

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, July 12, 1967.

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PLANNING BOARD CHAIRMAN.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. HALL: I refer to a statement, appearing in this morning's *Advertiser*, attributed to the Premier, concerning the appointment of Mr. Roder as Chairman of the appeal board set up under the town planning legislation. The Premier has not spoken to me, nor has he had any discussion with me, concerning that appointment. In reply to Mr. Tomkinson, who approached me and asked me whether I would oppose the appointment of Mr. Roder, I said that, although I could not commit my Party on the matter, I had no personal objections to the gentleman. At no stage of my discussion with Mr. Tomkinson was any mention made of the fact that the firm of Roder, Dunstan, Lee and Taylor would be involved in real estate development.

QUESTIONS

PLANNING BOARD CHAIRMAN.

Mr. BROOMHILL: In view of the article in this morning's *Advertiser* concerning Mr. Roder's appointment and in view of the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, will the Premier comment?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Roder, who has been a senior partner in my firm ever since it was constituted, is the one lawyer in South Australia (and one of only two lawyers in Australia) who is qualified in the law and in town planning. In 1965, by resolution of the Municipal Association, an approach was made to the Government by that association seeking that the chairmanship of any appeal tribunal under the planning and development legislation should be held by a lawyer with town planning qualifications. The association specifically made representation to the Government at that time that Mr. Roder should receive this appointment. When the Planning and Development Bill had passed, representations were made to the Minister of Local Government, who then approached me and the Cabinet with

a recommendation for Mr. Roder's appointment. Because Mr. Roder was a partner of mine, I anticipated not that there would be any impropriety whatever in the appointment, but that somebody would be low enough to suggest that there was.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! I cannot allow this kind of conduct when a Minister is answering a question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In consequence I was personally reluctant, against the view of every other member of Cabinet, to agree to this appointment. Indeed, it was only after widespread representations had been made to Cabinet in relation to it that the President of the Municipal Association asked me to tell Cabinet that he had spoken both with Mr. Millhouse, M.P., and with the Leader of the Opposition, who considered that in the circumstances Mr. Roder was so outstandingly qualified for this post that it would be unfair to him if he was not appointed, and that recommendation finally went to Cabinet. In relation to the last matter which the honourable member has referred to, I do not know what the suggestion is. I have seen reports of remarks of a member in another place about which, if he repeated them outside the House, I would take action.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier cannot refer here to remarks made by a member in another place.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker. Nevertheless, there has been published in the newspaper a report of an advertisement published on July 5 over the name of my firm. This advertisement simply said, however, that a client of my firm was interested in purchasing a large area for subdivisional purposes. Sir, I cannot understand where there can be the slightest suggestion of impropriety about that: I do not know that it involves the Planning and Development Authority or the appeal tribunal. It has been canvassed widely by members of the Opposition Party that they are going to put the dirt in somehow, and they are obviously endeavouring to do that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! I appeal for the last time for order. I will unhesitatingly name members if they do not respond when order is called for.

SWAN REACH SCHOOL.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I recently asked about the Swan Reach Area School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have not yet received a report concerning improvement of conditions at the Swan Reach Area School. The Director of Public Buildings was asked to estimate the comparative cost of erecting a new quadruple unit with toilets and shelter shed at the new site, together with minor repairs of the old as against the cost of carrying out work needed at the old site, including the satisfactory retention of sandy soil, satisfactory retention of the plateau, all fencing, repairs to floors, water services, heating appliances and painting. It was necessary for an inspection of both sites to be made by officers of the Public Buildings Department, and this has now been done in detail. The matter is rather involved and Public Buildings Department officers are at present estimating the comparative costs. It is expected that the report will be prepared and forwarded shortly to the Education Department for consideration.

DENTAL HOSPITAL.

Mr. COUMBE: The subject of delays experienced by people attending the Dental Hospital on Frome Road has often been raised. I recently received a letter from a constituent, who is an invalid pensioner and who is greatly perturbed at the fact that, having applied at the hospital for a new set of dentures, she must wait three years. As that seems an intolerable time, will the Minister representing the Minister of Health ascertain from his colleague whether the waiting time can in any way be reduced?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

CUMMINS SCHOOL RESIDENCE.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: For some time past it has been desired that a new residence be erected for the headmaster of the Cummins Area School. This morning I have been informed that the Housing Trust is calling tenders for the erection of a residence for that purpose. I understand that the residence is intended to be erected on land which, I think, is owned by the trust and which is somewhat remote from the school, being on the north-western side of the township. I also understand that the Education Department or the Public Buildings Department owns land in the same street as that in which the headmaster's house is at present located, which land is close to the school and has a good frontage.

Will the Minister of Education have the matter examined urgently to see whether it would not be possible to build the new residence on a more convenient site and in a better location than is presently proposed?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to see whether the location can be changed.

GRAIN DIVIDENDS.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Lands, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to my recent question about barley dividends?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have the following reply:

On June 23, 1967, the final advance on barley of the No. 27 pool, season 1965-66 was paid to growers at the following rates:

Bagged barley—8.73c a bushel on all varieties and grades.

Bulk barley—4.93c a bushel on all varieties and grades.

Regarding the No. 28 pool, season 1966-67, it will not be possible to pay a second advance until late October or November, 1967, because the board is in substantial overdraft at the Reserve Bank. This has been mainly brought about by the payment of a higher first advance on barley of the 1966-67 season, and until such time as the board is in credit funds at the Reserve Bank it is not possible to make a second advance to growers. The first advance in South Australia on barley of the No. 28 pool, season 1966-67 was 5c higher than the first advance in No. 27 pool, season 1965-66.

Regarding wheat, the following payments have been made:

July 11—Payment of 6.168c a bushel to growers who delivered semi-hard wheat to the pool for the 1965-66 season.

July 25—A third advance payment of 10c a bushel on both bagged and bulk wheat delivered to this pool (1965-66 season).

There is a possibility of a further payment being made for this pool in November next.

MODBURY WATER SUPPLY.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of June 29 about the discolouration of the Modbury water supply?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports that, since January 1 this year, the department has received only four complaints of unsatisfactory quality water in the Modbury and Tea Tree Gully area and all of these were rectified immediately. He has pointed out that, unless specific cases can be given, it is very difficult to locate the source of these complaints, as there have been many new extensions in these areas, which necessitates the dewatering and recharging of mains. All precautions are taken to ensure

that the water is of a high standard before it enters the distribution mains. These districts are supplied from the Anstey Hill tanks through a series of pressure-reducing valves and reducing tanks. Consequently, there is a number of zones, so that specific details are required in order to locate the source of any complaint. In the case of unsatisfactory quality water occurring, consumers should contact the Kent Town depot of the department, and an immediate investigation would then be undertaken.

RIVERTON-SPALDING LINE.

Mr. QUIRKE: Has the Minister of Social Welfare a reply to the question I asked yesterday about the re-railing of the Riverton-Spalding line?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: My colleague the Minister of Transport reports that the position with regard to the re-laying of this line has not changed. Secondhand rails from the Port Pirie to Cockburn line would not be available for use elsewhere until after conversion (say, in 1969) but, even so, re-laying priorities would have to be watched closely. In regard to the passenger service, it is considered that, in the light of the level of traffic offering, the existing bus service is satisfactory.

UNLEY DRAINAGE.

Mr. LANGLEY: A drain is now being provided in the south park lands. For some time water from the park lands has been flowing into the North Unley Creek area and causing flooding. Will the appropriate Minister see whether the provision of this drain will alleviate the flooding hazard in the North Unley area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall obtain a report on that matter for the honourable member.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Last week the Minister of Agriculture announced that a committee would be set up to give drought relief assistance to farmers suffering financial difficulties and trying to carry on although their stock were starving. Can the Minister of Lands, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, say who will comprise this committee, whether its duties have been defined, whether it will have power to purchase barley or other fodder from silos, and whether it will be allocated finance from the Treasury to undertake its task?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not think the Minister, if he were here, would be able to announce at this stage the terms of reference of the committee. However, having been asked to nominate from my department one member of the committee, I have nominated Mr. Joy, and the relevant docket has been returned to the Agriculture Department this morning. I will see whether the information sought is available and, when it is, I shall bring it down for the honourable member.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.

Mr. RODDA: Last year the matter of the Government Printing Office was dealt with. Because of the extra work that the Government Printer has to undertake, can the Minister of Works say what plans, if any, there are to build a new Government Printing Office?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Land has been purchased at Netley, adjacent to the Public Buildings Department's premises, and plans are being prepared so that they may be submitted to the Public Works Committee.

REGISTRATION PERMITS.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In country towns, reputable motor car dealers, on concluding the sale of a motor vehicle, require a temporary permit, signed by a police officer, for it to be driven on the road before registration documents are completed. In the metropolitan area and in larger country towns this is a fairly simple procedure, because blank application forms for such permits, held by the local police officer, can be released by him. However, in many country towns (and there are two of these towns in my district) there is only one policeman. He is obliged to attend to his duties not only in the town but also in the surrounding district which, in some cases, covers a large area and may require his absence from the township for at least one day a week. Further, he is entitled, and in many cases avails himself of the right, to take a day off during the week because he is on duty at weekends. Although I do not object to this practice, it means that for probably two business days in a week the motor car dealer cannot obtain an application form for a permit from the police officer and the approval cannot be authorized by the officer, because the office is closed. Difficulties have arisen, for instance, for people from as far afield as the Lock area who, after travelling to Cummins to buy a motor vehicle, cannot drive it away until after the weekend or some other time when

the police officer returns to duty. Will the Minister of Works investigate this matter with a view to solving this problem? Could application forms for the permit be held by the motor car dealer and, instead of their being authorized only by a police officer, could permission be granted for them to be signed by a responsible person, such as a justice of the peace in the town, so that the new owner could use the vehicle pending the issuing of the registration certificate from the Motor Vehicles Department?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I appreciate that difficulties exist in these cases. A purchaser should be able to use the motor vehicle immediately, and people who purchase motor vehicles or who wish to deliver them should be able to avoid unnecessary travel over long distances. I shall discuss the matter with the appropriate Minister to see whether something can be done to minimize these difficulties.

MIGRANTS.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Immigration a reply to my recent question about the number of migrants coming into South Australia in the last year?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The total number of migrants who arrived in South Australia and Australia as a whole during the year 1966-67 is not yet known. According to the Commonwealth Immigration Department, the figures will not be available for several months. Migrants come here under the auspices of the Commonwealth Immigration Department or the State Immigration Department. The State Immigration Department deals only with assisted passage British migrants. The Commonwealth Immigration Department deals with some British migrants and all migrants from foreign countries. Many of the Commonwealth migrant nominees are full-fare paying passengers and statistics regarding these migrants are not yet available for South Australia or Australia.

A total of 7,925 assisted passage British migrants arrived in South Australia in the year 1966-67 under State auspices. Approximately a further 6,500 assisted passage migrants arrived in this State under Commonwealth auspices.

TORRENS RIVER COMMITTEE.

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister representing the Minister of Local Government obtain a report on any progress made by the Torrens River Improvements Committee (under the chairmanship of Mr. Johnke) concerning its

investigations into the condition of the Torrens River? In particular, will he ascertain what findings were made following my request some time ago that the committee, in conjunction with the Health Department, investigate the state and quality of the water, especially in the upper reaches of the river?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to ask my colleague for that information.

SEISMIC PLANTS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Minister of Lands, acting on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture in his absence, a reply to questions I have asked about whether two seismic plants owned by the Government are being used and whether any boring plants are operating in the Great Artesian Basin?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Mines reports that neither of the two seismic plants owned by the Mines Department is at present operating. A 3,500ft. stratigraphic hole, Cootanoorina No. 1, was drilled at Mt. Toondina, west of Oodnadatta, by the Mines Department in the latter part of the last financial year in lieu of seismic operations, and it is planned to continue field seismic operations during the latter half of this financial year. There are at present no plants drilling for oil or gas in the South Australian portion of the Great Artesian Basin.

PORT PIRIE RAILWAY WORKS.

Mr. McKEE: Will the Minister representing the Minister of Transport obtain from his colleague a report concerning progress on the standard gauge work being undertaken at Port Pirie? Will he ascertain when the new station will be ready for use and when the over-pass at Solomontown Junction is expected to be completed?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes.

CONTAINERIZATION.

Mr. RODDA: With the introduction of containerization into our Australian ports imminent, I understand that Port Adelaide will be merely a feeder port. Obviously, if we are to engage in this new method of transportation, we must be ready for it. Will the Minister of Marine therefore say what plans, if any, are in hand for converting Port Adelaide in order to meet the requirements of containerization?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Much work has been and is being done in preparation for containerization. One shipping company has

already indicated that it has been arranged for a container vessel to visit the port in 1969. We expect that some oversea vessels will be working a combination of container and standard cargoes. Much preparatory work has been undertaken on the wharves, and we are confident that we shall be ready to deal with the situation. We are concerned at present at the fact that Port Adelaide may be only a feeder port. However, as the honourable member knows, a Senate Select Committee will be in Adelaide on Monday and Tuesday next. I am informed that officers of the departments of the Minister of Transport, of the Highways Department, and of the Marine and Harbors Department will tender evidence to that committee, and I believe that that evidence will prove that we have considered the matter closely and have taken the necessary steps to meet all possible eventualities.

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister say whether his department will present a case to the Select Committee to have Port Adelaide made a main port rather than a feeder port as is now understood to be intended?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I understand that the aim of the submissions will be to gain the best advantage for South Australia.

BARLEY.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Lands, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to the question I asked last week about the tonnages of unsold feed grade barley at present stored in South Australian silos?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A quantity of about 1,400 tons of feed barley remains unsold, consisting of both bagged and bulk barley. Supplies will be made available either in bags or bulk, depending on the locality of demand, until such time as the 1,400 tons is sold. Any demand for barley in excess of this quantity could be supplemented from stocks of chevalier No. 3 grade barley to the extent of about 230,000 bushels.

CLEAN AIR COMMITTEE.

Mr. CUMBE: In view of complaints I have recently received from constituents residing in certain parts of North Adelaide, will the Minister of Works say what progress has been made by the Clean Air Committee that was set up some time ago? Has the committee made any findings and has it been able to implement any remedial action to minimize air pollution in this State?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am grateful for that question. Indeed, like the honourable member, I have been doing a little urging myself in respect of this matter. Although I am not the Minister responsible for this matter, having written some time ago to the Minister of Health, I received a reply to the effect that regulations had been prepared and were being gazetted. As parts of my district are also badly affected, I am as anxious as the honourable member to get something done, and I will obtain a detailed report.

COUNTRY HOUSING.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am informed (I think reliably) that it is not the policy of the Housing Trust to build houses in country towns for purchase on a deposit of \$100. Although I understand that that policy may not be carried out generally by the trust, I am informed that the application made by at least one person interested in such a transaction has been refused. Although I know care is necessary in selling houses under such terms in some country towns, will the Minister of Works, in the absence of the Premier, ask the General Manager of the trust to ascertain whether it is the trust's policy to entertain applications from persons who wish to buy a house on the \$100-deposit basis and, if it is, will he try to persuade the trust, where approved applicants apply, to give favourable consideration to such applications?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As I am not the Minister of Housing, I regret that I am not aware of the trust's ramifications. However, in view of the question, I shall obtain a detailed report for the honourable member and inform him when it is to hand.

NARACOORTE ADULT EDUCATION.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week regarding the Naracoorte Adult Education Centre?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The condition of the exterior of the building and of the grounds of the Naracoorte Adult Education Centre are known to officers of the Education Department, and, in fact, I observed them as far as was possible at night time when I visited the centre last year. Plans have been drawn up to renovate both the building and grounds including, in particular, the points the honourable member mentioned in the provision of parking and the renewal of appropriate fences. The project is at present awaiting provision of funds for its completion.

EGGS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Last Monday, at Saddleworth, the United Farmers and Graziers Association held a well attended meeting of egg producers to discuss various aspects of egg marketing. One resolution passed at the meeting states:

In the opinion of this meeting the South Australian Egg Board be reconstituted to give producers a majority on the board by the inclusion of another producer representative.

Dissatisfaction was expressed at the meeting that, of the six members of the Egg Board, only three were elected by the poultry farmers. Three are grower representatives, two are nominated by the Minister to represent the industry, and the chairman is also nominated by the Minister. Will the Minister of Lands ascertain whether his colleague will introduce legislation to increase the grower representation on the board?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

NARACOORTE-BORDERTOWN ROAD.

Mr. RODDA: One of my constituents recently hit a kangaroo on the Naracoorte-Bordertown road. There are many kangaroos in this area, and I understand that towards Bordertown the road is suitably signposted so as to alert motorists to this hazard. However, this accident occurred near the Gap, where many of these animals congregate. Will the Minister of Lands therefore confer with his colleague to have these signs placed in that area also, so that motorists there will be aware of the hazard?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That in the opinion of this House, for the purpose of restoring the momentum of this State's development, the Government should immediately:

- (a) create a Ministry of Development;
- (b) appoint a Director of Development; and
- (c) form an Advisory Council of Development.

At last the Government is starting to take notice of the continual interest the Opposition has shown in industrial development because, only last week, it announced that it had appointed a Director of Industrial Development, thereby following the Opposition's policy on this matter. However, I protest at the false statement made in this House yesterday that members of the industrial community (with

whom the Premier says he has discussed this matter in the past) had told members of the Opposition that the Government had discussed, or was going to discuss, this matter with them. I deny that outright: at no stage has any member of industry discussed with me the Government's activities in this regard or in any way hinted that the Government is involved in this question.

The Premier's statement is false, and I challenge him to name the people or suggest which category of person told me or any other member of the Opposition about what he now says was the Government's intention all along. The lead the Opposition has given contains plenty of other subject matters on which the Government can act. We note with interest that this week the Premier, under questioning, said he would see that an advisory body was appointed to assist the Minister and the Director to promote industrial development in South Australia. I hope that this promise will be honoured and that we will have a body of men chosen on their capacity and ability in specialist fields of industry (including mining and other branches of primary industry) so that they may advise and bring information to the Director.

Mr. Hughes: Do you really feel this is necessary?

Mr. HALL: I do. We intend to use every means at our disposal to bring more industry to South Australia. The member for Wallaroo knows how much his district needs industrial promotion, but I will not go into that at this stage. Members can ask why it is so urgently necessary for industrial promotion to receive the attention it should receive in this State. Again, we have only to compare South Australia's progress with that of other States to see how necessary it is to busy ourselves in this field. We know that, whilst the Playford Administration was in power, South Australia was progressing almost automatically. In comparison with other States, South Australia was holding its own in employment, production, and, more important, in the rate of improvement in production and development. This State was the envy of the other States, industrialists and administrators of which came here to find out what was the secret of our amazing development. Yet since this Government has been in office, the development has dwindled and faded away until statistics now show our position to be at its most unfavourable level since the Government came into office. After two years and about three months of this Government's administration, we find the dire

necessity to go about rejuvenating industrial promotion in South Australia.

Several barometers are available which show how a State is progressing and which can be used as a basis of comparison with the position in other States. In debates on other measures before this House, the Opposition has put before the Government statistics showing the urgent need to get busy with promotion. Perhaps I should repeat some of those figures and add to them in support of my argument.

Mr. McKee: You are talking about it too late.

Mr. HALL: It is disturbing to hear the honourable member say it is too late. He has turned his back on the possibility of a natural gas supply for Spencer Gulf towns; it is too late under this Government for gas to be taken to those towns. As yet, no Government member has explained why the possibility of a gas supply for Spencer Gulf towns has not been fully investigated. The member for Port Pirie has made speeches to the effect that these towns do not need natural gas.

Mr. McKee: Don't tell lies.

