free.

Mr. COUMBE: I do not advocate that, but the present increase in fares is too steep and, before these increases were introduced, the Government should have taken steps to remedy the situation. If this motion is defeated the Government must stand charged with facilitating the spiralling of costs in our community, and with hitting the pocket of the working men and women where it hurts most. Many women have to travel to employment in the city each day, and they can ill afford this extra impost being levied on them.

Mr. Hudson: When was the last increase in fares?

Mr. COUMBE: In June, 1964, to be exact.

Mr. Clark: Was the Government increasing the spiralling inflation then, too?

Mr. COUMBE: On this occasion some of the fares will be increased by 1s.

Mr. Hudson: That is not so!

Mr. COUMBE: The fare increases that I earlier quoted are these: on the sixth and seventh section from 1s. 6d. to 2s. I apologize for saying that it was 1s. in some cases.

Mr. Hudson: There were more increases last time than there are this time.

Mr. COUMBE: That is not so.

Mr. Hudson: There were increases on all sections except the third, sixth and seventh.

Mr. COUMBE: That is not so. Although I do not have the figures before me at present, I differ from what the honourable member is saying. The people who can least afford these increases are those who have to use public transport. Many of them voted Labor at the last election, but they now bitterly realize that they have been misled. Indeed, they are becoming disillusioned. I have been told that these are the people who will regrettably remember the election catch-cry, "Live better with Labor." It has turned rather sour today, and the statement that I have now heard made is that we "Live dearer with Labor." The metropolitan members of the House are more concerned about this matter and must in all sincerity vote in favour of the motion. My suggestions whereby these fare increases should be avoided should be seriously considered.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion of the honourable member for Torrens seconded?

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Yes, Sir, I have much pleasure in seconding the motion.

Mr. Hudson: The terrible twins!

Mr. Jennings: He is not smiling; it is only wind!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am surprised that the honourable member does not wait a minute and say that it is hot air. One bad thing about this Government and its supporters is that they prejudice all the issues, and this is one issue they have prejudged.

Mr. Shannon: They are very unco-operative when it comes to criticism, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This is a matter of general interest to all members, especially to metropolitan members. Perhaps I should remind honourable members opposite that 10 metropolitan members sit on the other side. I suppose there is no metropolitan district in which residents will not be affected by this rise in bus fares. As six bus routes service my district, I naturally have a special interest in the matter. I cannot but think that, by the levity with which members opposite are treating this matter, and by the jocular

remarks they have made, few of them travel by bus themselves. If they did they would know the depth of resentment that has been expressed by the travelling public on this matter. I suggest that it will be to the disadvantage of honourable members opposite to treat the matter so lightly. If honourable members opposite took more notice of what the general public thought on these matters, they would be taking this debate rather more seriously than they apparently are.

Mr. Clark: Are you speaking as a bus traveller?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I travel by bus many times a week.

Mr. Hudson: Did you travel by bus last year?

Mr. Clark: I bet you used your member's pass!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My word I did, but that did not mean that my ears were closed to what was being said around me. Even if the minds of honourable members opposite are closed, they should leave their ears open and they could then find out what people think about this. It is extraordinary that only a week ago a motion of no confidence in the Government was moved by a backbencher of the Government Party. Yet he would be just as much affected by this increase as he was by the increase in Housing Trust rentals.

Mr. Shannon: He is very inexperienced.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I suppose he is. He protested against the rise in rents but now he is silent when it comes to a rise in fares, although that matter affects the people just as much.

Mr. Lawn: What did you do last year when bus fares were increased? You left the bus and travelled by train.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member asks about last year. May I remind honourable members opposite that last year, when fares were increased, the Liberal Government had not said six months before what the present Government said during the election campaign: that it would encourage the use of public transport.

Mr. Clark: You have said that over and over again.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, let me continue.

Mr. Hudson: If you are going to talk about motions of no confidence, why didn't you protest last year?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not in the habit of moving no-confidence motions in my own Government. The member for Onkaparinga said that the member for Glenelg was inexperienced

and the member for Glenelg is now underlining that statement. I also understand that he has advised people not to sign contracts with the Housing Trust, but that is another matter. I shall give an example of the cost of transport resulting from these increases. A friend of mine, who lives on the Anzac Highway somewhere between the city and Glenelg—

Mr. McKee: Is he your only friend?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, but he will do on this occasion. Living on the Anzac Highway, he works in the western suburbs, at Woodville, I think. To travel by bus to work five days a week and to attend army parades costs him now £2 2s. a week, which is a large sum to spend for travel to and from work and to one other activity each week. It is a big proportion of a man's pay. I do not altogether agree with the honourable member for Torrens when he emphasizes the fact that this matter hits the pockets of the working man, and that members of the public who supported the Australian Labor Party at the last election are hard hit by this. Everybody is hard hit by it. I do not make any distinction, nor do I think any valid distinction can be made between various members of the public and between various sections of the public. This hits everybody's pocket and should not have been imposed.

Mr. Shannon: Unfortunately, it does not really hit the wealthy and the poor alike: the man on the basic wage must pay the same fare as is paid by the man earning £50 a week.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is so. This is contrary to the policy expressed six months ago (and we are frequently told of the short time the Government has been in office) by the Government Party. Apart from one sentence which is incomprehensible, the Premier stated well his policy in this respect before the election. Although the member for Torrens has quoted what the then Leader of the Opposition said, I think it bears quoting. Under the heading of "Transport", he said:

Our policy provides for a co-ordinated transport system under a Minister responsible to Parliament.

We have the Minister, but he does not seem to have made the slightest difference to anything.

Mr. Coumbe: Yes, he has; fares have gone up.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. The then Leader of the Opposition continued:

Mobile transport, both passenger and freight, must be co-ordinated with that of air, shipping and rail.

I dare say we will hear more about that later. The Premier continued:

For instance, the capital investment by the Municipal Tramways Trust on its fleet of buses seems to be out of proportion when a comparison is made of the idle time the buses are in depot as against in use for the public, although it may be desirable to have such equipment in an emergency.

Whether or not that matter has been taken up with the trust by the Government with a view to saving costs, I do not know. If the Minister of Transport has taken it up I should like to know the trust's reply. The Premier continued:

However, the usage is also very important, and increased fares are not the answer concerning the use of the buses. A job of work awaiting a Minister is to set a policy in motion to make use of the buses by encouraging people to travel by bus.

That was the policy laid down by the Premier and his comrades in the Labor Party. No doubt all Ministers on the front bench supported that policy at the time, and I must agree with the sentiments expressed therein. However, this is in marked contrast to the answer given to me by the Premier when I asked him a question when the increases were announced. He then said:

It is common knowledge that any increase in fares is resisted for some time; it may even be longer than we expect. The trust provides a public service, but has only one form of revenue.

He then twisted right around and said:

I assure the honourable member that, if this Government can do anything to encourage people to travel on this form of transport, it will leave no stone unturned to accomplish this.

That is what the Premier said a few days after Cabinet had sanctioned these increases. I do not know what stones he will turn over to accomplish his aim, but he has not turned over many. He was full of fine words and laudable sentiments before the election but when he got into power the story was very different.

Of course, we know that what I have said is perhaps a little severe on the Government. Indirectly this is one way in which the people are paying for another part of the policy enunciated by the Labor Party during the last election campaign. One of the ingredients in the rise in costs of the M.T.T. is the payment of service pay which was promised at the last election by the Labor Party. It said that service pay retrospective to January 1, 1965, would be paid, with the provision

that the service payments would be in addition to any amount at present being received provided that it was in agreement with the decisions of the Labor Party's Industrial Advisory Committee. Therefore, the service pay was part of the Labor Party's policy at the last election. When the Premier replied to the Leader of the Opposition on this rise in fares, this is what the answer included:

Increased costs to the trust as a result of service pay and increased margins awarded by the Arbitration Commission are estimated to represent in this financial year £187,000.

Service pay is the first increase in costs mentioned, and the irony of the thing is that the Government is not paying for the service pay to M.T.T. employees: it is being passed on to members of the public. Therefore, the public is paying for the fulfilment of one of the other election promises of the Government, and that, Sir, I think, to say the least of it, (as things have turned out in this particular instance) is a most unfortunate and most unfair impost.

I also desire to mention briefly, as the member for Torrens did, the Auditor-General's Report. Members opposite when they were on this side of the House were far fonder of looking at it than they are now, apparently. That, too, sets out what happens when fares are raised. Last year patronage of the trust's services declined by 3.65 per cent. At the bottom of page 231 there is a table setting out just what variations have taken place in revenue, expenditure, and so on. We find there that in the year ended June 30, 1964, the total number of passengers carried was 58,571,000. In the year ended June, 30, 1965, it had fallen to 56,434,000. The average fare per passenger in the first year was 10.7d., and in the next year it was 12d. exactly. The fares had gone up, of course, by 1.3d. The total cost per passenger in the first year was 11.7d. and in the second year 12.77d., so that while the average fare paid by passengers had risen to more than the average cost per passenger before the rise, the rise itself (because of the decreased patronage) pushed up the average cost per passenger to the trust to a figure that was above the return. That just shows what happens: it is the dog chasing its tail all the time, and it is to me quite extraordinary that this Government should in this, as in so many other things, say one thing before the election and then when it comes into power do precisely the other thing, to the detriment of the public of this State.

What was the alternative then? It is all very well for members on this side to castigate the Government for its foolishness and for its lack of good faith, because that is what it is; but we must, of course, be prepared to suggest an alternative. The member for Torrens has already suggested that. This year, as was the case last year, an amount of £10,000 is on the Estimates as a contribution towards the running expenses of the trust. If it were necessary for the trust to have more money to keep up with its expenditure, then I believe that, because of the very great desirability of encouraging the use of public transport (the previous policy of this Government), the amount of money paid to the trust as a contribution by the Government should have been sufficiently increased to have avoided the rise in fares. As there is a line on the Estimates, I hope the Government will consider doing this, if this motion is passed and the regulation increasing the fares is knocked out. I believe that that is what the Government should have done. I believe that even now (although I suppose it would lose some face because it would have to acknowledge the mistake it has undoubtedly made) that is the policy it should adopt. This regulation should be disallowed in this place. The Government should start again on another tack. Only in that way can it honour the policy which it presented to the people on this matter before the election, a policy with which I think everybody agrees, and at the same time provide the trust with the funds which it apparently needs to meet its ordinary commitments and the extra commitment of service pay which has been loaded on to it by this Government.

Mr. JENNINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

TRAVEL CONCESSIONS.

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That in the opinion of this House the Government should forthwith, as an administrative measure, put into effect the proposals in the policy speech delivered on February 18, 1965, for assistance to schoolchildren in the metropolitan area, travelling regularly to and from school by Tramways Trust vehicles, by rail, and by licensed private vehicles, which Mr. Jennings had moved to amend by leaving out all the words after "should" and inserting in lieu thereof "be commended for its policy announced by the Premier on June 30, 1965, that the Government would subsidize the Municipal Tramways Trust for children's

travel to school by licensed privately operated buses to the extent necessary to enable it to issue one and two section passes at a reduction from the present charge of £1 to the trust's own normal charge of 10s. or 12s."

(Continued from August 4. Page 838.)

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): I rise on this occasion to reverse the compliment and this time to support the honourable member for Mitcham, who has just supported me in my motion, and to say at the outset that it is quite a coincidence that we have two succeeding matters on the Notice Paper with almost the same subject. I assure the House that this was not by design, because this matter has been on the Notice Paper for many weeks now. The essence of the motion is to request the Government by administrative action to secure greater concessions for schoolchildren travelling to and from school by Tramways Trust bus, private bus, and by rail. It follows the fact that the Opposition, when it presented its policy speech through the then Premier (Sir Thomas Playford), said that, as a definite plank of its election policy, it would further reduce fares to £1 a term for all schoolchildren travelling by these forms of transport, and that this would apply whether the children were attending independent, private or State schools.

Having moved this motion, we then found that the Labor Party Government moved an amendment. If we look at the amendment closely we can see that it is a very cheap and snide way to wriggle out of a rather awkward position, because what the amendment does in effect is to highlight in one way the complete inadequacy of what the Government has done in this regard. The honourable member for Enfield, who moved this amendment, talked of the audacity and the buffoonery displayed on this side of the House in moving this motion, but actually it was the member for Enfield himself who indulged in buffoonery in moving the amendment. The Liberal and Country League Party's policy on the occasion of the election was for a concession fare of £1 a term for the main sections of travel. So that the record is put quite correct, I propose to read out from *Hansard* again the exact words that were used. These were the words quoted by Sir Thomas Playford when he was Premier and when he was making his election speech on behalf of this Party:

If returned to office my Government proposes to make early arrangements to extend concessions for regular travel by children to and

from school by Tramways Trust vehicles, by rail, and by licensed private vehicles. It is proposed that for all scholars under 19 years of age the periodical pass for Tramways Trust travel up to seven sections of one mile each shall be £1 per term. The comparable rates will apply to rail and licensed private vehicles. . . . For scholars travelling regularly by private vehicles which do not at present issue passes, the concession will be greater still. On the average the latter would get concessions of about 70 per cent. The additional concession for rail travel will be much the same as for travel by bus. . . . Only one other State provides the type of concession proposed for the metropolitan area, and in that case the amount to be paid by the child is double that proposed for South Australia.

That was a clear and straightforward statement, and the motion by the member for Mitcham suggested and recommended to the Government that it should, by administrative action, adopt this policy. The amendment moved by the member for Enfield in such a comic way states that the M.T.T. fares and concessions shall stay as they are at present; that there shall be no concessions to children who at present travel on M.T.T. buses; and, further, that the private bus concessions will be reduced to the level of the M.T.T. fares being charged at present. These are considerably higher than the proposed motion would have them. The amendment is interesting because it states:

. . . at a reduction from the present charge of £1 to the Trust's own normal charge of 10s. or 12s.

It does not say whether the 10s. or 12s. is in respect of a week, a month or a term. The amendment does not make sense in its present form. The private bus concession referred to in this amendment has had an interesting history. The amendment states that the Government should be commended for its policy announced by the Premier on June 30, 1965, and that fares should be reduced on private buses. This was announced by the Premier on June 30, 1965, but the next thing is that we have an answer yesterday to a question by the Leader in which detailed concession fares were given.

Mr. Millhouse: It had to be announced on June 30 because that was the day I moved the motion.

Mr. COURCE: Exactly. It was announced yesterday that the concessions would operate from October. The people have had to wait for three months from the day of the announcement, but if we had been returned the concessions would now have been operating for some months.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: There are plenty of promises that you made that have not been carried out.

Mr. COURCE: No more than the promises made by the Minister's Party that have been broken.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What about the bridge over the Torrens River?

Mr. COURCE: Recently the Minister of Works told me that satisfactory progress was being made.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I am speaking about the one that was promised in the previous policy speech, at the continuation of Portrush Road.

Mr. COURCE: I am not interested in Portrush Road. If the member for Enfield had made representations as I have he may have got his bridge. Two bridges in my district are being repaired.

Mr. Jennings: I know of one that has been completed in my district without anyone making representations about it.

Mr. COURCE: The honourable member means at Darley Ford. Some bridge! This amendment is a miserable attempt at a compromise to square the election promise that was made. As a Party, we offered £1 a term up to seven sections, but the present Government's proposal is to leave the fare as it is at present. My son pays £3 a term to the M.T.T. to travel by bus to and from school, but under our proposal he would have paid £1 a term. No Government member has said anything about what is to be done about rail concession fares. It has not been referred to in the amendment. Is nothing to be done for children who travel by rail? Perhaps nothing is being done because of the extra £1,000,000 in revenue that has been promised will come from the Railways Department in this financial year. Many children travel by rail, but they will apparently receive no benefit. How can any member refuse to support the motion?

