

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, September 15, 1966.

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

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

Public Purposes Loan,
Bank of Adelaide's Registration Under the Companies Act 1892 Act Amendment (Private).

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for all the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

QUESTIONS

MAIN NORTH ROAD.

Mr. HALL: My question concerns access from the Main North Road to properties situated on the eastern side of that road and opposite the Parafield aerodrome. I have received correspondence concerning access to a property which has been denied by the Highways Department as a result of its policy of limited access to the Main North Road. Owners of this land can overcome the problem of gaining access to the road only by expensive road-making arrangements made necessary by the department's ruling. I have received a further letter from a Mr. Dunow, who lives at Magill but who owns property in the area that he wishes to use for commercial purposes. At the end of his letter he states his complaint clearly, as follows:

My complaint is this: with a clean title to a property, can the Highways Department prevent me from entering this land? If so, is it not the responsibility of the department to have it noted on a title to safeguard purchasers of land?

I understand that this gentleman purchased this land about 12 months ago and that at that time he was unaware that this restricted access applied. Can the Minister of Lands ascertain from the Minister of Roads whether, in the light of the fact that there is no notation on the title to the land, this action is legal?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to refer the honourable member's question to my colleague for investigation, and I will bring down a report as soon as possible.

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY.

Mr. CURREN: The salinity of the Murray River has caused much concern in recent months. I read in the press this morning a report that the Commonwealth Government had appointed a committee to inquire into this problem. Can the Minister of Irrigation indicate the latest salinity readings at the various Upper Murray pumping stations? Also, can he say whether South Australia has a representative on the committee to inquire into salinity?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Dealing with the latter part of the question first, I can say that South Australia has a representative on the committee appointed by the River Murray Commission to investigate salinity, as have the other two States of New South Wales and Victoria. This State's representative is a Mr. Gerny, an engineer with the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I believe this committee was formed almost 12 months ago, and to date it has set about collecting data which, of course, is so necessary to discover any solution to the problem of salinity in the Murray River. I am pleased to report to the House that the salinity readings have vastly improved. This, of course, is due in the main to a freshette. The effect of this is that at Lock 5 the salinity reading on September 12, 1966 (the last reading taken), was 170 parts per million, compared with 270 parts per million on August 31; at Chaffey pumping station (Ral Ral Creek), the salinity has been reduced in that period from 340 to 150; at Berri, from 350 to 150; at Loxton, from 360 to 200; at Cobdogla, from 480 to 185; at Waikerie, from 585 to 290; and at Cadell, from 630 to 360.

NURIOOTPA SCHOOLS.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: As the Minister of Education will recall, last year I introduced two deputations to him. The first deputation, from Nuriootpa High School Council, requested the Minister to give effect to a promise that had been made by the previous Minister, I think in 1964, that a solid construction building or additions would be erected on the high school grounds to house the ever-increasing school-going population at that high school, and to replace the old wooden construction buildings on the site. A second deputation from the Nuriootpa Primary School Committee drew the Minister's attention to the position at that school, which was hemmed in and surrounded by residences

so that it could not expand, and to the purchase by the department nine or 10 years ago of eight or nine acres in another locality with a view to erecting a school. Last Thursday, the Premier was reported in the *Advertiser* as saying that 15 new high schools would have to be built in South Australia by 1972 at an estimated cost of \$12,000,000 to \$15,000,000. Can the Minister say whether in that programme solid construction additions or new buildings are planned for the Nuriootpa High School, and whether further consideration has been given to erecting a new primary school at Nuriootpa on the land purchased?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I appreciate the remarks of the honourable member concerning the need to replace the school at Nuriootpa, and I assure him that I share with him the desire to replace this school. However, as I have said on several occasions in this House, virtually all the Loan money available to the Education Department has had to be devoted and will have to be devoted for some time to the construction of new schools in areas where there is and will be a population explosion. Consequently, the replacement of schools has had to be left in abeyance. Concerning the list of 15 schools to which the Premier referred, if the honourable member happened to see my remarks about the Premier's statement he will have noticed that I listed, I think, 18 or 20 high schools out of which the 15 referred to by the Premier would have to be built by 1972. These lists were not in any order of strict priority but were in alphabetical order, as it is impossible to say at this stage what the exact priority of the schools will be. The department's officers are watching closely the question of priority, and I have explained to the House how priorities are arrived at. We are aware of the conditions at Nuriootpa and, as Minister, I hope the day will soon come when we can replace some of the old schools. Recently, on a visit to Whyalla, I visited the Gladstone High School and was told that a new high school for that town had been promised by the previous Government since 1938, and that there had been a series of promises over the years since then; but the town is still some way from getting a new high school.

GLADSTONE HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. HEASLIP: A statement appeared in the *Advertiser* last week in which a high school at Gladstone was mentioned. In his reply to the member for Angas, the Minister

of Education said that a new high school had been promised for Gladstone as far back as 1938. Although I have been the member for that district since 1949, I have no recollection of any promise having been made for a high school in this town. In 1938 a site for the school had not even been purchased by the Government. As I know nothing of this promise, can the Minister tell me when it was made? A high school at Gladstone has been included in the list of high schools to be built by the present Government, although the project has not even been referred to the Public Works Committee. On the other hand, a high school for Clare was referred to the Public Works Committee and recommended by it but it seems to have been added to the list, given by the Premier last week, as an afterthought. Can the Minister say when the proposal for a new high school at Gladstone will be referred to the Public Works Committee and, if the committee recommends it, when the Government intends to provide it, as the people of Gladstone have been waiting for it for many years?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I thought I made it plain and gave the reason in my previous answer why it was impossible to say what was the order of priority of schools in the list given. It is impossible for me to say when a proposal for a high school at Gladstone will be referred to the Public Works Committee or when a school will be built there. As I have previously said in the House, I have no intention whatever of making promises that cannot be fulfilled. Concerning the inclusion of a high school at Gladstone in the list, this list of particular schools was provided by my officers on their assessment of the priorities in relation to high schools. Gladstone was included because it was felt that within the total number of high schools given in the list Gladstone should be included. Regarding the promise as far back as 1938, the honourable member will no doubt be interested to know that the member for the district at that time presented the plans for a new high school to the school committee in 1938. Representatives of the high school council told me that they had on their records written correspondence proving that subsequent promises had been made.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked some weeks ago about providing a new permanent air terminal at the Adelaide Airport?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: This matter concerns not only the honourable member who has asked the question but also the member for Gumeracha (Sir Thomas Playford). I corresponded with the Commonwealth Government in July last, and the most recent letter I have received, which is signed by Senator Gorton and dated at Canberra, September 5, states:

I refer to your letter of July 19 to the Prime Minister about congestion at the terminal buildings at Adelaide Airport. My colleagues and I are aware of the problems associated with the terminal at Adelaide Airport and we are giving the matter our close attention. I will let you know when a decision has been reached on the matter.

GRASSHOPPERS.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Has the Minister of Agriculture any further information on the question I recently asked about grasshoppers at the far end of Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Following the deputation introduced by the honourable member (and also attended by the member for Ridley) constant contact has been maintained with the Murat Bay council. Our officers have been acquainted with what has been taking place in the area, and it has now been decided that the farmers themselves will use their mist sprays to combat the grasshopper menace they are experiencing at present. Statistics taken out by the landowners concerned have been supplied to the Murat Bay council. I commend these landowners on their very enthusiastic approach to this problem, for they have been most co-operative with the council. My department is ensuring that the best possible effects are obtained in combating the grasshopper menace at an early stage. As members may know, at present the grasshoppers are still in the crawler and hopper stage, and it is expected that they will be taking to the wing within the next fortnight. The council is providing the landowners with the insecticides to be used, and I have authorized two of my officers to visit the area to supervise the work. Those officers left by bus this morning and will be in the area to ensure that proper methods are used.

In addition, the wide roads in the area that were mentioned at the deputation will require spraying, as well as infestations that exist at the Koonibba Mission. We are co-operating in respect of not only privately owned land but also Government land. It is expected that assistance will be given by way of a grant towards solving this problem. Having received requests for assistance, we will render that assistance as soon as the cost involved is known.

I assure the members concerned that the Government is particularly sympathetic in respect of this problem. Results at the top end of Eyre Peninsula will probably be the best obtained since cropping was commenced in the area. It would be a shame to see the landowners concerned suffer losses as a result of grasshoppers devouring their crops. The utmost co-operation exists on the part of landowners, the council, the department, and me, as Minister. I trust that much work will be undertaken this year to help the people concerned with this problem.

A departmental officer has also visited the Peterborough-Orroroo area, where he has carried out certain trials, and will return soon after visiting Ceduna. The member for Frome (Mr. Casey) who has brought this problem in the northern parts of the State to my attention last year and again this year, may be assured that we are watching the position keenly.

MOTOR VEHICLE INSURANCE.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about comprehensive and third party insurance procedure?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The honourable member mentioned "unsatisfactory settlements" by certain insurance companies with respect to comprehensive and third party insurances, and suggested that a Select Committee be set up to recommend a pattern of insurance that would be fair and reasonable. A settlement may be "unsatisfactory" as to amount or because of delay. An insurance company would be concerned with a vehicular accident either as insurer for a person against whom damages were sought by a third party claiming personal injury or property damage, or as insurer of a person claiming recompense for damage to his own property. In each case it is a matter of taking civil measures for recovery, which can involve the complexities of establishing the facts, determination of responsibility, assessment of damages, and then arriving at either an agreed or a litigated settlement. It is difficult to see how a Select Committee could perform any very useful purpose in recommending legislative action, particularly as any party unable to secure an agreed settlement satisfactory to himself has the full right to pursue his claims in a civil court.

Mr. HALL: Has the Premier an answer to the question I asked on July 13 about third party motor vehicle insurance premiums?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Maximum rates of premiums for motor vehicle third party insurance policies are determined in this State by a committee appointed under section 129 of the Motor Vehicles Act. It has been the practice of the committee to review these premium rates at intervals of two years and, in accordance with this practice, such a review would be carried out during the latter half of this year.