Mr. HALL: That has been the meaning of the honourable member's speeches. However, I will give him the benefit of the doubt. Can he say what he has done to have a natural gas supply provided to towns on Spencer Gulf? The policy he has pursued in this House has not in any way helped the industrialization of those towns. Last year, his colleague, the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson), spoke about imposing additional taxes on the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited at Whyalla. That is the sort of statement for which members opposite have been notable; we welcome indeed the change (in spoken word, at any rate) that has been evident in the last week or so.

I now wish to give some figures to show the position in this State. In 1964, 14,576 houses and flats were approved in South Australia out of an Australian total of 124,000, meaning that South Australia had 12 per cent of those approvals. In 1965, South Australia approved 11,631 houses and flats (or 10 per cent) out of an Australian total of 114,921. In 1966, South Australia approved 9,694 houses and flats (or 8 per cent) out of a total of 116,000. The latest available quarterly figures for this year show that South Australia has approved only 6 per cent of the total houses and flats approved in Australia. Therefore, the percentage of approvals in South Australia has fallen from 12 per cent, in 1964, to 6 per cent.

On Monday night I received a telephone call at home from a small building subcontractor who said that the position in his industry had never been worse. He said he had not had a job for four weeks, that he had constantly put off the thought of receiving unemployment benefits, but that on that day he had registered for those benefits. He asked me what was the trouble. I told him that I was a politician, involved in the political affairs of the State and that I must give him a political answer. I told him that the finances of the State were not being administered as they had been administered previously, and that a change would have to be made before conditions in South Australia could be improved.

Mr. Casey: What has that got to do with it?

Mr. HALL: The honourable member asks what this has to do with the promotion of industry.

Mr. Casey: That isn't what I meant. I agree with the promotion of industry; I advocated it 12 months ago.

Mr. HALL: The honourable member speaks like a good Liberal, as he certainly was at one time in his career. In fact, he was a member of the Liberal Party on the day he stood for election to this House.

Mr. Casey: You have been talking about that for five years.

Mr. HALL: The honourable member has settled into this House now and I believe he belongs where he is. I shall now give comparative figures for the States of persons receiving unemployment benefits. First, I shall deal with Victoria, which conducts the promotion of its industrial affairs on a similar basis to that which applied in South Australia: the Premier of Victoria bears the major load of presentation and of dealing with industrialists.

Mr. McKee: Is there any unemployment in Victoria?

Mr. HALL: At the end of February, 3,061 people were receiving unemployment benefits in Victoria. In South Australia, at the same time, 3,073 people were receiving unemployment benefits. At the end of May, unemployment benefits were being received by 3,701 people in Victoria and by 3,529 people in South Australia. I hope less people are now receiving relief, but the fact remains that for over half of this year nearly as many people were receiving unemployment benefits in South Australia as were receiving them in Victoria, a State with three times South Australia's population. In 1965, of the total of people in Australia receiving unemployment benefits, South Australia had 6 per cent; in 1966, we

had 13 per cent; and the latest quarterly figures available for this year show that we have 14 per cent. However, we have only about 9.3 per cent of Australia's total population.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Have those figures satisfied the member for Port Pirie?

Mr. HALL: Nothing will satisfy him. Even if someone else were to take the trouble to have natural gas supplied to Spencer Gulf towns, he would not be satisfied. Another indication of this State's position when compared with other States is the percentage of the work force registered for employment. These figures draw attention to the opportunities for employment within the State. The number of people registered for employment is the number of people looking for jobs. The member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) seems to be lacking in knowledge and does not seem to think that it is significant that we are about equal to Victoria in unemployment.

At the end of May, 1965, South Australia had .8 per cent of the work force registered for employment and 1.9 per cent at the end of May, 1967. The figures for Australia were .9 per cent at the end of May, 1965, and 1.4 per cent at the end of May, 1967. The member for Port Pirie may argue with me or with you, Mr. Speaker, but he cannot argue about the statistician's figures. Therefore, we do not have to go further to establish the necessity for submitting this motion, although the honourable member earlier queried the need to move it. The need for industrial promotion in South Australia has been established and at least in the last few months the Government has acknowledged that this State is not doing as well as other States. For so long under the Walsh Administration we had the Premier's refusal to admit that we were not doing so well. However, economic pressures in the last few months of his term had their effect and we had his public acknowledgment that South Australia was not doing so well.

In the last year or so, the Opposition has put forward a proposal for industrial promotion in South Australia and our being first in the field in this respect has hurt the Government. Many attempts have been made to discredit the Opposition's move, which move comes from our long experience of industrial promotion. All that we have had from the Government so far in answer to our moves has been the appointment of a Director and the Premier's statement in this House that he will appoint an authority to advise the Director. It is gratifying to the Opposition to know that its policies are being

carried out, but action has not been taken beyond that to which I have just referred. Most other States have in operation policies on industrial promotion that have been formulated over many years. Some of the other States envied the progress of South Australia, looked to their laurels and built up the promotion sections of their departments.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Sir Henry Bolte made a special trip overseas about six years ago to sell Victoria, and that was the beginning of Victoria's activities in that regard.

Mr. HALL: Most of the other States took their cue from South Australia because of the success that had been achieved here in industrial development. I have recently been to two of the Eastern States and have had discussions with those concerned with industrial promotion. One overriding qualification that has been mentioned in connection with industrial promotion relates to the person in charge. It is not important how many hundreds of junior officers are in the department. Although these officers can do useful research work and make projections about the future, the person at the top will be the man to develop the State. So, the matter of who is the Minister in charge of the department becomes important.

Mr. Lawn: Who handled it when your Party was in Government?

Mr. HALL: The honourable member knows that Sir Thomas Playford handled this matter very successfully. After the election in March, 1965, this matter was handed over to the incoming Premier, who was not qualified for this job and was unable to produce the results. This is an example of what the man in charge can do. One man had a tremendous record, yet overnight there was almost a complete break in the continuity of attracting industry here. We found in the other States that the Minister and the Director were the important focal points in development. Western Australia is a further example of that. In that State, a dynamic Minister for Industrial Development has brought about remarkable development.

The Western Australian Minister has been cast in the Playford mould and has been able to establish Western Australia as a dynamic industrial and primary-producing State. I wish him luck in the future. He has not been hampered by Socialist policies, and I shall refer again to that matter soon. We have much detail about the position in other States. Many booklets have been issued and projections made about future demands.

Mr. McKee: Why didn't your Party put them out when it was in Government for about 30 years?

Mr. HALL: I do not think we can wait until the member for Port Pirie catches up. I have said that we were proceeding nicely under the Playford Administration. Sir Thomas Playford set the standard for the development of South Australia. The present Premier has been jealous of that and has attacked the individual and the Administration. Other States are doing impressive work in decentralization and industrial development. Obviously, the New South Wales Government, because it has more resources than the South Australian Government, is able to allocate a greater financial vote to industrial development. The organization in that State is imposing.

I am grateful for the insight that the Director and the Research Officer gave us into the department's operations in Sydney. We spent one whole day looking at the industries of Sydney and the available land and discussing the problems of industrial development.

Mr. McKee: One day makes an expert!

Mr. HALL: I would say that 27 years make a Party well qualified to develop South Australia. The member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon) has been complaining that some capital works in his district are not being proceeded with because the Premier has switched the funds. South Australia can do without that type of financial management. We have not heard much about decentralization in South Australia since this Government has been in office, but decentralization is part of the administration of industrial promotion in New South Wales. The Department of Decentralization and Development acts as a central source of information on New South Wales. The staff of the department includes officers professionally qualified in industry who can advise on problems likely to be encountered by the prospective investor in the State. They can help in the following matters:

Location of industrial sites and advice on services available. The department has a comprehensive knowledge of sites and premises both in the metropolitan and country areas, including approximate costs.

Arrangement of interviews with Government departments and instrumentalities, and with employer and employee organizations. If required, the department will act as a central agency through which inquiries can be channelled on behalf of industrialists.

Comparative statistics, details on the capacity of major industrial organizations, basic materials and labour costs, and other information associated with industrial promotion.

Definition of industrial opportunities within the State.

Details of assistance available to industries considering establishing in country centres.

In London, the Agent-General for New South Wales, at 56 Strand, London, will give on-the-spot information to British and European industrialists considering establishment in New South Wales. In New York the Commissioner for New South Wales, New South Wales Centre, 680 Fifth Avenue, New York, offers the same facilities as the London office. Both offices maintain a close liaison with the Department of Decentralization and Development in Sydney. This has proved valuable in promoting industries to New South Wales from the United States of America.

A vigorous promotional effort to attract industry is being made by Western Australia, and the Minister for Industrial Development (Mr. Court) is renowned throughout Australia for his personality and ability to enthuse industrialists and potential investors in Australia to come to Western Australia. He is well supported by his department and by several organizations in that State. *Business News*, a small publication published by Western Australian Newspapers Limited, gives an up-to-date account of recent developments in that State. The impression one receives from these promotional efforts in Western Australia is the enthusiasm with which the various Ministers approach the matter of attracting industry and promoting it within the State. This attitude is necessary in South Australia because the old order of promotion has gone. The present Government's policies are not conducive to investors wishing to come to South Australia, but this policy must be reversed.

An organization should be set up to attract industry and to take an inventory of South Australian resources, in order to gather information and organize activities that will benefit the State. Further promotional efforts and the setting up of an administrative organization will be ineffectual unless the Government's policies, as conveyed to other States and promoted through this House by statements of the Premier and the Ministers, are changed and an incentive and reward are given to people wishing to come to this State. Soon after the Labor Government was elected it embarked on a socialistic platform that lowered the morale of the business community to rock bottom. One of the chief reasons for this change was the Government's attitude to transport. It set out not to impose taxation on road transport (which it could pay) but to tax road transport off the roads. The tax the

Government collected was to be channelled into railway revenue. This action would have been the largest single factor at that time that demoralized the South Australian business community.

In its last year or two in office the previous Government instigated a policy of free road transport, except for the areas in which licences had several years to run. However, an attempt was made to reverse this policy, when the Labor Government announced a penalty tax on road transport. Soon, other factors emerged. The financial management of the State took a new turn and South Australia, far from being a stable financial unit of the Commonwealth, was in great difficulty. This situation culminated in the use of \$9,000,000 from trust funds. I should not say "culminated": the culmination of this Government's record has yet to come. The Government used \$9,000,000 of trust funds, and in the past year has loaded the Loan Account with an additional burden of \$7,000,000 that it has not borne before.

Obviously, the financial management of this State can be questioned. During last session and this session, it has been apparent that the Government has a "don't care" attitude to a natural gas supply to Spencer Gulf ports. The Government has refused to investigate properly the western route.

Mr. Hughes: That's not true, and you know it.

Mr. HALL: The Government has not justified any figures on these alternatives or published reports of any investigations. Why has not the western route been properly investigated? Why not call tenders for both routes if we are doubtful of the price? It is about time that members for districts in which the Gulf ports are situated fought for this amenity. The Government's true attitude to industrial promotion in this State became apparent a few weeks ago when the Premier announced an additional week's leave for Government employees.

Mr. Hughes: You soon switched.

Mr. HALL: The honourable member will have the opportunity to justify his stand.

Mr. Hughes: I will justify it next week to prove how wrong you are: it won't be the first time I have done it.

Mr. HALL: The honourable member has not yet said why he has taken the attitude he has. I am sorry for the people of South Australia who have to writhe under this type of financial administration. The latest announcement of the Government to draw

dismay from the business and commercial world of South Australia concerns the institution of an additional week's leave for Government employees. Any realist will know that that will spread, and impose on industry in South Australia additional costs that will not be imposed in other States.

Mr. Broomhill: Are you opposed to the extra week's leave?

Mr. HALL: South Australia cannot at present afford it. Public servants and people in private industry who would quickly benefit from the announcement have said that South Australia is not yet ready for it—"Give South Australia better employment; give it jobs, rather than give something to a few and take from many!"

Mr. Broomhill: Are you opposed to it?

Mr. HALL: Any Treasurer and his advisers will know that South Australia cannot afford that extra leave. As the member for West Torrens knows, it is the result of a direction received from members of Labor's machinery outside the House. The Government is obeying its masters in this matter. Indeed, this is the latest indication of the Government's policy and its attitude to industry. So far, the Government has merely acknowledged that something in South Australia is amiss; it has acknowledged that we are not doing so well and that something must be done. In fact, the Government has taken its lead from Liberal and Country League policy and is now becoming involved to a small degree in industrial promotion in South Australia. However, it has a long way to go. Finally, I now read a letter that I sent to a company inquiring about the Opposition's policy to industry establishing in South Australia. The letter, which clearly sets out the Opposition's policy, states:

The Opposition is acutely aware of the need to encourage new industries to this State and to promote the expansion of those already in existence. Our past success in this field is probably best explained by the following, taken from a recent report on industry compiled by Sir Thomas Playford:

Liberal and Country Party Governments have been singularly successful in establishing industries in South Australia. Probably the most important factor to be considered before an industry is established in any country is the question of stability, both political and economic. The L.C.L. Government provided South Australia with this to a unique extent. Over a period of 27 years there was a balanced Budget, with low taxation and economic prosperity. The price structure was held the most consistently of any State in the Commonwealth, housing was provided at economic

rents, costs of public utilities were kept at the lowest possible level, and financial reserves maintained to provide services for all expansion.

In the country, housing was guaranteed for the workers in any new secondary industry being established. In the city, housing was made readily available for all skilled workers required for the establishment of any new industrial undertaking. In both the city and the country steps were taken to provide electricity, rail services, water, roads, and if necessary, land, for the establishment of new enterprises. If justified, finance was made available at low interest, and factories were built. Special legislation was provided to make possible almost any type of assistance necessary to foster the establishment of a new industry.

We believe our State offers further opportunities for industrial development, and when our Party is returned to office it will devote a great deal of its energy to the promotion of industrial activity. This will include: obtaining advice from industry and commerce as to its needs and capacity; assistance to expansion by the provision of technical advice and necessary services; a re-orientation of State finances to provide a greater investment in research and exploration; and a practical approach to industrial legislation based on South Australia's need to retain its competitive advantages in relation to other States.

Obviously, each proposition poses a different set of circumstances, and each must be treated on its merits. As an Opposition we are at a disadvantage in not knowing the immediate resources that are available in the Treasury. However, our past record, we believe, indicates a positive approach to industrial expansion in South Australia, and we look forward to a long period of co-operation between Government and industry on our return to office. Our Party would be very pleased to consider specific proposals concerning your company's activities.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I did not intend to take part in this debate—

Mr. Jennings: Someone had to come to the Leader's aid!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD:—because I will not be contesting the seat of Gumeracha at the end of this Parliamentary term. Although I intended to play a less prominent part in debating measures in the House, I was invited into the debate yesterday by the Premier who, in reply to a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition, said:

We had, of course, for the first time in South Australia, under our Government, established an Industrial Development Branch. That course was always open to the previous Government, but it did not do anything about it at a time when every other State Government in Australia had constituted a fully staffed, properly equipped Industrial Development Department, and despite the fact that it could be simply provided administratively in South Australia, with-

out requiring any alteration whatever in legislation. No such action was taken in South Australia under the previous Government.

The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) then interjected: "We had a good Premier then; we didn't need it," to which the Premier replied as follows:

If the honourable member thinks that the situation under the previous Premier (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) and two typistes constituted the development section of South Australia compared with what happened in some other States, I can only say he has not had a look at the facts.

The Premier was not correct when he said that, apart from me, the two typistes constituted the industrial development section, because those two typistes had other work to do as well: they were doing all the work that is at present undertaken by about 17 people in the Premier's Department. Indeed, I think they were doing it just as well as it is now being done in the enlarged department. It all comes back to a quotation of Emerson, who once said:

If a man can write a better book, preach a better sermon, or make a better mousetrap than his neighbour, though he build his house in the woods the world will make a beaten path to his door.

That was South Australia's position previously. There were conditions in South Australia under which industry could develop and prosper, and we did our best to encourage industry to come here. I could name many important South Australian industries which originally decided to establish in another State, but decided to come here when they saw the advantages of so doing. For example, the Philips organization, although it was originally established in New South Wales, came here at a removal cost of \$500,000. Members opposite would do well to consider why a firm such as that went to the expense of shifting 300 key operatives from New South Wales to South Australia. The South Australian Government provided \$90,000 and the Commonwealth Government \$180,000 to help the firm move, and it now employs about 2,000 people here and is a prestige industry. It is one of the leading industrial companies in the world, and it came here because it found the economic conditions in South Australia were better than those in other States.

It also found that it would be subject to less Government interference here than under the New South Wales Labor Government, which was telling it what to do. As a result, the company decided it would rather invest here where there was stability, good industrial relations, and a low cost of production as a result of Government policy. Why did Davies Coop,

having announced its intention to go to Queensland, suddenly come to South Australia? There was also the case of British Tube Mills. Mr. Moynihan, who came from a big British industrial corporation, was offered in other States all the blandishments of the department of which the Premier is so enamoured, but he chose between three States (New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia) and finally came here. Everybody realizes how important this firm has been to the industrial development of South Australia, not only as regards employment but also as regards its many subsidiary industries. Although I support the motion, I point out that, unless Government policy is harmonized with the necessities of industries, the new Director, or even the archangel Gabriel, will not be able to bring industry here.

I have received a booklet from one of the world's leading industrialists and, incidentally, a man to whom we in South Australia owe a tremendous amount. The book embodies lectures he gave to universities in America, and I will make it available because I realize it is not in the Parliamentary Library. Its author is Mr. Donner (Chairman of General Motors Corporation), who was responsible for the decision to establish the large works at Elizabeth which has meant so much to us, and particularly to the District of Gawler. Prior to that, Mr. Donner was responsible for the big expansion by G.M.H. at Woodville. He describes the motives that actuate business expansion and he explains in great detail what actuated G.M.C. to expand overseas. At page 54, he refers to the establishment by his firm of its Australian plant, and he states:

Second, in the view of General Motors the proposal was an economic one. Local industries to which General Motors could turn for materials, components and services were in existence, and with the stimulus provided by our participation, they would be encouraged to expand. The market potential was expected to support a manufacturing facility. Most important, at the demand levels we anticipated, we were able to conclude that a vehicle attractive to the Australian market could be supplied at a lower cost than a not-so-well adapted vehicle could be imported.

In other words, the establishment of industry is based on economic considerations, not on the personality or the name of the man in charge of industrial development. No doubt that would be advantageous in bringing the attractions of a country under notice, but it would not supply the fundamental requirement that the economy of a country must be sound and suitable and the conditions under which that economy is estab-

lished must be such that the industry could economically compete with its competitors from outside the country concerned. Mr. Donner, referring to the development in the Argentine, states:

We could foresee a possibility of an improving long-term potential. We concluded that national policies would be conducive to private enterprise.

Much is contained in those words. One of the problems this State must overcome at present is the fact that the Government is not a private enterprise Government but a Socialist Government. Yesterday the appointment of a Director of Industrial Development was announced along with the State's interest in attracting secondary industry. However, on the same day a Bill was introduced to provide for a Government Insurance Office to compete with private insurance companies.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: You say you believe in competition.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, fair competition. In this case one company will pay taxation and the other will not. This is an example of the crooked thinking of members opposite. They believe that, on the one hand, they can kick industries and, on the other hand, attract them.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: They wanted to rub out the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited at one stage.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I intend to deal with that subject. Another significant passage of Mr. Donner's book gives some clues as to what must be done to attract industries. Speaking on behalf of the biggest industrial organization in the United States of America (possibly in the world), he states:

Our own position is clearly defined. It is the responsibility of each country to establish those policies which it deems will serve its interests best. It is then our business responsibility to judge whether we can operate profitably within the framework of this national policy. This is a responsibility which requires a most careful weighing of alternatives. More importantly, it requires a willingness to take a long view of the prospects—both within the markets and in relation to the overall goals of the business world wide.