It seeks only the Government's agreement and co-operation to implement a proposal made by this Party, and the present Premier said that he would undertake the promises that we made at the election. In all the caustic remarks and buffoonery from Government members, the feelings and pockets of parents of children were completely overlooked. I expected Government members to display sincerity. The word "buffoonery" was used by the member for Adelaide, but I suggest that he is the chief buffoon in this debate, because he made a spectacle of himself when he was "having a shot" at the member for Mitcham. He quoted,

in what he thought was a humorous way, from *On Dit*. I shall give the whole quotation, which the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) did not do. It states:

We spoke to Mr. Robin Millhouse, M.P., to get a Liberal view on the matter. Mr. Millhouse felt that the concessions for students were in his opinion unnecessary, but he said he was "open to correction".

That is a fair statement. The article continues:

He suggested that students ride bikes to university, an entertaining but in most cases a most impractical suggestion.

Then the article states:

We also interviewed Mr. Don Dunstan, Labor M.P., who expressed sympathy for the students' financial difficulties, but, due to Party discipline, was unable to express very definite views on the subject.

That was the important part which, of course, the member for Adelaide so conveniently forgot to quote.

Mr. Millhouse: On that occasion the Party managed, in some way, to gag the Minister.

Mr. COUMBE: The member for Mitcham, in all sincerity, moved a motion seeking the Government's co-operation to give a benefit not to this Party or to your own, Mr. Speaker, but to a hard-pressed section of the community. These students are the citizens of the future. Many of their parents are finding it a hardship to send their children to school, and any impost by way of fare increases is an added hardship. On the other hand, a concession would be much appreciated, and the motion seeks to provide a concession. The amendment placed on the file does not improve the matter one iota; it is only political window dressing in an effort to give some credit to the Government by giving a concession to one small section only, namely, the children who now travel on private buses. The amendment is merely an effort to get the Government out of an awkward position. The motion before us should be carried, and I suggest that honourable members should, in all conscience, support it. I have great pleasure in supporting the motion.

The House divided on Mr. Jennings's amendment "That the words proposed to be struck out by the amendment be struck out":

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings (teller), Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, and Ryan.

Noes (15).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Pearson, Sir

Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Corcoran and Walsh. Noes—Messrs. Freebairn and Stott.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried.

The House divided on Mr. Jennings's amendment "That the words proposed to be inserted be so inserted":

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings (teller), Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, and Ryan.

Noes (15).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Bywaters, Corcoran, and Walsh. Noes—Messrs. Freebairn, Nankivell, and Stott.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried.

The House divided on the motion as amended:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings (teller), Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, and Ryan.

Noes (15).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Bywaters, Corcoran, and Walsh. Noes—Messrs. Freebairn, Nankivell, and Stott.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Motion as amended thus carried.

CITY OF ENFIELD BY-LAW: ZONING.

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford:

(For wording of motion, see page 1388.)

(Continued from September 1. Page 1389.)

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): I support the motion. For the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition and members opposite, and to put their minds at rest, I should like to inform the House that the Subordinate Legislation Committee thoroughly examined this matter; it took extensive evidence from witnesses, and it visited the area and inspected various factories and sites within the area. After carefully considering the matter, members

of the committee have decided to support the motion for disallowance, because the Local Government Act gives the council the power to control the situation.

Motion carried.

PROHIBITION OF PREFERENCE AND DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 15. Page 1526.)

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I emphasize my absolute opposition to compulsory unionism through coercion and what amounts to industrial blackmail. The note sent out from Cabinet simply means that anyone who is not a unionist will not be employed.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What about transfers within the Public Service?

Mr. QUIRKE: If a person is not a unionist he will not get a job in any capacity where the workmen are covered by a union, and to say that that is not so just beggars the question. The note states:

Cabinet desires that wherever possible present employees who are not unionists should be encouraged to join appropriate unions.

I can imagine what sort of encouragement they would get. Who would do the encouraging? It would be primarily the union concerned and, knowing unions and unionists, I know that the unionists would object to any non-unionists working with them. We have that position all the time today, and strikes occur because unionists will not work with non-unionists. I believe that anybody who does not have any substantive objection could and should belong to a union. When all is said and done, the unions have provided such a person with the conditions under which he is working today. Despite that, no man in these days of so-called freedom should be compelled against his will to join that union, yet that is what this present action will bring about. We know perfectly well that, if a person does not join the appropriate union, he will not be employed. Employers generally do not want the trouble that invariably follows the employment of people who do not belong to a union, and they, too, in order to avoid any trouble, are likely to see that a person either joins the union or leaves. We know that that takes place, and that can be a form of coercion. It is also a system of blackmail: "Join this union or get out." I know that this thing is inherent in the Socialist State. Socialism cannot

work without compulsion. This form of compulsion is the very antithesis of democracy, and this action is an entirely undemocratic one.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Hopelessly undemocratic.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes. The whole of the animal kingdom is controlled in some measure by instinct. Man is not exempt from having instinct, but in the whole of the animal kingdom he is the one that has free will and right of self-determination. The action contemplated denies him both those attributes, and to that extent it must be condemned. This edict from the Cabinet, the Government of the State, is a negation of an individual's right to that human freedom which his humanity and his manhood demand shall be his. Therefore, it is tyrannous.

Only this morning I was reading a letter from three members of my family who have been travelling the world. Having spent some time in Russia, they say that the Russian people are the kindest and most generous people that one could meet. It is a Socialist and compulsive State and has a system which, in many ways obvious to all, is degrading to the people who live there. In any street in any town can be seen women employed at the lowest and most menial work: women huddled in shapeless clothing sweeping the street, shovelling snow, and doing the most menial tasks. Although the people are nice, they are condemned, and that is the zenith of Socialism. Socialism completely takes away, in its compulsive factors, human rights and dignity. No one should be able to take away from any person his right to that dignity which is given to him as a thinking man with a mind and personality, the right to free choice, and the ability to decide for himself what he is going to do and how he is going to do it. What has been done by the Government is a start along the line of human degradation, because to say to a man you shall not work unless you do something at the will of the Government, and that you shall do something to which you are opposed, takes away from him his rights, and degrades him.

Mr. Broomhill: You did not object when another Government sought to apply the same things!

Mr. QUIRKE: I don't care who did it before. I say that your Government should not do it, and if you do, you will do it against my will.

Mr. Ryan: You said we would do it.

Mr. QUIRKE: The Government will not do it with my will: it will do it in spite of my

will. In spite of what his predecessors fought for and brought into existence in the unions, in which there was no compulsion, the member for Port Adelaide will be the first to say that a man must join or he will not get a job. The old unionists had a saying, "He who will not work shall not eat." Government members are saying that, although there is work, because a man will not join a union he will not eat. No Government on earth outside, those to which I have referred, should believe in compulsion and coercion of the individual. It is not the right of any Government elected by the people in a free election to do these things. It is entirely different to have a Government through force and which maintains its ascendancy by force. The Government of South Australia is here at the wish of the people; elected by the people to serve the people, and not to destroy any individual member of this society. That is what this can do, and inherent in it is the destruction of a man, no matter how perfect he is in his application to his job, and no matter what is his knowledge. If he is a non-unionist and is opposed by someone inferior in talent, it is the inferior talent that will get the job, because the superior man does not belong to a union and, indeed, does not wish to.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: It is a serious blow to the Public Service.

Mr. QUIRKE: Not only to the Public Service, but to human freedom.

Mr. Broomhill: Have you had any complaints?

Mr. QUIRKE: I don't have to look for complaints before I voice my opinion.

Mr. Broomhill: Is there anything wrong with it?

Mr. QUIRKE: I am not guided by running around seeing whether people are of the same opinion as I am. I am here to give my opinion of this in the interests of all people.

Mr. Burdon: Are you a financial member of the Liberal and Country League?

Mr. QUIRKE: I joined that Party of my own will, but what you are doing is compelling a man to join.

Mr. Burdon: And you are compelled to continue!

Mr. QUIRKE: I am not. I can resign at any time. These are not parallel cases. I joined of my own free will the same as I could join a friendly society, and leave it. In this case, a man has no free will. A man cannot be employed in a job if he is not in a union.

Mr. Burdon: You would be out of a job.

Mr. QUIRKE: If it was my concern I would not care, so long as I am not ordered out of it by someone else. That is when I would fight. If I were a member of a union but ceased to be a member, I would be ordered out of it. My present position is an easy one. I can say things in opposition to the rest of my Party that members opposite would not dare to say in their Party.

Mr. Ryan: Rubbish!

Mr. QUIRKE: The member for Port Adelaide is one that would bow his head the lowest of anyone in submission to his Party.

Mr. Ryan: This Party was good enough for you years ago.

Mr. QUIRKE: The honourable member would knock his head on the ground. This compulsion destroys human dignity and prevents a man from earning a living, which is his unalienable right. It is coercion and industrial blackmail, and should never be tolerated as emanating from a Government that was elected to serve all the people. Those who have ideas of compulsion and those who do not have such ideas, should not impose an alien will on the people as soon as they are able to do so.

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide): I am amazed at the remarks of the member for Burra when he says that the Government is to implement a policy that we have had for many years. Everyone has known of the Australian Labor Party's policy, and it was endorsed by the people of this State. It seems that when we attempt to implement that policy, it is wrong. The policy of the Australian Labor Party was good enough for the member for Burra for many years, but now, for several reasons, it is not.

Mr. Quirke: For the reasons I have given.

Mr. RYAN: They are not good, and I think the honourable member would be the first to admit that. What is in the Bill, and what does it represent? It is one of the most ambiguous Bills I have ever seen. It could never be put into practice, and the member for Mitcham, being a member of the legal profession, should readily agree.

Mr. Millhouse: No, I don't, actually.

Mr. RYAN: I should hate to engage the member for Mitcham as my legal representative. Members of the Opposition are not conversant with the contents of this Bill. Indeed, that has been evidenced by the remarks that have been made, first, by the member for Mitcham in introducing the Bill and, secondly, by the member for Torrens who supported his colleague, and who said that the Bill dealt only with the Public Service. I can find

nothing in this Bill that applies to the Public Service of South Australia. It is a general Bill which does not specifically mention the Government or the Public Service. I think the reason for the Bill boils down to one thing—the hatred of the member for Mitcham for the Labor Party and its policy. When explaining the Bill, the honourable member said:

After all, preference to unionism is set out in those words in the State platform of the Australian Labor Party, even though it was not mentioned in the A.L.P. policy speech before the last election. However, I entirely disagree with that policy.

That is all this Bill involves. Because the member for Mitcham entirely disagrees with the policy of the Australian Labor Party, he has introduced the Bill. The honourable member also said that the funds of our Party were augmented through the contributions made by union members. That is another major reason for the introduction of the Bill, which, again, illustrates the honourable member's hatred for the Australian Labor Party. The member for Mitcham has sought to relate the policy of our Party to a Bill, and to prevent the implementation of that policy. We have heard the great exposition by the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe), and we have heard all about his great knowledge of Parliamentary procedure. When quoting what the member for Semaphore said in this debate, the member for Torrens said:

He gave us a long history of the struggle to obtain recognition and to improve conditions, a subject with which I believe we are all well acquainted, and with which we are not arguing in respect of this Bill, which applies only to the Public Service.

The honourable member said the Bill applied only to the Public Service, and he said that anybody who referred to any subject other than the Public Service, in his opinion, was not speaking to the Bill. What does the member for Torrens know about the Bill? Absolutely nothing! The Bill does not specifically mention the Public Service in any shape or form and, as we all know, that was never intended. The tirade by the member for Burra is rather curious. The honourable member has been brought up with a knowledge of the trade union movement and of the policy of the Australian Labor Party. I am amazed to hear him say that, if a man is coerced or compelled to join a trade union, he will be prevented from earning the living he desires to earn. Foenander, an authority on this matter, states:

The trade union movement had its origin in the efforts of the wage earners to reduce the great disparities that were established between their masters and themselves when the factory system became prevalent—disparities in respect of status as well as remuneration, hours of work, and other conditions of employment.

How will people in any industry or profession enjoy improvements in their conditions and remuneration unless they are awarded to them by the tribunal or arbitration system that we have to-day? Every member of the Opposition who has spoken to the Bill has said that he is totally opposed to compulsion to join a trade union, but the same people support compulsion, where arbitration is concerned. It is compulsory to belong to an arbitration system; otherwise how will conditions or wages be determined? In a publication called, *Industrial Relations from the Inside* (written by a Mr. Lee Freestone, who apparently, by the book's preamble, is a great expert on industrial matters), the following appears:

Using its power to arrive at section 51 (28) the Commonwealth Government has passed the Conciliation and Arbitration Act which provides for compulsory arbitration by an authority called the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission.

Mr. Jennings: This is a bit different, isn't it!

Mr. RYAN: Yes, it is different to have compulsory arbitration concerning everybody who earns a living, but members opposite do not believe in compulsion to join a union or association. A legal opinion cannot interpret this differently because, strange as it may seem, no specific mention is made of trade union. The legal interpretation can only be that it refers to an association.

Mr. Jennings: There is no difference in the morals!

Mr. RYAN: There is no difference in the aims, ambitions and ultimate desires, where a trade union is concerned. How can anybody enjoy remuneration unless it is won by a trade union or association? That remuneration must be determined by an arbitrary body set up under Commonwealth or State Statutes. The *Public Service Review* of September, 1965 refers to a ceremony held when the Public Service Association's new building was opened by the Chief Secretary. The President of the association said that this association had been formed in 1885 and was now 80 years old, and that membership had grown from 100 at the meeting of formation to more than 7,500. How is it that the Public Service Association represents the

majority of members employed in the Public Service and why do public servants join this association? They join because they realize that great benefits can be obtained from membership. Benefits are applicable to the association because individual members of the Public Service cannot approach a tribunal for an increase in wages or improvements in conditions. That is laid down by the Statutes of this State. No individual member can go to a departmental head and say that he wants an increased remuneration for the job he is doing. The body to make claims is the Public Service Association. The member for Mitcham is providing for those who are not members of the Public Service Association to share the benefits obtained by it. Over the years, the Liberal Government never altered the procedure whereby only an association can make representations to the court.

Then there are the Teachers Institute and the Police Association. Surely no member of the Opposition would say that it was desirable to give rights to individual policemen to go to the Commissioner for increases in wages. In any event, the Commissioner would not have the legal right to grant increases. The only authorized body set up in South Australia to do this is the Industrial Court. The constitution of the Industrial Court states that only recognized bodies can make representations on behalf of their members. Would members opposite create a position whereby individuals could enjoy the benefits derived by associations without contributing towards the associations? Surely this would be against the express wishes of members of the Public Service. The member for Mitcham said that he was approached by one member of the Public Service and, because of that, he wants to introduce a Bill that will provide for all members of the service by its provisions. The honourable member for Mitcham apparently believes that what one member of the Public Service wants is good enough, and that the minority should enforce on the majority a compulsory law. The relevant section of the Education Act states:

The board may make any award of its own motion, or on application made in accordance with the regulations by the Minister or an association of teachers.

Clause 24 (3) of regulation IV of the Education Regulations states:

Every application made by an association of teachers shall be signed by the chairman or secretary of that association pursuant to a resolution of the council or other governing body of the association.

Clause 26(2) states:

Any association of teachers may intervene in any proceedings before the board, any evidence, information, or arguments for the purpose of safeguarding the interests of members of that association.

That is clear, and we do not need a legal interpretation to tell us that it means that every application to the tribunal that deals with wages and conditions of members of the teachers association shall be signed by the Chairman or Secretary of that association pursuant to a resolution of the council or other governing body of the association. That means that according to the law of the State an individual cannot make an application for an increase in his remuneration; this must be done by an association.

