

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, September 17, 1968

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

FRUIT AND PLANT PROTECTION BILL

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

MARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended June 30, 1968.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTIONS

PORT MACDONNELL JETTY

Mr. CORCORAN: During a visit to Port MacDonnell last week I noticed that the entrance to the Marine and Harbors Department land bordering the jetty was extremely rough. As I have received previous complaints about its condition from fishermen who use it, will the Minister of Marine have the matter investigated with a view to having effected necessary repairs? I am certain the council will be prepared to co-operate regarding any work required in this area before the fishing season commences.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I have had some discussions with the local councillors and fishermen in that area and am acquainted with the problem. I will obtain a report for the honourable member as quickly as possible.

BLANCHETOWN POLICE STATION

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked early this month about the intended erection of the combined police station and courthouse at Blanchetown, in my district?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The intended site of the new Blanchetown police station is adjacent to the Sturt Highway, at the intersection of Morgan Road.

OAKLANDS TREES

Mr. HUDSON: Some months ago I wrote to the Minister of Roads and Transport about the preservation of the trees in the Oaklands railway station yard, pointing out that the area had considerable aesthetic attraction and that it was of great benefit to the people who lived in or travelled through the area. As a result of my letter, the Minister inspected the area and agreed that action would be taken to ensure that only unsafe branches and dead trees were removed, so that the aesthetic qualities of the area could be maintained. Press reports in the last week or so indicate that the Railways Department may be carrying out, at that railway station yard, work of a more extensive nature and that a contract has probably been let for the removal of about 51 trees and for the extensive pruning of others. At first glance, at least, it is difficult to understand whether this action by the Railways Department would be consistent with what the Minister told me in his letter. Will the Attorney-General ask his colleague whether he has approved the action intended to be taken by the Railways Department, and will he obtain details of the department's intentions, including whether the work will interfere in any way with the natural beauty of this area?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: By coincidence, a friend of mine who lives in the vicinity asked me about this matter only last night, and I caused an inquiry to be made this morning. Unfortunately, I have not the information yet, but I am sure that the Minister of Roads and Transport will be pleased to provide a reply to the questions which the honourable member has asked and which I, too, asked in the same vein. One thing of which I am sure is that we will find that the Minister's actions have been entirely consistent.

MOTOR VEHICLE CONSTRUCTION

Mr. GILES: Has the Premier a reply to my question about structural weaknesses in modern motor cars?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Inquiries have been made about whether car manufacturers have overlooked the centre pillar position in the design of the modern motor car. Inquiries of the two major car manufacturing firms in this State disclosed an awareness of the need for incorporating safety in vehicle body design, and experiments are being continually carried out. It is considered that the Australian motor industry generally is now alert to such needs and their urgency. These experiments include

the "front to side" collision, incorporating the factors of strength and gauge of metal at the position of the centre pillar area, including reinforcement of the car roof. Where there is no centre pillar, as in the case of one new model, we believe that additional strengthening is built into the body panel and components at this point. It is of interest to note that, in a survey of traffic accidents in Adelaide conducted by the Australian Road Research Board, the most common configuration in car-to-car collisions was the front of one car striking the side of another (that is, the intersection conflict), and that the human element remains the major contributor.

ELIZABETH HOUSING

Mr. CLARK: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to the question I asked on August 27 concerning the development of land between Halsey Road and Adams Road, Elizabeth East?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The General Manager of the Housing Trust reports:

At the time the Halsey Road houses were sold, the undeveloped land between Halsey Road and Adams Road was reserved for a proposed by-pass road, and the trees were planted mainly for the purpose of screening the houses from the high-speed traffic movements that would be generated on a by-pass road, with controlled access. However, the Adelaide Development Plan of 1962 did not adopt the by-pass road proposal, but instead provided for the upgrading of Adams Road and the Main North Road, together with the provision of a freeway to the west of the railway line to Gawler. More recently, the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report has made alternative proposals, giving greater emphasis to Adams Road, which have yet to be studied in detail to determine its effect on the trust's proposals for the future development of the land between Halsey Road and Adams Road.