MURRAY RIVER.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: On August 31 I asked the Minister of Works a question, following one previously asked by the member for Chaffey, regarding the exchange of water through the Snowy Mountains scheme from the Snowy River to the Murray River, and incidental matters. Has the Premier a reply?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have received a full report from South Australia's representative on the River Murray Commission (Mr. J. R. Dridan). This report reads as follows:

The honourable member's first question referred to the transfer of Snowy water to the Murray River *via* MI powerstation. The estimated quantity to be diverted to the Murray River in this way during the year 1966-67 is 173,000 acre feet. The second question referred to the use of water from the Menindee storages. Under an agreement that came into force on January 1, 1963, New South Wales undertook, subject to certain conditions, to release water from the Menindee storages for use by the River Murray Commission in return for an annual payment by the commission of \$320,000. The agreement is for a period of seven years and New South Wales is required to release water as required by the commission until the total storage recedes to 390,000 acre feet. That State is then not required to make any further releases until the storage rises to 520,000 acre feet. Some water was obtained from this source in February and early March this year but releases ceased about the middle of March. The amount stored is now 280,000 acre feet and no more water will be available to the commission until this increases to 520,000 acre feet. The capacity of the Menindee storages is 1,470,000 acre feet. The Darling River has on many occasions discharged substantial quantities of water in years when drought or near-drought conditions existed on the alpine Murray catchment. Unfortunately, this has not been the case during the last two years, as there has been very little natural flow in the Darling since January, 1965. The honourable member also referred to diversions from the Tooma River (a Murray tributary) to Lake Eucumbene. Such diversions have been regarded as part of the New South Wales entitlement and have therefore not affected the overall situation. The estimated diversion of Snowy water to the Murray *via* MI powerstation this year (173,000 acre feet) is in

accordance with an interim clause in the Snowy Mountains Agreement, and the quantity will be substantially increased in dry years when the Snowy Mountains works come into full operation.

KAROONDA SCHOOL.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: As the Minister of Education knows, provision has not been made in this year's Loan Estimates for the erection of the Karoonda Area School. Therefore, can the Minister say when this school will be erected, as the Public Works Committee has reported favourably on it?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to obtain a report for the honourable member.

SCHOOL WINDOWS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This morning, at the suggestion of the Returned Soldiers League where he is a caretaker, Mr. D. J. Thomas of Kitchener Street, Kilburn, came to see me. Mr. Thomas is a pensioner on a 50 per cent war pension. I understand he is one of four cleaning contractors at the Nailsworth Boys Technical High School. He has the contract at that school for cleaning the woodwork shop, the sheetmetal shop, the science room and laboratory, and three classrooms. He tells me that this work takes 22 to 23 hours a week. Included in the contract up to the present has been the obligation to clean the windows of these rooms three times a year (once each term). He says this work takes him about a day and a half on each occasion—about 12 hours—so that the total time taken for window cleaning has been about 40 hours a year. He has received a letter from the department, as have all other cleaners, I assume, dated September 12 notifying him that as from October 1 he will not be required to do any further window cleaning. Incidentally, I understand that under the contract a month's notice must be given, whereas the time given was less than a month. Mr. Thomas has been paid up to the present under his contract \$1,519.85 a year, and his wage is to be reduced to \$1,250.85 a year. That is a reduction of nearly \$300 a year for not cleaning the windows, and on my rough calculation it means a real loss to him of more than 20c an hour in his cleaning rate. As this seems to be a disproportionate reduction in the contract price that is to be paid to him, and as he tells me, incidentally, that he has been depending on every penny he receives under this contract to keep himself, his wife and child, can

the Minister of Education say on what basis reductions have been made in contracts, as window cleaning is to be no longer included? In particular, will he have this contract investigated to see why there has been such a disproportionate reduction in the case of Mr. Thomas?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to investigate the case raised by the honourable member but, of course, the number of hours that the cleaner took on this work is not necessarily relevant, because the cleaning of windows is arranged by contract on the area of the windows. I might add that the job of cleaner is enthusiastically sought after by people, which indicates that these are lucrative positions relative to the work concerned. I shall be pleased to look at this matter and supply a report to the honourable member.

HOUSING.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about how many established houses will be financed by the State Bank this year?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: From memory, the State Bank expects to finance about 2,000 houses in 1966-67. If the honourable member desires further information, I shall examine the matter further.

KALANGADOO SCHOOL.

Mr. RODDA: I understand that there has been an unfortunate delay at the new school at Kalangadoo because of some trouble with water. The people at this centre have had a long wait, and it was hoped that the new school could have been occupied after the recent holidays. Can the Minister of Education say when the school will be ready for occupation?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to check on the matter and bring down a report for the honourable member.

RAILWAY HOUSES.

Mrs. BYRNE: I understand that the Premier, representing the Minister of Transport, has a reply to a question I asked on August 31 regarding three railway houses at Fords, near Freeling.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The cottages referred to were formerly occupied by the station staff at Fords. The station is now unoccupied, and one cottage has been let to an outsider who undertook, in writing, to carry out any maintenance required in connection therewith. It is not proposed to undertake

any repairs to these premises unless they are again required for the accommodation of railway staff, and at present this appears unlikely.

WEEKLY TICKETS.

Mr. HALL: I am told that before the Municipal Tramways Trust assumed control over passenger transport in the Salisbury area it was possible to obtain a weekly ticket for travel from the Parafield Gardens area to Adelaide at a cost of \$1.50. I am told that Lewis Brothers, who run the local bus line, are willing to issue weekly tickets, but that the trust has refused to grant them permission to do so, with the result that patrons of the bus service to Adelaide must now pay daily, at a total weekly cost of \$2. Will the Premier take this matter up with the Minister of Transport and have reintroduced in this area the convenience and saving of a weekly ticket?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will take the matter up with my colleague and ascertain the position for the honourable member.

HOPE VALLEY SEWERAGE SCHEME.

Mrs. BYRNE: In the absence of the Minister of Works, has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on August 23 concerning the extension of the approved main sewer in Grand Junction Road eastwards and north-eastwards to serve the Hope Valley Primary School and surrounding new subdivisions?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: In reply to the honourable member's question on August 23 my colleague, the Minister of Works, said that investigations were being carried out into extending sewerage facilities to include the Hope Valley Primary School and certain subdivisions in that area. In an interim report the Director and Engineer-in-Chief states that the investigation has not yet been completed and that surveys are still in progress. He will, however, forward his report as soon as possible.

WATERWORKS EMPLOYEES.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: At the end of each month the Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports to the Minister of Works on the number of persons employed in the Engineering and Water Supply Department on a daily-paid basis. In the absence of the Minister of Works, will the Premier ascertain for me the number of persons so employed on July 1, on August 1, and on September 1 this year, and also the number so employed as at June 30, 1965?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall inquire on behalf of my colleague if he is not back

by next Tuesday, and see whether I can get the information for the honourable member.

SCIENCE EDUCATION AID.

Mr. HALL: I believe the Minister of Education has an answer to the question I asked on August 31 regarding Commonwealth aid for the provision of science facilities at State schools.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Commonwealth aid for science facilities has been provided in the following 26 South Australian departmental schools:

High Schools: Adelaide Boys; Christies Beach; Elizabeth; Elizabeth West; Mount Barker; Mount Gambier; Renmark; Salisbury East; Strathalbyn; Underdale.

Technical High Schools: Brighton Boys; Kensington Girls, Mitcham Girls; Mitchell Park Boys; Port Pirie; Thebarton Boys; Whyalla West (Eyre).

Area Schools: Agincourt Bore; Ardrossan; Cowell; Cummins; Eudunda; Lock; Maitland; Meningie; Paruna.

It is expected that expenditure will be incurred on the Nuriootpa High School and the Port Broughton Area School in 1966-67.

Mr. HALL: Can the Minister say how the priority is decided with regard to science aid for secondary schools? As the list that the Minister has just given is not complete, can he say how the schools are selected?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: In my original reply I said:

The priorities governing the way the money is spent are determined in the usual way by appropriate officers in the department when such money is available: that is, on the most urgent needs of the schools.

I do not think I can go much further than that today, but if the Leader wants further details I shall try to obtain them. However, it is difficult to describe "urgent needs" without going into great detail.

EUDUNDA-MORGAN RAILWAY.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I believe the Premier now has a reply to a question I asked some weeks ago regarding Government policy on the future of the Eudunda-Morgan railway line.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Railways Commissioner reports that the department has no immediate plans for closing the Eudunda-Morgan railway. However, in view of the very light traffic now handled on this section, consideration might have to be given to its closure unless there is a substantial gain in the business handled.

CADELL TRAINING CENTRE.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Premier an answer to my question of August 16 about the Cadell Training Centre exhibiting at country shows?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It is intended that the Cadell Training Centre will continue to exhibit at country shows, and Eudunda, Kapunda, Saddleworth and possibly Loxton will be visited.

URANIUM.

Mr. HALL: Has the Premier an answer to my questions of August 9 about uranium?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The answers are as follows:

- (1) An Australian subsidiary of an American mining company, Newmont Mining Corporation, in association with an Australian company, the Electrolytic Zinc Co., has taken a special mining lease over the Crocker's Well area, and is searching for uranium.
- (2) Yes. The long-term prospects for the raw material uranium are considered good.
- (3) Yes. Provided of course any uranium found here can be mined and treated on a basis competitive with other sources of supply.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have been informed that a copper mining company has made overtures to the Government to secure the old uranium treatment plant at Port Pirie to treat copper ore, but that the application has been refused. Can the Premier say whether that information is correct, and whether the refusal is bound up with the suggestion that the plant may again be used for the treatment of uranium?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: As this is the first I have heard of it I shall ask the Minister of Mines for a full report and inform the honourable member when I have it.

GRAPES.

Mr. CURREN: Last week I noticed in the press a report that the Grapegrowing Industry Advisory Committee had been appointed. Has the Minister of Agriculture a statement about the operation of this committee and its terms of reference?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: True, this committee was appointed by the Director of Agriculture with my concurrence; each member of the committee has been notified, and a statement was issued to the press about the appointments. Tomorrow, the Director will consult with the Chairman of the committee, Mr. Guinand, to discuss with him the various

aspects of calling the committee together and matters relating to the first meeting. Following that meeting, I hope that all members will soon be called together to discuss future meetings and how often the committee will meet. I do not have the terms of reference here but they have been printed, and if the honourable member wants a copy I will get it for him. I trust that the appointment of this committee will do much to bring together the different interests concerned, and that some good will come from the knowledge gained by the discussions with the executive officer of my department, the extension officer, who will assist the committee considerably in advising on the future needs of the industry. From time to time I may be able to bring further reports to the House to assist honourable members.

CAVAN CROSSING.

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister of Lands obtain from the Minister of Roads the latest report concerning progress on reconstructing the Cavan crossing? Will he indicate whether there is to be an overway and, if there is, when it will be constructed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR.

The SPEAKER: I notice in the gallery a distinguished visitor in the person of the President of the Legislative Council of the Northern Territory, Mr. Harry Chan. At one time representatives of the Northern Territory sat in this very Chamber. I am sure that it is the unanimous wish of honourable members that the President be given a seat on the floor of the House, and I ask the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition to escort the honourable gentleman to a seat at the right of the Speaker.

The Hon. Mr. Chan was escorted by the Hon. Frank Walsh and Mr. Hall to a seat on the floor of the House.