The Bill exempts the organizations to which I have referred. It exempts Public Service Association members, Police Association members and the Teachers Institute. It provides that any organization already provided for by an Act or law of the Commonwealth or any award or order made therein is exempt. The organizations to which I have referred are already covered by an award of the court. The Bill does not cover the Public Service.

Mr. Broomhill: It does not make sense.

Mr. RYAN: That is so. The Bill is being introduced to prevent the policy of the Australian Labor Party from being implemented. The Leader of the Opposition knows probably better than does any other member that the policy of the Australian Labor Party over the years has been that of preference to unionists. The Leader himself has spoken of the good relationship between employer and employee in this State. Every time the Leader has wanted to discuss industrial matters he has gone to the trade union movement; as the Premier prior to March 6, he knew which body of men to approach.

I have dealt with what we might term the professional employees of the State—the Public Service, the police, and the teachers. The only other people employed by the State are those who we could say are members of craft unions. No-one can dispute that any person that relies on the conditions that have been won by the trade union movement should at least be a member of and contribute to the organization of the calling that he represents. Apparently, members of the Liberal Party are at variance as to their policy on preference to unionists. A *Current Affairs Bulletin* dealing with trade unionism in Australia states:

Trade unions, or some of them, seem to rank almost second to the weather as objects of popular abuse.

I agree with that. The article continues:

The letter columns of the newspaper are full of complaints that the miners or the watersiders are causing unrest, shortages, and public inconvenience, that they are out to run the country; but even the bitterest critics of their behaviour do not question their right to work for the industrial, economic, and social betterment of their members. Trade unions, in the words of a former Chief Judge of the Commonwealth Arbitration Court—

and he would be a really good solid Labor voter and contributor!

—must be recognized as an inevitable part of the industrial structure in its present stage of development.

Now comes the gem of them all:

"We believe," said the Federal Minister for Labour in May, 1950, "trade unionism in Australia should be supported, and that men who enter a particular occupation should, in general, join the union appropriate to that occupation.

Mr. Acting Speaker, that statement was made by the present Liberal Treasurer, who hopes to become Prime Minister if the Liberal Party remains in office.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: He didn't say it ought to be compulsory, did he?

Mr. RYAN: He said that trade unionism in Australia should be supported and that men who enter a particular occupation should in general join the union appropriate to that occupation. I know that the member for Alexandra never agrees to anything that comes from this side. Where do we believe in compulsion?

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You believe in preference to unionists.

Mr. RYAN: The honourable member does not know the difference between the words "compulsion" and "preference".

Mr. Hall: Apparently the Chief Secretary doesn't either, because he called it "compulsory unionism".

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Before you agree with what members opposite say, it will be a good idea to have it checked, because they have a great habit of misquoting and of taking things out of context.

Mr. RYAN: Yes. The whole of this debate from the Opposition has taken place upon an incorrect interpretation of the Australian Labor Party policy. Nobody knows the policy better than I, and I still cannot read where that policy is one of compulsion. The Liberals themselves believe in compulsion regarding the conditions of workers. It is compulsory for

certain conditions to be implemented in any organization, and any individual who receives salaries or wages must receive that remuneration as the result of some compulsion. Members opposite were in Government for many years, but now they want something done that they never attempted to do. This Bill was introduced because of the hatred of the member for Mitcham for the Labor Party and its policy. The Arbitration Court recognizes that representation can only be made from appropriate organizations for which awards are applicable. That is laid down by Commonwealth and State Industrial Courts, and the previous Government did not attempt to alter it. Applications to industrial tribunals, whether Commonwealth or State, can only be made by a respondent to an award. How can a person, not a member of a trade union, make representations about his remunerations or conditions? He is not a respondent to an award and someone must do it on his behalf.

The trade union movement does it for craftsmen and an association does it for professional members. Opposition members would not want to see that principle departed from. The present Leader of the Opposition realized that harmony in industry existed where someone represented the individual. No-one can accuse the Public Service Association of not acting in accordance with their charter of rights. On all occasions it has acted for the welfare of its members and the State as a whole. It is a legally representative body that can apply on behalf of its members. It commenced 80 years ago, and has grown from 100 members to about 7,500 members. In the professional section there are 1,815 male and 171 female members, a total of 1,986; 2,354 males and 817 females are in the clerical section, a total of 3,171; in the general section there are 1,278 males and 43 females, a total of 1,321; and in the nursing section there are two males and 734 females, a total of 736. That analysis of membership was at March, 1965, and since then the membership has increased by 300. If members of the Public Service Association are not satisfied with a Labor Government, it is amazing that membership has increased by 300 since the election. These people realize that if they want to receive the benefits of their calling or profession they have to be represented, and it is the Public Service Association that represents them.

Mr. Hughes: Do you think this Bill was designed to create unrest in the Public Service Association?

Mr. RYAN: No. The member for Mitcham said that he was approached by an individual and that, because of the discontent of that individual, this Bill was introduced. It is Parliamentary procedure that the majority shall prevail, and it is the main principle of trade unions and of professional associations that democracy shall prevail, although the minority shall not be disregarded. This Bill is ambiguous, and will not operate practically. The member for Burra at one stage said that the Bill would pass and then he said it would not pass. He meant that it would not be carried by his vote. In the last Parliament he had a balance of power, but now he is only one vote in 18 and that does not count much. He said that he was entirely opposed to the Labor Party policy.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: That is an offensive comment.

Mr. RYAN: I am glad to see that we can break through the iron curtain of the Opposition and become offensive to it. Opposition members now admit that we are offensive but, as a Government, we have to be on the offensive. If the Opposition wants to stay on the defensive they will be able to do so for more than 32 years. We on this side believe in the policy of our Party. If we did not we should do what the member for Burra did. He participated in the activities of the Labor Party for a number of years.

Mr. Quirke: It went bad, though.

Mr. RYAN: If ever a man went politically bad, the member for Burra did!

Mr. Jennings: He even wrote a treatise on Socialism!

Mr. RYAN: Every member of the Parliamentary Labor Party has the right to express his opinion in the framing of his Party's policy. We are not afraid to let the world know of our opinions and of the decisions that we make. Indeed, we allow the press to be present at our conferences and to publish those decisions.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We don't have a faceless conference as the other side has.

Mr. Hall: I hope you stick to your annual policy better than you did to your policy speech!

Mr. RYAN: I am proud to support the policy of our Party and, indeed, I shall audibly support it whenever it is necessary to do so. I hope that Parliament will not endorse the Bill, because it is not in the interests of the general public. I challenge the Opposition to ascertain the public's opinion whether this Bill should be carried or not. Indeed, if it

were carried, members opposite would not dare to show their faces, because their present numbers would probably be even more drastically reduced than they were recently. This Bill attempts to deprive a person of his legal right to have representation, and members of the Labor Party will always be prepared to resist that. If the Bill were carried it would take many people back to the principle that applied 50 to 60 years ago, when a person was fined by the court if he were found to be a member of a trade union or association. If honourable members opposite want those conditions to operate again then let them say so in the House. Members on this side have made their attitude clear to the people. Let members opposite do the same. I strongly oppose the Bill.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): We have just listened to a rather wonderful speech by the member for Port Adelaide. It was wonderful in two respects: first, it was noisy and everybody could hear it; secondly, scarcely one statement made by the honourable member as a fact was a fact. He did not understand the Bill or its provisions. In fact, he strenuously asserted something which, had he taken even a cursory glance at the Bill, he would have seen to be incorrect. He said that the Bill did not apply to the Public Service, but that it had general application.

Mr. Ryan: That is correct.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am glad that the honourable member does not contradict me. He quoted clause 3 to show that it was a Bill of general application. However, he did not look at clause 2, which gives a definition of "employee". Clause 2 states: "employee" includes a person employed in any capacity in the public service of the State. The Bill arises from a series of questions asked in this House and in another place about an instruction given by the Government, which was at first denied by it.

Mr. Ryan: You did not read it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have a copy of the instruction in front of me. It was given by the Government but it was completely repudiated by the front bench until it was read in the House. Even then a member opposite said he did not know anything about it. The instruction had a doubtful origin and did not arise from the Labor Party's election policy, as the honourable member for Port Adelaide would lead us to believe. He said this was a plank of the election platform of the

Labor Party. It is interesting to hear now what the Government intended to do at the time of the election and to see how it has failed to keep its promises. I shall quote what the Premier said prior to the election about industrial matters, and I am sure that the member for Port Adelaide will agree with every word. I am equally sure that the employees of the Government and employees in the State generally would agree with every word, if it ever happened. The Hon. Frank Walsh said in his policy speech:

As a Government we will introduce legislation to provide for long service leave on the basis of three months' leave after 10 years' service with any employer with provision for pro rata leave for any period of time thereafter. In addition, leave for casual workers similar to that which applies to waterside workers will be provided. Four weeks' annual leave will be provided for all Government day workers with an additional week for continuous shift workers.

Mr. Ryan: That will be done.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It could be done in the distant future, but it will not be done by this Government.

Mr. Ryan: You wouldn't like to bet on it!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am only going on the rate of progress we have seen up to date: so far the procedure has been in reverse. The Premier continued:

Service payment retrospective to January 1, 1965, will be made, with provision that our service payments will be in addition to any amount at present being received and— with this proviso—

that they will be in agreement with the decisions of our industrial advisory committee.

Not one suggestion of preference to unionists was made in the policy speech. It was not done by an alteration to the law which would have brought it out into the open and would have allowed the people to see what was being done: it was brought in through the back door by an instruction which, in my opinion, is completely illegal.

I shall pose questions to honourable members opposite and ask them to answer them because they are questions not on matters between the Labor Party and the Liberal and Country League but on matters of principle. They are important if we are going to maintain the standards we have enjoyed in South Australia. I point out to honourable members opposite that the unions that are to get preference are directly affiliated with the Labor Party.

Mr. Ryan: That is not true.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It is true; they pay substantial sums in support of the Labor Party.

Mr. Ryan: The Public Service Association is not affiliated with the Labor Party. You are talking a lot of rubbish as usual.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not talking rubbish. Honourable members know that these unions are affiliated with the Labor Party, and make payments to it.

Mr. Ryan: Name one!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Australian Government Workers Association is one. We have seen in another place recently that, where an association was not affiliated with the Labor Party, this rule was not to apply. The Chief Secretary said only this week that the compulsory provisions do not apply in respect of teachers.

Mr. Clark: What about the Public Service Association?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will deal with that presently. We had a few words from the honourable member about the Public Service, but frankly I found that he did not know anything about the Public Service; he did not even know the conditions under which the salaries of its members were adjusted. Yesterday, in another place, the Hon. R. A. Geddes asked the following question:

Has the Chief Secretary a reply to a question I asked last Thursday about teachers?

The Hon. A. J. Shard replied:

Yes. My colleague, the Minister of Education, has furnished me with this reply: Whilst it is not necessary for a teacher to be a member of the South Australian Institute of Teachers to receive appointment or promotion, nor is any preference given to institute members, the Government considers it desirable that teachers should be members of that institute.

All this standing up for rights and all the rest of it that we have heard so much of from the honourable member for Port Adelaide does not apply for some reason or other when it comes to teachers, but of course teachers are not affiliated to the Labor Party, and the compulsion does not exist where there is no affiliation. The teachers make no subvention to the Labor Party's funds, so the principle that applies in respect of unions (and which is the subject, incidentally, of the instruction) does not apply to teachers. Is there any other reason why this instruction does not apply to teachers, except the one that I have been able to find out? If it is legal for the Labor Party to give an instruction that preference shall be given to unionists, will it also be

legal if the Liberal Party comes into power and we give an instruction that preference shall be given to members of the Liberal Party?

Mr. Jennings: That is a purely hypothetical question.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I believe that honourable members who think about this matter believe in the freedom of association and believe that a great principle is involved in that freedom. It is a principle that was written into the Industrial Code, a document of which we in South Australia have every right to be proud because I believe that that legislation dealing with industrial conditions was the pathfinder to industrial legislation in other States. I believe that the original section 51 of the Industrial Code, going back to 1912, was sponsored and introduced by the Hon. Hermann Homburg. It states:

No employer shall dismiss any employee from his employment or injure him in his employment by reason merely of the fact that the employee:

- (a) is an officer or member of an association;
- (b) is not a member of an association; or
- (c) is entitled to the benefit of an award or order of the court, an industrial agreement, a determination of a board, or an agreement under section 98 of this Act.

The penalty prescribed is £50. It goes on to say:

In any proceedings for an offence under this section it shall lie with the employer to show that any employee, proved to have been dismissed or injured in his employment whilst an officer or member of an association, or whilst not such a member—

and this is the interesting thing—

or whilst entitled as aforesaid (according to the nature of the case), was dismissed or injured in his employment for some reason other than that mentioned in this section.

We see that the Government has given an instruction that is completely illegal according to the Industrial Code, which provides that no employer shall dismiss an employee from his employment or injure him in his employment by reason merely because the employee is an officer or member of an association or is not a member of an association. Here we see the Government flouting the law of the land. This was done in a surreptitious manner, and not owned up to in a frank and honest way.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: And not one member of the Government front bench has tried to justify it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No-one in this House can justify it. The member

for Port Adelaide made many statements about the Public Service.

Mr. Burdon: When I was an employee of the Government and engaging labour a few years ago, I received instructions that it was not the policy of your Government to force or coerce people to join a union, but that you preferred them to join their appropriate organizations.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: There is no compulsion in that. In fact, I believe that most employers would prefer to have the people in their employ under some such agreement. However, this is a totally different matter, for the instruction said that unless a person was a member of a union he would not get employment. That is totally different. The Government is trying to bring in compulsory unionism under the guise of preference to unionists. Time and time again the Industrial Court has set out that there shall be preference to unionists, to which there can be no objection as an arbitration decision. I believe that the Government instruction goes much further than the consideration of direct employment. I have received a complaint, which I have not verified, from an employee in a factory that is not controlled by the Government. He complains that a member of the Government went to the employer and told him that, if he did not ensure that all his employees were unionists, he would get no more contracts from the Government. I have not confirmed that but if it is confirmed in writing, I shall move to adjourn this House to have the matter thrashed out, because it is an illegal and coercive action. Everyone with the privilege of Australian citizenship has the right to free association. If a man wants to join a union he should have the right to do so, but if he does not want to, there should be no power on earth to compel him to join.

Mr. Burdon: There is none now, and you know it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That should apply particularly to Government employment. I have no doubt that Government members would scream to high heaven if a Liberal Government gave preference in employment to Liberals. That would undoubtedly, and deservedly, raise the ire of the Government. This Bill seeks to make it an offence for any Government to give a preference or a direction of a preference regarding the joining of a trade association. That is an inherent principle that has been observed

for many years, and one that should be maintained. I am surprised that we have to consider a Bill like this. I hope the people of South Australia realize what is involved in this legislation as it is a pointer to what we are going to get in the future. If this Bill emphasizes the danger we will have in the direction of everything, then the member for Mitcham has done a valuable service to this State in emphasizing an undesirable form of direction and administration, and the legislation will be opposed by the Opposition to the utmost of its power.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): In opposing the Bill, I congratulate the member for Port Adelaide on the magnificent way he clarified the situation so that members of the public would be conversant with the meaning of this Bill. I congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on the way in which he presented his confused opinion of this issue. It is plain that he has been misinformed by the member for Mitcham, as possibly was the person who gave this information to the member for Mitcham. The Leader knows that the Public Service Association is not affiliated with the Australian Labor Party. It is difficult to believe that members opposite cannot understand the meaning of preference and of compulsion. I am confident that I speak on behalf of the workers and I know that they understand and support the issue. This is the most ridiculous Bill that has been presented to this House and, as the member for Semaphore pointed out, the member for Mitcham was deliberately attempting to twist and distort the true facts by saying that the policy of preference for promotion was compulsory unionism. It is not: it means that a person who does not wish to join a union obviously does not desire promotion.