It is intended that this area will be subdivided, and a sketch plan for residential allotments has been prepared. The plan covers the area bounded by Main North Road, Adams Road, Halsey Road, and Dewey Street extended, being a total of about 63 acres, which includes 9.5 acres for reserves. Some of the plantation is incorporated on allotments, but a much greater area is shown for future tree-planting. At Elizabeth the trust has never sold land either in broad acres or subdivided form to a private developer, but has sold allotments to individuals, who then make their own arrangements with a builder. No consideration to this effect in respect of the land in question has as yet been given. In reply to a letter from several Halsey Road residents requesting that the trust make no final decision on subdivision until the petitioners had received some indication of the Elizabeth council's views on their suggestion in relation to the provision of a picnic area in the vicinity, the trust informed

the petitioners that it would appreciate their report on the results of the approach to the Elizabeth City Council. The trust is awaiting this report.

KIMBA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about water reticulation to Kimba from the Poldamain?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Work on the Lock-Kimba scheme will commence early in 1969 but, as it will be several years before the scheme, including approved extensions, will be completed, it is too early, at this stage, to prepare plans for extensions from the scheme to supply the Pinkawillie and Western Buckleboo areas. However, all requests will be considered at the time of completion.

DUDLEY PARK HOUSES

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: In my district low-deposit purchase rental houses at Dudley Park are to be acquired if the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan is adopted. Accordingly, as purchasers are concerned about the future can the Minister of Housing say whether, if this happens, those purchasing these houses will be considered by the Housing Trust as applicants for replacement, because of the special circumstances? If they will, should they lodge an application with the Housing Trust as soon as the M.A.T.S. plan is adopted, or should they wait until they are informed by the Highways Department that their house is to be acquired? Also, could an officer from the trust be made available to explain what the purchasing tenants should do to obtain a replacement of these houses, if I can arrange a meeting?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As the honourable member was good enough to forward a copy of his question to my office a few days ago, I have obtained the following report from the General Manager of the Housing Trust:

The houses in question at Dudley Park are being sold under an agreement, and the trust, as the registered proprietor of the land, would be served with the notice in the event of the land being acquired. The trust would favourably view an application from families affected by the M.A.T.S. plan, because the existing contract between the purchasers and the trust implied an obligation on the part of the trust to house them. If, after the M.A.T.S. plan has been adopted, the particular freeway was approved, the trust would consider making available an officer to meet purchasers directly affected.

CHOWILLA DAM

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Premier a reply to the question I recently asked about the Australian Broadcasting Commission television programme regarding the Chowilla dam?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have received the following report from the South Australian Manager of the commission:

The Renmark comments as quoted by Mr. Arnold in the House of Assembly on August 21, apart from being intemperately worded, are quite wide of the mark. The facts are as follows:

On August 18 our News Division's programme *Weekend Magazine* (on Channels 1 and 2) included a film report dealing with the proposed Chowilla dam and the halting of work on it as a result of the River Murray Commission's decision to investigate an alternative site. In this session we included statements made by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Story) and the Mayor of Renmark (Mr. Sims), both in favour of Chowilla, and by the Chairman of the Renmark Fruitgrowers' Co-operative (Mr. Seekamp), who expressed the fear that insufficient work has been done on the salinity problem said to be associated with Chowilla. Greater time was devoted to the statements of Messrs. Story and Sims, but because of the divergent views existing in the community, the point of view represented by Mr. Seekamp was included in the interests of impartial reporting, as usual. Judging from the letter quoted by Mr. Arnold, the Mayor of Renmark (one of those whose views we have faithfully reported) objected to any contrary view even being mentioned. The A.B.C. will continue to give fair representation to conflicting opinions when controversial matters are reported. This impartiality is the very basis of our news service.