That illustrates exactly the position taken up by that company: it does not want to interfere with the internal policies of a country into which it intends to go; it examines those internal policies and then decides whether it will go to that country. There is no doubt that within the last two years there has been a great falling off in industrial development in South Australia. Only a few industries have been opened in South Australia in the last two

years, and almost without exception the ground work in their establishment was done before the last election.

On a per capita basis, South Australia is the most industrialized State in the Commonwealth, but the impetus that was so important to it has slowed down quickly. I believe we must accept the fact (and I know members opposite sometimes talk with two voices on this matter) that South Australia cannot dominate the Australian economy. We have only about 10 per cent of Australia's population, and the rest of Australia does not have to follow what we do. I do not believe any State can dominate the Australian economy. Therefore, whether we like it or not, we must live by the Australian standards. I believe South Australia can prosper within the Australian standards but we cannot prosper if we try to get ahead of those standards. After all, I do not think any member opposite would say that it is better for a man to be unemployed than to have to work according to the Australian standards, and they are the alternatives.

The other evening I was interested to hear a broadcast by the Premier about price control. As I listened to it I thought, "He is beginning to learn!" I hope the members for Adelaide and Port Adelaide did not hear the Premier's remarks because they might not regard the remarks as conforming to Labor policy. Nevertheless, in this statement the Premier came as close to fundamentals as he has come on anything else I have heard him say. In a telecast on ADS7 on June 14, 1967, he said:

Secondly, because of this lower cost of living in so many things, wages can be lower in South Australia than in other places.

I am sorry that the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) is not in the House to hear this. The present Premier is remarkably good in debate and I have not the facility that he possesses. I speak only as an applegrower and as one who will not be able to speak for much longer. The late Right Hon. W. M. Hughes once said, "I speak with a dying voice." I am a simple man. Be that as it may, the Premier went on to say:

This does not mean less purchasing power but what it does mean is that you get more for your money in South Australia.

That was the position that my Government strove for so long to obtain and maintain. It was the reason why my Government maintained price control although the Governments of all other States had relinquished it,

and that is conveniently forgotten by members opposite. However, the fundamental point is that we in South Australia cannot economically control the Commonwealth. We can live within the economy of the Commonwealth and do well but we must maintain a standard that is based on the Australian standard, because whether we like it or not South Australian industries must export 80 per cent of their production to other States and, in addition, must compete with similar industries already established in other States.

I am sorry that the member for Adelaide has come back too late to hear the gem that I especially prepared for him, because he had made some comments on this matter a few days ago. In addition, the member for Port Pirie made some comments today. If the new Director of Industrial Development is capable and enterprising (and I know nothing to the contrary) he ought to be able to find the opportunity for industry to be established. Members opposite, and members generally, have taken the view that it is necessary to look for an industry. However, what is required is that we look for an opportunity for an industry to invest.

I have no doubt that \$20,000,000 is available immediately overseas, and probably a similar amount is available in Australia, for investment in a worthwhile proposition. We have to look not for some high-sounding name but for a commodity which can be manufactured in South Australia but which is not being manufactured here at present at all or manufactured as efficiently as we can manufacture it. That proposition begins to reduce the amount that we can do about the establishment of industry. I was able to secure for South Australia the Uniroyal Tyre Company, which I think operates in the District of Gawler. In New York I told the President of the company, "Here is a population of 1,000,000, a large percentage of which owns motor cars, and there is no tyre factory in South Australia."

In other words, the problem was to find not the company but an outlet for the company's activity. I say without any political motive, because I have no such motive in this debate except as may best serve South Australia, that we are losing a tremendous opportunity. In the last two or three days I have asked questions about what has been happening to the equipment that the previous Government purchased for oil exploration, the two immensely costly seismic plants, and also about what boring was taking place in the Great Artesian Basin in South Australia. From a reply given this

afternoon by the Minister of Lands I understand that the two seismic plants are not operating at all: they are in mothballs. As far as I know, they have not operated for more than a year.

In addition, although much gas has been found in the Great Artesian Basin, not even one boring plant is operating there today. Would any other country develop its oil resources in that way? Would not the Playford Government have had this immense potential explored? Members opposite are silent on this matter. Two gas fields were located and the first, Gidgealpa, was completely investigated by the previous Government, with the field's potential being checked and rechecked by several authorities. I believe that the second field has three productive and two unproductive holes but, although nothing has been adequately proved, the boring plants have been shifted. Now, we appoint a Director of Industrial Development. Isn't it a sorry picture? This State, always starved of industrial fuel, has occasionally imported coal from Africa and India, but by the enterprising efforts of the Electricity Trust we have effectively developed a low-grade coalfield 170 miles from the coast. And that was when we had only two typistes!

Mr. Bockelberg: And they did other things in addition.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, and I understand that it takes 17 people to do the same thing today. Government members know that the other gas field should be developed and that boring plants should be operating on it, but no Government action is forthcoming. If this State is to develop we must realize the urgency of this matter. When the last election was held, resulting in the present Government assuming office, much work had been done at Whyalla and Iron Knob concerning the development of iron-ore deposits, other than the high-grade deposits which were of such quality and nearness to the coast that they practically developed themselves. It was a rich field, well located, and, without any pressure, the company developed it.

Associated with the high-grade ore deposits were two types of ore, one of which was a screen ore contaminated with clays, making it unattractive. However, because of work done by the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited and the laboratories established by the previous Government, a method was found of cleaning this ore, and a screen ore plant was established at Iron Knob. It operated successfully and has been expanded since the original plant was built. The other ore, jaspilite, found

in immense quantities in the Middleback Ranges, will be of great significance to the future of the State. It is a low-grade ore contaminated with silica and extremely hard but, in America, it is used for much of the iron production. The quantity of high-grade ore at Iron Knob and the Middleback Ranges is limited, but the quantity of jaspilite is unlimited.

The Mines Department established that there were thousands of millions of tons of this ore, but it is extremely hard and a problem has existed to separate the silica from the iron content in order to make a fuel that would be satisfactory for use in blast furnaces. The Mines Department and the B.H.P. Company investigated this problem, with the company establishing a plant at Whyalla at a cost of about \$500,000. Experiments were conducted for 18 months, and it was found conclusively that by a heat treatment this ore could be made magnetic and could be changed from a hard to a pliable material. It could be easily ground and put over a magnetic separator, then made into high-quality pellets to be used in blast furnaces. Why did this work cease two years ago? Apparently, this work has been completely forgotten, but now we intend to build a pipeline from Gidgealpa to Adelaide for natural gas, which could be the key to cheap fuel necessary for the heat treatment of this ore. Members who represent the area seem to be complacent about the pipeline and its route. However, I believe that any problem about the route should be resolved in favour of the tremendous industrial potential that exists along the western, rather than the eastern, side of the ranges. One of the present gaps in South Australia's economy stems from our having to import nitrogenous manures from Germany, Japan and Norway as well as some from the Eastern States.

What is the key to nitrogenous manure production? Natural gas (provided the price is right)! The member for Wallaroo knows that an oversea organization was anxious to engage in this production at Wallaroo. He knows, too, that the pipeline will not be close to Wallaroo, and no doubt he will discover in due course what will happen the moment additional cost is added to the gas. Having made personal investigations in this regard, I know that the cost of gas and electricity is a fundamental consideration in respect of the industry concerned. If the gas and electricity could be provided at the right price, an industry with

a world market could be established, or we could at least have a South Australian market capable of spreading into Victoria.

Mr. McKee: There's a problem now in the acceptance of a price; do you want to make the gas dearer?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member should think before he speaks. I have already pointed out that the previous Liberal Government invested \$90,000 in having the Philips organization established in this State and that that organization now spends four times that sum each week in wages.

Mr. Hall: How much has been spent in Whyalla on a water main?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: We were confronted with a loss of \$140,000 a year but we swallowed that loss. In fact, I doubt whether the main pays its way even at this stage.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: We paid it out of the Budget, too.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: For the benefit of the member for Port Pirie, I point out that we also made some concessions in regard to the establishment of the zinc metal industry. We are not keeping a shop; we are running a State. We must be prepared to back our judgment and to invest in the future. Unfortunately, the Premier is mesmerized by the previous Liberal Government; he is always looking back to see what that Government did. He has the argument both ways, because if it is something he does not want to do he says that the previous Government did not do it, but if the previous Government did something, he uses that as an excuse.

Mr. McKee: The State has never been run so well.

Mr. Coumbe: Run down so well!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Not long ago Port Pirie was in the doldrums, and I was pleased to hear the honourable member say recently that the district now enjoyed great prosperity. Of course, he assumed that he was the culprit, but he is not the father of the child at all: he only thinks he is!

Mr. McKee: When I came into the House the Port Pirie wharf had fallen down; your Government didn't spend azac on us.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I suggest that the honourable member have one of those high-powered American private eyes investigate what has been going on behind his back. Port Pirie's prosperity does not arise out of any action taken by the present Government but out of the fact that for about seven

years the then Director of Mines analysed the position with the full support of the two typistes and me. We investigated a large zinc deposit in the form of dumpings from the lead foundry. At the time, of course, the honourable member was asleep.

Mr. McKee: Don't be rude.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: We then set about discussing with the Broken Hill Associated Smelters the development of that large quantity of material to render it useful. At that stage the Tasmanian Government came into the picture and offered—

Mr. McKee: It frightened you into going ahead with it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I can understand why the honourable member is a little perturbed. The Tasmanian Government came in and said, "If you will transfer the material so that it is treated in Tasmania, we will give you the electricity at only a quarter of the price you can get it in South Australia." As this was an electrolytic process, that was an important consideration. Did the South Australian Liberal Government of the day sit down? No, we made ourselves competitive and, as a result, the honourable member who is interjecting has all the home comforts he wants without any effort on his part.

The eastern route of the pipeline will not stand analysis in the long term. When the industrial potential of this State, particularly of the north of the State, is considered from the long-term point of view, the eastern route is unjustified. When we consider the potential of Whyalla, we must strongly favour having the pipeline significantly closer to the bigger industrial centres—the future big industrial centres of Australia. The honourable member for Port Pirie cannot deny that the establishment of the eastern route will do a dis-service to Port Pirie. That is why he is getting so excited this afternoon. He knows that the eastern route is not the proper route.

If we consider only the short-term aspect and whether the cost will be 30c or 29.75c per million British thermal units, the eastern route may be justified, but surely we should have more imagination concerning future possibilities. When the Morgan-Whyalla main was established, we had customers to take annually 500,000,000 gallons of water. The B.H.P. Company wanted 200,000,000 gallons, Port Pirie 100,000,000 gallons and, with considerable difficulty, we were able to sell 100,000,000 gallons on Yorke Peninsula. This pipeline was capable of conveying 1,000,000,000 gallons to the northern towns of this State, and another

1,000,000,000 gallons to Whyalla. In other words we built a pipeline that could supply four times the amount of water required. However, it is rather interesting to note that in 14 years we were up against it and, on one occasion, had to impose rationing.

Mr. McKee: Did you put the water where it was not required?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Minister of Works will agree that no State in the Commonwealth, or any country in the world, has done more for water reticulation than has South Australia. After all, South Australia is the driest State in the driest continent, yet over 95 per cent of our population can turn on a Government tap at any time, and restrictions are practically unknown. Indeed, the industrialization of South Australia has, to a large extent, depended on the adequacy of the water supply. The only criticism I have of the motion is that it does not go far enough. While it is necessary to appoint a Director and to have a Minister to control the department, I believe it is also necessary to have policies that enable the department to function. However, we have failed in our public policies, which have been dominated by a socialistic approach that is completely uncongenial to private enterprise. This Government believes in taxing private enterprise, and this taxation has undoubtedly increased the cost of production in this State to a level that makes it not nearly so attractive to come here as it was previously. For the benefit of members, I recall the following words of the philosopher Santayana:

Those who do not remember the past are condemned to repeat it.

I support the motion.

Mr. BROOMHILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens, for the Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer), obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Succession Duties Act, 1929-1963. Read a first time.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The amendments contained in this Bill are five-fold. First, the provisions in Part IVa of the principal Act relating to special rebates and exemptions for persons dying as a result of military service are to be extended to any person serving in an area proclaimed by the

Governor. This will enable the provisions to apply to persons serving in Vietnam or in other operations which may be proclaimed. Secondly, it provides for parents of an illegitimate child to pay duty on any property left to either of them by such child at the same rate as if the child were legitimate. Thirdly, it allows the Minister to direct that in the case of a *de facto* adoption of a child, that child shall pay succession duty at the same rate as a child who has been legally adopted. Fourthly, it clarifies the provisions relating to exemptions where the purpose is for the advancement of religion and, finally, it provides that bequests to any university in this State shall be exempt from succession duty. I shall now deal with the clauses individually.

Clause 3 inserts a new paragraph in section 55aa (1) of the principal Act. This section confers a remission of succession duty on the estates of persons who died on active service in the world wars, in Malaya or Korea. The new paragraph extends the scope of this section to any proclaimed areas or operations and may thus be applied to members of the forces who die in Vietnam or Malaysia or in any operation that may be proclaimed, subject to the limitation that the death must be caused by wounds, an accident or a disease and must occur within 12 months thereafter.

Clause 4 (a) raises the amount of the exemption referred to previously from \$10,000 to \$20,000 and clause 4 (b) provides that the foregoing new provisions will apply to persons dying on active service in any such area, even if the death occurred before the Bill becomes law. Clause 5 inserts a new subsection into section 56a of the principal Act. This new subsection provides that the parent of an illegitimate child, who derives property from that child, whether under an intestacy or not, shall pay duty at the same rate as if the child were legitimate. Clause 6 inserts a new section in the principal Act. This new section provides that where a person derives property on the death of a child who was not legally adopted by such a person the Minister may direct that the duty payable shall be the same as if the child had been legally adopted. The matter is in the discretion of the Minister and the provision is designed to cover cases of hardship.

Clause 7 amends the Second Schedule to the principal Act. It provides for lower rates of duty in connection with property passing for the purpose of the advancement of religion, science or education by limiting the provision to cases where the sole or predominant purpose is one of those mentioned. It also provides

for a complete exemption of duty for gifts to any university in the State; at present the exemption is limited to the University of Adelaide but this amendment is necessary so that the exemption may also apply to the Flinders University. Clause 8 is a simple amendment relating to decimal currency.

Mr. NANKIVELL secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSOLIDATION BILLS COMMITTEE.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens, for the Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer), moved:

That the House of Assembly request the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment for the present session of a joint committee to which all Consolidation Bills shall stand referred, in accordance with Joint Standing Order No. 18, and to which any further questions relative thereto may at any time be sent by either House for report.

That, in the event of the joint committee being appointed, the House of Assembly be represented thereon by three members, two of whom shall form the quorum of the Assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolutions.

That the Premier (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) and Messrs. Hudson and Millhouse be representatives of the Assembly on the said committee.

Motion carried.

LICENSING BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from March 22. Page 4051.)

Clause 2—"Division of Act."

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): I move:

That the Bill be amended *pro forma*.

Agreement to this motion will mean that there will be no further proceedings on the Bill in this present Committee. The Bill will be reprinted to incorporate the Government amendments and then members will have available to them the original Bill, a schedule of amendments and a reprint of the Bill which incorporates those amendments. On a future date this amended Bill will be recommitted and considered in Committee in the normal way and be subject to the usual examination and discussion and admission of further amendments. This procedure in no way prejudices or curtails members' rights and opportunities, but is designed to be helpful to a proper consideration of this important measure.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I should like to ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman,

regarding the many amendments on the file other than Government amendments. If the Minister's motion is carried, does that mean that the amendments of private members will not be considered? If that is the case, I object strongly. I have an amendment to clause 4 and, although the Government has a similar amendment, it is in a different form. Will amendments of private members be included if the motion is carried?

The CHAIRMAN: If the motion is carried, Government amendments only will be included in the Bill at this stage. However, when the Bill is again before the Committee an amendment moved by any member will be considered at that stage.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I rise on a point of order. If the Government's amendments are included in the Bill when it comes back to Committee, the Chairman will rule me out of order because the amendment is already in the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: That is not necessarily so. I point out to the honourable member that last session we had a position similar to that which has arisen today and no question was raised then about the acceptance of the motion "That the Bill be amended *pro forma*".

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Have I your assurance that my amendment will be considered when clause 4 is being dealt with?

The CHAIRMAN: I have given my assurance that the amendment would be considered but I am not saying that it will be in order. I am not, without knowing what the amendment is, guaranteeing that it will be in order, but any amendment will be considered.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: If a private member's amendment is substantially similar to a provision in the revised Bill, will the private member be precluded from taking the action and initiative that he desired to take?

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner), when he was Speaker, ruled that neither the Speaker nor the Chairman was required to answer a hypothetical question.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the amendments on the file are not treated as I have suggested, I must object. I was in favour of the procedure that the Minister outlined: in fact, I made a suggestion to the Premier. However, the Opposition cannot accept that all Government amendments go in *pro forma* and that all Opposition amendments be deleted *pro forma*. If the Premier moves

that all amendments go in *pro forma*, I shall support him. If he does not, I shall move an amendment to his motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I support the member for Gumeracha. I point out to the Government that this is not a typical Bill, in that it is a Bill on which we are supposed to be voting on non-Party lines, and that the attitude of the present Premier when he introduced the Bill as Attorney-General was that he would throw the Bill into the ring and that any member could move any amendment he desired to move. Now we are faced with about 150 amendments apparently moved by the Premier and sponsored by him and the Government, so it is difficult to know what the position is. In view of the Premier's attitude when he merely introduced a Bill that any member could move to amend, I cannot accept that the Government's amendments must take precedence, as must be the case if the motion is carried in its present form.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): When I prepared the amendments after a series of submissions had been made to me by interested organizations, I gave members an undertaking that the amendments would be placed on the file, together with an explanation, so that members could see what I, as Minister in charge of the Bill, was prepared to accept.

Mr. Millhouse: Well, you will move them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. That would give members an opportunity to consider what further amendments, if any, they wished to move. When I gave that assurance, I was asked by Opposition members whether I would then proceed to incorporate my amendments so that we would have the Bill as it would come before Parliament from the Minister in charge of it. I have made all the arrangements so that we would not have to go through a whole series of separate amendments but would have the proposition that I, as Minister in charge, wanted to submit. That procedure would simplify the whole proceedings of the Committee. I agreed to this course and put the Government Printer out somewhat to ensure that that procedure was followed. We did exactly what we were asked to do and now we are told that what we did was wrong!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the Premier listens, he will realize that there is not much difficulty about the matter. One recommendation by the Royal Commission was not included in the Bill as introduced. In my speech on the second reading I gave notice of an amendment along the lines of a recommendation by the Royal Commissioner. I gave

the Parliamentary Draftsman an instruction to prepare an amendment, which is to clause 4, and he has done that and the amendment has been placed on the file. The Government now proposes that that amendment will be included in its amendments, although in a slightly different form that will not be acceptable to me.