Mr. Heaslip: If he doesn't join, he won't get the job.

Mr. McKEE: That is not so. The member for Rocky River would know less about the trade union movement than anyone else in this House. He is opposed to trade unions and to the trade union movement, as he has often indicated. He would not support an award for rural workers, but I know that people are working on farms for up to 60 hours a week in season.

Mr. Freebairn: What do you think would be the award rate for an agricultural worker?

Mr. McKEE: Would the honourable member have any idea?

Mr. Freebairn: I am asking you.

Mr. McKEE: I would not like to get the honourable member's opinion, as his figure would be well below the award rate. Anybody who does not desire to join a union does not desire promotion. Indeed, it is only right and proper that he should not be promoted over a person who honours his obligations and joins a union, knowing and appreciating the great work that has been undertaken by the trade union movement in bringing about improved conditions, and wage adjustments from time to time to meet the increased cost of living. The member for Mitcham and members on his side pretend to represent the people, yet they support a measure that is not acceptable to the people, and they well know that it is not acceptable. As the member for Port Adelaide has pointed out, the member for Mitcham desires to introduce a Bill for every individual in the Public Service and, as the service employs over 7,000 people, we are apparently expected to introduce over 7,000 Bills, so that every individual can make his own arrangements.

Mr. Millhouse: I don't quite follow that.

Mr. McKEE: A measure such as this could have only one result: it would retard our progress and development, and it could well bring about discontent in industrial relations in the State. The Leader of the Opposition has frequently boasted in the House about the wonderful industrial relationships that we enjoy, but they have been brought about only by the harmony that exists within the trade union movement. Members opposite who support this measure are only attempting to pull a political stunt to delay the business of the House.

Mr. Lawn: They have been doing that all the session.

Mr. McKEE: The member for Mitcham knows that that is so. Very few people today do not voluntarily join a union applicable to their work. They know that if it had not been for the trade union movement they would not be enjoying the conditions that exist today. They also know that, if the trade union movement were abolished, in no time at all they would revert to the conditions that existed before the turn of the century. If any member supports this Bill, it is obvious that he supports exploitation of the people. I notice a smirk on the face of the member for Rocky River; he is probably thinking, "We've been doing that for years." Although working conditions have improved through the efforts of the trade union movement, the unions have to fight continually to maintain justice for

the worker and to keep him on a wage commensurate with continually increasing prices.

Therefore, unions are continually before the court, and continually spending money in obtaining wages and improved conditions for their members. However, here we have the member for Mitcham introducing a Bill to support one man who sponges on his workmates to gain conditions. In my opinion that man is without principle. He would not have any workmates, anyhow. It should be the function of a responsible Government to encourage people to recognize their responsibility and loyalty to the Government. The person concerned, who passed all this information on to the member for Mitcham, is no doubt one of the few who is not a member of the Public Service Association. Unfortunately, while he remains a non-unionist I should say that he will not qualify for advancement, and rightly so!

Mr. Jennings: He apparently chooses to remain anonymous, too.

Mr. McKEE: I do not blame him for that. He should not qualify for promotion while he continues to steal the privileges brought about by his workmates who are union members. His future in the Public Service will be limited, anyway; no doubt his workmates will see to that.

Mr. Millhouse: You are now giving way to coercion!

Mr. McKEE: I am sure the Public Service will not allow one non-unionist to undo everything that has been achieved over many years.

Mr. Hall: Do you suggest that he could undo it?

Mr. McKEE: I certainly suggest that he could not.

Mr. Hall: What are you talking about, then?

Mr. McKEE: If that person thinks he can disorganize the Public Service, through the member for Mitcham and members of the Opposition generally. I suggest that he take himself aside and have a talk with himself, because he is on the wrong tram. I oppose the Bill, and I am confident that I speak on behalf of, and with the support of, members of the trade union movement throughout the State. I can assure the member for Mitcham that the members of a union in this State far outweigh non-unionists, so I suggest once again that the member for Mitcham has backed a loser. I should also like to advise him that he be careful in the future when he seeks information from a non-unionist. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): Any opposition to this Bill is a restriction and victimization of a totalitarian nature. There is only one way to describe the attitude of the member for Port Pirie: it is menacing. He admitted, in reply to an interjection, that a member of the Public Service could not undo the good that has been achieved in that organization; yet he should be victimized and excluded from promotion. Many people (both Labor and Liberal supporters) have discussed this attitude with me, and I have yet to hear one of them support compulsory unionism. I invite the honourable member to come with me and hear about this victimization and intimidation. We realize that this is a policy of socialization at any price. This compulsive attitude of the present Government has been unknown to the public, because the Labor Party has been in Opposition for many years. However, the attitude is now becoming evident and people have told me that the Government is manned by "confidence men". The people have become accustomed to the freedoms they have enjoyed during the time of the previous Government.

Mr. Jennings: That is why they threw it out!

Mr. HALL: Let us look at the instruction on this matter. The present notification is dated July 19, 1965. It countermanded an instruction issued in 1933, which stated:

Cabinet has directed that any instruction of the previous Government to the effect that daily and weekly paid employees should become unionists is revoked.

The instruction of July 19 last says:

Heads of departments are informed that Cabinet has decided that preference in obtaining employment shall be given to members of unions.

Of course, the member for Port Pirie goes further and includes promotion, as well as employment. Now there is intimidation. When I was thinking about this matter, I recalled what I said in this House in 1961. Dr. Cairns, M.H.R., who is still a prominent man in the Australian Labor Party, wrote as follows in a University of Western Australia student magazine:

It is not a matter of leaders, parties, or who was on the side of the Federal Executive or the State branch, as it was in New South Wales in the 1930's and Victoria in 1955. It is not a matter of being for or against unity tickets that counts. The only thing that counts is whether you are for the socialization of the means of production.

So, according to the attitude of the Labor Party, this is the only thing that counts; personal freedom does not matter. Dr. Cairns,

—who may some day become the leader of his Party, advanced a policy that would be dangerous to this country.

Mr. Jennings: Why did you stop reading the instruction?

Mr. HALL: The honourable member for Enfield is adroit at sidetracking speakers.

Mr. Hudson: He is trying to get you back to what you were talking about before.

Mr. HALL: One night two unionists came to see me and expressed disenchantment at this instruction. They said that they were loyal to their union; in fact, one held a high place in his union, but they considered that compulsion was being introduced by this Government by "back door" methods.

Mr. Hudson: It is not compulsory unionism, and you know it. Read the instruction again.

Mr. HALL: We have just heard an intimidating speech by an honourable member who says that not only employment should be affected, but promotion also. What nonsense!

Mr. Hudson: You are engaging in distortion, for political purposes.

Mr. HALL: There are right wing unions and left wing unions, as the honourable member for Glenelg well knows. If a person does not wish to support these unions, his employment will suffer, according to the policy of the Labor Party. Let us see what happened in the affairs of one of the extremely left wing unions in Australia. I go back to what I quoted previously, which has not been refuted, regarding the business affairs of the Seamen's Union. This statement appeared in the *Seamen's Journal* of December, 1958, under the date-line "Canberra, November 25, 1958":

On behalf of my co-trustees Dr. Evatt and Mr. Calwell I desire to thank your union for its very generous contributions to the Federal Parliamentary Labor Party's election campaign fund. Our press, radio and television advertising campaign, although reduced to a minimum, was very costly and your contribution was most opportune. I enclose official receipts for the sums of £1,300, £423 4s., £297 and £288 10s., in respect of your union donations. Your sincerely, N. E. McKenna (Labor Leader in the Senate).

There we had a union contributing directly to the election funds of the Labor Party. This practice is not confined to the Seamen's Union, but I gave only one example. Yet, we hear Government members say, "You shall be a member. Your funds will support the Labor Party, whether you like it or not." In the same issue there was a statement, which I shall not take the trouble to read, showing that there was a total contribution of £7,407 17s. to political parties and there was a

letter of thanks from Mr. L. L. Sharkey (General Secretary of the Communist Party). The journal reports that of the £7,407 17s. the A.L.P. received £4,350 6s. and the Communist Party £3,057 11s.

They divided it almost equally. Let us go further. It is said that we should have preference to unionists and promotion should depend on whether a person is a member of a union. It is not compulsory, of course! Whether you clothe yourself or eat does not matter! I wish the honourable member for Port Pirie was here now, because he is guilty of having left his supporters without spokesmen. In a Waterside Workers Federation election, there was an example of how the Labor Party leaders left their members high and dry. The election was held in 1961, I think on July 5. At that time the Labor Party left its members who were employed in the Waterside Workers Federation without a candidate in the election.

Mr. Ryan: What are you talking about? Talk sense for a change.

Mr. HALL: The member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) had to advise members of the Waterside Workers Federation to vote for a D.L.P. candidate or a Communist candidate.

Mr. Ryan: Any candidate can nominate for a position. The Labor Party does not nominate them. Talk sense!

Mr. HALL: What a lot of utter nonsense!

Mr. Ryan: What should have happened?

Mr. HALL: There should have been a Labor Party candidate in the election. The member for Port Adelaide and the member for Port Pirie were jointly responsible for this neglect. Although they say that it must be compulsory to join the union, they tell people to vote either Communist or D.L.P. If people are not members of the union they get no promotion, but the unions do not care where the funds go; they can go to Moscow or anywhere else. Members opposite should not underestimate the thoughts of freedom brought here by people from other countries. The member for Gawler is smiling; he represents many migrants from Great Britain.

Mr. Clark: They are happy with my representation.

Mr. HALL: These people will adhere to their ideas of freedom. They do not want compulsion, which they did not have in the countries from which they came. It is only in the last few months that the people have seen

this menacing attitude towards freedom. Members opposite have made the ridiculous statement that the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) hates the Labor Party. I am sure the honourable member hates no-one. He is trying to sift the facts and get down to what is being done. We have what the honourable member for Glenelg would call an innocuous direction of compulsory unionism. The member for Mitcham saw this, and he did a service to Parliament by bringing his Bill forward. I am sure members of the Government Party have two opinions about this. Their public opinion, which they presented today, is to oppose the Bill. However, I believe that in their own minds they know that it is difficult to oppose freedom. I object to the totalitarian nature of edicts such as this preference to unionists. I heartily support the Bill.

Mr. JENNINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

TEA TREE GULLY BY-LAW: MOTOR BUSES.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That by-law No. 35 of the District Council of Tea Tree Gully, in respect of motor buses made on April 20, 1965, and laid on the table of this House on July 27, 1965, be disallowed. There are two objections to this by-law. First, I believe that it is completely beyond the by-law-making power of the Tea Tree Gully council. As far as I can ascertain from my examination of various Acts, a council has power to make a by-law with regard to fare-paying passengers or hire. If the by-law had been confined to fare-paying passengers I should not have moved my motion, but the by-law is not confined to this. Probably a certificate should not have been issued in this case because I believe it is beyond the scope of local Government to provide a by-law of a general nature. I think this is probably *ultra vires* the Local Government Act. However, I know that point cannot be taken because it has probably had a certificate.

Mr. Jennings: The Crown Solicitor gave a certificate.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Unless there is a provision that I have not been able to find I doubt whether this by-law comes within the powers provided in the Local Government Act. However, my chief objection to the by-law relates to something it contains. It has two main clauses to it, the first of which is in the definition, which is as follows:

- (1) "District" means the district area of the District Council of Tea Tree Gully.
- (2) "Council" means the District Council of Tea Tree Gully.
- (3) "Licensee" means any person who shall have received from the council a licence pursuant to the provisions of this by-law in respect of a motor bus.

This is the important one:

- (4) "Motor bus" means any motor vehicle or motor carriage which is so constructed as to be able to seat nine passengers or more and which is driven or propelled or ordinarily capable of being driven or propelled either partly or wholly by any volatile spirit or by any means other than animal power and includes a trailer at any time attached to a motor vehicle.

Mr. Jennings: That is fairly cumbersome drafting.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not worrying about the cumbersome nature of it but point out that "passenger" does not necessarily mean "passenger for hire". If it had said "passenger for hire", that would have put it into a totally different category. This is, purely and simply, a "passenger". Under this definition a Kombi van (of which plenty are operated by private people; I know of many Kombi vans with accommodation for nine passengers; often, a man with a large family has one) immediately becomes a bus. Having got that definition, I want to show what the council then proceeds to do with it. Clause 2 of the by-law states:

Subject to the provisions of the Road and Railway Transport Act, 1930-1939 and the Municipal Tramways Trust Act, 1935-1952—and, incidentally, I do not think that either of those Acts applies to this district at present—

no motor bus whatever shall be used within the district for the conveyance of passengers unless and until the same shall have been licensed by the council by a licence in the Form B hereto.

That must mean that no person could drive a bus through the district unless he had a licence issued by the council and, irrespective of whether or not they were paying passengers, "no motor bus whatever shall be used . . ." I point out to the Minister how broad that is.

So I presume that, if a bus was licensed by the Transport Control Board, for instance, that would probably be done by the first few words of the by-law. I showed this to the Attorney-General. I think that, when he looked at the by-law, he found that my objection did

not concern—whether—or not the council should control fare-paying passengers. I am not concerned about that; I am concerned that the regulation is so wide that it drags in people whom, I am sure, it never was intended to drag in. If every council in the State proceeded to frame a by-law along these lines, we should have a hopeless position. I move for the disallowance of the by-law.

Motion carried.

[*Sitting suspended from 5.54 to 7.30 p.m.*]

REGISTRATION OF DOGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ALSATIAN DOGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

THE BUDGET.

The Estimates—Grand total, £121,518 000.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 21. Page 1652.)

THE LEGISLATURE.

Legislative Council, £16,167.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I support the first line. In my many years' experience in this place I have found that there is a repetition of the same old formula every year. Although the Government on this occasion congratulates itself on obtaining a little more money, it must be admitted that it is **insufficient because** it has been necessary to take action recently to increase the revenue by increasing taxation in various phases. There is one feature to which I have always addressed myself, and I intend to do so again tonight. I refer to debt charges, a matter to which our attention is drawn by the Auditor-General each year, and this year he has dealt with it with greater force than ever before. Regarding the mounting debt charges, he says:

Every year I have commented on the growing public debt which comprises bonds, bills, stocks and debentures and other interest-bearing indebtedness of the State. At June 30, 1965, this figure was £530,000,000, equal to £503 a head of the population, an increase of £23 a head during the year under review.

Briefly, that means that every child born today carries with it an indebtedness of public debt of £503. It went up by £23,000,000 last year and it will go up by at least that much again this year. Interest-bearing indebtedness has increased over the past 10 years from

£249,000,000 to £530,000,000, or 113 per cent, but the amount a head has risen by 65 per cent only, because of a gain in population. Total payments on account of debt charges, interest and sinking fund payments for 1964-65 were £25,968,000, representing 23 per cent of Consolidated Revenue payments. That is a colossal extraction from the payments that go to meet past commitments and make no contribution to the future. Some of this was recovered from the earnings of public utilities and statutory bodies whose financial transactions were not included in the Budget. In his report the Auditor-General states:

It is necessary for me to again report that very few of the capital works approved in recent years returned sufficient revenue to meet working expenses and debt charges. South Australian Waterworks, for example, incurred debt charges of £3,847,000 but surplus earnings over working expenses available to meet this cost were only £1,740,000. Some recently undertaken capital works illustrate this problem as for example the Tod River Trunk Main replacement which is estimated to cost more than £4,000,000 and will not be directly revenue producing. Unless the earning capacity of new capital works is sufficient to pay running expenses and debt charges, frequent reviews of public utility charges will be necessary. Because capital works for education and social services give very little direct return, the debt charges have to be met, together with other running costs of the projects, from various forms of taxation. For this reason, the importance of keeping capital costs to a minimum is again emphasized.