BORDERTOWN SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked some time ago about providing additional accommodation at the Bordertown Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I am afraid that the honourable member's information (that the matter of providing additional accommodation at Bordertown Primary School was awaiting my consent) was not accurate. Information is at present being collated in the Education Department concerning the needs of the various divisions for timber classrooms to be erected in the first half of next year. When requirements have been stated and priorities established, a recommendation will be made to me for approval of classrooms to be erected, having regard to the total number of rooms that can be provided. An application has been received from the Headmaster of the Bordertown Primary School for a dual timber classroom to free the library and to meet

expected increased enrolments. Bordertown's claims will receive every consideration when a decision is being made.

PORT PIRIE EDUCATION

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of September 3 regarding the Port Pirie branch of the South Australian Institute of Technology?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: As promised, I have again considered the honourable member's representation concerning retaining a branch of the South Australian Institute of Technology at Port Pirie. However, for the reasons I gave in replying to his earlier question, I consider that it is no longer desirable or practicable to retain the Port Pirie branch. As I mentioned, the Broken Hill Associated Smelters Proprietary Limited management accepted the position that the best training available for the two categories of professional employees needed by it (in metallurgy and accountancy) was provided by the full-time courses adequately staffed and equipped at Adelaide. In 1967, there were 69 B.H.A.S. students at the Port Pirie branch, and 14 others. In 1968, when the metallurgy cadets had been transferred to Adelaide, the relative numbers were 39 and 17. Also, as I said earlier, classes will continue to be provided at Port Pirie on a reducing scale until 1970 so that students will have at least one opportunity to proceed to the level previously available there.

PINE TREES

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Forests, a reply to my question of September 3 regarding pine trees in the Bundaleer forest?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Conservator of Forests states that a precise percentage figure of pine tree losses due to drought is difficult to determine. However, following the serious drought conditions experienced last year, fairly widespread deaths occurred in the Bundaleer forest. Plantations most seriously affected were in the 13-20 year age group, and fatalities varied in individual compartments according to soil type and density of stocking. A survey of the whole area indicated that, overall, between 10 per cent and 15 per cent of the total standing trees died. Salvage operations are proceeding, and it is expected that about 50 per cent of the affected trees are capable of being used.

GAS PIPELINE WELDING

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Premier a reply to my question of August 27 regarding a contract for pipeline welding?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Deputy Chairman of the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority reports that the purchase of welding electrodes is the responsibility of the construction contractors, Snam Progetti Australia Proprietary Limited. The contractor has made an extensive survey involving trials of all electrodes of Australian manufacture. The contractor has not called tenders, but has received quotations from each of the vendors. Purchase orders will be placed in due course for the type of electrode most suitable for the job.

PUMPING STATION

Mr. WARDLE: A certain paddock about three miles from Murray Bridge has been used over the years by a glider club and, more recently, by a light aircraft club. It would appear, however, that the paddock's usefulness is in jeopardy because a high-tension powerline will pass close by. The course the line will take is at the moment not fully determined, partly because of the establishment of the first inland pumping station in connection with the Murray River to Onkaparinga main. Can the Minister of Works say what is the section number of the site of the pumping station, if a site has been chosen, and, if possible, can he indicate the exact site?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: As well as furnishing the honourable member with the section number he requested, I will also look at the possibility of this powerline's interfering with the flight of light aircraft. I will have the information for the honourable member later this week.

MOSQUITOES

Mr. BROOMHILL: During the summer months a large section of my district is subjected to the nuisance of mosquitoes and, during this period, in most years aerial spraying of the Torrens River, the upper reaches of the Port River, and the Adelaide Airport is undertaken. Will the Premier ask the Minister of Health what plans have been made in this respect for this year?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be happy to bring this matter to the notice of my colleague. I think I recall that, in an answer to a previous question about an area north of the honourable member's district, it was stated that there had been a cessation of

spraying in that area because, as has been stated this year, an investigation was being carried out into the habits and type of mosquitoes there. However, I will obtain a report in relation to the honourable member's district.