I asked whether acceptance of the Government's amendments *pro forma* would preclude my moving my amendment. If you, Mr. Chairman, had given me an assurance that my amendment would not be ruled out of order because the provision was in another place, I would not now raise the matter. However, you will not give me an assurance that I may move the amendment. I shall not accept that an amendment cannot be moved by a member of the Committee, especially as I was the first to give notice of the amendment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I intend to ensure that every amendment sought in substance, whether to the Bill as it stood when it lapsed last session or to the Bill as now printed *pro forma*, will be considered by the Committee and I give the honourable member the assurance that I shall give him every facility to do that.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Before the Premier returned to the Chamber, I had asked whether, if the subject matter of a private member's amendment was substantially similar to a provision in the Bill, the private member would have the right to move his amendment. You, Mr. Chairman, ruled that it was a hypothetical question and you would not answer it. The Opposition desires definite assurances. The Premier has given an assurance that seems to override your ruling.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I cannot override the Chairman of Committees. I have said that we will see to it that the procedures are such that members will have the opportunity to have their amendments considered.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: We have had no assurance from you, Sir, and we have a valid doubt.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chairman determines points of order as they arise. That has always been the procedure since I have been a member of the Committee, and I shall continue to follow it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Before the member for Gumeracha raised the present matter the Minister of Works read what purported to be an explanation of what was to happen. Unhappily for me, it was far from clear what is intended. Now that amendments are to be

accepted *pro forma* it is possible for other members to consider further amendments they wish to place on the file. This process will take time because members will need assistance from the Parliamentary Draftsman. I know that he has problems of overwork, about which he tells us from time to time. As there should be ample time between now and the debating of the Bill to enable amendments to be properly prepared, can the Premier say when it is intended that this Bill should be debated?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I expect that this can be done next week. I shall try to ensure that assistance is given to those members who need further drafting assistance. Although we have had an enormous number of requests, many of the submissions having been incorporated in the amendments now on file, the different issues raised by interested parties in addition to those requests are fairly limited, and I expect that the honourable member should be able to get his amendments drafted within the next few days. The Parliamentary Draftsman will be made available for that purpose.

Motion carried.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 11. Page 483.)

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): This important measure deals with the health of the community, which is a matter worthy of being fully considered by this House. Cattle compensation was first introduced in 1939, and the Act has been amended several times. The fund, built up by a stamp duty levied on the sale of cattle, now stands at about \$275,000. The real purpose of the Bill is to give power to the Minister to meet the cost of the programme to control bovine tuberculosis, contagious abortion or brucellosis (controlled by Strain 19), Johnes disease, and actinomycosis, with which cattle owners are concerned. Certain areas of the State are now controlled for tuberculosis testing, but most of the State does not come within the ambit of this control.

The testing programme has been successful, because in 1953-54 about 33,000 cattle were tested and 108 reactors were found, whereas in 1965-66, 43,000 were tested and only 20 reactors found. In 1954 compensation was paid in respect of 248 cattle, and in 1966 for 174. Although the number of reactors has been

reduced, an increase in disease has occurred in the number of cattle for slaughter, which emphasizes the need to increase the investigation beyond the areas that are now subject to testing. It will be difficult for the staff of the Agriculture Department to conduct testing throughout the State. Private veterinary practitioners do much of this work under contract, but more officers will be needed. Testing should be carried out more frequently because, at present, there is an interval of 10 years between the first testing and the next examination of the herd.

For the dairy and beef industries to be placed on a sound footing (which we all desire) and to be free of disease, so that our exports will be guaranteed free of disease and thus demand a premium from countries seeking our products, we should strongly emphasize the current expansion in the cattle industry and the present value of cattle. More officers will be needed in the field and in killing works where inspection and identification are important, because this work requires devotion and vigilance by people who are responsible to ensure that a high standard is maintained.

Although this Act has been amended several times and the levy reduced, any improvements and increases in controls and testing will require additional money. We must be clear about what is involved. The fund must be maintained in a balanced state so that sufficient finance will be available to do the work notwithstanding the expansion envisaged in the Bill. I am aware that money available from the Commonwealth extension fund complements the valuable cattle investigation work that is undertaken. However, the second reading explanation is somewhat nebulous in that regard. The project is sound and effective, and we should do everything within our power to produce a first-class article. By eradicating such diseases as tuberculosis and brucellosis, we shall make for a healthier community and establish a widely sought export product.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I support the Bill. The measure contains a provision that is essential in maintaining the high standards that have been established over the years in protecting cattle in South Australia. Ovine brucellosis is a prevalent disease in certain parts of the State, although it is not particularly widespread in the North. Compensation is paid to the owners of diseased cattle; indeed, I recall that several years ago the legislation was amended to increase compensation payable from about \$40 to \$120, which was more in

keeping with modern requirements. The main purpose of this Bill is to authorize the payment of compensation out of the fund rather than out of General Revenue. Indeed, that is specifically why the fund was first established. As interest will be paid on money held, the fund will be kept buoyant. In addition to the payment of compensation, expenses will also be paid to the veterinary surgeons who travel throughout the State for the purpose of treating cattle.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Establishment of cattle compensation fund."

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Lands say what expansion is envisaged and how the money in the fund will be applied?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands): Although I believe substantially more will be spent in future than is being spent at present, I doubt whether anybody can forecast the end result.

Clause passed.

Clause 8 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 11. Page 483.)

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I support the Bill, which is small and has two objectives: first, to extend for two years the life of the Land Settlement Committee and, secondly, to extend the committee's powers in the western division of the South-East. Probably the Land Settlement Committee has lost some of the work it had previously in connection with the war service land settlement scheme. The quantity of its work has been reduced substantially although it has had additional duties given to it in regard to the Rural Advances Guarantee Act.

The process of obtaining a rural advance necessitates consideration by the Land Settlement Committee. This is an extremely worthwhile provision. The Rural Advances Guarantee Act has worked satisfactorily, as far as it has been used, partly because of the requirement that the committee shall consider matters associated with it. It is rather a pity that the Rural Advances Guarantee Act has not operated more widely than it has. Within the

last few years, it seems to have been less and less usable. The reason for that is another matter, which I do not intend to go into now. Although the work of the Land Settlement Committee is not so onerous at present, its existence is justified, and I support the provision in the Bill that relates to it.

I also support the extension of the provisions of section 27a for another two years. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

These powers have not, in fact, so far been used but it is thought that it may be useful to extend their duration to correspond with the life of the committee.

That is interesting because, when these powers were debated in Parliament in 1948, they were responsible for one of the most vigorous discussions I can recall. In spite of that, the powers have not actually been used. This case could act as a good example to guide us. Even though we think it necessary at times to have most sweeping powers to carry out some legislative act, in fact it is often quite unnecessary to use those powers. We should be careful not to provide for more power than we actually need. I support the second reading.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I, too, support the Bill. The Land Settlement Committee was established in about 1944 in relation to the acquisition of land for closer settlement. More recently its functions have been restricted to two fields, and the quantity of work done by the committee (and I speak with some experience, having been Chairman of the committee) has been progressively reduced over the last few years. Of course, before 1960 there was a period when the committee did not function at all. More recently the committee has been concerned with two functions towards both of which it is an essential adjunct; therefore, it would be difficult not to support the Bill. Section 23 of the Act states:

(1) It shall not be lawful for any person to introduce into either House of Parliament any Bill—

(a) authorizing the carrying out of any land settlement proposal estimated to cost more than \$60,000; or

(b) appropriating money for expenditure on any land settlement proposal estimated to cost more than \$60,000,

unless that proposal has first been inquired into by the committee in the manner provided by this section.

That means that the drainage proposals in the South-East that have largely taken up the activities of the committee in the past few years cannot be proceeded with unless they are inquired into and reported on by the committee.

Also, as the member for Alexandra said, in 1963 the House passed the Rural Advances Guarantee Act which sets out specifically that applications must be referred to the committee for recommendations to the Treasurer. In view of the fact that this committee is essential to the functioning of two Acts, I have no hesitation in supporting the second reading.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): The member for Alexandra said that the duties of the Land Settlement Committee appeared to be getting less onerous and, perhaps, less in volume. The South-East now has an extensive system of drainage. Recently some concern has been expressed in many places at over-drainage. We will have wet seasons again as sure as hens will lay small eggs, so there is a need to look at the matter of drains. Last week the matter of the McDonald ponding was discussed. The Land Settlement Committee could perform an important function by looking at this aspect of ponding and by examining the further use of drains in the South-East. For this reason if for no other, I support the Bill.

[*Sitting suspended from 5.14 to 7.30 p.m.*]

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I support this Bill in every respect, mainly because it does what is required, as the members for Alexandra and Albert have said. The Land Settlement Committee has to perform the important task of making inspections, advising the Treasurer about applications under the Rural Advances Guarantee Act, and advising the Minister of Lands about drainage in the South-East. Therefore, it is imperative that such a committee continue to operate. Since the passing of the Rural Advances Guarantee Act in 1963, 99 applications by people wishing to take up rural occupations have been approved through either the State Bank or the State Savings Bank and one investigation is pending. Since the passing of the Act only two guarantees have been discharged and repayment of advances under the Act made.

I think this shows how capable members are of dealing with matters before them and of making recommendations to the Treasurer. Next Monday the committee will be examining the matter of future extensions to drainage work in the South-East. This is of importance not only to the people in the area concerned but also in the interests of the whole rural development of the State. I sincerely trust that this committee will function for many years and so assist the Government, particularly in rural matters.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 11. Page 484.)

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I have discussed this Bill with the Secretary of the Local Government Association (Mr. Smith), who informs me that he has not seen it. As I am still awaiting confirmation from that association that it agrees with these amendments (as was suggested in the second reading explanation), I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

MORPHETT STREET BRIDGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 11. Page 490.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): This, a simple Bill, but one with which I am not happy, amends the Morphett Street Bridge Act which, passed in 1964, sets out the agreement with the Adelaide City Council to construct bridges across the railway lines and Torrens River on the road leading from Adelaide to North Adelaide, forming a major highway from the city to the northern suburbs and passing Montefiore Hill and the site of the proposed festival hall. The present bridge construction is ahead of schedule; the bridge seems to be an extremely graceful structure, and when completed it will fulfil a useful purpose.

When this legislation was introduced in 1964, being a hybrid Bill, it was examined by a Select Committee, which heard evidence from several witnesses concerning whether the bridge should be built in its present position. The committee considered the methods by which the building of the bridge should be financed, and also the details of the agreement between the Government and the Adelaide City Council. Following its consideration by the Select Committee, the Bill was referred back to this House and one condition laid down in the committee's report was that half of the Government's contribution should come from Highways Department funds and half from Loan funds. This Bill, however, provides the whole of this amount shall be taken from highways funds.

Members of the Select Committee were unanimous in their report, which was supported in this House not only by the member for Adelaide and myself but by every other member. Subsequently, the Bill went to the other place where it was also supported unanimously. So,

members of Parliament at that time were unanimous that this was the best way to finance the construction. However, this Bill alters the conditions laid down by the Select Committee, and for this reason I oppose it.

We are considering today an arrangement that has not been referred back to a Select Committee. We find that the Government now for its own good purposes is trying to vary the procedure. I emphasize that the rights, conditions and privileges of the Adelaide City Council are in no way affected: we are only talking about the share of the money that the State Government has to find from various funds.

First, I pose the question: would the members of the Select Committee have agreed that all the Government's contribution towards this construction should have come from highways funds? I do not know, nor does any member of this House. However, the committee at that time did agree that half the Government's contribution should come from highways funds and half from Loan funds. When we remember the way in which the highways funds have been raided lately, I doubt whether it would be agreed, if the investigation that then took place were being held now, that the whole of the Government's contribution should come from highways funds, which are being used today for purposes never before contemplated (although these purposes are legitimate).

Secondly, I raise the question of highways funds being used for Loan or Revenue purposes. The Minister in his second reading explanation said that the statutory account attracts substantial interest from the Commonwealth Government and that certain amounts are being retained in highways funds, but last year an extra \$1,000,000 was taken from these funds and paid into general revenue, and it is intended to do this again this year.

When we consider all these points we realize that fewer roads will be built in this State and that less money will be spent on roads. This is not the only amount that is being taken from highways funds; I refer members to the reply I received from the Minister of Roads about a fortnight ago to questions concerning the financing of the new wing of the Highways Department building at Walkerville. The answer given was that the whole cost of erecting this wing was to come from highways funds, and the amount was not small—\$1,762,324. I have specifically referred to this because, when the original building was erected

four or five years ago, it was financed from Loan funds. After the Public Works Committee investigated and reported favourably on the project, work commenced under the former Liberal Government and was financed from Loan funds. The new wing was then announced and a preliminary investigation was subsequently made. Although I know that additional work must proceed, I point out that the whole of the money is coming out of the Highways Fund and that, therefore, less money (\$1,762,324) will be available for roadworks. I do not think that would appeal to country members.

We have seen the Government adopting the principle of taking money from the Highways Fund to bolster the Loan Account; indeed, we saw that happen in respect of the two major bridges that were investigated by the Public Works Committee (the Jervois bridge and the proposed Kingston bridge). I remind members that the whole of the motoring public contributes, through the payment of registration and licence fees, to the Highways Fund. Indeed, it was always understood that the fund was sacrosanct. Although it may be argued that a bridge is a roadwork, I point out that it is about time we stopped raiding the Highways Fund and let the Highways Commissioner get on with the job of building more roads in the State. I suggest that the Minister of Roads would not be at all happy about the Bill and, indeed, that the Highways Commissioner would be even more unhappy about it.

I strongly doubt whether the Minister of Roads supports the Treasurer in respect of this matter. Do members opposite know what their Treasurer is doing in his efforts to balance the Budget? If this means that the Budget is being balanced (bearing in mind the announcements made in His Excellency's Speech), any Budget can be balanced if we fiddle the accounts sufficiently. I suggest that the present method of financing the bridge be left alone; it is working well, and the Bill is not at all necessary. The fact that the Treasurer has gone to such lengths to explain and justify his action makes me wonder about the measure, even though I appreciate the information he has given. It is wrong that, after a Select Committee investigated and reported unanimously on the matter (that report being supported unanimously by both Houses), the agreement is now to be varied. So, Sir, I suggest to the House that this amending Bill should not be agreed to and that the Act should remain unaltered.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support entirely what the previous speaker has said. I was a member of the Select Committee that recommended to Parliament that a certain procedure be followed, and I object strongly to the Government's altering the terms of the reference which we had before us and on which we reported. This proposed action by the Government reminds me of the cartoon that we used to see depicting "Famous Last Words". One of the Labor Party's Saturday commentaries in the newspaper shortly after it assumed office claimed that we now had a Government that would assess the highways position accurately.

The spokesman said the Government would give to the councils amounts that they would have for the full year, and that there would not be the old procedure of a sort of supplementary contribution to local government at the end of the year. This Government stressed strongly that under this new management that old procedure would not apply. However, in March we had the engineers of the Highways Department going around to councils and telling them that no more money would be available this year from the Highways Fund, and the councils in consequence cut down on their allocations for works, but within the space of a month this Government, which was going to forecast accurately what local government was going to be able to spend, came out and said, "Here are additional funds for you to spend; you have to spend them before the end of June."

I know that in one instance the District Clerk of a council told a contractor that the council had so much to spend for the rest of this financial year; and he ordered the contractor to go up to such and such a road and spend money as quickly as he could so that the council could qualify for this grant. This is just another demonstration of the way in which this Government has proved itself inadequate in coping with financial problems of the State. For any organization to exist there must be some degree of financial assessment and budgeting, and that applies to the Government as much as it does to private individuals. The people are lacking confidence in this Government because its failure to forecast and budget accurately has proved detrimental to the affairs of this State.

This Bill covers the circumstances in which the Government has lent money to the Adelaide City Council to be repaid over a certain number of years. This is definitely an item that should come out of Loan funds, because in

lending money the Government has an asset through the fact that the council owes the Government money and that this is to be repaid over a certain number of years. This Bill proposes that the money will come out of the Revenue Account and the revenue of the Highways Department that has been collected from the people of South Australia in the form of motor registration fees, licence fees, and road maintenance tax. This money will come also from petrol tax collected for the express purpose of building roads.

The Government now intends to collect money from these funds and to pay it into an account for a specific purpose, namely, to lend money to the City Council. The Treasurer has got up and abused companies over the way they conduct their affairs. Companies should carry out certain definite lines of financial management but, if a company acted in a way similar to the way in which the Government is acting in this connection, the Treasurer would be the first to scream that it was an improper practice. What the Government is doing is bad bookkeeping procedure. It is not in the interests of the State to use the Highways Fund for this purpose when we need roads so badly. In fact, the Road Transport Association and various other bodies claim that the lack of adequate roads in South Australia costs \$2,000,000 a day, although I do not know how that figure is arrived at. Therefore, for the Government to cut down in any way on the roads programme is definitely not in the interests of the State.

Since its election, the Government has not succeeded because it has given hand-outs to the community by way of long service leave, additional annual leave and so on, thus diverting its finances away from developmental works, investment into which results in a greater production of goods from which every section of the community benefits. The Government's narrow-minded viewpoint of trying to give things to a small section of the community rather than attending to matters in their correct order of priority has resulted in the situation in which the State finds itself today: people are leaving South Australia and building up the populations of other States.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I join with other members, who have spoken tonight, in protesting at this Bill. As is usual with this Government, one gets little time indeed to consider legislation brought before the House. The second reading explanation having been given only yesterday, we are supposed to go on with the Bill this evening. As I understand the purport of the Bill, the whole thing is simply

to provide that in future the Government's contribution to the Morphett Street bridge shall be out of the Highways Fund instead of out of the Loan Fund. Of course, the Loan Fund is being used to prop up the ordinary revenue of the State.

Mr. Coumbe: It is fiddling.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Whatever we call it, the Government cannot escape the consequences. Whether we say the Government balances its Budget by transferring moneys from one account to another or by debiting certain works against one account or another, the fact remains that the accounts of the State are now kept on a less satisfactory and lower standard than they were during the time of the Playford Government.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What rubbish!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has it ever happened in the State before that bridge works have been paid for out of the Highways Fund? The arrangement in the original Act was entered into during the time of the Playford Government and, as I understand the member for Torrens has already said, it was agreed to unanimously by a Select Committee and by both Houses. What is the Government doing now because it cannot afford to pay for everything that it wants to do out of its Revenue Account? It is transferring items to Loan Account. Therefore, they are paid for out of the Loan Account and now because the Loan Account is running a bit low and because the Government still has this obligation for the Morphett Street bridge, the Government goes to the No. 3 account, which is the Highways Fund. The Treasurer can grin in that apish way if he likes. I do not know whether or not he calls this a joke, but I do not call it a joke.

Mr. McKEE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I take exception to the remark of the member for Mitcham about the apish way in which the Treasurer is supposed to be looking. I think that is a most unkind, ungentlemanly and unparliamentary thing to say.

The SPEAKER: What was the word used?

Mr. McKee: "Apish".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: You should have seen the Treasurer's face, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Clark: You should see yours now!

The SPEAKER: I do not intend to call the honourable member to order on this occasion but I suggest he be careful with his statements in future

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for not pulling me up, but the fact is that the Premier was grinning at what I was saying.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will address himself to the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. The only point of the Bill is that, instead of the contribution of the Government for the Morphett Street bridge works being paid out of the Loan Fund, it now is to come out of the Highways Fund. That is further proof of a lower standard of State accounting than we have had in the past. Members opposite cannot get away from that. They can argue that this brings us down to the same standard as has been adopted in other States, but it is a lower standard than we have had previously in this State. What does it mean? It means that there is less money than hitherto in the Highways Fund for the construction and maintenance of roads. I may be wrong—

Mr. McKee: You are wrong.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Am I wrong in my conclusions about the purport of this Bill? Am I wrong in that, Mr. Speaker? Of course I am not wrong.