That is the point on which I take issue: keeping capital costs to a minimum. The receipts in the Consolidated Revenue including tax reimbursements from the Commonwealth represent 37.1 per cent of the total receipts last year. The amount spent on social services including education and medical was 42 per cent, so that these services exceeded the receipts from the Commonwealth, which comprised 37.1 per cent. State taxation represented 16 per cent of the receipts, public undertakings 26 per cent, other public services 20.5 per cent, but the interest on sinking fund on payments represented 23 per cent of the total, while payments on public undertakings, including railways and waterworks, were only 19.9 per cent. Yet in the face of that the Auditor-General says that capital expenditure must be kept to a minimum in order to keep down our debt charges. I cannot reconcile those figures. It means that when we have the position as it is today, the net increase in the public debt is £24,634,000. According to page 36 of the Auditor-General's Report under "Payments", repurchases and redemptions at net cost amount to £5,005,890,

and interest on funds provided by the National Debt Commission amount to £4,686, making a total of £5,010,576. The report also states that redeemed securities cancelled by the National Debt Commission amounted to £4,915,391, making a total redemption to June 30, 1965, of £64,485,112.

The debts that have been incurred total £530,000,000. We all know the workings of the national debt sinking fund, and how certain sums are applied to the redemption of our national debt, but I think the time is approaching in Australia when we shall have to do what has already been done in the United Kingdom, that is, ignore the sinking fund altogether. It was found to be completely unworkable in the United Kingdom, and the sinking fund no longer applies there. I shall not suggest an alternative, but I point out that we are getting further and further into debt every year, as more and more of our precious revenue is being eaten up in the payment of interest and debt charges. Over 23 per cent of the total revenue goes into that fund, which is an enormous proportion. While we are paying 23.9 per cent of the finances that we collect into that fund, the development of our State resources relies on only 7.7 per cent.

If this State is to progress we must have more money than that. Are we to reduce our annual capital expenditure, and cut our coat according to the cloth? Much money is being expended on such projects as carrying water from Tailm Bend to Keith, which will bring hundreds of thousands of acres into full production. Shall we restrict that project? If we proceed with it, we shall add to our capital debt charges. By 1970 the metropolitan area will require the construction of a massive main from Mannum to Adelaide, which will cost millions. Can we economize on that? If we try to, we shall be short of water in Adelaide. The Whyalla main brings that town's colossal industrial works into full production, and we cannot economize on that. Every one of these capital works leaves in its train a tremendously heavy addition to this State's debt charges. That is not recouped in the charges made for water. We spend immeasurably more money on pumping water to Whyalla and to the metropolitan area than we receive in return. The Engineering and Water Supply Department is down by over £3,000,000, but the forward movement of the people and industries of this State must be maintained.

After allowing for social services, all that we have left for developmental works is 7.7

per cent, and that is completely insufficient. Time and time again questions are asked of Ministers by members who draw attention to the necessity for expenditure for the betterment of their districts. I know this from experience and I also know that too often, the money is not forthcoming or the work is deferred to take its turn. However, that is not the way this country must be developed. Development is necessary, because we are in a precarious position at present from the point of view of the workforce and the money available. Millions more migrants must be brought here and we must provide work for them.

We have inflation when the quantity of goods is insufficient to meet the demand of the money available. Then, there is deflation, the reverse position, where we have more goods than money, and God deliver us from ever getting into that position again! However, the state of our economy is such that we dare not advance. As soon as there is a measure of prosperity in this country, we are fearful and start to restrict credit. The banks, on instructions from the Reserve Bank, start to reduce credit.

They say, "We must restrict the advancement of credit." In such times, we have an insufficient number of goods to meet the money available and, therefore, no more money must go out to compete for those goods, because that causes inflation. As yet, no one has provided the solution, but it is imperative that a solution be found.

Exactly the same position applies in the United States of America, where President Johnson openly said, in effect, that the whole monetary system was wrong and that an investigation was needed to see if the production of the country could be brought to a position where the people of the United States could be employed. Although about 30,000,000 people are living in substandard conditions, it has been said that it will cost £30,000,000,000 in a few years' time to provide the necessities of space aircraft and investigation of space. I do not know whether that makes sense. How can people be expected to sit down and listen quietly to news of such astronomical expenditure when they do not have one decent meal a day and live under conditions under which we in Australia would hesitate to keep animals for fear of the activities of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals? The 30,000,000 people in the United States living under substandard conditions are causing much trouble, and justifiably so. Possibly every member has seen pictures of the conditions under which they live.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We have similar conditions in South Australia.

Mr. QUIRKE: I am coming to that. We have those conditions notwithstanding our enormous expenditure on social services (including education) of 42 per cent of the total revenue whereas our expenditure on progress is only 7.7 per cent. I do not know how we can survive as a nation under those conditions. If we are to survive we must have the capacity to absorb millions of people in production. What will we do with the product of their industry?

Mr. McKee: Would you agree to the breaking up of big holdings to settle these people?

Mr. QUIRKE: No, that is only running a pony track. The number of people employed on these holdings now is probably equal to the number who would be settled on them if they were divided. Such is the keenness in primary production today that the owners of big holdings are forced—if force is necessary; they are keen developers—to do the best to obtain maximum production. What is now maximum production will seem small when we take advantage of present research. The other day I spoke of the capacity to produce by using a different process 100 times as much protein from one acre as is now produced. We have not yet arrived at that, but we shall have to do so. However, it needs the expenditure of money. We must have that money internally.

The other day a man whose name escapes me said that we must get millions of pounds of oversea capital into this country to develop it. I absolutely deny the necessity for that, particularly as, in the case of General Motors-Holden's, nearly 100 per cent of the capital is already held in a foreign country. We must go overseas only for what we do not produce. If we import things we can produce, we deny our people the right to produce and work. There is very little we cannot produce in Australia, and anything that we can do physically in this country we should be able to do financially. Until we realize that, we are going to be kicking against the wind forever. Concerning the cutting up of land the number of people who are in succession to that land must be considered. Succession duties can act against the right of succession by families. Where a family consists of two or three sons, the third son may miss out because of high succession duties. I know this is the way to break up big estates—they can be killed with death duties. However, this will not necessarily add to the production of the country. I know

the production that comes from large holdings and the number of people who work on them.

Mr. McKee: Is the pastoral industry run by monopolies?

Mr. QUIRKE: The member for Frome can tell the honourable member how many monopolies there are on the Birdsville track. There are very few indeed. Certainly pastoralists have large holdings there but a great many people work there and how they do it beggars imagination.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What about Sir Philip McBride?

Mr. QUIRKE: He has a holding there. If the Attorney-General has anything against Sir Philip then he should have a look at how he treats his employees. He has provided them with a superannuation fund for which he pays. The people in this area have been pioneers, and very often nobody else wanted to work under these conditions. Tremendous capital is needed for the development of these properties. While I was Minister of Lands a pastoral lease was granted for one property and the people who took it over had to pay £40,000 on housing alone. This is not a little man's country, and the member for Port Pirie knows that as well as anybody else.

I should like an answer to the point I have raised. I have seen this happen every year. Members opposite are jubilant that this year there is an increase in the money available. Good luck to them—they will need more than that next year! There has been a slight increase every year as far back as I can remember, but never has it been sufficient. I emphasize that the present position is no different from what it has been in the past. All State Treasurers are at the mercy of these things: they always have been and always will be. If we are to advance this fair country of ours, we must get something to enable us to carry the people along without their incurring an increasing load of debt, that being the first charge on every pay envelope received.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): I support the first line and commend the Treasurer for the way in which he has presented his first Budget. It will not be the last time the Labor Party will be introducing a Budget here. I have noticed how Opposition members have lauded what has been done this time. The Budget will be of great benefit to the State generally. Members opposite have at least agreed with much of it.

One increase that affects my district more than it does others concerns the Highways and Local Government Department. I have

often spoken about the way in which we handle our road traffic. We have all seen accidents in Adelaide and its suburbs that could have been avoided. Even in front of Parliament House we know of traffic mishaps that occur and the way in which people do not heed traffic lights, moving off in their vehicles when they should not. There are two types of traffic lights—the pedestrian-activated and those for vehicular traffic. I strongly recommend that Adelaide people should always use the traffic lights when crossing the main streets. Four or five accidents, several of them fatal, have occurred in the last 12 months, and these could have been avoided if the people had crossed where traffic lights are installed. At the same time it would help motorists if pedestrians crossed with the lights. I have seen the staff of one of our wellknown emporiums coming to King William Street after their day's work; many of them could not care less about the traffic, and they walk in between motor vehicles when crossing the street. Two deaths have occurred as a result of this sort of thing. Those people think they are saving time, but they are creating a hazard for themselves and for motorists.

The Unley District is very well served with lights at schools, with the result that accidents involving schoolchildren have been few and far between. Traffic lights are now required for other purposes. Many years ago most tradesmen called at people's homes, but today people attend the bigger suburban shops and supermarkets. Many of the older residents of Unley have only a certain amount of money and have to buy at the best prices and therefore they find it necessary to go to the main shopping centres. The increase in traffic in suburban areas has created a traffic hazard, and we have reached the stage where something must be done to protect pedestrians. Lights near the new shopping centres would enable people to shop in safety and help the motorists. I know the installation of lights can be overdone, especially if too close, but if placed properly they must be of great benefit to the public. In most cases schoolchildren and vehicular traffic are considered, but we have not catered enough for the older people who have to cross streets. Other States are much more advanced than we are in this matter. I hope we can improve our assistance to pedestrians, so that our methods will be a lead for other States.

The previous Government for many years did nothing to improve the position and we should now look to the future. The public

realizes that action must be taken and looks to the Government to take it. I urge the Government to take the necessary steps, but realize that we have only been in Government for about six months. The Opposition apparently thinks we should have performed miracles in that time. However, the State will continue to progress under this Government's leadership. The people in my district, and I am sure throughout the State, are pleased to know of the actions taken by the Government, and what it proposes to do.

The appointment of a public relations officer in the Attorney-General's Department has caused comment by Opposition members, who have asked many questions about it. The appointment will assist in the Government's general policy of helping people. The other day a census was taken to find out what the average person knew about politics, and it was learned that few possessed any real knowledge of the matter. The picture generally in this State is not as black as Opposition members try to lead us to believe.

A member becomes well known in his district if he takes the time to visit his electors. An approachable member of Parliament makes all the difference. However, the appointment of a public relations officer is a welcome move. It is money well spent, because this officer will assist many people. He will be able to clarify many matters, as well as inform the people which Minister they should approach with their problems.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I cannot commend the Treasurer for the Budget he has introduced. Indeed, it is not the type of Budget that I would introduce if I were Treasurer (and that is not likely to come about). Money that will be raised from the public by way of taxation will be spent on non-productive works. Much of it will be used for social purposes. Money should not be raised in this way for such purposes. In the Treasurer's remarks the first comment of any consequence was the reference to only £611,000 being left by the outgoing Government. Frankly, I think an incoming Government is fortunate if it has any money left for it by the outgoing Government. I venture to say that at the end of the term of the present Government much less than £611,000 will be available to the next Government. The Treasurer has no reason to complain about this sum. He should have drawn up a Budget without having to rely on money left to him by the previous Treasurer.

Mr. McKee: Your Government was far behind, so there is much to do. Yours wasn't a progressive Government.

Mr. HEASLIP: I think it was a progressive Government, because of the rapid way in which the State advanced under its administration.

Mr. McKee: The people decided it wasn't very progressive.

Mr. HEASLIP: It was only because the people did not know what another Government would be like that things turned out as they did.

Mr. Shannon: They are learning quickly now.

Mr. HEASLIP: They are. I think that at the end of three years (if it is that long) many people will have learned more and will cast their votes in a different way from that in which they voted at the last election. The Treasurer tells us some of the means by which he is going to raise revenue to pay for non-productive expenditure, such as service pay, four weeks' holidays and equal pay for women. We have heard a lot about equal pay, but it is a promise that has not materialized.

Mr. Hudson: You cannot say that equal pay is nonproductive.

Mr. HEASLIP: We have heard a lot about it, just as we have heard a lot about free books. That is another promise that was made but now the people are told, "If you are good, you might get the benefit of free books by 1967." Many people who voted for this Government were swayed by the Treasurer's promise to introduce a system of free books for school-children and I can understand that, because books are quite an expense to many families. Unfortunately, these people are still waiting for effect to be given to this promise.

Mr. Shannon: They are also paying for the transport of their children to school.

Mr. HEASLIP: The present Government will have to pay for these non-productive items.

Mr. Curren: Are you opposed to them?

Mr. HEASLIP: I did not say that I was opposed to them, but the Government should have the money available before it makes promises. One way in which the Treasurer intends to get this money is by increasing water rates by about 15 or 16 per cent. If there is anything needed in Australia, particularly in South Australia, it is more water, and more money should be spent on water reticulation, which is productive work. The

honourable member for Burra mentioned the Keith water scheme.

Mr. Casey: There will be a scheme for Burra soon.

Mr. HEASLIP: I hope so, and I hope that hundreds of thousands of acres that are not productive today or that are not producing as much as they should be will be brought into full production. If water is needed anywhere, it is needed at Kimba, but that proposal has been deferred. We will be paying more for water, but a supply will not be given to the people to whom it was promised. Anyone who has lived in the Kimba area will agree that it needs water. It was promised a supply, the Public Works Committee recommended the scheme, but the present Government deferred it. I have sunk bores in this area without success and have constructed dozens of dams, but a dam is no use unless there is enough rain. If this country has water, it will become more productive.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: I think it is unfair to say that this Government has done nothing. It approved the Kimba water scheme in the Budget.

Mr. HEASLIP: But the scheme has been deferred.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: How long did your Party take to approve it?

Mr. HEASLIP: The original idea was to supply Kimba from the Murray River. The Public Works Committee investigated the matter and reported on it, but it was deferred pending further investigations into the Poldo Basin.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Do you know how much it cost to pump water during the depression when your Party was in office?

Mr. HEASLIP: Had the water been pumped from the Murray I think it would have cost £2 14s. a thousand gallons.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: It was regarded as prohibitive, wasn't it?

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not think so. I think Kimba would have got a supply on a restricted basis if it had been from the Murray River. However, it was deferred, yet the Minister of Mines announced a few days ago that he had inspected the area and had had reports that sufficient water was available.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: What was not done by any other Government has now been started at Kimba by this Government.

Mr. HEASLIP: The scheme was deferred by the Public Works Committee, which did not make a recommendation until the development of the Poldo Basin was assured. When

it was found that water could be supplied from Polda to Kimba and to landholders between Lock and Kimba at about one-quarter of the price of Murray water, the Public Works Committee recommended the scheme.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: And a Liberal Government was pumping Polda in 1928-29.

Mr. HEASLIP: That may be so, but it did not know how much water was there.

Mr. Shannon: There was one little hole, and the Minister knows it. Not much was known about Polda then.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: What did your Party do?

Mr. HEASLIP: The Engineering and Water Supply Department does not construct mains or guarantee water until it is sure of a supply. That was the position at Polda.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Can you tell me the date on which the Public Works Committee approved the scheme?

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not know the date.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: You will admit that it was a long time before the March elections, won't you?

Mr. HEASLIP: It may have been, but I do not know. However, the present Government has not accepted the committee's recommendation, as it has not gone on with the scheme.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: That is a wilfully incorrect statement.

Mr. HEASLIP: My colleague now informs me that the scheme was recommended by the Public Works Committee on March 10, 1965, and the election was on March 6.