MEAT BOARD

Mr. FERGUSON: During the last decade, from time to time the Government has established boards, when requested by sections of primary producers, to receive and market the produce of those producers. This has been done in relation to wheat, barley, citrus, eggs, potatoes and other commodities, and some of the boards have been highly successful in their operations. In view of the great concern about lamb prices and the fluctuations in meat prices to producers generally, can the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, say whether, if a reasonable scheme were submitted, the Government would consider setting up a meat board in South Australia to receive and market meat on behalf of producers?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will direct this question to my colleague.

WHYALLA TECHNICAL SCHOOL

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: On March 14, 1968, as Minister of Education, I approved of the zone for students attending Eyre Technical High School, Whyalla. The minute on this subject covered additional action subject to this approval, namely, immediate requests for additional classrooms and immediate consideration of the need for solid-construction boys' craft accommodation at this school. In view of the rapid increase in enrolments that will soon take place at this school, will the Minister of Education say what stage has been reached in regard to the provision of these solid-construction additions?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I shall be pleased to obtain a report on the matter and let the honourable member have it as soon as possible.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. VENNING: As my question is of Commonwealth significance, I direct it to the Premier. It concerns the compensation payable to property owners affected by the Port Pirie to Cockburn section of the rail standardization work. Can the Premier say what authority calculates compensation to be paid to recipients and whether there has been any delay in such payments being made?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will obtain a report from the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, an answer to my question of August 27 regarding the Solomontown over-pass?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Minister reports that provision has been made for expenditure against standardization funds during the current financial year for the construction of the Solomontown over-pass. Tenders for this work are expected to be called this month.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked earlier this month about Commonwealth money that was made available for planning and survey work on the railway line between Adelaide and Port Pirie?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: There is not yet a reply for the honourable member, but I will obtain one as soon as possible.

STURT PEA

Mr. CASEY: No reference is made in the Native Plants Protection Act to the floral emblem of this State—the Sturt pea. A wonderful season is being experienced in the northern areas of the State and over the past several weekends tens of thousands of people have visited the Flinders Ranges to take full advantage of the beauty spots. However, I have often had reported to me the indiscriminate destruction and removal from the area of native flora, particularly the Sturt pea. Unfortunately, this plant lends itself to use as a decoration on motor cars. As these plants are for all people to see and should therefore be allowed to flourish, they should not be destroyed in certain places by people who unnecessarily pull them out of the ground to drape them on their motor cars. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the Sturt pea and other plants in the Flinders Ranges and elsewhere can be included in the Native Plants Protection Act?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will refer the matter to my colleague. If the reports stated by the honourable member are correct (and any further information he can give to my colleague would probably be appreciated by him), it is unfortunate that the northern districts, which are almost a unique tourist attraction in Australia, should be subjected to the ravages referred to and have to

be protected from this senseless kind of vandalism of people picking baskets of wild-flowers, all of which are obviously wasted. If anything can be done to see that this practice is stopped, I will see that it is done.

VEGETABLE GROWING

Mr. RODDA: During the weekend I was in the Kalangadoo district, where some primary producers are concerned about the parlous plight of the vegetable-growing industry. Because of the natural conditions, agricultural and climatic, that obtain in that district, there is interest in vegetable growing and I understand that trials have been conducted in the lower part of the South-East. Of course, the success of potato growing in the area is assured. Can the Premier say whether his department has concrete evidence of the likely expansion of this sort of industry in the Kalangadoo district, and will he have made investigations that may lead to the development of this industry, having regard to the favourable climatic and geological conditions?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I think most residents of South Australia know the peculiar advantages of the district that the honourable member has mentioned and, of course, he has referred to specific investigations that may have been made already. The Industrial Development Branch is aware of the advantages and of some interest that has been shown in this area, although at the moment the branch cannot speak of interests in particular localities. I will refer the matter to the branch, ensuring that it is added to the existing framework of the investigation being carried out.