BRANDING OF PIGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill to amend the Branding of Pigs Act, 1964. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time. It amends the principal Act in two substantive respects. Clause 3 amends the definition of "brand" in the principal Act by providing that a brand means a mark of a kind to be

prescribed by regulation. The Act provides that a brand must consist of a letter, numeral, sign or character, or any combination thereof. It is intended that brands for pigs should consist of three letters, but the Government has been advised that, as the Act now stands, there is no power to limit the form of brands in the desired manner. Accordingly clause 3 provides that the form of pig brands will be as is prescribed. The second amendment will enable the sale of pigs under six weeks old to be sold unbranded. It is not practicable to brand pigs of this age. Clause 5 (b) of the Bill accordingly enables the sale of unbranded suckling pigs with the sow. This is a necessary practical measure.

The amendments made by clauses 4 and 5 (a) are formal, being designed to achieve consistency through the Act where, in all but two places, the word "brand" and not "pig brand" (which is not defined) is used. Clause 6 of the Bill makes the usual amendment to convert references to money to decimal currency equivalents.

Mr. FERGUSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

THE BUDGET.

The Estimates—Grand total, \$258,018,000.

(Continued from September 14. Page 1607.)

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On this motion I desire to raise a matter of the very gravest concern to a constituent of mine, because it may mean his financial ruin. It comes about by the exercise of powers granted by this Parliament last session. I refer to the refusal of the Citrus Organization Committee—

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, this matter is *sub judice*. There is a matter before the court, and I suggest that you should rule the member out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This matter is certainly not before the court. The court proceedings have nothing whatsoever to do with the matter I intend to mention.

Mr. Ryan: A point of order!

The SPEAKER: I believe the debate can continue in so far as it does not encroach on matters that are before the court.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your help in this matter. I cannot see how the Minister could even have

believed that this was anything to do with the matter before the court.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Perhaps he didn't wish to have the debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No. This matter concerns the refusal of the Citrus Organization Committee to grant a packer's licence to Mr. Gordon Eitzen, who trades under the name of G.D. Wholesalers at Hawthorndene in my district, where he has been established in this business since about 1959. The balance-sheet he has shown me, made up to June 30, 1966, reveals that he has an investment at Hawthorndene in his packing shed of about \$44,000.

The SPEAKER: It seems to me that the powers of the committee in respect of which action has been taken, and to which an objection has been raised, are the subject of a court hearing.

Mr. Millhouse: No, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have had no knowledge that this debate was coming on, and therefore no opportunity to check. I throw the onus on the honourable member: can he assure me that the matter is not *sub judice*?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I can give you an assurance. There is no suggestion that this matter is involved in court proceedings.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: But the practice is!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I give you my unqualified assurance that this matter is not involved in court proceedings.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, in offering help and guidance to you in this matter (having been honoured to have previous experience in the Chair) I point out that, although the member for Mitcham may be correct about the situation of his constituent in saying that the matter is not before the court at present, another matter concerning the same principle before the court is *sub judice*.

The SPEAKER: I am asking the member for Mitcham to address me, and inform me (apparently he has knowledge of it) just what is before the court and whether the powers of the committee to which he is taking exception are not involved in the court action.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I can tell you plainly. What is before the court has nothing to do with this at all. A man named Kalliontzis has also been engaged in the citrus industry.

Mr. Curren: Packing!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. He has lodged an appeal pursuant to section 20 (6) of the

Citrus Industry Organization Act against the refusal of the committee to grant him a licence.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: It's the same thing.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It may be; he was refused a licence, but my constituent has nothing whatsoever to do with these proceedings. I have no idea whether the facts are similar, or not. Under section 20 (6) he has the right to do this, but my constituent has not taken any proceedings in court.

The SPEAKER: It seems to me that the committee's power to refuse the licence is at present before the court—

Mr. Millhouse: No, Sir!

The SPEAKER: —and that the matter is *sub judice*. I will have to rule in that direction.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The powers of the committee are not at issue before the court; it is the exercise of powers and right of appeal that are before the court. This has nothing to do with me; in any case, what if it were *sub judice*! The only prohibition, as members should know, when a matter is *sub judice* is whether any debate in this House could influence a case before the court. There is no possible suggestion of that in this case. If you do not let me speak, this will be a grave injustice to someone in my district.

Members interjecting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This man is being ruined, and I want to ventilate it.

The SPEAKER: I think the power of the committee to which the honourable member is taking exception and which he desires to debate is a matter before the court.

Mr. Millhouse: No, Sir. It is the exercise of the power that is before the court in another case.

The SPEAKER: Order! Until I obtain further assurance from the honourable member that this matter is not before the court, I feel that the matter is *sub judice*.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Sir, I have given you assurances three times now that this matter is not before the court. I give you the unqualified assurance again that this matter is not before the court. I cannot say it any more plainly than that, Mr. Speaker. This man is not involved in any litigation whatsoever.

Mr. Ryan: Sit down!

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Can I have a word at this stage, Sir?

The SPEAKER: I ask both members to be seated for the moment. This is a difficult situation.

Mr. Millhouse: This man's future is at stake.

The SPEAKER: I am prepared to accept the honourable member's assurance. At this stage I will hear the Minister on a point of order.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: My point of order is that I have no right of reply to the statement that the honourable member is making.

Mr. Millhouse: Why not?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Because if I do I will involve others because of the principle that is before the Court. Any statement made by the honourable member would require some reply from me, but to do this I must involve the principle that is before the court. Any statement made by the honourable member would require some reply from me, but to do this I must involve the principle that is before the court at the moment. This is my point of order; it is definitely *sub judice*.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The case before the court has nothing to do with this at all. I desire my right to ventilate a grievance before going into Committee.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will hear the honourable member, but he must not refer to the case before the court or the action of the committee, which may be challengeable before the court.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Very well, I will go on as best I can. I had no intention of referring to the proceedings before the court, because they are utterly and entirely irrelevant at this stage. What I am complaining about is that this man, who has had a business established at Hawthorndene in my district since 1959 and who has an investment of about \$44,000 in that business, has been refused a packer's licence. The way in which he has operated up to date has been that he has packed apples and oranges, the oranges being supplied to him by growers up the river, a number of them being from Mypolonga, which is in the Minister's district.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Exactly the same as the matter before the court!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am talking about Gordon Eitzen in my own district. I hope the Minister will listen and let me ventilate a grievance. The growers have been sending oranges to Mr. Eitzen for packing. He has not bought them but has packed and sold them on their behalf on the local market. His business cannot continue unless he is able to pack both oranges and apples. When the Citrus Organization Committee was set up he

was notified that he should apply for a packer's licence. He made application, and was sent a roneoed letter saying that his application was deferred because he did not have the necessary equipment for waxing the oranges. I have already quoted the roneoed letter in this House in explaining a question.

After a number of questions had been asked in this House and much talking backwards and forwards, he was told by the committee that he could carry on indefinitely as he was doing without a licence, and that was what he proceeded to do until August 26 last, when a Mr. Sanders, who I think is the executive officer of the committee, rang him and said that he was to pack no more oranges, as he had been forbidden by the committee to pack oranges. Subsequently, his supplies of fruit were stopped. Unless he is able to go on packing, his business will be ruined because he does not pack a great enough volume of apples to keep the business going. Financially, as the Minister and I know, Mr. Eitzen has been operating on a knife-edge for quite some time and, if his business is taken away from him by the refusal of the committee to grant him a licence, he will have to be sold up and will probably go bankrupt.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Is there any provision for compensation in the Act?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There is no provision for compensation, as I think members are well aware. If he has to go out of business and sell his assets, he will be very much the poorer because he cannot expect to get back for his asset, which is a packing shed in the hills, what he has put into it. He will be financially ruined and his creditors also will suffer financial loss. It now transpires that the real reason why he has been refused a licence is not that he lacks proper plant and equipment to do what the committee requires of him but simply that he is a packer in the Adelaide Hills and not up the Murray, and the committee has decided that all packing will be done up the Murray and nowhere else. Simply because he has established his business at Hawthorndene, he will be put out of business. It is entirely and utterly unjust that a man's business should be ruined for this reason. If this is how the Citrus Organization Committee proposes to go about reforming the citrus industry in this State, the sooner this Parliament makes other legislative arrangements the better.

On August 31 the Minister was kind enough to see Mr. Eitzen in company with me at

Parliament House, and subsequently the Minister convened a meeting between some members of the committee, Mr. Eitzen and himself to see whether anything could be done. The Minister now says that nothing can be done; he says that he is very sorry and has done his best to try to find him another job. This is surely an admission that nothing can be done, or that he does not think that something can be done but that something should be done. I believe the Minister should be trying to avoid the injustice of a man's business being ruined and his assets depreciated when he has no redress and no right of compensation. The Government itself really acknowledges this.

Mr. Hudson: Has he a right of appeal?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will deal with that later; I will not be sidetracked. The Premier is aware of the Minister's attitude, because Mr. Eitzen has an employee who appealed direct to the Premier, who replied on September 9 to this man (Mr. Ray Hughes):

Dear Ray—
and he ended the letter "With kindest regards, yours sincerely", and a fat lot of good that has done him—

I have endeavoured to prevail on Mr. Bywaters concerning the question of the citrus licensing in this State.

A fine admission—that the Premier has to try to prevail on his own Minister! The letter continues:

He informs me that he has tried to meet the position as far as Mr. Eitzen is concerned, but unfortunately I have not met with the desired success.

That meant, I suppose, that he had not been able to prevail on his own Minister. The letter continues:

Whilst Mr. Bywaters is most sympathetic in the matter (which I have no reason to doubt)—something that I thought would have gone without saying—

it seems to be one of those cases in which the hardship is going to react against Mr. Eitzen. I have been informed that the Minister is endeavouring to find him some other type of work which will assist him through the very bad period to which he is subjected.

In other words, the Premier knows all about this; he says, "This is too bad; I know that an injustice is being done, but I am not going to do anything about it and I cannot persuade my own Minister of Agriculture to do anything". This is a scandalous and disgraceful situation. The Government acknowledges that harm is being done and that it is unjust, yet the Government is not prepared to do anything about it. The member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) asked me about an appeal and what

redress this man has. Certainly in section 20 (6) of the Act there is a right of appeal within one month of the notification of refusal, but I could point to the remarks of Justice Travers concerning this which were published in the *Advertiser* on September 9. That right of appeal is illusory; I do not propose to go on with it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sure the House will appreciate the position the Speaker is in. I cannot be expected to have a knowledge of all matters before the court.

Mr. Millhouse: There is no matter before the court here.

The SPEAKER: I have asked for an assurance from the honourable member that this matter is not *sub judice*.