Mr. Shannon: If the Liberal Government had been returned the scheme would have been provided for this session.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, but under this Government the provision for the Engineering and Water Supply Department has been reduced by £1,000,000. Money will not be spent in this way as it was spent by the Playford Government in the past. Water is the staff of life and an adequate supply is necessary if satisfactory production is to take place. The scheme on Kangaroo Island is not being proceeded with but Kangaroo Island is in a better position regarding water than Kimba. Although it does not have underground water it has a better rainfall than has Kimba.

Mr. Shannon: But the quality of the river water there is poor—not much better than sea water.

Mr. HEASLIP: I agree that it is poor quality water. It is good for stock only. The Government intends to raise more money from succession duties. Also, land tax will be

increased, which means another increased cost of production. I have not heard of a more iniquitous charge than the doubling of stamp duties. I do not know why any Government should have to double this charge. Most South Australians save money and have current accounts at banks on which they draw cheques. Each cheque will cost 6d. instead of 3d. Another increased cost concerns the Harbors Board.

The Government promises that £1,000,000 extra revenue will be raised from the railways but we have to rely on a promise because we are not told how this £1,000,000 will be raised. With my experience of the Government's promises, I should say they are not worth much because so many have been broken. If the Government raises this extra money it will do so only by increasing the cost of production. This will have to be paid by people in country areas remote from the city, not only by primary producers but also by those living in country towns. Australia has to face up to increased costs if we are to be successful, because all surplus produce from our primary industries exported overseas has to be sold on world markets. If our costs become greater than those operating in other countries, we shall not be able to sell to advantage. This affects particularly the primary producer, who supplies nine-tenths of our export earnings, which enable secondary industries to carry on.

Mr. Jennings: That figure is wrong, for a start. How do you do it without the help of other people, anyway?

Mr. HEASLIP: It may not be exactly nine-tenths; that was just a stab at it, but it is the biggest part of the money. Without primary producers, secondary industries could not carry on.

Mr. Hudson: Could primary industries carry on without secondary industries?

Mr. HEASLIP: Primary was first and secondary was second; there would be no secondary were it not for the primary. There are many more people employed by secondary industries but they could not exist and would not be producing without the primary industries.

Mr. Casey: The whole world is in that position.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, and honourable members here argue that secondary industries are primary; they are not—they are secondary. Their name denotes it. They could not carry on without the primary industries.

Mr. Hudson: And primary could not carry on without secondary.

Mr. HEASLIP: That is incorrect. They would not be as well off without secondary, but primary can carry on without secondary. When the first people came to Australia and South Australia, they carried on without secondary industry. They made the tools themselves. It was only after the primary producers got going and were able to send their produce overseas that secondary industries were able to start up—and that still applies today. If we are to populate this country, we cannot do without secondary industries, because they provide employment for the people. Primary industries cannot provide enough employment for all, but the two are complementary to each other. The member for Glenelg said that primary industry could not carry on without secondary: I say it can.

Mr. Hudson: You cannot deny that fact.

Mr. HEASLIP: The honourable member stated that primary could not carry on without secondary; I still say it can. It is interesting to note in the Auditor-General's Report whence the Railways Department gets its revenue. It is from country and suburban passengers, parcels, mail, etc., general merchandise and miscellaneous freight, wool, wheat, barley and other grains, livestock, minerals, rents and miscellaneous, refreshment services and bookstalls—a total of £14,900,000. The only item that is metropolitan in that list is "suburban passengers", who contributed only £858,000 out of a total of £14,900,000.

Mr. Quirke: Yes, and the people in the country contribute more money than that.

Mr. HEASLIP: Of course; and they are the people to be slugged again. The Railways Department will raise another £1,000,000 at the expense of people remote from the metropolitan area, and it will be another increase in the cost of primary production. The following statement from the Labour Party in England may surprise members of the Government:

"Britain faced economic disaster if wage rises could not be kept in step with growth of productivity," the Minister for Labour (Mr. Gunter) warned yesterday. He was addressing the 8,000,000 strong Trade Unions Congress in Brighton, Sussex. Mr. Gunter, who is also Chairman of the Labour Party, spoke on the opening day of the T.U.C.'s annual conference as more unions joined to oppose the Government's policy on prices and income. Despite strong objections from some big unions, including the transport workers, industrial experts believe the conference will approve a new "early warning" system to contain wage rises.

The British Labour Government was trying to reduce costs of employers, and I commend it for taking that action. The Government had the courage to do it, for it knew that if it was to be successful it was necessary to increase productivity. Most of the money the Government in this State is raising in this Budget will not produce one penny more: it is just going to social services or other non-productive things. The Labour Government in England has said that if extra wages are to be paid production must be increased, and that is correct. Another illuminating article from the *Advertiser* about the waterfront situation in South Australia states:

Man-hours lost on South Australian wharves through stoppages rose from 594 in July to 16,771 in August, according to a report issued yesterday by the Port Adelaide representative of the Australian Stevedoring Industry Authority (Mr. R. B. Martin). Throughout Australia in August, 236,103 man-hours were lost through stoppages. This is less than the loss for July, but is more than four times the average loss for August in the three years 1962-1964. The report says the loss in the first two months of 1965-66 already exceeds the loss for the whole of the year 1963-64. Two nation-wide strikes on August 4 and 18 account for 80 per cent of the total. A total of 188,407 man-hours was lost at 22 ports as a result of nation-wide stoppages in support of claims by watersiders, including non-contributory pensions and mechanization fund.

If it is possible, something should be done to solve these problems. If we are going to succeed in South Australia we must produce more. I do not object to higher wages being paid, provided that production increases. I do not know how people on the basic wage can bring up a family of four or five. I should be happy if they received more wages, but for that extra money they should produce more. Men should not be allowed to refuse to work and so hold up all interstate and oversea traffic, as these stoppages add to the cost of production. Country people will have to bear the cost of the increases proposed by the Government, and these increases again add to the cost of our primary products, which must compete on world markets.

I doubt whether the Aboriginal is ready for full rights, and I do not think the Government can take credit for all that has been done for Aborigines. Mission stations and property owners have been working for a long time with the Aborigines. The grant to the Australian Presbyterian Board of Missions for the Ernabella Mission Station has been reduced by £2,600. The grant to the Lutheran Mission at Yalata has been

decreased by £3,275; the Umewarra Mission Station's grant has been decreased by £1,250; and the Nepabunna Mission Station grant by £250. These are all deserving institutions that provide the cheapest education for the Aborigines. We see on the Estimates that many people are receiving increased grants, but the grants to these missions are drastically reduced. The total grant to the Yalata institution last year was over £4,200.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: There is provision for an increase in teachers at Ernabella under "Education".

Mr. HEASLIP: That could be so. However, turning to the provision on the Estimates for the Tourist Bureau, I believe that one of our most important incomes can be derived in this field. Such parts of the State as the Barossa Valley, the Flinders Ranges and the South Coast could be exploited, so as to attract many more thousands of tourists each year.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I rise to support the first line, and to congratulate the Treasurer on presenting his first Budget and on the excellent job he has done in allocating the limited resources that were available. I, like the honourable member for Unley, consider that this Budget is the first of many that will be introduced by Labor Treasurers after a drought of 30 years.

Before developing a point on the overall character of the Budget, I should like to reply to the honourable member for Rocky River, particularly in relation to his remarks on the water supply for Kimba and the fact that, although this scheme was approved by the Public Works Committee in March this year, the project has not yet been proceeded with. The honourable member knows as well as any other honourable member that at any one moment the quantity of work approved by the committee greatly exceeds the amount that can be carried out in any year and there is invariably a time lag between the approval by the committee and the commencement of the project.

There was no justification for the honourable member's remark and in case any further argument or stone-throwing develops from this, it might be worthwhile remembering previous examples. The report of the Public Works Committee on the electrification of the Adelaide suburban train service was made in 1951 and that recommendation holds good today, although it was never carried out by the previous Government, and that Government had almost 14 years in which to carry it out. Another report by the committee is one on the duplication of the Woodville to Henley Beach

railway line. The Government must have read the word "duplication" incorrectly because it cut out the line altogether from Grange to Henley Beach. That report was presented on June 28, 1950.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Would you say that was "duplicity"?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. I think that while the Leader of the Opposition is out of the Chamber, it is safe for me to refer to the previous Government; if he were here, I should probably be required to withdraw. The Leader, along with the member for Flinders and other members opposite, attempted to make some capital out of the Treasurer's remarks that we commenced this year £2,000,000 worse off than the Playford Government commenced the previous year and that funds had been run down to the extent of £2,000,000. The member for Flinders said:

Even if we did run down to the extent of £2,000,000 last year, the recovery as far as Commonwealth reimbursement grants are concerned adequately covers that position.

I do not think that was the point at all. The Treasurer was simply saying that the fact that funds had run down last year to the extent of £2,000,000 made his job so much more difficult this year in terms of what he was trying to do. It is not possible to deny the general validity of that statement, and it is silly to try to deny it. The running down of balances and the elimination of previous surpluses, which mean that the new Government does not have these funds available to it, make the new Government's job more difficult. Members opposite may try to suggest that it was done in all sincerity, but the Treasurer did not make any point other than that his job was made more difficult because balances had been run down. This is perfectly obvious to anyone, even to the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip).

Mr. Nankivell: Are you saying that we expected to be defeated?

Mr. HUDSON: Nobody on this side has suggested that the previous Government ran down the funds because it expected to be defeated. The first time this subject was raised was when members opposite raised it. The Leader of the Opposition tried to make the point that the deficit in the Consolidated Revenue Fund proposed this year would have to be funded, and by reference to Appendix 6 of the Financial Statement he pointed out that the previous deficits in the fund had to be funded. That statement is only partially correct. Previous deficits in the

Consolidated Revenue—Fund were funded only if they persisted and did not correct themselves. For example, the deficit in that fund in 1946-47 of £60,459 was funded. In other words, it was paid out of Loan Funds, but not until 1949, so deficits had to repeat themselves for three years before that amount was funded. The deficit in 1954-55 of £2,233,928 eventually resulted in £40,000 of the amount being funded in the Public Purposes Loan Act of 1958—four years after the deficit took place. If honourable members look at succeeding years they will see that they were years of continuing deficits. The situation did not rectify itself. In 1959-60 there was a deficit of £311,104 in the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and the comment alongside the reference is "Absorbed by the surplus in 1960-61." So, it is simply not true that if there is a deficit in that fund it must be funded. It must be funded only if it persists over a number of years. If the deficit in the fund can be corrected fairly quickly it need not be funded.

The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) referred to the weight of debt charges in the Budget. I did a little work on this, and I think it can be argued that, while interest and sinking fund charges rise each year, they have not risen, in the last few years at any rate, as a percentage of the total receipts of the Government. Therefore, the weight of these charges in the Budget is not proportionately greater than it was a few years ago. I suggest that the real worry with interest and sinking fund charges occurs when these charges become an increasing proportion of the total revenue and do not remain constant.

I believe a general theoretical proposition can be stated that, if the interest rate on money borrowed is 5 per cent, over a long period of time, so long as revenue grows by 5 per cent a year, the percentage of debt charges to total revenue will remain constant. This means that, if the percentage of debt charges to total revenue remains constant in a year, other items of expenditure (such as social welfare and development and maintenance of the State resources) can keep on expanding over the years, and it is not necessary to impinge on them as a result of interest or sinking fund obligations. The position this year is slightly better than was the position last year. Interest as a percentage of total revenue is 20.2 per cent this year and the sinking fund contribution is 3.9 per cent, making a total

of 24.1 per cent. I think the honourable member for Burra referred to 24 per cent. These two figures combined are slightly higher than they were 10 years ago, and that is a pity. In 1955-56 (11 years ago) interest payments were 16.8 per cent of revenue, the sinking fund contribution was 4.5 per cent, and the total was 21.3 per cent. The sinking fund contributions 11 years ago were higher, while interest payments as a percentage of revenue 11 years ago were lower. The position changed quite significantly in 1958-59, and from then to now the total debt charges as a percentage of total revenue have remained more or less constant. The figures for the intervening years were as follows:

	Interest per cent.	Sinking Fund per cent.	Total per cent.
1958-59 . . .	19.1	4.6	23.7
1961-62 . . .	19.5	4.4	23.9
1962-63 . . .	20.4	3.8	24.2

Mr. Quirke: That is based on an increasing Budget figure.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, but the honourable member for Burra has missed my point. I have tried to suggest that interest and sinking fund charges become particularly serious where these charges rise as a percentage of the total revenue, which means that a smaller percentage of the total revenue must go in providing the things for which the Government is responsible. Then there is a smaller percentage of the total revenue for education, hospitals, the development of resources, and so on. As a general proposition, if the total revenue grows over the years, and so long as the interest and sinking fund payments do not grow at a faster rate, it is possible, percentage-wise, to increase other payments at the same rate as the overall rate of growth of revenue.

Mr. Quirke: They must increase.

Mr. HUDSON: I am not denying that the debt charges increase. The relevant comparison is to compare them with the percentages of total revenue. It has to be met and it is the way in which we meet our capital development. All I am pointing out is that, while these debt charges do not become a rising percentage of the total revenue, the financing of the capital development is not impinging on current revenue payments from the Budget, other than the debt charges.

Mr. Quirke: It remains comparatively small compared with the debt charges.

Mr. HUDSON: The general development is not to be found in the current Budget or in the Loan programme. What the honourable member calls development is taking a very

narrow and restricted view of the matter. The Auditor-General is a little narrow-minded in this respect: I can and do disagree with him there. I argue that expenditure on education is just as much a contribution towards the State's development in ultimately helping all sorts of productive activities in our community, as is, for example, "Lands Department administration", which is included under "Development and maintenance of State resources". I am sure that the member for Burra will agree with me that many of the expenditures under "Education" contribute to the overall development of the State much more than the "Lands Department administration" does. This overall classification of the various net payments from the Budget as social service "handouts" suggests that such "handouts" do nothing effective towards improving our overall productivity.

Mr. Quirke: The Auditor-General does not say that.

Mr. HUDSON: It is the implication when members opposite harp on the great achievements of the Playford Government in the field of development. I took some figures out. I refer now to Appendix 8. I took the net payments on social services and those on "Development and Maintenance of State resources" as a percentage of the total net payments. But I deducted from the total net payments the £4,000,000 paid to the Railways Department.

Mr. Nankivell: Because it is a self-balancing item?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. The percentage figures I got are interesting. The net debt charges here are interest and sinking fund contributions minus recoveries. The debt charges are a percentage of the total net payments minus the £4,000,000 paid to the Railways Department. They were 24.4 per cent in 1962-3, 23.5 per cent in 1963-4, 23.7 per cent in 1964-5, and 23.5 per cent (estimated) in 1965-6. The figure for "development and maintenance of State resources" has declined slightly, although we raised it a little over what it was in the previous year, percentage-wise. It was 11.7 per cent in 1962-3, 11.9 per cent in 1963-4, 11 per cent in 1964-5—a significant reduction last year—and the estimated figure for 1965-6 is 11.2 per cent. Now let us look at social services, which (according to the line laid down by the Leader of the Opposition and followed so slavishly by his hordes behind him) come in the category of hand-outs. The percentage of social service payments as a percentage of total net payments, adjusted in

the way I mentioned, was 54.7 per cent in 1962-63; it was 56.9 per cent in 1963-64; and 58.2 per cent in 1964-65. The estimated figure for this year is 58.4 per cent.