Mr. Hughes: Of course you are.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let the member for Wallaroo follow me and say where I am wrong. The fact is that money for the bridge works is now coming from the Highways Fund instead of from the Loan Fund because there is not enough money in the Loan Fund as it is being used for Revenue Account purposes. That is the change. Nobody can deny that. This means a lower standard of accounting and that there is less money now than in the past for what have always been regarded as roadworks in this State. I was going on to say, when the member for Port Pirie interrupted me, that I may be wrong but I do not think that the roads in this State are in such a satisfactory condition that we need not spend more money on them. If I am wrong in that, let the honourable gentleman get up and say so. There seems to be plenty of work to be done on our roads, and the Highways Fund is the fund from which the money for those works should come; but it is being reduced to be spent on something else, on bridge works which, as I understand it, have always been paid out of Loan moneys previously. With other members on this side of the House, I emphatically protest at this further demonstration of the lower standard of accounting that

we now have in this State. Let the Treasurer get up, for all his grins, and deny that what I am saying is right.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): This Bill is obviously an attempt on the part of the Government to get the House to agree to what it has been doing in many ways since it took over the Treasury. It has been the practice in this State to use Loan moneys for works of what may be called a **semi-permanent character**—bridges, buildings and the like. In all my experience in the House, Loan funds have been the source from which we have financed such undertakings. Obviously, as the honourable member who has just resumed his seat has said, this is a Loan Account matter. The money from the Highways Fund comes from the taxes paid by people in South Australia in registration and licence fees; also, of course, it comes from taxes paid to the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: But you are not in Government now.

Mr. SHANNON: No, but I merely point out for the benefit of those people not in this Chamber that we are pursuing a course which, of necessity, must mean less money for our roads. It cannot lead to anything else. That is so obvious as not to require explanation. We cannot filch money from the Highways Department for other than road works and still spend as much money on roads. I object to the method by which this State is paying for long-term assets. A life of 50 years is a modest estimate for a bridge or building. The Public Works Committee is at present considering replacing a bridge at Murray Bridge that is about 80 or 90 years old, so it is obvious that the expenditure from current or revenue funds on the new bridge will meet the cost of an asset that will benefit the community for the next 50 or 60 years.

We are tinkering with an important principle when we are tinkering with the Loan Account, which enjoys the benefit of a 53-year term of repayment, and the benefit of Commonwealth assistance in amortization. It is probably expedient for the Treasurer to take such steps but I consider it cheeky of him to bring in a Bill of this kind and flout the House, as he is doing. One of the Treasurer's problems is that he wants to spend more money on other matters, and he is raiding funds. The proposal for a new Marine and Harbors Department office at Port Adelaide has been put into cold storage. Doubtless, when that project comes before the Public Works Com-

mittee for investigation the mode of financing it will be from that department's accumulated profits.

This is not sound finance. It robs the State of the benefit of the agreement between the Commonwealth and the State in relation to amortizing loans over 53 years and it cripples our present roads programme. I do not know what the National Roads Council will think about this exercise when they hear of it. Pressure has been brought on all Parliaments to provide a proper highway linking all Australian capital cities. However, if we go on in this way, it will be a long time before such a link is provided. I object to the use of current Highways Department funds on matters that should be paid for over the full period for which Loan money is available.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I, too, oppose this Bill.

Mr. Burdon: Why?

Mr. HEASLIP: There are so many reasons that I do not need to explain them. The remarks that the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) made about me were undignified and unparliamentary and were such as could come only from an uneducated person such as he. I think it was low and dirty.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is not in order in referring to remarks made in another debate.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am linking up my remarks with the Bill, Mr. Speaker, and I shall explain why. He said, "The honourable member", referring to me—

The SPEAKER: The member for Enfield is not the subject of discussion and the remarks to which the honourable member is referring were not made in the course of this debate.

Mr. HEASLIP: I represent a rural district, and this Bill will deprive the people in my district of funds to which they are entitled and which should be applied to the roads in that district. It has been said that the primary producers are my interest, and that the rest of the people are either robbing or trying to rob primary producers.

Mr. Casey: Who said that?

Mr. HEASLIP: I am not allowed to say that. I resent those remarks. The purpose of the Highways Fund is to build roads and bridges. A bridge is to be built across the Murray River at Kingstons and another is to be built at Port Augusta. These are a claim on the Highways Fund. The Government has seen fit to take \$1,000,000 from the Highways Fund to build additional offices at Walkerville for the Highways Department. That means

that \$1,000,000 will be taken from the fund, and the people in the country, who I am accused of representing, will have to go without. I do not think that any Government should run into such difficulties and then try to cover up its difficulties by robbing one fund or trust funds to balance its revenue accounts—not only try to, but the Government has said that it has balanced the Budget. The Government might be able to fool some people, but anyone who knows anything about accountancy knows that the Government has not balanced the Budget. The Government does not seem to think there is anything wrong in this. The Bill will further raid the fund, and it will upset a decision of a Select Committee, which said that the Government would provide one-half and the other half would come from the Highways Fund, whereas under this Bill the whole amount will come from the Highways Fund. This will again reduce the amount of money for country roads and bridges.

On June 15, 1965, I asked a question about the Laura-Appila road (Appila having been deprived unconstitutionally by the present Government of the right to have a silo) and the sealing of a road from Appila to Laura. The following was the reply I received, which points out clearly how much further this other raid on the fund will affect that road and every other road throughout the country areas:

The Minister of Roads reports that it is planned to commence the sealing of the Laura-Appila road during 1968-69.

Mr. McKee: You were there for 30 years and didn't do anything about it.

Mr. HEASLIP: We did not have silos or bulk handling in those days, as the honourable member should know. The Minister continued:

If funds were allotted before this date it would be at the expense of works of higher priority.

What priority? Obviously, it will lower the priority of other roads, because if the fund is robbed less money will be available for other projects. In this case, instead of waiting for two years the people will have to wait for three years for the roads.

Mr. Clark: Has this never been done before?

Mr. HEASLIP: It has not been done like this by the previous Government.

Mr. Clark: You will be surprised.

Mr. HEASLIP: When investigations were being conducted into the building of Kingston bridge, the cost of which I agree should come from the Highways Fund, we were told that

if more money was spent on that bridge less money would be available for country roads, the building of which would be further delayed. This money will be taken from the Highways Fund and spent on the Morphett Street bridge, so country people will have a further wait before roads are built. This is wrong and improper and, as I do not believe in it, I strongly oppose the Bill.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): The more one studies the proposals in this Bill the more one becomes inclined to rigidly oppose them. I have read again, with much interest and not a little concern, the second reading explanation and have noted carefully the emphasis on various aspects. Previously, I sought information from the Government about the proposal to build the new Highways Department building at Walkerville and the information I obtained disturbed me considerably. Now, we are to see another diversion of Highways Fund money, contrary to the deal originally made when this bridge proposal was put to the Playford Government, and contrary to the arrangement entered into by all parties and validated by this Parliament. I see no justification for altering those arrangements; certainly no validity exists in the argument advanced in the second reading explanation for doing so. It seems that in its rather desperate search for funds the Government has considered every possible pocket into which it can put its hands to relieve the Budget account, and has subtracted something from every pocket, other than genuine revenue money, for its purpose. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

Looking at the situation facing the South Australian Government today, it is clear that all sources of funds are under heavy pressure. He did not need to tell us that: we have been aware of this for the last two years. We have been acutely aware of it and seriously concerned about it. The Treasurer continued:

It is clear that all sources of funds are under heavy pressure but that the pressure on Revenue Account in relation to available funds is greater than the pressure on Loan Account.

This also is obvious to us. Unfortunately, I think it is an artificially created lack of pressure on the Loan Account. As I have said before, it is a most unusual circumstance in my experience for the Loan Account not to be under heavy pressure: it ought to be under heavy pressure and, if it is not, something is wrong with the administration and planning of this Government.

Yesterday the Minister of Marine was good enough to give me a full reply to my questions about the activities of the Harbors and Marine Department. I had asked what projects had been approved by the Public Works Committee but had not yet been commenced by the department. Unfortunately, the list of such projects was long.

Mr. Lawn: Would you say that your Government never used funds in the way proposed in this Bill?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I was about to say that the Harbors Board Department was one department that did not always spend its full Loan allocation; I understand the department's situation. However, with equal truth I can say that the Engineering and Water Supply Department never had enough Loan funds.

Mr. Lawn: That does not answer my question.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have given the honourable member the facts. I have administered both departments, and I know their position: what I have said is the truth. The point I was making was that there was no good reason why all the Loan funds available to developmental departments in this State should not be under heavy pressure; indeed, they should be under heavy pressure. Furthermore, they should be over-committed rather than under-committed if we are to get the kind of development that this State's welfare demands. The Minister in his second reading explanation went on to state:

The pressure on Loan Account is in turn greater than the pressure on the roads funds. So, coming down the scale, we have: Revenue funds, No. 1; Loan funds, No. 2; and roads funds, No. 3. Putting it the other way, the only fund that the Government has which appears to have any liquidity is the Highways Fund; the next best banker is the Loan Account, and the poor man of the whole show is the Revenue Account. I wonder why the Government is in this position?

Although it is extremely bad business for this State to have unused surplus funds in its Loan Account, it is equally bad business for it to be failing to use the money in the Highways Fund for road purposes. I would not have minded so much if this proposal to finance the Morphett Street bridge had been part of the deal at the time the deal was made, but I object to further and

unnecessary inroads into roads funds, for the simple reason that we need roads in South Australia as much as we need anything else. Indeed, I believe that the Government has in mind that we shall not need roads so much if its proposed transport legislation comes into effect. We do not know what the Government intends to do, but this may be a pointer to what it has in mind regarding road transport. In any case, the Highways Fund is created solely from moneys collected from road users. The fund should at all times be used for the construction of good roads throughout the State. Although in my time in this place we have extended sealed highways over great distances, anybody who has had to fight the battles which I have had to fight, which my colleague the member for Eyre has had to fight and which, before him, the late Mr. Christian had to fight in order to attract attention to the need for providing roads on Eyre Peninsula, would possibly be in the same state of mind as I am; such a person would want to jealously guard the use of the Highways Fund and ensure that it was used for roadworks.

Indeed, although substantial improvements have been made, thousands of miles of main road in South Australia, which are not yet sealed, ought to be sealed. It is wrong that there should be any money to spare for other purposes; it is unfair to the people who provide the money in the first place; and it is retarding the development of the State as well as the facility for the movement of goods and the carriage of the products of industry around the State. The new Highways Department building at present being constructed at a cost of \$2,500,000 out of the Highways Fund is unnecessary; it cannot be justified on the figures that the Minister has provided. The proposal to double the department's staff in five years is also completely unjustified. Every country district will suffer because money is being spent unnecessarily on a new building at Walkerville and on providing unwarranted staff. We are not having any more roads built.

Mr. McKee: How do you know?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The facts and figures submitted by the Minister indicate that. I was so incensed about the matter that I intended to move a motion of censure against the Government. However, that motion would not have been carried because the member for Port Pirie, being the good follower that he is (he is always chasing tin hares), would have

followed the Government, and the numbers would have defeated the motion. It would have been a waste of time.

Mr. McKee: You're wasting time right now.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I shall continue to waste time for the honourable member's edification. I well recall the honourable member's colleagues and you, Mr. Speaker, complaining about the lack of progress on the sealing of country roads. Indeed, I think the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) would be saying "Hear, hear" if he were here at present. Mr. McKee: You don't want to burden him, too!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: He ought to be here. The Highways Fund is buoyant, and if the Minister wishes to know how to spend money from the fund on projects on which it should, in fact, be spent, I can tell him right now. Contractors in this State with the machinery, equipment and staff are languishing for contract work and would be prepared within a fortnight to put all sorts of heavy equipment into use to undertake formation work over 100 miles of road. If the Highways Fund has any money, that is what ought to be done, but apparently it is not to be done because the money is to be used for other purposes. The Bill sets out, I admit, certain provisions for repayment of some of this money, but I am not satisfied with it, and I will protest at any time to any Government.

Mr. Lawn: You did not do it when your Government was in office.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I did; if the honourable member cares to have the Minister of Roads look up some correspondence he will see that I did.

Mr. Lawn: You did not object in the House.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I repeat that if the honourable member confers with the Minister of Roads on this point he will see what protests I made when I sat opposite as a member of the Government Party, and it will illuminate him. I had plenty of battles to fight in getting some recognition from the Playford Government of the necessity for roads on Eyre Peninsula, and I finally achieved some result, so the honourable member is not correct when he says I made no protest. I did make protests and, what is more, I made them in public, through the press, on Eyre Peninsula. I made protests in this House, too, as the honourable member can see for himself in *Hansard*. I circulated replies for himself in Minister to district councils on Eyre Peninsula to let them know what I was doing and to tell them that my own Government was not doing

what I thought should be done. The member for Adelaide would not dare to do that with his own Government; he would be ex-communicated. Finally, I did get a hearing and I did get results.

Mr. McKee: I'll say you did; look where you finished!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member is not finished yet; if he would chase the needs of his constituents as hard as he chases tin hares, I think they would all be better off. I could continue in this vein for some time, but I think I have said enough to make my point and register my protest. I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): This Bill raises the whole question of road finance and the maintenance of roads in this State. I think it is advisable to look at what has been the structure of road finance, the reasons for the present set-up, and what is involved in the present change. I believe that every member of the Ministry opposite realizes that there is always a reason for charging certain items to one account or another. The Highways Department has been established for many years, and it has had the support of both Parties for many years. I must confess that there was a break in the procedure during the depression that occurred at the time of the Hill Government, but with that exception the position has always been that money collected from the people in the form of motor registration and licence fees is set aside for the establishment and maintenance of roads.

The present legislation provides that automatically moneys from those sources, amounts that are received from the Commonwealth Government under the Federal Aid Roads Act, and collections from road maintenance tax are all paid into the Highways Fund for the maintenance of roads. True, over a period of years there has been one departure (although not a major departure) from the major rule that all revenue collected by the State in relation to motor vehicles (less the cost of collection and one or two administrative costs) shall be made available for roads. Although the owners of motor vehicles have complained about the taxation they have had to pay, they have accepted it on the basis that they are substantial users of roads and are therefore obligated to pay for them. The one exception to the rule has been that bridge works have not, in the past, been charged to the roads funds. The reason for that is that it would obviously be unfair to tax people

who now own motor vehicles for a costly major bridge that will last for 30 or 40 years. In the past major bridge works have been charged to Loan Fund and all other expenses in connection with roads (including the cost of administering the Highways Department) have been charged to the Highways Fund.

Because of the bottleneck that was occurring as traffic entered the city from the north, the previous Government and the City Council commenced negotiations. It was agreed that the Government would supply the money for the erection of the Morphett Street bridge and that the City Council would pay back 50 per cent (from memory, I believe that was the percentage) of the costs. The Government decided to provide its 50 per cent out of Loan moneys which was the normal procedure in connection with bridges. Because the council would pay back this money in a comparatively short period (it was not a 50-year loan), it was decided that it would be charged to the Highways Fund so that it could be returned to that fund as the City Council made its disbursements from time to time. Substantially that was the arrangement that was accepted by the City Council after some discussion. A hybrid Bill was introduced and referred to a Select Committee which unanimously agreed on the arrangements. One of the points in the agreement was that the City Council should undertake the work because officers of the Highways Department were fully engaged on other work. The department agreed to give technical assistance where it was possible to do so.

The work has gone ahead expeditiously and I believe officers of the City Council have done a good job. Now, at this stage, with the work well on the way to completion, a Bill has been introduced the effect of which is to take from the Loan Fund the sum provided for the Government's loan to the corporation, and to ask the Highways Department, instead, to lend the corporation that money from the Highways Fund. That has, of course, some attractions for the Treasury. I do not think it has any attraction for anybody else, though it may have some for the Treasury officers.

Mr. Coumbe: Certainly not for the Minister!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am certain it has no attraction for the Minister of Roads or for anyone else, because in the first place it compels the motorist of today to pay for an asset that will last for probably 40 years, which I think is not an unreasonable life expectancy for the bridge. It compels him to pay for money lent to the Adelaide

City Council by the Government for it to pay its share, which will of course be repaid in due course to the Government not to the Highways Fund. I very much doubt whether the Government is wise and justified in this transaction.

Let us be clear about its purpose. The Treasurer will agree that I am not wrongly stating the position. The purpose of charging this work to the Highways Fund is to provide the Government with additional Loan money. I notice that the Auditor-General in his report, points out in black print that the Highways Fund has already been raided by the Government. The purpose of this transaction is to bolster up the Loan Fund at the expense of the Highways Fund. I have no doubt that shortly the Loan Fund will be required also to bolster up the Revenue Estimates. So the purpose of this transaction is threefold. It is to make the Loan Fund appear to be in a better position than it is so that, in turn, it can be raided to make the Revenue Account appear a little better; and then, to take this to its ultimate conclusion, it can be fairly claimed that this will go to the payment of the one big item of additional cost that the Government is up against this year: at least some of it (we cannot identify money in the Treasury) will go to provide payment for the extra week's leave that the Government is benignly giving to the public servants of this State. When the member for Port Pirie gets up, as he will no doubt shortly, to try to justify the charge being made upon the motorist to provide for the extra week's leave (which, incidentally, the motorist will not get), I should like him, if he will, to invite me to Port Pirie to debate this matter with him and explain to his constituents just what the procedure is and how we are financing the extra week's leave. The people at Port Pirie will be delighted to hear my exposition of what is involved. The ultimate purpose of this Bill is, by a series of transactions and transfers from one account to another, to provide part of the cost of the additional week's leave. I think the Treasurer gave the total cost as \$1,750,000.

Mr. Millhouse: That was the second estimate.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The computation is a difficult one to make, because of the difficulty that any Minister or officer of the Public Service would have in working out the cost involved in overtime and in additional employment. The Treasurer gave a figure of one in 45, but much of the overtime involved will be worked at one and

one half times the ordinary rate of pay and I consider that a more accurate figure is one in 50. However, that is only an opinion and I do not rule out the Treasurer's estimate. He may make savings in some departments.

The fact remains that ultimately the motorist will be called upon to contribute to this expenditure that the Government is incurring lightly and without full consideration of the effects on industry generally or on the State Budget, with which difficulties are associated at present. It is disquieting that in the last few years transactions in public accounts have been designed to take money from the Highway Fund in several ways. One was the taking from the Highways Fund of money that had been provided from a surplus that the previous Government had, while another was the taking from the fund of moneys that had been provided by loan by the previous Government. The result of those transactions has been to take from the fund a large amount of revenue.

At the end of a financial year the Highways Department usually has a carry-over of about \$2,000,000, as can be seen from the Auditor-General's Reports. However, that money is barely sufficient to enable the department to carry on, because revenue does not come in equal proportions each month. Motor vehicle registrations are now made on a staggered basis and the department could run out of money towards the end of July or about the middle of August were it not for these transactions. I am not particularly concerned about that, because the Treasurer can make a temporary arrangement to tide the department over.

What I am concerned about is that this Bill is further evidence of the breaking down of a principle of which South Australia has been proud: that motor taxation shall be used for road-making. This principle has gradually been adopted by the other States as being a fair proposition for the motorists. I believe that every other State now has this principle in its legislation. I consider that it is bad to break down this principle, and I hope that the Government will not adopt the expediency that the Hill Government adopted, of taking this fund over completely and pushing it into the Revenue Account. That is the next step, of course. There have been three bites at the cherry already.

Having broken away from the principle that the motor taxation goes to road-making, the Government is virtually getting to the position where the money becomes part of the Treasury funds to bolster up the Budget. I suggest to

the Treasurer that important considerations are involved in this Bill. I consider there is some complication in the Bill, and I put it to the Treasurer that this system of road maintenance tax has been accepted by the High Court and upheld by the Privy Council: that money collected for road maintenance shall be lawfully payable to the State. Both the High Court and the Privy Council, I understand, have made it clear that the moneys collected from road maintenance tax are not to be used for capital investment, certainly not for building grandiose buildings for the Highways Department.

I consider not only that there are good reasons on the grounds of propriety, but that, if the Government starts playing around with the Highways Fund by paying from it for items that should properly be paid for from Loan funds, the Government lays itself open to a charge that the road maintenance money is not being spent for the purpose for which it was collected. Apart from that, there is one other serious point, and I know that members from the country, on this side of the House at least, will agree with me that at present the sum available for road construction is still insufficient to provide for the expanding economy of the State.