Mr. Millhouse: It is not.

The SPEAKER: Order! It seems to me from the honourable member's own statements that there is an appeal before the court against the powers of the committee to do the very things that he is objecting to.

Mr. Millhouse: No!

The SPEAKER: If that matter is properly before the court and this debate could influence or be held to influence a decision on that matter, it would be *sub judice*. That matter is worrying me considerably, as members will have observed. I do not want to have to rule the debate out of order, so I will give the honourable member a further opportunity of addressing me on the question of whether this matter is *sub judice*. He obviously has some knowledge of the court proceedings, and I think there is some onus on him to assure the House that this is not a matter before the court.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have already told you it is not.

The SPEAKER: I do not know about the particular case. The honourable member says that the case with which he is concerned is not before the court, but I am told that the other matter before the court is of similar circumstances.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have no idea of the circumstances in the other case.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will see the Minister on his point of order, but I have already given the member for Mitcham an opportunity to clarify the position for me as to just what is the matter before the court.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: So far as I am aware the matter before the court concerns a man called Kalliontzis, and there is a specific

appeal in his case. What the facts are in his case I do not know and I do not care: I am talking about the facts concerning a man in my district who is not involved in the litigation before the court or in any other litigation but is a man suffering a grave injustice. I believe this is the place where this matter should be ventilated and I do not know why the Minister is trying to stop me from doing this.

The SPEAKER: I will see the point of order of the Minister.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: My earlier comment that this matter was *sub judice* was borne out by the honourable member himself when he quoted a case being heard by Justice Travers.

Mr. Millhouse: I didn't.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The honourable member started to quote a case being heard by Justice Travers and, therefore, what he says must be involved with an action before the court. Already this is borne out by the fact that the honourable member has referred to the court statement made by Justice Travers. I believe it is entirely wrong that this matter should be drawn into the debate if the honourable member desires to continue with the case to which he referred.

The SPEAKER: Having heard both sides of the matter, I believe that, on balance, the House should do nothing that would prejudice a hearing before the court.

Mr. Millhouse: And let a man go without any redress or an opportunity to have his case heard.

The SPEAKER: After considering the facts, I rule that the matter is *sub judice*.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am not involved in any way in this matter and I know nothing at all of the facts involved. However, because one matter is before the court, is it, from your ruling, Sir, to be understood that justice will not be done if the case of some other person not before the court is dealt with? I do not know whether justice is being done to the person referred to by the honourable member for Mitcham; it may or may not be—I do not know the facts. However, if a man were before the court charged with stealing, could we not discuss the general matter of stealing in this place? I point out that the member for Mitcham is not raising any of the questions or matters being dealt with in the court. Therefore, I believe it is perfectly proper for this House to consider his complaint. I am not speaking about the merits

of his complaint because I do not know the facts, but this House has always heard complaints of injustice. The person referred to by the honourable member is not before the court. Therefore, why should his case not be ventilated so that the House might know the facts?

The SPEAKER: As I understand the position, the matter before the court has general application. Matters before a court have relation to the powers of the committee to do the very things to which the honourable member is objecting. I believe it would be unwise and against the Standing Orders to allow the debate to continue on a subject that might influence the decision of the court. On that ground, I rule that the matter is *sub judice*. I believe the member for Mitcham will agree that I have not reached this decision lightly but only after full consideration of the facts he wanted to put before the House. I have tried to preserve to him the rights I want to preserve to all members of free speech in this place but, on balance, I believe I must rule that the matter is *sub judice*.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: All I can say to that is that this means that until a proceeding in which this man is not involved and in which he has no interest at all is completed (and this may take many months) my constituent, who is suffering a grave injustice, has no remedy at all open to him because this matter cannot be ventilated in the House. I cannot believe for a moment that this is a just ruling because, if that is your ruling, Sir, I cannot raise the matter on his behalf.

The SPEAKER: That is my ruling. I am afraid that is the effect of the Standing Orders that I have to administer. If this matter is really a matter before the court, there cannot be any further debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, Sir, I must regretfully move:

That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to.

The SPEAKER: I have ruled that reference by the honourable member for Mitcham to a case which I consider is before the court is out of order because the matter is *sub judice*. The honourable member has moved that my ruling be disagreed to, and has stated his reasons as follows:

The case which I desire to ventilate is not before the court and therefore not *sub judice*. No court proceedings are involved in the matter which I desire to bring before the House.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (14).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall,

Heaslip, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Coreoran, Curren, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, Stott, and Walsh (teller).

Pairs.—Ayes—Mr. McAnaney, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner. Noes—Messrs. Dunstan, Hutchens, and Jennings.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

In Committee of Supply.

THE LEGISLATURE.

Legislative Council, \$37,030.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I think that when my colleague, the member for Stirling, was speaking in this debate last evening he said that when one was satisfied it was a sign of old age. I suppose, in view of that, there must be many people in this State who are feeling as fit as two-year-olds. Much has been said in this debate about the appropriations of moneys to various departments, and with charity not flowing from the breast but starting at home I think perhaps I had better say something about the consequences of the reduced grants to local government bodies, which we know do so much for people in this State. The member for Rocky River ventilated fully the consequences of these reduced grants, and he was supported by other members on this side.

Concern exists amongst local councils not only in the South-East but throughout the whole State regarding the retrenchments of the labour force that works for local government in the interests of the people. Many truck drivers and truck owner-drivers (the latter are a feature of local government work) have been stood down or are on half-time. It is interesting to look at the allocation this year to the Naracoorte District Council. Last year this council received \$6,800 from the main roads grant but this year it has been reduced to \$6,400. The debit side of the appropriation was \$116,000 last year, but this year it has been reduced to \$58,000. The Commonwealth Rural Aid grant has been reduced to \$20,000.

Mr. Nankivell: Where has the money gone?

Mr. RODDA: After viewing television last night we know where some will go. Councils have been asked to increase their contributions. At Naracoorte eight tip trucks are being purchased by their owners on hire-purchase, but the men have been placed on

half-time, and may possibly be put off. Perhaps they could go over the border and get similar work. The Naracoorte council has built up a large fleet of machinery to meet its obligations and it is disheartening for it to see the grant reduced, particularly as the debit order of \$58,000 can be recalled. This council, of which I was a member for several years, offered service payment to members of its staff with more than five years' service and it has to pay this out of the district fund. When the Treasurer introduced this Budget he said that the Government would take \$1,000,000 out of the Highways Fund, and subsequent legislation would be introduced to enable the Government's share of the cost of Morphett Street bridge to come from the same fund. Apparently, money that should be available to councils is being transferred for other purposes.

A great need exists for additional housing in the Naracoorte area. The S.A. Tractor Company set up in Naracoorte in 1956 with a staff of one, but now employs 19 people from the district. The workshop overhauls earth-moving machinery weighing up to 32 tons with diesel engines of 235 h.p. Similar machines, fully equipped for earth-moving, may cost up to \$60,000 and require special facilities and skilled men to maintain in repair. This company is required to have spare parts and service facilities for over 300 machines operating in the South-East, and these machines and facilities are playing a large part in the development of this and surrounding districts. This firm has been trying to obtain suitable rental housing for its skilled employees. At present, one man lives at Mount Gambier and travels to Naracoorte and another, about to be married, cannot obtain a house. A need exists for additional housing in these areas, and no doubt in many other areas. Some effort should be made by the Housing Trust to vary its programme in order to meet these needs. The trust's policy is to supply a uniform house from \$6,000 to \$7,000 and to build in specified block areas.

I do not disagree with that policy, but it tends to supply the needs of the long-term family house and supply it as a completed job. To a young couple, however, more space is provided than is needed; consequently money is being spent for one house that could be diverted towards the cost of another; small families, transients, or young couples are paying more a week than they need to; and the policy of using one-block areas has the effect in a country town of leaving many allotments

vacant and unsaleable although they are nearer to facilities and amenities than is the trust block area. If the trust were allowed to erect small ready-built houses on scattered allotments they would readily be availed of whether on a rental or a purchase basis. Most young couples starting off would be happy to have a large lounge-diningroom, a passage containing a refrigerator, gas stove and sink, leading to a corner bedroom with an offside utility room (toilet, hot and cold shower, laundry and ironing room combined), extending off that a portico type verandah serving as a car park.

These houses could be designed so that the occupants could use their initiative later and, more important from the financial outlook of the trust, their own money to add rooms as required. However, if the trust built them in blocks of 30 or 40 in specified areas they may not be acceptable to councils, which would regard them as a block of cheap houses, but if scattered through the town on various allotments they would be acceptable, particularly as they would use allotments that are at present a municipal headache because of the fire hazard. At least 20 of these could be used within the next three months at Naracoorte. They could be built of weatherboard or other material that could be supplied by a ready-built housing business at a reasonable price. Land in the area would provide sufficient allotments costing about \$400, or perhaps slightly higher in better areas of the town that are sewerred, are high and dry, and served by all the municipal amenities.

Mr. Casey: What do the houses cost?

Mr. RODDA: I am saying they are too dear. These houses to which I have referred, however, would provide the immediate requirements of a young couple. The others would cost about \$6,000, whereas these would cost \$3,000, and would fill an immediate requirement. This land is situated throughout the town but, of course, the trust's policy is to build *en bloc*. The municipal authorities would not accept this type of house on a mass of blocks.

Being keenly interested in agricultural production and development in this State, I note that \$4,707,000 is allocated to the Minister of Agriculture and Forests this year, which is an increase on last year's figure of about \$196,000. Although the increase is only small, it is heartening to see any increase at all at this stage, and illustrates that somebody is recognizing the importance of agriculture. However, I do not under-estimate the impor-

tance of secondary industry, which creates markets and provides employment for a great mass of our population. Secondary industry is indeed needed in this country. I believe that the Agriculture Department requires more skilled extension officers who can inform the man on the land of new developments. It is interesting to note that, compared with the existing requirements, not sufficient people are undergoing training at the agricultural colleges, or the agricultural science faculties at the universities, to fill our requirements for the next 10 years. At the end of the year, when banks, Army officers and others visit the schools for recruiting purposes, pointing out the virtues of their particular occupations, we do not see many people representing the agricultural industry. I think that is contributing to the present shortage in this field. Last year I said something about farmers' clubs and about what they were doing to promote agriculture in this State. I wish to quote now from a report of the Mount Gambier Advisory Service, written by its adviser, Mr. Murray Keene, who is a New Zealander, holding the Diploma of Agriculture and a degree in Agricultural Science. This man, who has worked wonders, states in the second report of the organization:

I have tried to analyse results and the picture obtained is very interesting overall. He is commenting there on the second year of the club's activities. The organization having obtained Mr. Keene's services, he has been its adviser since its inception. Mr. Keene continues:

Overall progress has been outstanding and I feel that individually, only about four of our members have not gained substantially from their membership, and this has been because of their lack of interest, or failure to adopt new techniques. But the majority of our members, who have accepted advice in varying degrees, seem to have progressed accordingly. I have managed to obtain complete financial figures from a representative sample of 23 members. These members, with properties varying from 90 acres to 3,300 acres in size, and whose average holding is 1,190 acres, have recorded between them a gross income increase in 12 months of \$288,360. There has been an increase in expenditure also, but most of that has been due to stock purchases, and pasture establishment and improvement. Despite these costs, we can still quote the most important figure of all—increase in net income—as being 40 per cent above the previous year's net figure. If we treated the extra stock and improvement costs as asset income, the net figure would approximate 50 per cent.