What happened to these social service payments in the much vaunted Playford Administration, with all the concentration (as the member for Flinders is fond of telling us) on development, keeping social services down as much as we possibly can because they do not contribute to the overall development? The overall effect was to raise the percentage of net social service payments from 54.7 per cent to 58.2 per cent, while expenditure on the development and maintenance of State resources was reduced from 11.7 per cent to 11 per cent. In fact, the increase in the percentage for social services this year is the smallest in the last three years. I suggest that honourable members are looking at the whole problem in an incorrect way if they just concentrate on the headings in Appendix 8 as the only contributions in the Budget to the overall development of the State. Even in improved hospitalization services there is a contribution to the overall development of the State, if it means that people on average, over a longer period of time, spend less of their lives sick than they did in the past. Even this sort of thing can make an indirect contribution.

Education at all levels certainly makes an important contribution to the overall development of the State. Members cannot deny that, and to ignore it is sheer folly. A great song and dance has been made by Opposition members who have spoken in this debate about the serious increase in taxation that is involved in this Budget, and about the fearful weight of these taxes. The member for Rocky River prated on about the effect of them on the primary producer and on his costs. Let us take the honourable member for Torrens first as one prize example of this sort of argument. He said that this Government proposed a fearful (he may not have used that exact word, but that was what he implied) increase of 17 per cent in stamp duties. The previous Government between 1963-64 and 1964-65 increased stamp duties by £1,700,000 on a total of £2,800,000, so, instead of a 17 per cent increase, as it is this year, in the previous year it was an increase of more than 60 per cent on my calculations. If members look at the last Budget speech by the now Leader of the Opposition they will see (at page 685 of last year's *Hansard*) the following:

The main increase will be in the general category of stamp duties. They are:

1. Licence fees payable by insurance companies which are calculated as a duty on net premiums will be increased from $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to 5 per cent.

That is an increase in the rate of the levy on that duty of over 200 per cent. I continue quoting:

This will apply to fire and general insurance but not to life assurance business.

2. The duty on brokers' contract notes for transfer of shares will be increased from 1s. per £50 of face value to 2s. per £50 of present value, and there will be a comparable adjustment with share conveyances otherwise made.

3. The duty on mortgage documents will be increased from 2s. 6d. a £100 to 5s. a £100.

We have heard Opposition members making a song and dance about the change in relation to the duty on cheques, yet the Leader of the Opposition, in his Budget last year, increased the duty on mortgage documents by 100 per cent and by over 200 per cent in the previous case. The speech continues:

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

5. An *ad valorem* duty of one per cent will be levied on documents relating to new registrations and to transfers of registration of motor vehicles.

The effect of the changes introduced last year by the now Leader of the Opposition was to bring about an overall increase in the amount of stamp duty levy of about 60 per cent compared with the proposed increase this year of 17 per cent. One or two Opposition members have been honest enough to point out that half of this year's increase is due to the rates imposed in last year's Budget having, for this financial year, the effect for a full year whereas previously they did not. It is worth noting that South Australia has for years been one of the lowest taxed States for State taxation, and that position will continue under the changes proposed in this Budget. I did not have time to make comparisons between all States on the difference between the rate of tax levied per capita in the various States, but I have the figures for New South Wales and Victoria.

In 1962-63 in the field of succession duties the amount levied a head of population in New South Wales was £4 8s. 7d., in Victoria, £4 1s. 7d., in South Australia £2 12s. 7d., and the Australian average was £3 14s. 8d. For 1964-65, in New South Wales it was £5 0s. 5d., in Victoria £4 19s., and in South Australia £3 6s. I have not yet received copies of the

New South Wales and Victorian Budgets for this year, but the estimated figure for South Australia for the current year would give succession duties of £3 15s. a head, which is still well below the New South Wales and Victorian figures for last year. It is almost certain that, as a result of normal growth, apart from any change in rates, the figures for those States for this year will be in excess of £5 a head, compared with an estimated South Australian figure of £3 15s. No-one can claim that this State's succession duties are heavy.

Mr. Nankivell: Do you think you can keep it down to that low level, with the programme you have promised?

Mr. HUDSON: I think it will inevitably expand year by year, as it has expanded for the last 10 years, even under the previous Government.

Mr. Nankivell: Will it increase progressively?

Mr. HUDSON: I do not know; I know only about what has applied up to the present. South Australia has had the most regressive system of any State in Australia, that is, the most regressive rate at which the marginal rate of taxation in the pound (in value) increases. In other words, the rate of succession duty in the pound levied on a small estate in South Australia is almost as high as the rate of duty levied in the pound on an estate of high value. As the Treasurer indicated not only in his policy speech during the election campaign but also during his Budget speech, we are prepared to alter succession duties, first, by extending the exemption limit and, secondly, by making the overall rate of progression of duty rates much less regressive than it has been in the past.

In South Australia, once the exemption (which was no more attractive than it was in most other States; in fact it was less attractive than that of three or four other States) was exceeded, the rate of duty was 4s. in the pound on the first pound in excess of the exemption limit, rising to 5s. in the pound on £200,000. In Queensland the rate of duty started at 1s. 8d. in the pound, rising to 4s. in the pound when the balance exceeded £115,000. In Victoria the rate started at 2s. in the pound, rising to 4s. 6d. in the pound when the final balance exceeded £94,667. In New South Wales it started at 5.4d. in the pound and rose to 5s. 4.8d. in the pound on an estate in excess of £100,000. There was not one single example in any of the other States where the rate of succession duties was nearly

as regressive as it was in South Australia. The effect of our proposals will be, on smaller estates, to produce a significant reduction in the amount of succession duty paid, not only because we shall be extending the exemption but also because the rate of regression of the duty will be changed. On estates of higher value the rate of duty levied will be increased.

Mr. Nankivell: Progressively?

Mr. HUDSON: Up to a certain limit.

Mr. Nankivell: There is a limit?

Mr. HUDSON: A limit applies in all schedules in all the various States. When I listened to the speech of the member for Albert I thought he had undertaken so much homework that one should treat him kindly and be friendly towards him, but unfortunately, so far, the standard of his interjections does not stand comparison with the quality of his speech.

Mr. Nankivell: Or with the quality of the speech in which he is interjecting!

Mr. HUDSON: I shall leave that to other people to judge. I do not believe these increased succession duties will have an impact on production, one way or the other. However, in so far as they involve lower rates of duty on estates of lesser value, they will make the position of the small man much easier than it has been in the past and he will be able to take over after the death of his father or mother and succeed instead of getting himself involved in such heavy debt with interest payments that he cannot save, as the honourable member for Stirling tells us is so important.

The honourable member for Frome tells me that one of the reasons why honourable members opposite are upset about the proposed changes in succession duties is that they are talking through their pockets. They do not expect to fall into the category of small farmers.

Mr. Quirke: The only difference there is that the honourable member for Frome has not spoken. He would be talking through his pocket, too.

Mr. HUDSON: Again, South Australia's land tax per capita is lower than applies in New South Wales or Victoria. For the year 1962-63, the figure for New South Wales was £2 10s. 6d. and for Victoria, £2 16s. 7d. The figure for South Australia was £2 9s. 2d. Over the last two years the figures have changed: for the year 1964-65, the figure for New South Wales was £3 9s. 9d., for Victoria £2 19s. 7d. and for South Australia £2 9s. 8d. The estimated for 1965-66 is £2 17s. 3d.

for South Australia, which is still less than the New South Wales and Victorian figures for 1963-64 and 1964-65 and the South Australian figure certainly will be less than the New South Wales and Victorian figures for the current financial year.

Mr. Quirke: You will agree that it is necessary to keep it as low as one can keep it.

Mr. HUDSON: One does not tax where it is going to have an impact on current production; in other words, by taxing the small man. The Treasurer indicated that, by and large, the increase in land tax will be confined to land that has an unimproved value in excess of £5,000, and the smaller man will not experience any significant effect. The amount of land tax paid by the ordinary primary producer is small indeed when compared with what he pays in other taxes to the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Hall: What amount would you say a small primary producer would need to have invested in order to gain a livelihood?

Mr. HUDSON: Do you mean what is his net investment, free of encumbrances?

Mr. Hall: What would be his capital outlay in order to gain an income?

Mr. HUDSON: It has to be net. I think it would be about £20,000.

Mr. Hall: He would not get far on that.

Mr. HUDSON: I said "net". The honourable member does not listen. On the matter of stamp duties, South Australia again has one of the lowest levies per capita. The figures for New South Wales and Victoria respectively for the year 1962-63 were £4 4s. 4d., and £4 4s. 11d., whereas the figure for South Australia was £2 6s. 3d. In 1964-65, because of the additional imposts by the previous Government in last year's budget, the South Australian stamp duty was £4 9s. 2d. per head of population, but the New South Wales figure had risen to £5 8s. 2d. and the Victorian figure to £4 19s. 0d.

Mr. Heaslip: Was that the ambition of the Government—to make us the highest?

Mr. HUDSON: I am just pointing out that these figures increase year by year. Our proposals were nowhere near as savage in terms of increase as the previous Government's proposals in last year's Budget.

Mr. Nankivell: But you are getting the benefit of them.

Mr. HUDSON: Members opposite can make a song and dance purely for political purposes and to get publicity that this Government is increasing charges all over the place, but it has not done anything nearly as severe as

the previous Government did last year. This point is quite clear and should be recognized by everyone. If the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) has looked at the figures in the appendix—and I suspect from the effort he put into his speech that he has—he will know as well as I that there is a growth in taxation figures year after year whether or not the rates are increased. This is due to the increase in economic activities each year. The increase in stamp duty that we propose is very small compared with the overall growth, and it will still leave our tax at a lower rate per capita than that of most other States. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) said that the £400,000 increase in land tax proposed for this year was a very big increase to make in one particular line. I direct his attention to Appendix 4, which shows that, under the previous Government, land tax increased by £1,000,000 from 1960-61 to 1961-62 and by over £800,000 from 1955-56 to 1956-57. The increase we propose is small compared with those two previous increases introduced by the previous Government.

Mr. Coumbe: Would they be quinquennial adjustments?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, they would be. All I am pointing out is that the increase this year is small compared with the quinquennial adjustments. If honourable members look at the various figures given in Appendix 4 to see how the items have changed over the last 10 years they will see that total State taxation increased by about 120 per cent but that land tax under the previous Government increased by over 300 per cent in that period. In that same period motor vehicle taxation increased by 66 per cent; stamp duties increased by over 200 per cent; succession duties increased by 83 per cent; and other licences increased by 80 per cent. The overall increase in taxation that we propose for this year is 11.5 per cent. That is less than the increase of 17 per cent in State taxation levied in 1964-65 by the Playford Government over the previous year. It is also less than the increase of 15.3 per cent between 1955-56 and 1956-57 and about on a par with the increase of 10.4 per cent between 1962-63 and 1963-64. The record of the Playford Government over the years is a record of increasing taxation, and no amount of glib or untruthful talk can alter that. The same thing applies in the figures for public works and services and other receipts, particularly the item for waterworks and sewers. In the years 1956-57 to 1957-58 the increase for waterworks and sewers was

£900,000, which was a much greater percentage increase than that proposed for this year—an increase of 25 per cent. The increase between the years 1959-60 and 1960-61 was £1,200,000, and this again was a much greater percentage increase than that proposed for this year.

Mr. Quirke: Is the honourable member talking about receipts?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, receipts under waterworks and sewers. They were not just installation increases over these years. There have been changes in assessments as a result of changes in land valuations.

Mr. Quirke: The honourable member is giving the impression that this is an increase in revenue.

Mr. HUDSON: The honourable member for Onkaparinga delights in telling me that I am inexperienced. I realize that I am normally so inexperienced that I would point out that some of this is because of growth and only some is because of increased rates and assessments. Do I want to become as experienced as honourable members opposite? They made remarks on charges and put nothing down to growth. They were saying that the full effect of the increase in rates is shown in the increase in revenue, and that nothing was owing to growth. If, when I am as experienced as the member for Onkaparinga, I shall be able to say whatever I like then I hope that I do not gain this experience.

I think 1962-63 to 1963-64 was the period when there was an increase in rates announced by the previous Premier on his television programme. Honourable members should not kid themselves that the glorious Playford Government never altered water or tax rates when forced into the position of needing additional revenue. The records show that over the previous 10 years the total revenue receipts for waterworks and sewers increased by 200 per cent. The total receipts in the Budget are gross receipts, which is a little misleading, but over the 10-year period total receipts rose from £59,000,000 in 1955-56 to £111,000,000 in 1964-65; they almost doubled. The most sluggish item of all is railways and this has probably had some effect on overall Government activities in development, education, the provision of hospitals, and so on. Railways receipts have increased from only about £13,000,000 (when one sets out the payment made towards debt charges) to about £14,500,000.

Mr. Quirke: That should be more static than any other item.

Mr. HUDSON: One would expect that; but its being more static as a revenue item has affected the kind of services that the Railways Department can provide and its capital expenditure. In all sorts of ways services have had to be reduced. The recommendations that the Public Works Committee made in 1950-51 in respect of the electrification and duplication of railway lines, which were worth while carrying out, were never implemented by the previous Government.

Over the years this has been one of the most important drawbacks in the overall financial position of the State. Honourable members, if they are honest, will recognize that this has created continuous difficulties. Many items of expenditure are worth a mention. I refer to a point made by the Leader of the Opposition about hospitals, when he tried to suggest that this Government had treated subsidized hospitals shabbily, and he used a shabby argument to suggest this. He pointed to the maintenance subsidy given to the subsidized hospitals and indicated that in many cases this had not increased, whereas the proposed appropriation for many Government hospitals under "Contingencies, wages and salaries" had increased. He failed to point out, however, that the capital grants proposed for subsidized hospitals had been increased in this Budget by 29.5 per cent. These are the capital grants made under the Budget. It is one of the largest percentage increases of any Budget item, and indicates clearly this Government's concern for these subsidized hospitals.

Mr. Quirke: There have been no increases in the subsidies paid to hospitals in my district.

Mr. HUDSON: I do not know, but, overall, there is an increase. For instance, the capital grant for Jamestown has risen from £2,006 to £7,000, an increase of £4,994. Item after item shows significant increases in capital grants being made. The subsidies paid to hospitals under the heading "Capital grants and maintenance to subsidized hospitals" have increased by 29.5 per cent; salaries and wages to Government hospitals are up by 6½ per cent; contingencies for Government hospitals are up by 14 per cent. The capital grant for Millicent increased by over 100 per cent, and that for Naracoorte rose from £8,119 to £9,546. As the capital grant for Pinnaroo has risen from £1,876 to £7,507, it has almost quadrupled. The maintenance grant for Pinnaroo has gone from £3,100 to £4,000. Keith (also in the district of Albert) has had a £200 increase in maintenance, but the capital grant has been increased from £284 to £42,886.

Mr. Nankivell: That is a new nurses' home.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, and that grant was increased by the present Government. The figures I have quoted cannot be challenged. The Leader of the Opposition was concerned to make a great song and dance about the position at Whyalla. The maintenance grant proposed in last year's Budget was £58,000.

Mr. Nankivell: And they got £82,000.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, £24,000 above the Budget estimate, and they are getting the same this year. How was that maintenance grant made up last year? Actually it exceeded the estimates. Was the increase in the maintenance grant paid prior to the election or after the election? I do not know. It is inane for the Leader of the Opposition or his back-bench chairman to suggest that Whyalla has been harshly treated. In fact, the Minister of Education indicated previously that Whyalla was very well satisfied. The argument that Opposition members are trying to introduce about hospitals is completely specious. In 1964-65 the actual payment made in subsidies to hospitals was £2,290,691, and the amount proposed this year is £2,968,317, an increase of £677,626 or 29.5 per cent. As the member for Burra knows, the amount of subsidy paid to an individual hospital from year to year can vary depending on the hospital's financial position. An examination is made by the Chief Secretary's Department.

Mr. Quirke: You should look at the figures for capital expenditure.