Mr. Nankivell: There are no interest-free grants any longer; they are cut out now.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No, that was one of the previous Government's silly ideas in giving assistance to local government! However, I shall not go into that. I consider that any member who examines our industries, the problems of transportation, and the cost of maintenance of vehicles on rough roads, will come to the conclusion that the money provided for roads today is insufficient. We are still not connected by road to some of the more important markets in other States upon which our industries depend. For instance, the road to Western Australia is not completed. As this expenditure should be charged as it was originally provided for in the agreement approved by the Select Committee, and which I believe is in accordance with the principles of sound finance, I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I listened with attention to Opposition members, as this has been an academic exercise in opposition. One would think to hear the thundering of members opposite that there was, in their accounting principles, something to which they turned, under which permanent

assets were paid for from Loan Account. That is what one would conclude from what they have said.

Mr. Lawn: They have different opinions since the member for Flinders spoke.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They have been saying that when permanent assets of 30 to 40 years' life are paid for from the moneys of this State their principle of accounting is that it should be paid for from Loan Account. I listened carefully to Opposition members and, so far as I can distil any principle from what they said, that is what I would conclude. The member for Mitcham thundered here about accounting principles. What they were he did not say and when I looked amused he became abusive.

Mr. Millhouse: Nonsense! I was talking about practices, not principles.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Precisely what the accounting practices were that could relate to principles, I could not distil from the honourable member's remarks. He did not vouchsafe anything with any clarity, because he did not understand what he was saying about accounting practices. Let us turn to what has been said recently by members opposite on this aspect. It had been the practice of the Playford Government, and of Labor Governments elsewhere in Australia, to charge capital works to Revenue Account where it was possible to do so, because if capital works are paid for out of Revenue Account nothing is added to the annual interest bill. So, it was the practice of the Playford Government to charge some capital works subscribed to by this State to Revenue Account.

Mr. McKee: They would deny that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That was the practice and what they did between the Revenue and Loan Accounts. It was the practice subscribed to by Opposition members. It was a practice adopted by the Heffron and Renshaw Governments in New South Wales—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: And continued by the Askin Government.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. When we found that the Loan Account was more buoyant than the Revenue Account in this State and transferred to Loan Account certain capital works which would have a life of more than 40 years, and which had been spoken about by honourable members opposite, they said that it was shocking accounting principles and that we were cooking the books, although exactly the same thing was done by the Askin Government—the Liberal Government of New South Wales—which, in fact, ran into deficit, unlike

this Government. Honourable members opposite stated that this was bad accounting principle. We are proposing to pay for a certain capital work in South Australia out of Revenue Account.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Out of the motorists' money.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Out of revenue. The revenue goes to the Highways Fund; it is current revenue.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: That is what I thought you would say.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is current revenue. We are now transferring to a revenue account something which is a capital work and which can be paid for out of Revenue and will not add to our interest bill in the future. Members opposite now say exactly the opposite from what they said when this Government transferred money from Loan Account to Revenue Account. These are the accounting principles that the honourable member for Mitcham referred to: is it any wonder that I smile?

Let us consider this matter, because members opposite have told us that the Playford Government's practice was to charge bridge works and buildings to Loan Account. Let us look at the year 1963-64, which was the last full year that the Playford Government was in office, and see what it did. This appears in the Auditor-General's report, pages 112-114.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You are not supposed to look back at past history.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No; apparently I am not supposed to look back at what that Government did. At that time the Loan funds that were paid out for highways purposes amounted to \$950,000, but in that year the administration buildings of the department cost a very considerable sum indeed—in excess of \$1,000,000. The bridge works are detailed: the Taylors Road bridge, the bridge and culvert at North Reynella, the Reynella by-pass, including overpass bridge and culvert (and this is an overpass bridge we are talking about tonight), the Gladstone bridge, the Murray Bridge to Taillem Bend road, including railways overpass bridge, the Bundaleer Creek bridge, the Blanchetown bridge and approaches (that was quite a big one: \$334,000 was paid for it in that year), widening bridges between Nackara and Cockburn, and the railway bridge and approach at Springbank Road (in the district of the honourable member for Mitcham).

These amounted to \$1,136,000, so, in fact, far more—well over twice what was paid in from Loan Fund for highways purposes—was paid out for administration buildings and bridge works in that year. One would think also, from what had been said by honourable members opposite, that the Morphett Street bridge was something that had to be financed from Loan funds.

The honourable member for Gumeracha was the only one who was clear on the subject at all; every other member opposite seemed to be under the impression that the agreement made when the Government put forward the proposition to the Select Committee and the Adelaide City Council for financing this bridge was that the moneys were, in fact, to come from the Loan Fund. In fact, half of them were to come from the Loan Fund and half from the Highways Fund to finance this bridge. If the Highways Fund is used considerably to support the project, where is the matter of principle between charging this to Loan Fund or to the Highways Fund?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It is a question of half or whole.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Indeed, it is. But the principle of the previous Government (if one can talk about its principles) was never clearly such that capital works in respect of highways (including bridge works) were to be charged to Loan Fund at all.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Talk about the Morphett Street bridge!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am, right now!

Mr. McAnaney: It's a loan to an outside body; answer that one!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course it is a loan to an outside body!

Mr. McAnaney: It's the first time it has ever happened.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is nothing unusual about that. The honourable member's colleagues in Canberra proceed to take South Australia's revenue money, lend it to us, and charge us interest on it every year. In fact, there is no basic reason whatever why we should not change the basis of the charging to accounts in respect of this particular work. Had the present Government been sitting on the Opposition benches, and had members opposite (including the member for Gumeracha) been sitting over here, not one word would have been raised by any of them when the Under Treasurer advanced a proposal of this kind. This is not a deal to which the

Adelaide City Council raises the slightest objection as far as our accounts are concerned, because it will not make the slightest difference to the council. Honourable members opposite are now saying that, in allotting our priorities, we should have fewer schools and fewer water supplies in order to ensure that we have more roads. They are saying that we should have fewer capital works, in the way of providing the basic necessities for this State in buildings, in order to surface the roads.

They want over \$1,000,000 less spent on schools in South Australia, in order to see that a road is surfaced, in addition to our existing programme. The present Government does not believe that to be the basis of priority; it believes that this is a proper accounting practice, that nothing is changed in principle in this matter, and that the Bill is a proper measure to bring before the House.

The House divided on the second reading:

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

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

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Bywaters and Hudson. Noes—Messrs. Rodda and Stott.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Financial provision."

Mr. SHANNON: I would not have spoken had it not been for the attacks of the Treasurer on members on this side of the Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is out of order in referring to the second reading debate at this juncture.

Mr. SHANNON: That will not deter me from saying what I have to say, Mr. Chairman. I am more than a little concerned at the method being adopted to finance the affairs of this State. In fact, I can almost see that soon the Highways Fund will be providing money for schools, hospitals, water supplies and in fact anything the Government of the day might require. Motorists will understand what the Government is doing; they will be unhappy when they see that the

money they have provided is not being used (as they thought it would be) for the maintenance of roads.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to emphasize the following words in new subsection (2a) of section 9 of the Act: "Notwithstanding anything in the Highways Act, contained". This shows clearly that we are now changing the practice that has obtained up to date—a practice that obtained pursuant to the Highways Act. I thought I would point this out in view of the fighting defence the Treasurer made of the Bill in his reply to the second reading debate. This shows that we are departing from our previously accepted practices.

Mr. McANANEY: Under the Bill, the Government will lend money to the City Council at a rate of interest and will adopt a new principle entirely by using moneys from the Highways Fund for this purpose. There are certain clearly defined lines laid down for accountancy procedure, and this is not one of them. To take money from this fund to lend to somebody else is acting against all accepted accountancy principles.

Mr. Casey: Are you a qualified accountant?

Mr. McANANEY: I am, and also I hold an auditor's licence, but I should be ashamed to put my certificate to the present South Australian Government accounts.

Mr. QUIRKE: I do not care what procedure the Government follows in this, but it is an unassailable fact that it has not enough money to do all the jobs it wants to. Under this clause, it is concentrating on spending whatever money it has from whatever funds are available in order to attract votes. However, if the Government makes this money available to the Adelaide City Council, it will mean that somewhere else its funds will be lighter by a like amount; and the Highways Fund will be down. I am not concerned with the possible publicity to be gained. Previously, money from car registrations, licences and things like that went into the Highways Fund on the clear understanding that it was to be spent on roads; now, under this clause, it is to be spent in the metropolitan area on a bridge providing access to the suburbs. Clearly it is the task of the City Council to do the work, but it is short of money so we make some available to it, which it has to repay at some time. There is now a grave risk that other road projects in the country will not be able to be proceeded with. This is just an emergency measure to get the bridge completed, at the same time

leaving insufficient money for works urgently needed elsewhere. It is one way of spending money to get the most votes.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

In paragraph (e) to strike out "such other account as the Treasurer determines" and insert "the Loan Fund".

It is clear that the Government has not seriously considered certain aspects of this clause. We have to remember, first, that only half of this work is being done over Government property. The road user has to provide, by taxes, the cost of the overway over the State railway system, in terms of this clause. Clause 3 (e) refers particularly to the payment that must be made under the agreement by the Adelaide City Council, which is responsible for the repayment of half of the costs of the bridge. Although this provision seems innocent and includes such words as "shall" and "having regard to", it gives the Treasurer complete discretion. Money could be taken from the Highways Fund, loaned to the council, and used for any purpose whatsoever when it is repaid. However, my amendment provides that the money shall be paid back to the fund from which it was taken, not diverted to some other account. I do not think the Treasurer would agree that money taken from the Highways Fund should not be credited to that fund when it has been repaid.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I have some difficulty in accepting the amendment. I accept what the honourable member is endeavouring to do, but at the same time it is not possible for me simply to credit to the Loan Fund generally an amount paid back: it must be paid back to the specific account from which it has been paid. As the honourable member well knows it would involve specific funds, rather than that the whole could be lumped together under the heading of Loan funds.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The Highways Fund is mentioned in the clause.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, because that is a statutory fund. As the honourable member knows, the other funds of the State are held at large, and I have to credit to a specific account when it is paid back. I have to credit to the account from which the moneys have rightfully been paid. Various Loan moneys are held in different accounts, and there is no one statutory fund in the accounts of South Australia known as the Loan Fund. As a former Treasurer, the honourable member will be aware of that, and that is why the Bill has

been drawn the way it has. I do not mind if the honourable member removes the words "as the Treasurer determines". If he thinks this means that the account is at large, I do not mind leaving it to the Auditor-General to decide where the money is to go. I want to be able to run the accounts satisfactorily, but I do not think the amendment would allow me to do that. I have no intention of simply allowing to the Treasury a general discretion, and I do not think the clause as drawn allows a general discretion as to where the amounts are to be credited. I think the Treasury is involved in giving a direction to see that the accounts are properly kept, and when the moneys are paid back, they must go to the account from which they were originally paid.

Mr. Millhouse: Why can't we simply say that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am happy to do that, but I do not think the amendment as it stands accomplishes what the honourable member wishes it to accomplish.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The money should be paid back where it came from and not to any other account, as provided in the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Would the Treasurer be content if the amendment of the member for Gumeracha was adapted so that the passage would read:

- (e) by inserting after the word "Treasurer" last occurring in the said subsection (3) thereof the passage
 "and each such instalment shall be credited to the Highways Fund or to the account from which payments in accordance with subsection (2) of this section shall have been made".

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I ask leave to withdraw my amendment, so that the member for Mitcham may move another.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

Mr. MILLHOUSE moved:

To strike out "such other account as the Treasurer determines having regard to"

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the Bill to pass through its remaining stages without delay.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: No.

The SPEAKER: Ring the bells.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am sorry, Sir, but I misunderstood your motion and did not realize I was voting against the suspension. I withdraw my remark.

The House divided on the third reading:

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

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

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Bywaters and Hudson. Noes—Messrs. Rodda and Stott.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

Bill passed.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 11. Page 491.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): This is the usual annual Bill the like of which we have seen introduced over a number of years to extend the operations of the Prices Department. It contains the usual provisions relating to price reductions and savings that have been made by the department on behalf of the people of South Australia. The Bill also relates to the operations of the department in the field of trouble-shooting which helps to justify its existence for another year.

I support the Bill. The Prices Department is, of course, an instrumentality that depends very much on good administration for its efficiency and proper attitude towards trading and the fixing of prices. This factor determines whether it is an effective branch of Government and whether it is effective in achieving its aims as the Premier claims it achieves them. It is apparent now that the Premier is at last admitting certain facts that have previously been denied by his Party. The member for Gumeracha, in an earlier debate, referred to remarks made by the Premier, either on television or over the radio, to the effect that South Australia has a lower cost of living in so many respects that wages can be lower in this State than in some other place. As the member for Gumeracha said, that is the first time for many years that the Labor Party has acknowledged that fact. Indeed, it severely criticized the previous Liberal Government's claims that wages,

because they had more purchasing power in South Australia, were accordingly fixed on a lower scale. However, I think that the Premier is on less solid ground when he refers to cost increases, for he has found that these increases greatly concern industry and the public generally. The Premier said:

... nevertheless, some increases are unavoidable. The \$2 basic wage increase last July and the interim margins increase this year, are still being reflected, on top of which is now this year's increase of \$1 in the wage. There are also increases in the cost of raw materials from time to time, and the Metal Trades margins application is still to be completed.

The significant words are "nevertheless, some increases are unavoidable", but I wonder how the Premier will justify his imposing avoidable increases on the South Australian community, notice of which he has already given. How will the Premier justify imposing extra costs on the community by granting an additional week's leave to Government employees? Obviously, such a move will soon gravitate right throughout South Australia's industry and commerce and will be a factor contributing to increased costs in this State. I believe that that sort of increased cost is avoidable and that the Premier must assume full responsibility for it. The announcement of the additional week's leave makes a sham of the Government's claim that it is concerned about prices in South Australia. However, the Prices Department functions for the benefit of the public; indeed, as the Premier has said, it acts as a safeguard in respect of unfair transactions, and it is a body to which a member of the public can appeal if he believes he has been unfairly treated. I support the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I regret that on this occasion I am not able to support the view taken by my Leader, because I do not support the extension of price control. This is something I have opposed, I think, every year (except the year in which I entered Parliament) since I have been in the House.

Mr. McKee: What happened in the first year? Were you afraid of the big boss?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Port Pirie seems to be able to make contributions in this Chamber only by way of silly interjections. He never stands up to give us his own views.

Mr. McKee: Don't be silly.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He simply tries to distract other members when they are speaking. I have noticed it repeatedly and I wish he would desist from the practice. It ill becomes the dignity of this Chamber. I was saying, before the honourable member for Port Pirie interjected, that I have invariably opposed the extension of price control, and I have given the reasons until I am blue in the face. I do not intend to repeat them all here, but I sum them up by saying that in my view price control is a waste of manpower in the Prices Department and a waste of State money. It is ineffective because it does not keep prices down in this State, and it is unjust on those sections of industry and commerce that have to put up with it.

Those are the three reasons basically why I always have opposed price control. Now I do not expect, quite frankly, to have any greater success in this House on this occasion than I have had in the past. I wish to goodness I could bring about the defeat of price control. However, one thing I would say (and this is in answer to a taunt of the Premier to me during his second reading explanation) is that at least on this side of the House, whether we be in Government or in Opposition, it is the right—indeed, the obligation—of every member to get up and to give his own personal point of view. This is more than one can say for members on the Government side, who are bound by decisions of Caucus and bound by decisions of their Party outside this House, so even if they do oppose or not agree with something that their own Party wants to do they are not free to get up and say so.

What I have stated as applying to members on this side of the House has been the rule on our side of politics, both in Government and out of Government, and it is pursuant to that rule that I get up now and oppose price control. There are a few things I want to say about this matter arising out of the Premier's speech yesterday and the circumstances in which we find ourselves. The honourable gentleman said in his speech that it was estimated that lower prices in this State in a number of items (he enumerated seven items) had saved the people of this State \$7,500,000, and this is something which he said some weeks ago and which was reported in the newspaper. Goodness knows how he arrives at that estimate, for no details of how it is reached have ever been arrived at.

Let me make one point quite clear, as I tried to do by way of interjection yesterday.

From whom is this money saved? It is saved from other people in this State, by and large. The member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren) may like to listen to this and take it back to his own district, because there are a number of people up there who are just as much affected injuriously by price control as people in other districts. Who are the people, by and large, who are affected by price control? They are people in this State who run small businesses and are tradesmen. The Premier himself enumerated, as I said, seven items, and they are as follows: petroleum products, bread, soap, footwear, certain clothing, men's haircutting charges, and superphosphate. If members look through those items they will see that the people connected with most of them are small businessmen in this State.

Mr. Ryan: You could not say that about superphosphate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, let us take some of the others.

Mr. Quirke: Superphosphate has a subsidy.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, so I will not deal with that but will get on to the other items. It is completely specious for the honourable gentleman to say that the people of this State are being saved \$7,500,000 or any other amount. That money is being saved not from people outside this State but from people in the State who would otherwise get it. The people who do not get whatever the amount is (if it is any amount at all) are other South Australians. That is the complete answer to it. Let us look at hair cutting, for example. I have my hair cut regularly. Looking at the Premier's hair, I think he may not have his hair cut as often as I have mine cut. However, I guess he does have his hair cut from time to time. Who is the man who cuts his hair? Is it somebody from outside the State? Is it somebody who works for a boss in Victoria, New South Wales, America or Great Britain? Of course it is not. I guess that the chances are that the man who cuts the Premier's hair is self-employed in this State, because that is the case with most barbers in South Australia. They are the people who are suffering because of price control on hair cutting charges, and yet when I interjected yesterday "From whom are the savings made?" (I said they were made from South Australians), the Premier said, "Not always: sometimes they are the shareholders of firms from other States." I bet that is not true in the case of 99 per cent of the barbers in this State.

Another example the Premier gave of items concerned with price control was footwear. How many of the shoe repairers in South Australia are controlled by outside interests and send their profits outside of the State? I do not know of any. There may be some, but the vast majority of them conduct their own businesses in the various districts of members of this House. They are self-employed, and they are the ones who are suffering under price control.

Let us take another of the Premier's examples—petroleum products. It is popular on the other side of the Chamber to get stuck into the oil companies as great big foreign companies who come here. Of course, the people who sell these products are, by and large, the local garagemen in the State. Only a fortnight ago the Premier and I were both entertained at the motor trade dinner, the members of which organization are largely local garage proprietors of South Australia. On this occasion the Premier made a good speech, as he usually does, but it was full of sweet nothings. The one thing which he did not say and which would have made him popular in that gathering was that he intended to lift price control on these products. He skated carefully around this matter but he expressed sympathy for them, saying they were not getting enough money and putting the blame on other big companies with industrial pumps. However, he did not get down to the root of the thing and talk about price control; he did not refer to that, even to defend it.

Mr. Hughes: Did you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Unfortunately I did not get the chance to speak; I wish I had been able to say something because I would have referred to this subject. They are the people who are suffering as a result of price control; they are the people who suffer when the Premier boasts that the people of this State are being saved \$7,500,000. This is something within the State. Certain people within the State may be saved this money but those who are losing the money are also South Australians, which is something the honourable gentleman should bear in mind when he makes these comments.

I was amused with what the Premier said about the activities of the Prices Department in investigating complaints. He said much the same sort of thing as we have heard before from previous Ministers in charge of price control (the practices of the Prices Department in investigating complaints are well known).

He said:

The Prices Department has continued to investigate complaints of over-charges on both controlled and de-controlled goods and services. He went on about this and gave the numbers of complaints that had been dealt with, and then said:

In addition, in some other cases, arrangements were made for work to be completed or re-done. An important aspect of this service to the public is its deterrent effect. Tradesmen and industry generally are well aware that the department will investigate thoroughly complaints of overcharges.