These average increases are excellent, but some of the individual progress could be

described as almost unbelievable. One member with not much more than 2,000 acres of land, has had a gross income increase of \$25,071 in 12 months, while his annual expenses only increased by \$174 in that period. If we add this net increase of \$24,897 to the extra \$10,800 worth of stock he has on hand, we can say that he is getting somewhere fairly fast. But although we obtained large increases on the larger properties, the greatest percentage increases were on the smaller properties where owner-operators had full control of their own destiny. It is very pleasing to see that some of our members who have small farms—and this applies particularly to the dairy farmers—have increased their total production by up to 150 per cent in two years. Over the last two years, for our members as a whole, I would estimate an average increase in net incomes of 50 per cent. This is good, but I would suggest that we are only just starting, because only about five of our members have as yet realized even 50 per cent of the potential for increased production which they possessed two years ago, and the average for the group would be a realization so far of about 25 per cent of that potential.

This apparent slowness in realization of the actual production potential is of course partly due to the fact that farming is such a long term project, and the returns for much of today's expenditure and planning may be five or more years away. Because of this, we can safely say that if 25 per cent of the potential production has been obtained in the first two years, then probably only 15 per cent of the possible increase in net economic return has been gained. So we have much to look forward to in the future. Another feature of the last year has been the progress made on many properties in "estate planning"—in straightening up family partnerships, wills, land tenure problems, etc. Because of its essentially private nature, this is not a very widely publicized part of farm management, but it is certainly a most important part, and I have gained much personal satisfaction in knowing that the business affairs of many of our members and their families are on a much sounder footing now than they were 12 months ago.

In my annual report in 1965, I stated that poor pastures, and understocking, were the main problem on most properties.

Mr. Keene stated that improvement in these two aspects, plus an increase in fodder, had given increases of up to 14 dry sheep an acre. He then continued:

Results in the past year have certainly borne out my contention that grazing management will make the difference between over and understocking, and that a good manager will run five sheep to the acre where a poor manager could only run three. Indeed, our heaviest stocked members, in terms of dry sheep equivalents, were the ones with the most feed in June and July this year, with many of them actually buying more stock in these months, and this is because the most intelligent and forward thinking farmers have

been capable of not only accepting modern ideas on stocking rates but have accepted also the grazing methods and other management techniques which must be so closely allied with these increased rates. I would emphasize again that your farming, to be completely successful, must have a "farm management" approach—a whole of farm plan must be adopted which will give the best overall results, because the "chain reaction" effect of your management practices must be made to work for you, rather than against you.

In particular, it has pleased me to find that some of our older members, who were doubtful about the consequences when they increased their stock numbers, are now able to say that they have the best young stock that they have ever had. However, this can only be said by those who altered their grazing and other management to suit. Actually, very few of our members struck any serious stock problems during the year, but when they did it appeared in all cases to be due to a combination of bad grazing management with either poor stock management, or poor types of stock. This of course brings up two questions to which the majority of you must give closer attention. Firstly, an appreciation of stock health must be cultivated further. At present it varies from the sublime to the ridiculous—from those who are busy enjoying ulcers by imagining all kinds of troubles, to those who do not spot trouble until deaths are occurring. Obviously, those of you who are in the first category must revise your standards, and realize that fatness is not the sole criterion of stock health, and is not even a sure criterion at times. And those of you in the second category must learn to pay closer attention to your stock—to recognize the first signs of health problems—to pick poor animals out for special treatment, and to make more use of specialists in this field.

The other question which has disturbed me considerably is that of how I can help our members to purchase the right type of stock when they are buying. There have been a number of instances when very poor stock have been bought—stock not suited to the area, or just generally of a poor type. This has proved very expensive to the farmers concerned, and has occurred with both sheep, beef and dairy cattle. Many farmers have neither the time to "shop around", nor the knowledge to be able to buy wisely. I do not know the answer to this problem—perhaps an association with a part-time purchasing officer is one solution—but there is certainly a need for further consideration of this question.

I have stated that overall progress has been outstanding. However, although the average improvement in terms of both financial progress and personal satisfaction is great, there is still a wide variation in the individual benefits gained by our members. Last year I suggested that there was much which could be gained by members who attended our field days and evening meetings, but that in many cases those who failed to attend were those who stood to gain the most. Well certainly this suggestion has been borne out since then.

At that time I tried to emphasize that the benefits gained from membership would depend on the individual interest taken, and this has eventuated since then. The keen interest of many members has resulted in increased demands for special visits and hence there has been a slight lengthening of the time between my main farm visits. I think that this is a good development. More frequent contact with most properties, even if only for a short time, is desirable, and these short visits are of course available to all members. I believe Mr. Keene's report bears out the value of farm management clubs and highlights the production that can come from farming generally with the right kind of advice and management. The farmer of South Australia is an enterprising individual and, when we see the progress that has been made in the farmlands of this State, we see that the efforts of the clubs are extremely worthwhile.

The report of the adviser of the Mount Gambier farm club highlights a need for increased production. If the Government of the day encourages efforts in this field the result can be real production and consequent benefits to the State. There are many other matters on which one could talk in this debate but a further opportunity will present itself in the debate on the lines. Without further delay, I support the first line.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): I support the first line and I wish to comment on various matters closely related to the Budget. I join with other Opposition members in expressing my regret that the Treasurer has found it necessary to bring down a document containing so much rather depressing information. Of course, for many years this State has enjoyed a buoyant economy. It has had its ups and downs, and I wish to refer to some of the downs a little later. The buoyant economy enjoyed by the State was brought about by several factors. First, throughout the whole State generally there has been a run of particularly good seasons climatically. Coupled with this have been improved rural, agricultural and animal husbandry practices that have lifted tremendously the returns from primary production and animal husbandry. Also, we have enjoyed, in the main, good prices for our main rural products. In addition, the State has had a buoyant and rapidly developing secondary industrial complex that has balanced out in the most satisfactory way the total production and economy of the State. Therefore, I suppose that we have been able to bring forward Budgets from year to year that have reflected, to a large

extent, the buoyant conditions the State has enjoyed. Obviously, if the people of the State are doing well, and if industries are prospering, it is comparatively easy to frame a Budget that does not make unduly heavy demands on taxpayers.

Of course, this general picture has another important side. Although we have enjoyed a series of prosperous years agriculturally as well as a buoyant secondary industrial economy, we have had some periods in the last 10 or 12 years when things have not been so rosy. We have had droughts, recessions in secondary industry, and depressed prices for wool, one of our main products. The prices of some of our coarse grains have decreased, and the price of barley today is very much lower than in 1952. The price of wheat, because of the legislation that covers it, has remained very steady and risen slightly. Dr. A. R. Callaghan, in a recent lecture in Bonython Hall, produced figures and graphs suggesting that the level of consumption of wheat throughout the world was likely to remain high. From the point of view of a State which is growing more and more wheat, and, if I may say so with modest pride, from the point of view of Eyre Peninsula (in which my district lies) which is producing one-third of the State's total wheat production, Dr. Callaghan's assurances are encouraging to those people pioneering the development of new land.

Recently, by way of a question to the Minister of Works, I asked what was being done to explore the limits of the capacity of the Poldia Basin. I am sure that it will be a headache for any Minister of Works and any Treasurer to finance the extension of water supplies for the vast areas which are being developed on Eyre Peninsula in a way that will provide them with what is necessary to carry the stock they will undoubtedly be able to carry, without unduly charging them for the cost of such services to a point where their use is uneconomic without placing undue burdens on the State. Consequently, I regret that on this occasion the Treasurer has brought in a Budget with such sobering overtones. I wonder whether the present Government has not looked at the picture of State figures upside down. I know that the Government is attempting to budget to develop the State and to satisfy the needs of its citizens, but (in the words of the Irishman) I am afraid that there is more than one way of killing a pig: you do not necessarily have to choke it with butter. That is not a very apt analogy but it illustrates what I have in mind. That is the

essential difference between the two political Parties in this State: we are both trying to do what we can for our citizens; we are approaching a similar object in different ways. More particularly, the Treasurer has said that if the Government needs money it must increase its taxes, but I do not think the problem is as simple as that. No private individual can finance his ordinary day-to-day undertakings on this basis. If he wants to spend more he has to earn more, but if he spends before he earns then he is in great danger of being in real trouble. This is the whole problem that confronts us in the vast and rather congested field of hire-purchase where people, finding it easy to involve themselves in obligations, do so without always being careful to ascertain the full cost of their commitments to see how those commitments compare with their earnings.

It is not proper for the Government to assume that it can spend as much money as it desires and recoup itself by way of increased taxation without regard to the effect of it. The Treasurer may be learning a little about Treasury finances as the years pass. Earlier in the life of this Parliament I heard him say at least twice that the taxpayer must provide the money the Government needs.

One can, of course, expand one's needs in the private as well as in the public sense very easily and, when one is seeking favours from people and the provision of some financial benefit to them is used to encourage a favour, the temptation to adopt this method becomes stronger, and I am afraid in some cases to some political Parties it is irresistible. It may be one of the weaknesses of our democratic system that every three years the Government of the day must face the electorate and receive from it a vote of confidence or censure as a result of which it will or will not continue in office. Human nature being what it is, there is always the tendency to offer to the electorate some pecuniary or social benefit. All Parties are probably equally guilty in this matter, but particularly vulnerable to this temptation are Parties that have been a long time out of office and seek more urgently on each occasion to attain office. I believe that on this occasion such was the case. I do not think Governments and politicians are entirely to blame for this: I believe the electorate has something to account for as well, because the continuation of democratic government successfully will depend on the good sense and good judgment of the electors as to whom they instruct to do the work of

government for them. Therefore, so long as the electors are prepared to lend, without deep thought, their support to the people who offer them the highest inducements financially, or social or other hand-outs, then Governments and political people are encouraged to proceed along these lines.