Mr. HUDSON: We are not worrying about the capital figures, as they are part of the overall picture. For hospitals subsidized under the Hospitals Act, which does not cover all hospitals, it is true that the maintenance figure increased by £12,000, but the capital figure increased by £180,000. If a hospital is subsidized on capital account and that hospital has to provide, out of its own funds, money on capital account also, and if the amount given on capital account is increased, that may affect significantly the amount the hospital has to provide from its voluntary funds on capital account. It may mean that the hospital has additional money available out of its own funds on maintenance account. To try to suggest that there is no connection between maintenance and capital is one of the most specious arguments I have heard.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You obviously don't know much about country hospitals and the way they are run.

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Flinders, like the member for Burra and the Leader of the Opposition, ignores altogether the capital items change. One would think that they would at least give credit where credit was due, and that they would not be so mean-minded as to snap at any figure in the Budget. They pick out an increase that does not seem large enough, and ignore a substantial increase right next to it. Why not give credit where it is due instead of adopting a cavilling and sneering attitude? Members opposite call it experience, and if one attempts to make an honest assessment of things he receives this sort of rabid interjection.

Mr. Quirke: If I took the honourable member to a few country hospitals I think he would change his view.

Mr. HUDSON: I am not saying that what is done for country hospitals at this juncture is necessarily adequate, but this Government is doing much more for them than the previous Government did.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You are quite wrong.

Mr. HUDSON: The capital grant has been vastly increased, percentage-wise. Honourable members can ignore that as much as they like and say that we are not interested in country hospitals, but they are not telling the truth if they say it.

Mr. Quirke: I am saying it now.

Mr. HUDSON: All right, the honourable member is not telling the truth.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask the member for Burra to stop interjecting so much.

Mr. HUDSON: If we look at the grant for hospitals under "Hospitals Department" it does not refer to subsidized hospitals but to Government hospitals. We see that the figure is increased by £827,000, or only 10 per cent. However, the overall grants and subsidies to the hospitals and institutions operated by independent boards (not Government hospitals) is increased by 23 per cent, or £958,000. The Leader of the Opposition tries to tell us that this Government favours Government hospitals at the expense of independent hospitals that are subsidized, but the lie to that statement is clearly illustrated in the Estimates. If we look at the other expenditure items in the Budget, we find that nearly all of them have not been increased by as much as have the items relating to hospitals and institutions operated by independent boards. They could not be, because overall expenditure has not increased by more than 9 per cent, whereas this particular item has increased by 23 per cent.

The grant to the Education Department shows an increase of £1,630,000 or 9 per cent, the total grant for this department having been increased by £2,330,000, or 10 per cent. Other items, such as interest, have increased only by 7 per cent. Sinking fund contributions have been increased only by 8 per cent. Therefore, despite the overall effects of debts we have been able to increase our expenditure on hospitals and education, as well as on many other things, by much more than the percentage increase for interest and sinking fund. I was particularly pleased to see an increased appropriation for the purchase of areas of land suitable for national parks and wild life reserves. The sum proposed for land acquisition under the Public Parks Act has been increased from £30,000 to £125,000, as recommended by the Town Planning Committee. The recommendation of that committee has been accepted by this Government and the total vote has been increased by £30,000 to £125,000. Let me finish by making an appeal to honourable members opposite to try to argue in a reasonable way. I know that they are more experienced than I am and that they like to make a great song and dance about inexperience on this side, but experience should not lead one to ignore the true facts of the situation.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): The member for Glenelg should realize that if he hands it out by way of interjection he must expect to receive interjections. I listened with interest to his arguments and the detail he gave, but found that often he seemed to be arguing in two different ways. He said that the previous Government, over a number of years, had increased taxation significantly, and mentioned the figure of 17 per cent for one year. He went on to say that this State was regressive in its approach to taxation, when compared with other States. Let me interpret the word "regressive". The honourable member meant that our taxation level was below that of other States. He says that when the new Government took over it found that taxation rates in South Australia were lamentably lower than those in other States.

In spite of the attention that the honourable member for Glenelg gave to the preparation of his speech, it contained contradictions of major proportions. I was much alarmed by the honourable member's reference to the honourable member for Rocky River. It may well be that the honourable member for Glenelg disagreed with the honourable member for Rocky River. I do not agree with him myself at times, but I was alarmed when he said that that honourable

member prated on the problems of the primary producers. By using one word, he indicated his attitude to the problems of those producers. Apparently, in his mind, they do not exist.

Later, by way of reply to an interjection, the honourable member for Glenelg said that a primary producer could carry on a business with a net investment of £20,000. One member on the Government side of the Chamber is connected with primary production. I refer to the honourable member for Frome. Let him try to justify the figure given by the honourable member for Glenelg. This reflects that so few members on the Government side are connected actively with primary production. Although many of our resources have been devoted to developing secondary industry, we cannot ignore the problems of the primary producers. By their increased efficiency they have been able to meet increased costs in the last few years. Their efficiency has been greatly increased because of better knowledge, better machines and scientific discoveries. However, there will be an end to increases in efficiency, and soon they will have to meet from their incomes the increased costs. When that stage is reached the policies enunciated by the member for Glenelg will be disastrous to country areas.

We have heard much orating by members opposite, but the fact still remains that there will be increases in land tax, water rates and succession duties. The latter fall unfairly on primary producers. This State has been well managed for a long period, and I regret that the member for Glenelg and his colleagues are tinkering with the successful institution handed over to their management. The theories expounded by the honourable member will reduce the incentive of country people in many ways. When the Party opposite governs by compulsion instead of incentive, it will indeed be disastrous for this State's economy.

It has been said that the proposed increase in railway revenue will come mainly from country areas. I believe we shall have to await the introduction of a Government Bill to discover the full ramifications of increased transport control. I know that country people will be alarmed at not being able to use the most efficient method of transport and at being coerced into using the railways. The member for Unley (Mr. Langley) tried to justify the employment of a public relations officer by the Attorney-General. I cannot be bothered about whether the Attorney-General

spends several thousands of pounds on having such an officer; the theories enunciated by several members opposite will do much more harm than this expenditure will. It is not the employment of a public relations officer that worries this side of the Committee; it is the general trend of political interference with private rights and incentives.

I wish to refer now to items under the control of the Publicity and Tourist Bureau. Although I am pleased that an increase of about £10,000 has been made in the vote to municipal authorities for development, there is a reduction of about £8,000 in the sum provided for swimming pools. I believe that the Government must change its attitude towards subsidies. Something must be done to assist country centres in their efforts to build swimming pools. In country towns there is accelerating interest in the provision of swimming pool facilities for schoolchildren and other citizens. If this Budget is strictly maintained with a one-third reduction in the allocation for swimming pools, many country centres will find that swimming pool installations will be delayed until the L.C.L. Party is once again returned to office.

I regret that no special allocation for beach development has been provided. I agree with the Government's policy in appointing a waterways recreational committee. It was set up to study what could be done to develop our foreshores and waterways. Unfortunately it will get nowhere unless it has financial teeth, and there is no vote in relation to it. During the last election campaign the Government Party promised to allocate greatly increased sums for this purpose, and I hope that in time the Government will do this because there is a great demand for improved beach facilities. Of greater importance, even than beach facilities, is the need of newly developed areas for financial assistance. I refer to the areas with which I am connected in the Salisbury council area. During the debate on the Loan Estimates I spoke of the need to grant assistance to new areas, such as Para Hills, Parafield Gardens and so on, which are in the Salisbury council area. Perhaps the honourable member for Gawler is interested in them, too. These areas have been and are being built by private enterprise, and were not entirely constructed by the Housing Trust as was Elizabeth.

Government money has been spent at Elizabeth, and the citizens there have been left without many public financial burdens. By comparison the citizens in areas that have been privately built, such as Para Hills, find

themselves in a worse position, as they are in need of financial assistance for public facilities. At the moment I do not know how the problem can be overcome, but the Treasurer should be actively considering assisting these areas which have been populated to a large extent by people from Europe. We need to look more closely at the private housing developments going on. They are going ahead apace, are successful and are attracting buyers, but not everyone who has purchased a house in South Australia from a private developer is in a happy position. Many people coming to this country from Europe and the United Kingdom are being overcharged when they buy a house. The amount of money that a person may deposit on a house costing between £4,200 and £5,200 is important to him when making his financial arrangements for living in this State. I have been able to help two people who were in financial straits in purchasing a house. Many people buy houses without having accurate information about the loans that may be obtained in this State. They are pressurized by land and house salesmen too soon after their arrival in this country from abroad.

Within two or three days of their arrival, a salesman is showing them around the town and pointing out the affluence of our society. (Of course, we all know that, compared with people in other States, South Australians are the most affluent!) It is all very well for a salesman to point out these things in general to a new arrival in this country to whom he wants to sell a house that the migrant cannot afford. Recently, two people were sold by an astute salesman for £5,200 a house on which they paid £500 deposit. The breadwinner was earning £23 a week and had three children to raise. How can a man run a motor car (which is essential to anyone going to and from shift work), pay £500 deposit on a £5,200 house, eventually get a loan, and pay his way? We all know it is impossible to do that and maintain a proper standard of living. In this case the salesman is guilty of participating in what amounts to nothing less than a racket.

Mr. Clark: This is not an isolated case, either.

Mr. HALL: It is not, but I use this as an example. These people come to me and point out the hopelessness of their position. What can we do about it? The whole financial transaction into which the family is entering depends on getting a first mortgage. I do not know the procedure for approaching a

bank when two people buy a house on the understanding that they will get a loan, but I understand that a tentative approach is made to a lending authority and it is understood that a loan will be granted.

Mr. Clark: But a person may wait a long time for it.

Mr. HALL: Yes, but it is necessary at the tentative approach for the loan that the lending authority is sure of all the financial details before it even says it may eventually grant the loan. If he does not get a loan, what is he then offered?—only a return of £70 on the £500 deposit. It could be said that this family has had the use of this house and therefore its rental value for perhaps eight months, but I say the salesman and the company are culpable in arranging for the sale of the house on a £500 deposit. It seems that some control is needed.

Mr. McKee: How long has this been going on?

Mr. HALL: A long time, and it is not confined to my district. I am sure that salesmen in other districts are astute, but this seems a particularly bad case. These people had been out from the United Kingdom only a matter of days when they were pounced upon. How can a person who has lived in one country and has travelled halfway across the world to an entirely different environment make an assessment in two days or even two weeks?

Mr. Clark: This doesn't happen with the Housing Trust, nor does it happen with all private sellers.

Mr. HALL: No; there are hundreds of satisfied customers, but this does not vindicate even one instance of wrongful selling. I know of another instance in which a house was bought for £4,200. I called on the purchaser of this house during the election campaign, and he told me he thought Australia was a paradise. He said he had come here with £300. He received nearly a full bank loan on the £4,200 house, put his £300 into it and raised the balance by second mortgage. He was able to save quickly and repay the second mortgage, and he was in this pleasant house and paying only his interest and principal on a first mortgage bank loan, and indeed he was in a happy position. I emphasize the difference £1,000 makes to the long-term financial arrangements a family can make. People do not understand the burden they are putting upon their shoulders by looking at these higher-valued houses. This is not an isolated case. Can we do more in

giving further information to migrants, especially those from the United Kingdom, on the obligations they may take on here and the way in which they may become burdened financially? This is no small matter; it is tied up with housing loan finance, and I understand that the Commonwealth Government has set up a committee to look into this matter of second mortgages. I would think the Commonwealth £250 home savings grant has been introduced to try to get young people to save money, thus obviating the necessity to take out second mortgages. It seems to me that at least people could be given more warning officially of the trouble they can get themselves into if they are unwise in their house purchases.

Another matter that I have raised before is the question of the Virginia water basin. Indeed, it has been brought up here and in another place so many times that perhaps members may be weary of the subject. Let me say that it is a most important subject, one that has great implications on the livelihood of the South Australian vegetable-producing fraternity as well as on the consumers. In the future the water basin at Virginia will be depleted. This is indicated by answers to my questions, and the Minister told me last week that there was a real danger of contamination of the basin by sea water. Those who know the problem await with some dread the first indications that the quality of water in the Virginian bores is deteriorating. When it does the Government will be faced with a serious problem. Will it then use the machinery of the Underground Waters Preservation Act? I am speaking of the Government that is in power at the time, and whether it will have the courage to restrict water usage in the basin so that the basin is protected. If it does how much damage will be caused to occupiers of the land and what reduction will there be in the quantity of vegetables available for sale in the Adelaide market and to other States?

I urge the Government to make more rapid investigation into the possible use of effluent from the Bolivar treatment works. The use of that effluent is the only long-term method of saving the Virginia area as a vegetable producing district. The need for alternative arrangements is urgent in the face of the threat to this basin caused by depletion of the supply and also to protect the quality of the water. If the quality of the water deteriorates it may well be that many bores will have to be shut off immediately. Nothing

can take their place except effluent from the treatment works, and the Government should make an active and constant investigation into the possibility of reticulating treated effluent in this area. I regret the attitude of the member for Glenelg to the problems of primary producers and country areas of this State, and of his accusing those who speak of these problems of "prating". I disagree with that attitude, and hope the Government will consider the matters I have enumerated.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I join with my Leader in complimenting the Treasurer on introducing his first Budget, which is also the first Labor Budget to be introduced in this State for many years. I noticed that, in his opening remarks, the Treasurer said that he had been assisted in preparing the Budget by the smooth running and efficient staff of the Treasury, and he added that no change in that staff had taken place since the election of the Labor Government. Speaking not only for myself but also for other members of South-East districts, I am pleased to say that we are enjoying an excellent season in that area. May I say here, too, that I heard today that the member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) left hospital this afternoon, and I know that everybody joins me in wishing him a speedy recovery.

Much has been said about secondary and primary industries in this State. I believe that each is complementary to the other, and I think that we must achieve some balance between them. We have seen many recent innovations in agricultural development in the South-East, and not the least of these, of course, is the advent of deep sand, a technique whose discovery is largely due to Mr. Newton Tiver who, I am sorry to say, has recently left the Agriculture Department. The major part of my district is anxiously awaiting the completion of an extension by the Electricity Trust. I am grateful for the co-operation I have received from the Minister of Works in regard to the extension of electricity since I became a member of this place. We look forward to the completion of the substations and the extension of transmission lines to Naracoorte and Lucindale, which are necessary for the completion and extension of the rural lines in the district. We appreciate the bounteous ground supply of water in our area and the Electricity Trust of South Australia extension will give much impetus to the irrigation projects.

Much has been said this evening about hospitals and I wish to say something about the Naracoorte Hospital, for which a special grant has been made. This 70-bed hospital has been

in existence for 84 years. It has experienced its difficulties and we are mindful of the assistance received from the previous Government and the special consideration that the recent deputation received from the present Minister of Health, for which the people of my district are grateful. Naracoorte has an excellent surgeon and five doctors, whose medical history is sound. We have had more than our share of road accidents and surgery of a high standard has been carried out at the hospital. In times of financial difficulty, the local government authorities contributing to the Naracoorte Hospital considerably increased their contributions. Charity begins at home, and our people are practising that principle.

The member for Burra said that the pumping of water would cost £750,000 this year. As I said, charity begins at home and this is a hoary old chestnut. There is hardly a tank in Adelaide and I think the people

should be encouraged to provide tanks and so avoid what I consider a wicked waste of water. My colleague the honourable member for Yorke Peninsula says that by-laws prevent them from doing that. If that is the case, something should be done about the by-laws. I am not detracting from the excellent work that has been done or from the importance of bringing water from the River Murray, but I think that people should be encouraged to help themselves by providing tanks at their homes. I have pleasure in supporting the first line.

First line (Legislative Council, £16,167)—passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.45 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 23, at 2 p.m.