Then he went on to say how many letters of appreciation had been received. The honourable gentleman must have a short memory, for I remember what he himself said about this aspect of the matter less than four years ago when speaking in the corresponding debate—as a member of the Opposition then, of course, but when things are different they are not the same. His tune on November 13, 1963, was different from the tune he played last night in giving the second reading explanation of this Bill. What did he say on that occasion? It is recorded at page 1684 of *Hansard*:

However, I wish to sound what is perhaps an unusual note of warning from this side about the administration of price control.

Then he went on to discuss anomalies that would occur, and this is what he said (I am sure he will welcome my reading out a few sentences of his speech, even though other members are not so interested in it):

There are occasions when the Prices Commissioner or his officers take under notice certain contracts which are made by people in South Australia in relation to declared goods and services, and there have been somewhat unfortunate consequences to some perfectly legitimate traders from time to time.

He went on to set out the way in which these things were investigated by the Prices Department:

Some people who are suppliers of declared services have had complaints made to the Commissioner about their charges. It is not possible for them to complain to the Prices Commissioner about the fact that people are not paying their bills regularly, but the people concerned may go to the Commissioner, who calls for these people's books and examines the contract and as a result things are held up for a period while he has a look at them.

Then he went on to say what was perfectly obviously the case, that in many instances the complaint was not justified and the person against whom the complaint was made was put to much trouble for nothing. He went on to mention the practice of the Prices Department officers' suggesting that for the sake of peace

and quiet an account would be reduced, just to satisfy the complainant. It was a very different story in 1963 on this aspect of the matter from the story the honourable gentleman tells now. He finished this part of his speech by saying this:

In some cases where the people have declared goods and services and the price of the services is calculated on a cost-plus system, those supplying the services operate on a pretty narrow margin. That is particularly so in the plumbing trade in South Australia.

I want to say something about the plumbing trade, as the honourable gentleman is now, by virtue of his office, in a position to help the plumbers of this State. I shall quote a letter that I had a week ago from the Plumbers Association of South Australia Incorporated on this very matter. I ask the honourable gentleman, in view of the sympathy he expressed some three and a bit years ago, to do something about this. The letter is dated July 6, 1967, and reads:

Dear Mr. Millhouse,

We have taken the liberty of writing to you on the subject of price control because of your understanding and sympathetic attitude toward us on the last occasion we consulted you on the subject. The situation we are now placed in is almost intolerable. Many of our members are finding it impossible to run their business at a profit. Overhead costs are continually rising, bad debts are becoming more frequent and the depressed economy of the State means that many of our members have insufficient work to keep them fully employed. Customers know the building trade is in a recession—

and on these matters there is, of course, no argument between the two sides of the Chamber—

and they are asking a ridiculous number to tender for a job. We know that a person would be quite foolish to only obtain one quotation, but we have some customers who obtain an unreasonable number of quotations and this means that plumbers are spending more and more time on overhead.

That refers to giving quotations but not getting the jobs. The letter continues:

To our amazement, despite all our troubles, the Premier saw fit, during his television session—

I do not know which one: there have been so many that it would be hard to pinpoint the one, but the Premier may remember—

to worsen our situation and he warned the public of possible overcharging by the service trades, and particularly the plumbing trade, suggesting that the public should demand detailed statements and query all items on the accounts. This has made our position much more difficult and the clients are now treating us with a suspicious attitude on the assumption

that the Premier was correct in presenting all plumbers as profiteers. Nothing could be further from the truth! We know that members charge more than Prices Branch rates on certain occasions—if they did not they would not be in business. Our Prices Branch will not grant us a realistic hourly rate and as long as they continue with this attitude of fixing a rate too low to be practicable our members will be forced to break the law.

This is one of the arguments against price control that I have canvassed over and over again.

Mr. Hurst: What is their hourly rate?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have them all here.

The letter continues:

The Premier's gift of an extra week's leave to all the Public Service, plus the many other reforms he is carrying out, leave no doubt of his attitude to the small businessman. He—that is, the Premier—

—is obviously going to be forced to increase taxation and we feel sure we will very soon have further burdens to carry.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They wouldn't be political, would they?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Does the honourable gentleman want to hear the letter?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I don't mind.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, let me continue. The letter goes on to state:

We are unable to understand why, when the industry is in the worst recession we have known since pre-war times, we should be the victims of this unwarranted attack. If you feel our complaints are justified and if you feel you can assist us or advise us we would be most grateful for any help. We desperately need help in order to survive.

The next paragraph gives the *Hansard* references that I have already given, and the letter concludes:

For your information we are attaching hereto a copy of the latest charge-out rates under which the trade has to operate.

I have that information here if the member for Semaphore wants to see it. I do not propose to read it to the House. This letter was not solicited. I have not had contact or association with the Plumbers Association for I do not know how long, certainly not for some years: the last thing I had on my file, which was not from them, was in July, 1966. This letter came this week, completely unsolicited and completely out of the blue, on this topic. If that does not demonstrate the truth of what I have been saying about the injustices that small businessmen in this State suffer, I do not know what does, because plumbers are not controlled by big companies outside South Australia. By and large they are, as the Premier well knows, self-employed men or men in

small businesses. They are the men who are suffering and that is the way in which their association has written to me about price control. Yet the honourable gentleman, without, I should think, even considering the consequences to the plumbing trade, made his statement, no doubt for something to say on television.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What are you saying that I said? Certainly not what is in the letter.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have already read the letter and the Treasurer will be able to read it in *Hansard*. He can read it now if he wishes.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The letter is false.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Is it? I rely on the letter, not on my memory, but I have a recollection of having seen some such warning as this in the daily newspaper after the Premier said it.

Mr. Hurst interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I challenge the member for Semaphore to go to the Library and then to show me that my recollection is not correct. I ask the Premier, who is so anxious to help all sections of industry and commerce in South Australia, to take up this matter, especially because fewer than four years ago he referred, in terms of sympathy, to this very calling. I think I have made my position crystal clear over the years. I do not regret the opposition I have voiced to price control year by year, because price control is unjust, ineffective, and a waste of time and money.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I do not rise to oppose this measure. There are some circumstances in which price control continues to be necessary—not in cases covering whole industries but in cases where individuals do not play the game. In the latter cases price control has some virtue, but it has never controlled prices and never will. Price control can only prevent an infamous action on the part of an individual who tries to exploit an opportunity. It is for that reason that I support it, because in those circumstances there must be power to deal with it. In supporting what the honourable member for Mitcham has said, I can tell the Premier that the whole plumbing industry resents his statement and that he has done incalculable harm to many people who are honestly trying to earn their living in a difficult trade, the materials for which are probably the most expensive of any handicraft that people are engaged in today.

Plumbing entails a colossal outlay for materials, as today copper, which is very expensive, is the main material used in the trade. What the Premier has said has sown doubts in the minds of people who employ plumbers to do a job that the plumber is a scoundrel who will rob them because of prices he charges. It is becoming increasingly difficult for plumbers to collect money from people, because everyone is suspicious that the plumber is overcharging them. I did not hear the Premier's speech—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It would be a good idea if you quoted from it.

Mr. QUIRKE: It has been quoted to me plenty of times. I am connected with the plumbing industry and I know much about it. Whether the Premier did or did not say all the things he is alleged to have said, he is blamed for saying them.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I am often blamed for all sorts of things I have not done.

Mr. QUIRKE: As 5,000,000 Frenchmen cannot be wrong, 1,000 plumbers cannot be wrong! The Premier should retrieve his position, in fairness to people who are doing a difficult job under possibly the most difficult individual conditions under which tradesmen operate. Every month the Master Plumbers' Association sends out price lists to its members. The prices are on sheets which, as the prices alter, are replaced by new sheets, which are put into loose-leaf books. The old sheets are discarded. Included on the sheets is the rate per hour to be charged. I suppose there is no trade that is more rigidly controlled by its organization, through its instructions to its members, than is the plumbing trade. Plumbers can ascertain the price from the list and can quote for a small part like a T piece in a galvanized iron fitting, plus whatever freight is necessary from Adelaide. The most minute of parts are listed. I cannot understand why they should be held out as people who are victimizing those for whom they work: they are doing no such thing. As in any other organization of tradesmen and of shopkeepers, there will be people who will try to take advantage of others. But why pick one trade and brand them collectively as people that must be watched?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Well, I did not.

Mr. Millhouse: They thought you did. That is the general impression you gave.

Mr. QUIRKE: The Premier had better correct it because that is what they believe.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: In that case there was some pretty "shonky" political work done by someone.

Mr. Millhouse: It was your responsibility: you are the one who spoke.

Mr. QUIRKE: The Premier did the political work and harmed himself. He picked the wrong people, and they are agitated about what they heard. There is nothing political about it. When I heard about it it was not told to me with the idea of my trying to take political advantage of the Government: it was merely sheer, open resentment that anyone should accuse a trade like that of universally exploiting the people.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Why don't you quote what I said instead of telling those untruths?

Mr. QUIRKE: Let the Premier go on the air and tell them what he said was untrue.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What I said was true, but what you are saying is false and deliberately untrue.

Mr. QUIRKE: I am not giving a deliberate untruth, and don't you accuse me of doing so.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Yes, you are.

Mr. QUIRKE: If you accuse me of that, then I tell you that the most accomplished liar in this place is the Premier.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! I ask the member for Burra, as that is a reflection on another member, to withdraw that remark.

Mr. QUIRKE: Will the Premier withdraw what he said?

The SPEAKER: I am asking the member for Burra to withdraw his remark.

Mr. QUIRKE: I withdraw. Now I ask that the Premier withdraw what he said.

Mr. Millhouse: He said practically the same thing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member objects to what I said I shall be content to withdraw.

Mr. QUIRKE: Now we are equal, and we can start again. I did not say what the Premier said I did: I am speaking of what a collective body of people said that he said. They will tell him what he said. I am defending a good, honest trade but, at the same time, I support this measure, because there are instances where it can be an advantage, and that is the only reason why I have ever supported it. However, I deprecate these people being collectively accused, whether they are plumbers or anyone else. I do not believe that this measure is necessary because of the use of large-scale improper practices that oppose

the wellbeing of the people. People cannot profiteer today unless they have something that no-one else has to sell.

Today, particularly in the building trade, there is no such thing as profiteering; people in the trade are lucky to get a crust out of it because so many people are in competition for the jobs offering. Today, Adelaide operators are going into the country and quoting for work there at prices much lower than those which local people could offer. These operators would tell us straight that the reason is that they want to keep their skilled men together, and therefore they go into the country and operate in the way I have described with no possible chance of making a profit. We can applaud them for their motive, but it means that there is no chance of their making a profit. Nobody in the country resents it but how can people make a profit in an industry in that situation? If that is the situation today, how on earth can the plumber make a profit, particularly when his own organization tells him what he should charge? I support the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I oppose this Bill, but not because I support any restrictive trade practices that are carried on in South Australia; I am not in favour of them. This Bill is a conglomeration: it grew like Topsy. It contains provisions for price control and provisions for propping up prices. I am not in favour of a situation where the Prices Commissioner can stand over business people. Boring as it may be, I intend to read what the Hon. Frank Walsh said in 1965 regarding price control. Mr. Walsh, the Leader of the Labor Government, the Leader of the socialistic Labor Government, said:

The other matter to which I desire to refer is the continuance of the sections inserted in the principal Act in recent years covering certain trading practices. It is the Government's intention to introduce as soon as practicable a general measure governing restrictive and unfair trading practices which will include the provisions now in the Prices Act. Those provisions will then be taken out of the Prices Act and enacted in permanent form.

As I have already indicated, the Premier promised that that would be done—that the Bill about which he was speaking would operate for a year and then he would divide the legislation into sections. If he had done this I would have supported some of the sections, but I am definitely opposed to the conglomeration that we have before us tonight.

The new Premier tried to transfer these powers holus-bolus to the Commonwealth Government. He said, "What will we do if we

cannot hand them over? We have not the power to do anything." How can one transfer a power one has not got? I think he admitted, in effect, that his statements were bunkum. After we have experienced the operation of the Commonwealth legislation we will be in a better position to judge this matter. The Walsh Government held out the promise that we would have a good Act (it was to be split into sections) but the promise was not kept. The then Premier continued:

In asking the House to agree to an extension of the Prices Act for another 12 months the Government is satisfied of the continued need for a public authority to watch price movements which may occur over this period, and to take action where warranted in the interests of the community. As a result of the £1 basic wage increase last year, the 1½ per cent margins increase and the increases in customs and excise duty recently, internal pressures in the economy are increasing and are already evidenced by an upward trend in some prices.

The Prices Department works on the basis that if an industry can prove an increase in the cost of its commodity, its price to the consumer must also be increased. Unfortunately, however, as the department is a Government authority, it may take six months for a decision to come down, during which time the industry concerned may be penalized. The Premier admitted yesterday that prices in South Australia were rising as much as were those in other States that did not have price control. Over the last 12 months the increase in South Australia's cost of living has been second only to that of Western Australia. That State is at present experiencing a boom; there is an excessive demand for labour and goods; much money has been poured into the State, and it is heading towards inflation.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It is taking money out of every wage-earner's pocket, too.

Mr. McANANEY: Western Australia's unemployment figure is low. The Prices Commissioner, if he is honest and a good book-keeper, must pass on increased costs to the community, provided those increases are justified. Increased costs in respect of competitive industries will not be excessive on the community, because the competition will keep them down. The previous Premier also said that we had to have price control for a further year because of the introduction of decimal currency and the existence of crooked traders who might take advantage of the changeover. However, I have already said that South Australia's cost of living rose more than that of any other State except for Western Australia, despite the fact that South Australia had price control

and other States did not. The former Premier's assertion was ridiculous. He continued:

Secondly, the Government's policy is to ensure that the consumer gets a fair deal. Current trading conditions have become so complex and involved that many consumers, including persons on fixed incomes, find it difficult to make ends meet without some assistance and guidance.

Anybody on a fixed income is in trouble during a period of inflation. The Government is increasing taxation, as well as costs through the introduction of an additional week's leave. Naturally, we like to help people, but we must have some sense of priority when people are clamouring for additional schools and hospitals. Only by producing more goods will costs be kept down and inflation removed. The previous Premier also said:

Thirdly, the policy of my Government is also to watch the interests of the primary producer and to give assistance wherever possible.

In what way last year did the Government assist primary producers? It increased land tax (half of which is collected in the city square mile, anyway). If the Prices Commissioner does his job and if he is asked by a business organization to allow an increase in price because the Government has increased land tax, he must effect that increase, because it is one of the basic factors included in an organization's production costs. That increase flows through to the wage-earner, who will then approach the Arbitration Court with proof that his cost of living has risen and that he is entitled to an increase in wages. Ultimately it comes back to the primary producer in additional costs, and of course there is also the additional cost he has to bear in his own direct land tax increase. Therefore, how the then Premier can claim that this was of assistance to primary producers, I do not know. It just is not correct to say that price control assists the primary producer, because if his basic costs are increased the prices of the things he has to buy must also increase. The then Premier went on to say:

Fourthly, apart from pricing, the department is covering a rather wide field of activities which include special investigations for the Government. The outcome of these investigations has been of considerable benefit to various sections of the community. Inquiries into a number of hire-purchase agreements . . . have also been made.

I think hire-purchase contracts would be covered far better by an improved Hire-Purchase Agreements Act than by a Prices Act. The then Premier continued:

Inquiries into a number of hire-purchase agreements, insurance claims, used car trans-

actions, etc., have also been made, and it is in the interests of the community that these activities be continued. Fifthly, this State continues to enjoy the lowest home-building cost in Australia and savings on homes are considerable. For example, a five or six-room home of about 12 squares of brick construction can be built for up to as much as £800 less than it can in other States.

The present Premier now says over the radio that a house of a certain type is \$3,000 cheaper in South Australia than it is anywhere else. I think it is difficult to arrive at comparative costs. An investigation that was made by an independent authority revealed that the cost of an average size house built in South Australia was the second highest in Australia, so just how the Premier makes this claim I do not know. On looking at the consumer price index we find that housing costs have risen here as much as they have in other States. Can it be said that we see houses of any lower standard in the other States? I maintain that there are many houses in New South Wales and Victoria that are of a superior type to those in South Australia. Therefore, I think the Premier's claim is exaggerated. Possibly in some instances houses can be built more cheaply in this State through using sub-contractors, but apart from the wild statements that have been made I do not think any evidence has been adduced to show that housing is that much cheaper in South Australia than anywhere else. The then Premier, in 1965, went on to say:

Since the 1961 census, when South Australia was shown to be one of the best housed States in the Commonwealth, this State has improved its position still further. The following figures (Commonwealth Statistician) illustrates the number of new houses and flats completed for the year to June 30, 1965, for each 10,000 head of population.

The then Premier at that stage claimed that through price control South Australia was building the greatest number of houses per head of population. The position in that respect has changed completely in the course of a year, because now we are building fewer houses than any other State in Australia, so there must have been factors other than the benefits of price control that caused this great change. The then Premier continued:

Proof of the State's commercial growth is given by the following percentage increases for 12 months over the previous 12 months for retail sales of goods (excluding motor vehicles, parts, petrol, etc.) as obtained from the Commonwealth Statistician.

The Government claimed then that in the 12 months to June, 1965 (at which stage it had been in office for only three months), the retail

sales in South Australia were the highest in Australia. What has happened in the year since the former Premier made his speech? In New South Wales retail sales have increased by 4½ per cent; in Victoria, by 5½ per cent; in Queensland, by 5½ per cent; in Western Australia, by 7 per cent; in Tasmania, by 8 per cent; and in South Australia (the State with price control from which we are supposed to be getting benefit), by only 1½ per cent.

The former Premier claimed that price control resulted in prosperous conditions in South Australia and yet, in the 12 months since he made his speech, conditions here have become worse and worse. Instalment credit for retail sales in South Australia is down by \$8,000,000 and this fall represents a far greater percentage than has been experienced in other States. Only a fortnight ago, on talking to representatives of hire purchase companies, I was told that money was available here if people had confidence enough in the State to use it. If that money were used it would be a boost to our economy.

Recently the Premier went to Canberra to ask for a reduction in the sales tax on motor cars, a request with which we heartily agreed. Sales tax is not liked by many people. However, how could the Premier confidently ask for such a reduction when only last year stamp duties on hire purchase contracts for the purchase of motor cars were increased considerably in this State? This has increased costs and impeded the progress of the State. The former Premier also said:

Sixthly, the legislation on unfair trading practices has since its inception proved itself to be working well. A number of undesirable practices have been stopped since the legislation was introduced.

He did not enumerate what those practices were, but a number are still existing. As I have said before, when people combine to fix prices they should be dealt with because they are really combining to exploit the public. There are selling rings into which a person has to be voted before he is allowed to sell certain commodities. This is bad, but it will not be eradicated by price control. Everything the former Premier said last year, in advocating a further extension of the Prices Act, has proved to be fruitless. I believe that what the Premier has said on this occasion may also prove fruitless in the next 12 months. In his second reading explanation, the Premier said:

Control of prices of a fairly extensive range of goods and services by which increased costs

incurred by manufacturers and traders have to be established before price increases are approved.

There are delays in cases where people are entitled to a reasonable increase in price. Often competition achieves the end the Premier desires. If there is competition and prices are kept reasonably stable, the Prices Commissioner should not have power to inquire into the private circumstances of a company or trader. Referring to the examination of price movements of decontrolled items, the former Premier said:

This also includes the operation of agreements between the Prices Department and certain industries whereby prices are not increased without details first having been submitted for examination.