I sometimes wonder whether or not we are going too far in seeking political favours or electoral favours from the electors and whether we are not encouraging them to demand these things by continually offering them more on each successive occasion. I believe that this Government was elected on a platform of promises, and that either it had not taken the trouble to study and to determine the consequences of the fulfilment of these promises financially or it had gone into this electoral programme willy-nilly, possibly knowing that it could not financially fulfil its obligations but disregarding the consequences of that failure. The facts are that the electoral undertakings of the Government are largely responsible for the Budget that we have before us today. The Treasurer admitted this in so many words in his speech, for he said:

The Government, in seeking office, told the electors of South Australia what it proposed to do if it were elected.

That, I think, proves that the point I have been trying to make is very much in the Treasurer's mind. He went on to say:

Programmes were put before Parliament for 1965-66 and have now been submitted for 1966-67 to carry on the traditional services that must be given by all State Governments, and to bring into effect the specific undertakings that were made early in 1965.

Of course, that was the date of the last election. The Treasurer sought to minimize the consequences of this in the earlier statements by pointing out the difficulties under which he was placed in providing the finances for the State. He referred, for example, to such things as the effect of droughts. I agree that droughts affect the Treasurer's returns. He pointed out that the yield of all grains was only 64,500,000 bushels, compared with 87,500,000 bushels and 88,700,000 bushels in the previous two preceding seasons. Then he said:

This materially reduced rail and harbours revenues directly, and at the same time contributed to reduced economic activity in the State through the reduced buying power of the rural community.

No-one can deny that there is much truth in that remark. However, I point out that the yield in one cereal year does not necessarily

reflect itself in reduced earnings of railways and harbours in that year. It is a well-known fact that the quantity of grain moving over railways and through harbours depends on the amount of grain sold, not on the amount produced in a given period of time. There have been years when, because of the extremely buoyant marketing conditions in oversea countries during the second half of the financial year (the first half of the calendar year) a considerable part of two crops has been moved by railways and over harbours in the one financial year. If, for example, the marketing conditions and the shipping conditions to oversea destinations are not good following one harvest, and as a result of that there is a carry-over of grain into the next financial year at which time oversea markets materially improve; and during the first half of the financial year (just before the new crop is harvested) there is a rapid movement of grain to outports over railways and through shipping galleries into ships, and the market continues buoyant during the next six months, we do in effect get a large proportion of two crops moved in one financial year, and the railway and harbour authorities both benefit materially to this extent. However, of course, they must suffer a reduction correspondingly in the two financial years, both the one preceding and the one succeeding the financial year under consideration.

I therefore find it difficult to segregate figures in a way that would throw some really true light on this statement by the Treasurer that because the yield of grains was down his railway revenue necessarily was down by that precise amount. I do not think for one moment that it would be. We have had droughts before. I think 1959 was the lowest cereal year that we had experienced in South Australia for many a long day. I am not certain offhand what the yield was in that year.

Mr. Ferguson: It was 11,000,000 bushels of wheat.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I thank the honourable member for that information. The total production of cereals in that year could not have been more than 18,000,000 or 20,000,000 bushels for the whole of the State. Therefore, members will see that the alleged drought we experienced last year with cereal production was a very mild affair compared with what previous Treasurers have had to contend with in compiling their Budgets. The Treasurer also said that because it was a dry year it had been necessary to pump much water.

According to the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended June 30, 1960 (the year that included the 1959 drought), pumping costs for the Mannum-Adelaide main, excluding interest, amounted to \$1,268,000. We find from the most recent report that the cost of pumping water in the Mannum-Adelaide main for 1965-66 was \$2,186,000. It can be seen that the cost of pumping water, although high, is not necessarily a crippling factor with respect to the Budget. The previous Treasurer had to contend with a high cost in 1959-60, and in 1960-61 it cost \$2,094,000 to pump water. Last year the Treasurer spent \$1,413,000 to pump water, but the impact was more serious in 1959-60 and again in 1960-61. Obviously, there are other reasons why the Treasurer finds himself in difficulties, and these have been thoroughly discussed. The Treasurer said:

A calculation of prospective revenues for the current year, without alteration, of taxes, rates, and charges from those in force at the commencement of the year, has indicated a total revenue of about \$249,677,000, or \$8,341,000 short of the minimum expenditures deemed necessary.

The Treasurer intends to raise \$2,100,000 from land tax, a tax that is spread over the metropolitan area and country districts, but the big weight of it falls on the highly assessed properties in the expensive parts of the metropolitan area. Premises in the city of Adelaide contribute a substantial amount to this tax, as do industrial concerns occupying large areas and large blocks of shops. In most cases they are able to pass on their charges to other sections of the community and, for that reason, we do not hear much from owners of that land. The land is usually not individually owned and, as I said, the tax can be passed on to other people. This increased tax will hit hardest the people who own property and make a living from it. The Land Tax Act provides that an assessment of unimproved value shall be based on the present market value of the land with a deduction from the total value in respect of the value of improvements.

The determination of the sale value is simple: sales of land in the area are studied and a reasonable valuation of the property can be arrived at. In South Australia, there is a cost of developing land that does not occur to the same extent in many other States, and when the Treasurer compares the incidence of per capita tax in this State with other States, this should be borne in mind. I do not know the present

Land Tax Commissioner's views, but I discussed with his predecessor the determination of the unimproved value of land, which is now producing cereal crops and which was previously mallee scrub. Once, most South Australian cereal-producing land carried fairly heavy timber. If the Commissioner uses the present sale value (as he must do) and deducts the cost of clearing that land at today's costs, it will be difficult for him to arrive at an unimproved value as high as the one he uses now.

It has been argued that it does not cost as much to improve land and convert it from scrub to cereal-growing land by the old methods and at the old costs, but it is not proper for the Commissioner to take today's sales values and deduct the clearing costs of 35 or 40 years ago. It would be fair for the Commissioner to take today's clearing costs, sale price, and cost of establishing improvements, and use these figures to arrive at an unimproved value. Much of our rural-producing land today carried heavy timber compared with land in other States that was ready for the plough when it was taken up for agriculture and did not incur the heavy costs to bring it into production as did land in this State. It is unfortunate that, when values for many products are remaining stationary or falling, the Treasurer has instructed the Railways Commissioner to increase rail freights and fares. The Treasurer has spoken about increased costs, the impact of the new basic wage determination, and increased prices, but, although these things are real and relevant to the State's secondary industries, they do not apply to the returns received by our primary industries. As I said earlier, the price of most rural produce has either remained static or tended to fall. Therefore, the producer has been able to meet these costs, as well as his living costs, by increasing efficiency, mechanization, acreage production (including sheep), and by adopting the modern farming practices available to him. As a primary producer, I am pleased and proud to be able to say that we have been able to meet these costs by virtue of modern methods and techniques. That satisfactory position reflects much credit not only on the farmer but on those people who have been the advisers in this matter. Here, I unreservedly include our own Agriculture Department which has rendered the producers in this State a unique service (unique in Australia, at any rate) in the way that it has assisted people to overcome their problems.

The impact of additional taxation, therefore, on the primary industries of the State causes much concern because, obviously, the techniques for improved production and increased returns will not be available in the next few years as they have been in the past. The increased charges on these industries cannot be passed on or recouped by the industries concerned. I view with much concern the steep increases in the railway freight rates (particularly in regard to the freights on the cartage of grain), which will penalize (perhaps to an extent not yet appreciated by the community or the Government) those people who are more remote from the export outlets. It has always been the Governments' policies in this State to assist the people living some distance away from outports, by providing a low schedule of freight rates for grain cartage. However, the Government in its recent determination has departed from that principle to the extent that the increase on long hauls is 33 per cent, as against an increase of only 6 per cent on short hauls. That is not a wise provision; it is a sudden departure from previous practice which, I believe, will have repercussions on the development of land more remote from outports (as is the case in most of the new land now available for development).

The Treasurer also said that he intended to increase tram and bus fares, although he kindly said that these would be restricted to section fares and other charges that were not increased in the adjustment in August, 1965. The significant and rather serious part of his statement, as I see it, is as follows:

It is anticipated that these increases will involve nearly \$275,000 this year and about \$375,000 in a full year.

Those increases are unjustified, from the point of view of the people using those services who mostly, indeed, have little alternative but to use them. Often, they are not those members of the alleged affluent society who can afford to drive motor cars to work; they depend on public transport in pursuing their daily activities. This impost will seriously affect those people who need to economize in every possible way, including those who attend educational institutions. These are the people who, with lesser-paid jobs, travel throughout the city and suburbs to reach their places of employment. I believe that I am correct in saying that the return fare, for example, from Elizabeth to Adelaide will be about 60c.

Mr. Quirke: That applies, too, to people who have to change from one bus to another.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. In terms of the basic wage earner's pay packet, this is a serious problem. I believe that the impost is also unjustified from the point of view of financing the Municipal Tramways Trust. I telephoned the trust's Assistant Manager a few minutes ago for the trust's figures for the past two years. Mr. Wilson informed me that the trust's deficit in 1964-65 was \$106,696, from which a grant by the Government of \$20,000 had to be subtracted, leaving a net deficit in operations for that year of \$86,696. This year, as we all know, the trust's operating deficit increased. It is the first year, I think, for a number of years that the trust has had to report an increase in its deficit. For most years that I can recall, its deficit has been declining, and it is gratifying to be able to recall that, when the trust was reconstituted, it had an operating deficit of about \$1,200,000 a year. Its then Chairman (Mr. Barker) who was one of the most able businessmen of our city and who accepted the chairmanship of the trust on condition that he received no salary for his services, was able to reorganize the trust's operations to a point where its deficits were reduced. Its whole running fleet of vehicles was reorganized, the whole system was rebuilt, and the completely new set-up was running very satisfactorily.

Last year, however, the deficit rose to \$261,418 which, when the Government grant of \$20,000 was subtracted, left the trust with a net deficit of \$241,418. By increasing bus fares, the Treasurer hopes to recoup \$375,000 to the trust in a full year, and yet the trust deficit this year, even taking into account the wage increases that employees are enjoying, is only \$261,000. The Treasurer intends to increase fares to an extent that will not only overtake that deficit but provide the trust with a credit of about \$110,000.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Don't forget the marginal increase to be determined!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I was coming to that. I do not think it is proper for the Treasurer to race ahead on these matters. He has not provided for the marginal increase in any other item in the Budget, so why should he do so here? He can examine this matter when it arises, and I say to the Minister that, although this may be prudent and financially possible, I think it is loading many people with a charge that (at the moment, at any rate) is unjustified. I know (and I thought this was the point the Minister was going to

make in his interjection) that as soon as fares are raised patronage is lost. That is obvious. I know from my own experience in administering this section of activity that the trust expects its patronage to drop by about 20 per cent after an increase in fares. That applies to general increases over all sections; it should not occur in this case where increases do not affect all sections. Nevertheless, there will be some drop in patronage, and to work out what the expected extra revenue will be on a strictly mathematical basis is not satisfactory. Of the 20 per cent patronage usually lost in the first week or two at least 10 per cent eventually comes back again, and I believe in this case possibly that pattern will apply. I make the point strongly that the proposed increases in charges for bus fares to an extent that will return the trust \$375,000 in a full year is unjustified, at least at this time. It should not have been considered with the degree of severity that the Treasurer proposes, because it is not required in order to finance the operations of the trust on a purely satisfactory basis.

The Treasurer made the point that the revenue derived by the trust will not directly augment his Budget but that, for the time being, it will avoid the necessity for an increased subsidy from the Budget towards the trust's losses. The subsidy he has been paying in the last two years has been only \$20,000 but, even taking all these things into account, the people who are obliged because of their location or the size of their pay packet to use public transport are being slugged in this matter to an extent not justified by the trust's financial affairs. The Treasurer intends to increase a number of other charges. He has referred to stamp duties on conveyances and on hire-purchase and money-lenders' contracts. He says that in other States the rates are significantly higher, and that it is proposed to bring these duties into line with those in other States by appropriate increases, which it is expected will bring about \$900,000 extra revenue this year and \$1,350,000 in a full year.

I looked up the figures on this matter to see what the proposed increases mean in terms of percentages. I find that the sums received last year from stamp duties on conveyances and hire-purchase and money-lenders' contracts, according to the Auditor-General's Report at page 197, were \$4,242,537 on one line and \$463,025 on another, making a total receipt last year from these items of \$4,705,562. The Treasurer intends to increase

that by \$1,350,000 in a full year and that is slightly more than an increase of one-third. Without going into details, that is an increase of about 35 per cent in these charges. Here again, I believe the Treasurer has forgotten that not only the well-to-do members of society incur these charges on documents. In fact, with regard to hire-purchase contracts, I point out that those with plenty of money do not have recourse to hire-purchase in order to provide themselves with the things they need: the people in the middle and lower income brackets will be hit by this charge. I would not object if, in order to gather some revenue from here and there for legitimate increased costs of government, the Treasurer had increased these charges a little, but he is increasing them by 35 per cent, and this again is unnecessary and unjust.

I had intended to refer to one or two other matters, but I believe they have been covered well by other Opposition members and I do not think there is any necessity for me to restate them. I believe that the principle of recouping to the Budget moneys loaned or granted to the Highways Fund in previous years is not a principle to which we could subscribe in any case other than one of extreme emergency. I know that this is not a new practice as it has been done in the past, but I have yet to be satisfied that we have any money in the Highways Fund that cannot and should not be used for the purposes of the fund. Indeed, there are always complaints about the condition of the State's secondary roads, even though perhaps there is not much to complain about in regard to the main arterial roads. Nevertheless, tremendous work still needs to be done in order to provide, for people generally in the State, a decent standard of roads on which to travel. It is rather interesting that all the money that comes into the Highways Fund is provided by the people who use the roads. It is all very well for the Railways Commissioner to get up, as he frequently does, and say that he should be protected as he has to build his own tracks and so on. I point out that the people who drive on the roads today pay for the roads—nobody else pays. The Railways Commissioner cannot logically and legitimately make a comparison between his basic stock costs and costs of road users, and say that he is in a disadvantageous position thereby, because he is not.

Mr. Casey: Do you think the Highways Department should construct bridges, as it is doing on the South Road now, or that they should be built by contract?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That depends a good deal on the circumstances. I administered a department and, in many cases, work was done by contract and in other cases departmentally. I do not think much can be said for or against either proposal because it depends on the circumstances of the case. If a job is involved and is likely to incur many side issues involving other services and involving interruptions, and if the position is not reasonably clear-cut, then I believe it is better for the job to be done departmentally and for each particular difficulty to be accommodated as it arises. However, I say unhesitatingly that, wherever a specification can be prepared and a proper bill of quantities and costing can be produced, I am completely in favour of doing the job by contract, for I believe this method saves money because a clear-cut, straightforward job can be done by contract. That is the policy I tried to adopt in my days of administration and to which I now adhere. I believe that is the proper policy.

As I was saying before the honourable member interjected, frequently misstatements are made and the impression is given that somebody is riding on the roads for nothing. Nothing could be further from the truth. We do not ride on the roads for nothing: petrol tax, tax on diesel fuel, and the equivalent of a duty on tyres is paid. In the tyre industry there are duties on modern tyres that benefit the industry in Australia and about which I do not complain.

Mr. Casey: Do you think the road hauliers should pay more?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I cannot deal with that subject now. The honourable member wants to go home and burn up some petrol on the way to Peterborough. He will pay tax because he will wear out tyres and use petrol.

Mr. Casey: I will not damage the roads, as the hauliers do.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not think the hauliers damage the roads as much as the honourable member suggests, but I shall not deal with that subject today. Every penny spent on the roads today is being provided by the people who use them, and by no-one else. The member for Frome and members of his Party know that much of the money collected from people who use the roads is not spent on the roads, because the Commonwealth does not return all the money to us. I am not arguing about the principle, but that is

the fact. These old alleged debts, gifts granted by the Treasury (I think this one is dated 1952) may very well be forgotten. In those days we had little revenue for our roads.

We faced colossal difficulties in building even the main arterial roads to the required standard, and only in the last two or three years have we brought them to anywhere near the state in which they can serve people in the far-flung parts of South Australia. In the Flinders and Eyre Districts many miles of main and feeder arterial roads are in a rough and undeveloped state, and I view with concern the taking of \$2,000,000 from the Highways Fund for revenue. Money has been taken from this fund on two or three occasions, but I hope it will not happen again. Although there are many local matters that I should like to discuss, I shall forbear, because it is time to adjourn. With the comments I have made and in view of the necessity to get on with the financial measures incidental to the Budget, I support the first line.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): This debate has centred mainly on the questions of the amount of the deficit and the measures that the Government is taking to obtain additional revenue. Whilst one or two of the speeches from the Opposition have been couched in reasonable vein, many have been extremely destructive and certainly have not taken into account the position in which all the States find themselves today. It is reported in today's newspaper that the Victorian Government has taken steps to alleviate its position by imposing higher gas and electricity charges, which are expected to yield \$6,000,000. That Government has also increased fares and other charges substantially indeed.

Mr. Casey: By 15 per cent!

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: It is interesting to see that there we have a State under a Liberal Administration, a State that is very compact and acknowledged to be probably the most wealthy in Australia, a State that has resources far beyond those of this State, and yet it finds itself in very serious difficulties. We also know that New South Wales is in serious difficulties. We read reports of its problems concerning education, of the disquiet among teachers who are threatening to strike, of the shortage of schools, and so on.

In Western Australia, according to the *Australian*, there is likely to be a deficit of \$7,000,000. That State has been held up to us as a model of all the virtues since it

acquired a Liberal Government! We have been told how efficient is the management in Western Australia. Yet, although it has a smaller population than has South Australia and although it has undoubted resources, it is faced with a deficit of \$7,000,000. So, there must be something common to all States today that is causing them difficulties in balancing their Budgets. According to today's *Advertiser*, the Premier of Victoria (Sir Henry Bolte), in a strong attack upon the Commonwealth-State financial system, said:

The whole system is so patently crazy and loaded against the States that it is beyond comprehension how anyone can defend it.

He said that State Governments were expected to expand services, the key example being education, but had no effective access to any of the major revenue fields.

Mr. Quirke: He said that many years ago.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes; he has been saying it for a long time. I will say, for the member of Burra, that he does not get up and pretend that this is solely the fault of the Labor Government. He has often said that all the States are in this predicament and has put forward a proposition involving a form of social credit to get over these difficulties, but the States are hamstrung even in this and not able to use social credit to the extent he suggests. He may tell us we can, but so far I have not been able to find the key to this.

Mr. McAnaney: Shouldn't the State Government come up with some constructive ideas?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: All the States to which I have referred are blessed with much greater natural resources than is South Australia, and this has been admitted by members of the Opposition in this debate. However, those States find themselves in difficulties similar to South Australia's. So, it is rather ridiculous for members of the Opposition to prate about mismanagement, misrepresentation, plundering, and all the other extravagant words that have been used about this Budget.

It is not what has been said by the Opposition in this debate that is important, but what has been left unsaid, and I shall examine some of the things that members opposite have left unsaid. They have made no attempt to suggest alternatives that the Government might have adopted to avoid the present deficit, except that they have suggested that no service payments should have been made and that women should not at this stage have received equal pay for equal work. Of course, I think

the people who have received service pay and the women teachers who have received the first instalment of their equal pay for equal work should take notice that, had a different Government been in office, they certainly would not have received those advantages.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: That is unfair.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Are we to believe that, had the Opposition Party been in power, it would have provided these things? Up to the present the Opposition criticism has been that we should not have provided these things. Members opposite cannot have it both ways.

Mr. Hudson: There are two Oppositions these days, an official Opposition and an unofficial Opposition.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Members opposite have not selected any other items of expenditure which, in their opinion, should not have been incurred. None of them has mentioned that we should not have provided free books in the primary schools. I wonder why not. The only thing that they have said is that we should have adopted a different method, which would have cost us much more, despite their pleas for economy. In fact, of course, the cost of free books in primary schools will be \$563,000 less the \$77,000 that we are already providing for free books for children of parents in financial difficulties. So, if we had adopted the suggestions made by members of the Opposition, it would have cost \$814,000. I am surprised at this sort of suggestion coming from members opposite, who are so keen on the score of economy.

The member for Mitcham contended that the Budget should be redrawn. He said that it could be put right in only one of two ways: either by increasing the income of the State or by reducing its expenditure. He believed the Government should have adopted the second course, and he referred to Mr. Micawber, who realized how happy he could be if he could only balance his budget. Of course, Mr. Micawber was always in an unhappy situation where he found it very difficult to balance his budget; he was very much like the States in this regard. When we examine this we find it very interesting. The member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) said that there was great virtue in balancing one's budget, and that in fact anybody who could not do so ought to be sacked.

It would be very interesting to see what would happen if we had balanced the Budget in South Australia this year. I guarantee that the Opposition, had it been in Government,

would never have dared balance the Budget, because it knows jolly well what the consequences would have been: either it would have had to increase taxation far beyond what this Government is doing, or it would have had to slash services to such an extent that there would have been a tremendous upheaval.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Not services. You know better than that.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will show that the Opposition Party would have had to do it. I will deal with the contention of the member for Mitcham sufficiently to show at least some of the results that would have come following his suggestion as applied to Mr. Micawber. First, it should be emphasized that when the Government came into office it found itself committed to an unprecedented programme of Loan works beyond the capacity of the State to keep in motion with revenue available while at the same time meeting the increased costs of general development. Of course, this is the sort of thing the States are experiencing. Further, there was a backlog of development required in social services, including some aspects of education. I could mention the Public Library, which has been starved for years and is still being starved. Even the member for Mitcham got up and drew my attention to the fact that the Principal Librarian should be better paid.