As I have said before, where there is competition we do not have to worry about this aspect, as has been proved by the other States in which there is no price control: price increases there have not been as great as they have been in South Australia. The next function of the Prices Department was described as follows:

The investigation of complaints of overcharges on both controlled and non-controlled goods and services.

The most amusing thing about this is that most complaints are about things that are controlled. I know that the Prices Commissioner denied this the other day, but the Secretary of the Carpenters Union (I think it was) said that food prices and the price of building materials should be controlled. Building materials, to the best of my knowledge, are controlled, yet this man asked for them to be brought under control. Most of the complaints of the Secretary of the Housewives Association were about plumbing and electricity charges, which are already under control. Rarely do we hear complaints about prices where there is free competition. For instance, there is great competition in the selling of groceries, and prices have not risen in proportion to the rise in cost of the ingredients over the last five years. That is because there is keen competition between the supermarkets and other retailers, and prices show merely a very small margin of profit. The next function was described as follows:

Special investigations including investigation of doubtful practices where excessive prices or charges may be involved.

I have already agreed with that. Where certain practices exist, they should be reported, as in the case of the Commonwealth Act, and it should be ascertained whether they are detrimental to the community and consumers as a whole. The Premier then dealt with the fixing

of minimum prices for wine grapes. This is where the Prices Act works in the opposite way. Normally, it fixes maximum prices, but it fixes minimum prices for wine grapes. When this legislation was introduced, we had just been through a period of surplus grapes. If we had had another surplus harvest, it would have been difficult for the growers to dispose of their grapes. I know that the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren) will agree with me on that, because at the beginning of that season, when it appeared that there would be a surplus, some grapes were not being taken in. I know that some grapes of a higher price were sent in by growers who accepted a lower price as though the grapes were of a lower price type.

Mr. Curren: You put it in a way that I do not think anybody else could. Could I have it in writing?

Mr. McANANEY: I will explain it again for the benefit of the honourable member.

Mr. Curren: I want you to put it in writing.

Mr. McANANEY: I have faith that *Hansard* will do a good job.

Mr. Clark: *Hansard* will have to work hard on you!

Mr. McANANEY: I will repeat what I said just now, that in the first year of fixed minimum prices for wine grapes the wine-makers were not prepared to accept all the grapes, and certain growers sold at the minimum price fixed for a different class of grape; so, instead of getting, say, \$50 a ton, or whatever it was, for that specific type, they put them in the grade with a price of, say \$40 a ton, and they accepted a price lower than the minimum price for that type of grape.

Mr. Jennings: It is clear now.

Mr. McANANEY: There have been two light harvests and they can now sell more wine than is available. Many wine-makers have sold all of the dry reds that they can sell, and perhaps some other varieties. In the last year, as the honourable member must agree, winemakers have paid much more than the fixed price for various types. A minimum price is fixed for one commodity, while maximum prices are fixed for others. That is a controversial principle.

So that the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren) will not try to make political capital out of this, I point out that these grape prices should be fixed in the same way as other commodity prices. The Premier appointed a committee to endeavour to arrive at a better and more orderly marketing scheme for wine grapes than had been in existence. The pre-

sent scheme has worked satisfactorily in times of light harvests but cannot work when there is a big surplus. We should be trying to arrange an orderly marketing scheme for all harvests of wine grapes.

Mr. Curren: Can you tell me how many vintages of wine grapes have been covered by prices orders?

Mr. McANANEY: I think there have been two since this Government has been in office.

Mr. Curren: But you aren't sure?

Mr. McANANEY: I believe there have been two. In order to show how silly the Prices Act in this State is, I shall refer to other commodities. The price of wheat is fixed after independent inquiry by an authority of which I think the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott) is a member. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics in Canberra works out the cost of production of wheat on a reasonable basis and that becomes the guaranteed price for a certain production. The price of barley is fixed under another Act, not by a scientific method but by agreement between the maltsters and the producers.

Mr. Freebairn: That is not quite right.

Mr. McANANEY: It is. The price of barley has not been fixed by the Prices Commissioner for about 12 years. I had something to do with the matter at that time. The price is fixed by the board, in agreement with the maltsters. I have been working in primary production activities for about 25 years and I know a little about what goes on. The member for Frome still claims to be a primary producer, but he advances some fantastic ideas.

Mr. Casey: What have I said to deserve that?

Mr. Clark: You wait until you read your *Hansard* proof tomorrow. It will be fantastic.

Mr. McANANEY: I thank the member for Gawler. If he thinks it will be fantastic, my speech must be good. The price of potatoes is fixed on the basis of supply and demand, irrespective of cost of production or anything else. The Auditor-General has criticized the way the price of eggs has been fixed and, if he has been upset about that in the last few years, he will be turning handsprings this year when he finds out the price of eggs in relation to the cost of production. I am pointing out how silly it is to have six different methods of fixing the prices of six different commodities. I may be repeating myself, but it is necessary to say things twice before the Government comprehends what has been said.

The idea of asking members to speak on this Bill at 10 o'clock at night, when at 5 o'clock the Government decided to attend a party when the House should have been talking conducting business, is against all fundamental reasoning.

Mr. Curren: Say something serious about the Bill!

Mr. McANANEY: I am filibustering to an extent as a protest against the unreasonable demands of the Government. When the Government came into office it said there would be a new existence in South Australia, but what are we getting here? Honourable members are asked to debate a Bill at 9 o'clock and finish it on the same night. I protest very strongly. It is not fair on the staff.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Did your colleagues go to the party?

Mr. McANANEY: I do not concern myself with what my colleagues do. We are all free individuals, and my colleagues can do anything they like.

Mr. Shannon: We don't have to do as we are told.

Mr. McANANEY: That is so. I will speak for as long as I can.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to address the Chair and keep to the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY: I apologize if I have wandered from the Bill. I get led astray occasionally. Regarding the fixing of minimum prices for wine grapes, I voted for this measure when the Bill was introduced two years ago. When the winemakers agreed to form an association to fix the prices for grapes to be paid to grapegrowers, some action had to be taken to ensure an orderly marketing scheme. Two other commodity schemes are working well, but some marketing boards are not successful, because there are too many wholesalers or merchants on them, instead of primary producers. Under these circumstances, I consider that the producers of wine grapes must be given every consideration. Provisions to prevent misleading advertising should be included in unfair trade practices legislation not in the Prices Act. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: No.

The SPEAKER: There being a dissenting voice, the honourable member must continue.

Mr. McANANEY: In any State, prices can be below those in other States but it is the average price that must be considered. In recent years in this State prices have increased, and are now higher than the Australian average. It is claimed that the price of

bread is cheaper here, but manufacturers of machinery used in the wheat industry are not restricted in their profits, and one firm's profit was 30 per cent to 40 per cent. The price of machinery coming into this State from Victoria cannot be adequately controlled, and a large staff would be necessary if control were to be exercised over every price. At present, petrol resellers have a slight margin above those in other States, but it is difficult to work out a comparative basis. Competition is necessary in this industry: in Victoria the price of petrol varies because of it. Competition did not exist in South Australia until new companies began trading, but before then, under price control, profits made by petrol companies were substantial. It was about 18 per cent, but has been reduced in the last two or three years to 6 per cent, not because of any efforts of the Premier or the Prices Commissioner, but because of competition in the industry. I can now buy petrol at a price that is 2c a gallon lower than the price at which I used to obtain it, because of this competition.

I now turn to soap. How much soap is used now, compared with the amount used in past years? Detergents and products like Lux are at a high price mainly because of the high cost of advertising; all the soap and detergent manufacturers advertise widely. In Great Britain the Lever Company was compelled to cut back its advertising to a reasonable amount, and this brought down the cost of its detergents and soap by 20 per cent or even more, I think. This method has never been used here. My colleague has handed me an article that states:

Soap and washing powder makers were told today to cut prices by 20 per cent. A Government-appointed anti-monopoly commission also called for a 40 per cent cut in the \$23,000,000 annually spent on advertising by Unilever and the American firm of Proctor and Gamble.

If such a measure was introduced in Australia, undoubtedly we would be able to buy cheaper soap and detergents; this would be much more effective than a Prices Act. One cannot watch television programmes these days without their being frequently interrupted by advertisements for soap.

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member is getting well away from the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY: I am talking about the Prices Bill and I am dealing with items referred to in the second reading explanation. I have described one way in which prices could be reduced. Although it is necessary

to use advertising to introduce a product new to the market, advertising is a complete waste when it deals with a product that is already firmly established on the market—and it results in increased prices to the consumer. It is to the consumer's detriment that, in addition to production costs being included in the retail price of a commodity, advertising costs should also be included. It is the increase in basic costs, resulting in higher prices, to which people object. Whenever an increase occurs in the gross national product, it is claimed that wages should be increased accordingly.

Mr. Hawke (who is an able man but who might well be better off in another job) tried to prove to the Arbitration Court that the percentage received by the worker under the existing system had slightly decreased. The increase in costs is one of the factors considered by the Prices Commissioner when fixing a price. In a recent Gallup poll 12 per cent of those who were approached, when asked what they wanted most of all, said that they objected to increased prices. However, I point out that under the Act production is restricted, which results in increased prices to the consumer. On the other hand, prices are more realistic when industries are able to manufacture goods, unhampered by other considerations, for producers cannot then claim an increase in the price of a commodity when their costs do not warrant it. Under the system of fixing prices, because there is no incentive for a manufacturer to improve efficiency, the result is increased costs.

Although it has been claimed that there have been savings in respect of certain clothing as a result of price control, the Adelaide level went up last year by 2.7 points, which was the same increase as the Australian average, so it is extremely doubtful whether price control has been very effective with this item. With men's hair cutting, the fixed price of 65c applies pretty well throughout the whole of the Adelaide area. Mr. Speaker, I again ask for leave to continue my remarks.

Mr. Lawn: Why are you stalling?

The SPEAKER: Does the House grant the honourable member leave?

Mr. Lawn: No.

Mr. McANANEY: The prices charged for hair cuts in the other capital cities would apply not throughout those cities but only to the high-class hairdressing shops, whereas in Adelaide the price of a hair cut is fixed and that would be the charge throughout. The claim that has been made in respect of super-

phosphate is really the daddy of all claims. Admittedly, there have been times during the last 10 or 15 years when the price in South Australia has been lower than the price in the other States, but this has arisen mainly because our sulphur is obtained from Broken Hill and Tasmania and also from Nairne Pyrites. When the price of imported sulphur in the other States is higher than what it is in South Australia, superphosphate is dearer there, but when they were able to get cheaper sulphur four or five years ago superphosphate was much cheaper there than in South Australia. In 1966 Adelaide and Wallaroo Fertilizers Limited earned 16 per cent on capital. How many industries not under price control make 16 per cent on capital? One could count them on one hand. The dividend paid by Cresco Fertilizers Limited in South Australia was 10 per cent, but its subsidiary company in Western Australia, which is not under price control, paid 8 per cent.

Mr. Ryan: How many millions were they offered as a takeover?

Mr. McANANEY: That is another claim that I think is absolutely false. The superphosphate companies were making profits that were more than adequate; they were in excess of the average, and in excess of what the Tariff Board allows when it is assessing what is a reasonable tariff for an import. Increases in wages make increases in prices inevitable. If the Arbitration Court thinks that industry can stand an increase in wages, surely the solution to the problem of increased prices would be to reduce tariffs so that we could have cheap imports with resultant benefits to everybody in the community, especially those on fixed incomes. The Premier said that South Australia can have lower wages because everything is cheaper here, but I doubt that. The basic wage for South Australia is only 40c below the Australian average. Since this Government has been in office the average weekly wage earned in South Australia has declined by \$2.40 in relation to the average Australian weekly wage. The Premier is always making sweeping statements, such as he made when he gave his second reading explanation on this Bill and such as he made when talking about companies recently.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is getting away from the Bill. I ask him to relate his remarks to its provisions.

Mr. McANANEY: I accept your ruling, Sir. The Premier blamed the price of meat for some of the cost increases, but that has not increased unduly. In fact, the present price

of mutton is lower than it has been many times in the last five years. The price of beef is up by perhaps 5c and lamb could be up by 5 to 8 per cent, but two months ago the price of lamb was lower than it had been at that time of the year for many years. The farm production price index is significant; in that in agriculture the price structure has increased by 4½ per cent in the last 10 years. The pastoral industry is down by 14 per cent, and all farming costs are down by 4 per cent on average costs over that period.

The Prices Commissioner, when determining meat prices, often merely telephones a wholesaler and asks him what he has paid for his meat on that day. That is the haphazard way in which meat prices are fixed. This Act does not effectively deal with those people engaging in restrictive trade practices. I oppose price control (which is really profit control) where honest people are trying to reduce costs as much as possible. Queensland has realized the ineffectiveness of price control legislation and now retains it in only a limited form. The points made by the Premier now will be proved ineffective in 12 months' time. The price of sugar will have a big impact on prices. I oppose the Bill and hope that the House will consider the ineffectiveness of such control in other States and in other parts of the world.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): Now that the sighs of relief have subsided, I speak in support of this Bill, because it will be of much benefit to the majority of the people of this State. The member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) based what argument there was in his speech on the submission that with price control there was no free competition. However, I point out that orders issued by the Prices Commissioner in South Australia merely fix the maximum prices at which goods may be sold, except in the case of wine grapes, for which a minimum price is fixed. There is no bar on any trader's reducing his prices below the maximum price fixed if competition is so keen and fierce.

Mr. Nankivell: Are you talking about grapes?

Mr. CURREN: I ask the member for Albert to be patient. I have said that, with the exception of prices fixed for wine grapes, the prices fixed were the maxima. The member for Stirling said (I think it was about an hour ago) that he was invincibly himself. However, I think he was incomprehensibly himself. I managed to decipher that phrase from the dreary monotone or monologue to which we have been listening for about an hour. He referred to the effect on cost of production of

primary products of the operation of the Prices Act, and I wish to read this statement made by the then Premier and Treasurer (Sir Thomas Playford) on November 12, 1963, as reported at page 1591 of *Hansard*:

The necessity to maintain production costs of the primary producer at the lowest possible level and to afford him every consideration possible are still matters of paramount importance. In the last seven years savings to primary producers on superphosphate amounts to over £1,500,000—included in which are the more recent reductions of from 12s. to 13s. a ton on the new season's superphosphate prices, amounting to a saving of £280,000 per annum.

Later, he said:

In just over the last six years, State-wide savings on petroleum products resulting from reductions effected by the Prices Department exceed £16,500,000, and of this saving it is calculated that primary producers in this State have benefited by at least £5,250,000.

The remarks of the member for Stirling are very much in opposition to the views of the former Liberal Premier (Sir Thomas Playford). Apparently he disregards the benefits that have been apparent as a result of the action of the Prices Commissioner in fixing minimum prices for wine grapes. I understand he has some wine grapegrowers in his own district. The member for Stirling, in conclusion, said, "I oppose the Bill".

Mr. Hughes: "Innocuous legislation"—those were his words.

Mr. CURREN: The member for Stirling is not capable of understanding what he says, so how does he expect other honourable members to understand? He does not know what he is saying half the time. I commend the Premier for the explanations he gave in his second reading explanation yesterday. As he pointed out, the Prices Act provides for six principal functions. The fifth point he made was in relation to the fixing of minimum prices for wine grapes. This is a matter of considerable interest to many members in this House who represent wine grapegrowing districts.

As members will no doubt recall, this procedure was brought into effect as a result of an amendment to the principal Act in 1966. That will make it clear to the member for Stirling that the fixing of wine grape prices has been in effect for two years. The amendment was carried in this House and also in another place, despite the half-hearted opposition by certain members and the gloomy predictions made by some members opposite as to what effect the proposal to fix minimum

prices for wine grapes would have on the industry as a whole.

Mr. Clark: What has been the effect of it?

Mr. CURREN: There has now been achieved in the wine grapegrowing industry and in the wine-making industry a greater degree of stability than has ever been achieved before in this State. This has been brought about by the fact that wine grapegrowers are now paid fixed prices. The fixed prices today are the same as those operating at the last vintage. The order will be in effect until another order has been issued by the Prices Commissioner. The present stability was not possible under the previous system of price recommendation and the annual haggle between winemakers' representatives and grapegrowers. I have received reports from both organizations that indicated that the fixing of a minimum price for wine grapes was the greatest single factor in obtaining this stability. The member for Burra, as a winemaker, would appreciate what has been done for the industry by the actions of the Labor Government.

This, also, was a promise made prior to the last election, and has been carried out by this Government. The price-fixing order was made in December of last year, which I had advocated should be done. Under the Playford Government the recommendations by the Commissioner were not issued until the vintage was well advanced and grapegrowers had to negotiate with their opponents when they were at a disadvantage, resulting in prices being accepted by the growers under duress. Most members support this legislation, which will be welcomed by the people of this State, and I remind the members for Stirling and Mitcham that it will be welcomed by electors in the Chaffey District.

Mrs. BYRNE (Barossa): I, too, support the Bill. Unlike the member for Stirling, who said that because the Bill was important he had to speak for a long time, I consider it so important that the less I say about it the better, because the sooner it is passed the better it will be for the people of this State. The limited price control experienced under the Prices Act is appreciated by the general public. I proved this about 12 months ago by publishing an itemized list of goods controlled under the Prices Act, and I received many phone calls and letters thanking me for doing this: people expressed pleasure that this State had price control.

Mr. Hughes: Particularly from parents of children who quickly wear out their shoes.

Mrs. BYRNE: I have not received many complaints of that kind, but perhaps the member for Wallaroo has. Another reason why this Bill is justified is that for another 12 months there will be a continuance of the services provided by the Prices Department by way of investigation into complaints of overcharges on controlled and uncontrolled goods and services. I notice in the Treasurer's second reading explanation that during the last 12 months the Prices Department has investigated 350 complaints of overcharging and that it was successful in helping 174 of these complainants.

During the last 12 months I myself have had cause to refer many cases to the Prices Department. I have looked through my files and I have easily come across 12; these can be summarized as investigations into dental charges, disputes over insurance claims, building services, road transport charges, charges for repairs to electrical appliances, charges for bond store clearances, charges for delivery of goods by road transport, charges for stainless steel cooking utensils, and misrepresentation in connection with the sale of a secondhand car. This is a very good service to the community by the Prices Department which is greatly appreciated.

Mr. Jennings: You are speaking as a housewife and mother.

Mrs. BYRNE: I do fill those roles as well. For the reasons I have given I should like to see this legislation continued. In fact, if this service were taken away, the public would have no redress.

Mr. Hurst: It would also affect some of the grapegrowers in your district.

Mrs. BYRNE: Yes; there are some grapegrowers in my district but not as many as there are in districts of some other members. I hope the Bill will be supported by all.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I rise to reply to the debate on this measure only because of some accusations that were levelled against me by two members opposite. It was said here this evening that I had made a general accusation against the plumbing trade in South Australia that it was exploiting the public or acting improperly in relation to prices and charges. On no occasion whatever have I uttered any words publicly or privately that could give rise to such a charge. I challenged members opposite to produce the statements which I had made. The scripts of my telecasts are available to them. Instead of that, it was suggested that

somebody unnamed had made a general statement of this kind to them, and that therefore I was responsible for the conclusions that some unnamed persons had falsely given.

I say that those charges are completely base and false. I have never said such a thing. The charges in this House this evening were uttered with a reckless disregard for the responsibility that members ought to discharge. I invite members to pay attention to what is said publicly and to base statements in this House only on evidence that they can substantiate. I ask members to support the Bill.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (30).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Broomhill, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Coumbe, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Ferguson, Freebairn,

Hall, Heaslip, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, Ryan, and Walsh.

Noes (2).—Messrs. McAnaney and Millhouse (teller).

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Bywaters. No—Mr. Teusner.

Majority of 28 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 11.53 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, July 13, at 2 p.m.