Mr. Millhouse: So he should.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I go further and say that much more could be done in the way of better salaries for the librarians at the Public Library. We have seen librarians one after the other go to other States. Why? Simply because we have starved the Public Library. Everybody today who knows anything about education is saying that society needs better libraries, and that is true. This is only one of the social services that has been starved by the previous Government over many years. When we came into office we were elected on a policy of improving the social services, and we have set out to do it. Of course, we have met this accumulated demand for improvement, and we have had to try at least to satisfy it in some directions.

Because education expenditure involves about one-quarter of the State's Budget, I shall deal with what would have happened if the Opposition's suggestions, referred to in this debate, had actually been carried out. I do not intend to traverse all aspects of this question (that is, the other aspects of different departments) because the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson), in a very able speech, has

traversed all these other aspects so well that it would be a waste of time for me to go over that ground again. I shall deal particularly with the aspects as applied to education, if the suggestions of the Opposition had been put into practice.

The only thing apart from education that I will refer to in order to show what would have happened to the deficit if we had not included some of these things is service pay. The Government, when it came into office, put into operation service pay that cost the State \$1,600,000. It was service pay of \$1 a week after 12 months' service; \$1.75 after 24 months' service; and \$2.50 after 36 months' service. Of course, we know that the previous Government had applications for service pay, and it has been said that had it been re-elected it would have had to award some service pay in order to retain people in the Public Service. It would be very hard to deny that contention. However, I will forget that aspect, except to point out that seeing that the present Government offered \$1 a week after 12 months' service no-one surely would entertain the idea that had the Liberal and Country Party been in Government it could have offered much less than 50c a week.

Mr. Heaslip: Why offer anything?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Well, I realize the honourable member would not have offered any at all; the honourable member has made that very evident from time to time. Let us assume for the moment that half of this amount had been offered. The Government of the day, had it been a Liberal and Country League Government, would have been up for about half of what the present Government has been up for. Therefore, the Opposition cannot get out of this by just condemning the present Government for offering service pay. Let us assume we did not make any payment for service pay; let us assume for the moment that we did not award equal pay for equal work for the women teachers (incidentally, the first instalment of this latter expense is \$340,000); and let us assume that we had not provided in these Estimates for free books for the coming year, at a net cost, by the way, of \$486,000. As I said before, the first two are the only items the Opposition members have said should not have been paid: they have not referred to free books. However, I will include them. The total cost of these three items is \$2,426,000.

It is interesting that the *Advertiser*, which talks of overspending, had in its cartoon some little while ago only three things: service

pay, equal pay for women, and free books for primary schoolchildren. Therefore, the *Advertiser* thinks that these are the only things of magnitude on which the Government has over-spent. Accepting that assumption, if we deduct that amount from the Budget deficit we have a balance of \$5,651,000. However, the L.C.L. at the last election made promises regarding education, and I suppose its members will tell us they intended to carry them out.

Mr. McKee: I doubt it very much.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Let us see what they would have cost. Three promises were made regarding education. One concerned concessions for transport, which would have cost an additional \$400,000 at least, on the Opposition's own admission in its policy speech. Increases in boarding allowances for country students were promised, and subsidies were promised for the provision of sporting equipment, teaching aids, and maintenance of recreation areas for private or non-Government schools. This would have cost an additional \$180,000, and that is on a basis of the average cost of subsidy to the students in our departmental schools. Therefore, I do not think anybody can quarrel with that particular figure. The then Government, had it been re-elected, would have been up for another \$580,000. Thus, if service pay, equal pay for women, and free books had been omitted, and other services provided as provided by this Government (and the promises were carried out by the L.C.L. in respect of those particular things), its deficit would have been \$6,231,000. It would be interesting to know what would have happened had this Government had a deficit of \$6,231,000. I venture to say that the member for Mitcham and the the Leader of the Opposition would have castigated the Government just as heavily for \$6,250,000 as they would have for \$8,000,000. I can imagine them saying precisely the same things and what they said would be just as destructive and lacking in construction.

Let us see what other increases in expenditure we as a Government have incurred: the new teachers' award, the decision of the Teachers Salaries Board. I do not think any honourable member opposite would debate this issue. In fact, I remember the member for Gumeracha getting up and questioning me to see that we were really going to pay the teachers all they were entitled to and to make sure that they got a fair deal from the Teachers Salaries Board. I feel sure that the honourable

members will not contradict that. In 1965-66 this teachers' award cost the Government \$908,000; this year it will cost the Government \$1,558,000. Will any member opposite say that that expenditure could have been avoided?

Mr. Heaslip: Aren't you assuming a lot?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Not a bit; I am not assuming anything. These are the facts of life. Then we come to increased allowances for teachers college students—\$410,000 in 1965-66 and \$450,000 in these Estimates. Of course, when we came into office we found that the allowances to teachers college students had not been raised for over 10 years. Will any member opposite say that we should not have raised those allowances? We were not extravagant in the amount by which we raised them. After all, one of the highest priorities today is to ensure that we have an adequate supply of teachers of quality in our schools. No member opposite will say that that is a wrong priority. As a consequence of our determination to try to ensure that we got an adequate supply of teachers of quality, we granted a number of unbonded tertiary teaching scholarships, which cost us \$6,500 in 1965-66, and this year we expect them to cost \$30,000. Now we are coming into a full year of operation when two lots of scholarships will be made available instead of the one, as happened in the first year.

Then there are the basic wage increases in the Education Department: in 1965-66 they were nil; in 1966-67 they amount to \$940,000—again inescapable. Then there is assistance in fees to students going to the university and the Institute of Technology—\$70,000 in 1965-66, and this year the estimated figure is \$75,000. The member for Mitcham was complaining because it was not enough; he thought it ought to be much more. For scholars on public and private buses, \$32,500 was spent in 1965-66, and \$45,000 is in the Estimates for this year. I am sure that no member opposite would say that we should take it away.

Then we come to free books for secondary schoolchildren whose parents are in difficult financial circumstances: nil in 1965-66, and \$52,000 on the Estimates for the coming year. Of course, this was a thing that was never properly provided for by the previous Government. Although it had been provided for in primary schools, there was no proper arrangement in regard to the provision of free books for children in secondary schools whose parents were in difficult financial circumstances. The headmaster or the school council made some special arrangements of their own to try to

meet the cost in some instances, but I heard of a case where one parent was told to talk to the children's welfare people in order to get help to buy books.

These increases in expenditure in the Education Department resulting from awards and the application of Government policy totalled \$1,427,000 in 1965-66 and are estimated at \$3,150,000 in 1966-67, but the increases in those years because of Government policy alone, as distinct from awards, are a little over \$500,000 in each case—in 1965-66, \$519,000; and in 1966-67, \$652,000. So, in the main, these increases are entirely inescapable. On this point let me say that more than 80 per cent of the estimated expenditure from revenue in the Education Department is on salaries and wages; there is no freedom for manoeuvring on the Education Department Estimates in this direction.

The other items I have mentioned that were increased because of Government policy were long overdue. They were necessary in the interests of education and were part of the policy on which this Government was elected. Are we to be condemned for putting into operation a policy on which we were elected? Will members opposite say which of these things should not have been carried out?

Mr. Millhouse: When are you going to put into operation your policy of bank amalgamation?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The honourable member was not present when I was making my earlier remarks, when I said I was going to concentrate on questions relating to education because the member for Glenelg had so ably dealt with all aspects of these other departmental matters and there was no need for me to traverse that ground again.

Mr. Millhouse: I do not think the member for Glenelg mentioned the amalgamation of the banks.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Knowing the kindly attitude of the member for Mitcham when another member is speaking, I am sure he will understand that point.

Mr. Millhouse: Nevertheless, I am disappointed.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Let us suppose that none of those items of expenditure, those increases in Education Department expenditure, was due to the implementation of Government policy as distinct from amounts due to award increases, that a Liberal Government had done none of these things: what would have been the position? The deficit then would have been \$5,579,000. So, despite the

implementation of Government policy, the position is not as bad as Opposition members have tried to make out, because, if the Government had not implemented this aspect of its policy in the measures I have mentioned, it would have been left with a \$5,579,000 deficit.

Mr. Hudson: The deficit that members opposite would have had would have been greater than that.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: How would members opposite have cut that and still maintained the State services? The deficit at this level would have been possible only if the Liberal and Country League had been prepared to impose the levels of increased charges and taxation that the Government proposes. They could not have got out of it, but some members opposite have said straight out that we should have emulated Mr. Micawber and gone for a balanced Budget. I wonder whether they really contemplated just what this would have meant? What services would have to be slashed and what would be the repercussions? When I examined my Budget as Minister and considered what reductions would have to be made if I had been asked to reduce it by \$2,000,000, what would I have to do? That is only a small part of \$8,000,000, but I would have to reduce equipment and materials by about 46 per cent; I would have to make a 25 per cent reduction in administration costs; a reduction in the number of teachers; a reduction in the expansion of lecturers at teachers' colleges; a reduction in students' allowances; a reduction in cleaners' wages; to suspend payments for subsidy; to reduce minor repairs by 50 per cent; to reduce boarding allowances; to reduce conveyance allowances

by 50 per cent; to cut fuel, gas, and electricity charges; to suspend the swimming campaign; to cut telephone and postage charges; to cut transport of handicapped children right out; to cut visual aids; to reduce the expenditure on the Psychology Branch; and to suspend State exhibitions and bursaries. These are only some of the cuts that would have been necessary.

Are Opposition members saying that these things should be done? They are not prepared to carry into effect what they suggested should be done to balance the Budget. Had we followed what was suggested by the Opposition not only would the repercussions have occurred but we would have had a considerable increase in the number of unemployed, because unemployment spirals. Once it starts, it has repercussions from one set of people to another and grows. Not only that, but any Government that tried to balance the State Budget in these circumstances would have to disorganize completely many well established parts of our society. What I have referred to in the Education Department would have happened in other departments. I think I have shown conclusively that Opposition criticism has been, in the main, completely destructive. An Opposition has two duties: first, to oppose and, secondly, to regard itself as an alternative Government. The Opposition's suggestions, however, were not those that should come from a responsible alternative Government. I have much pleasure in supporting the first line.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 20, at 2 p.m.