GRAIN CROPS

Mr. HURST: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question about the acreage sown to cereal crops this year?

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

Most of the cereal crop seeding this year was completed by the end of August. In mid-July it was estimated that 3,700,000 acres of wheat, 1,500,000 acres of barley and 1,000,000 acres of oats had either been seeded or would be seeded this year. The wet conditions in August, however, prevented seeding in some districts. Most of the area which has been too wet for seeding is in County Flinders, on Eyre Peninsula. The area involved is estimated to be 60,000 acres. It is further estimated that half of this area, plus smaller areas in the North, Upper South-East, Southern districts and on Kangaroo Island, will still be sown to barley as soon as conditions are suitable.

CRIMES OF VIOLENCE

Mr. LANGLEY: It was reported in the press on June 17 last that the Attorney-General would seek information about payment of compensation to victims of violent crimes. Under the New South Wales Act, \$2,000 can be paid to victims in that State, and a recent newspaper report stated that similar legislation would be introduced in South Australia. As three months has elapsed since the meeting referred to and as information would surely have come to the Attorney-General's hands by now, will the Attorney say whether he intends to introduce soon legislation similar to that in other States?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member will also recall that this matter was mentioned in the policy speech delivered by the then Leader of the Opposition, the present Premier, before the last election, to the effect that we would investigate the practicability of introducing such legislation. We hope to do so, but the matter is not easy, as the previous Government found when it was in office and refused to take action on it. We hope to overcome the complications and to be able to find the requisite money to set up such a scheme, but no decision has been taken yet.

RAILWAY HOUSES

Mr. RYAN: Has the Treasurer a reply to the matter that I raised in the Loan Estimates debate regarding houses which are owned by the Railways Department and which have been vacant for a considerable time?

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

I have to report that the provision made on the Loan Estimates for new residences is primarily to replace older units lacking modern amenities. The cost of maintenance of cottages is charged to working expenses, not to Loan as stated by the honourable member. In the localities referred to by Mr. Ryan, there are 18 residences available for occupation. As stated by Mr. Ryan, some of these are required to enable employees transferred from country stations to be accommodated in the metropolitan area until such time as they are able to find their own accommodation. The tenure varies according to the particular circumstances. In most instances the employees concerned are able to find permanent accommodation within a year. Employees who are transferred to the metropolitan area in order to take up appointments in the course of their progression in the service are not subject to restriction in respect of tenure, provided that they seek promotion to positions which they are qualified to fill. Employees in prescribed grades who are required to reside in particular

localities for purposes related to the duties they perform are not subjected to any restriction while they continue to be employed by the department. In order to permit the department to implement such transfers and appointments involving promotion, it is necessary that a number of cottages be available for occupation at short notice. Residences surplus to requirements, as indicated above, are disposed of by arrangement with the Housing Trust. During the past three years 19 units have been disposed of in this manner.

RED SCALE

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As the Minister of Lands has been good enough to inform me that he has a reply to the question I asked in August about red scale, for which I thank him, will he now give that reply?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Director of Agriculture reports that over the past 20 years it has been recognized that a fair degree of biological control by natural parasites and predators operates in the Adelaide environment, and this will probably continue as long as broad spectrum insecticides are not used unwisely in gardens. For this reason, the treatment favoured against red scale in metropolitan gardens is summer oil spraying. Legislation now being considered envisages amendments to the Vine, Fruit, and Vegetable Protection Act that are designed to control, *inter alia*, the situation where owners of trees allow pests to build up to a sufficient intensity to constitute a threat to the gardens of neighbouring householders.

FIAT MOTOR COMPANY

Mr. HUGHES: I am pleased to read in this morning's *Advertiser* that Mr. A. Galleotti (Australian Manager for the Italian Fiat Company) is visiting South Australia today to see for himself and hear from the Premier what South Australia has to offer his company on the establishment of a plant in this State. The article states:

However, much would depend on what the South Australian Government could offer in the way of land, housing accommodation and rail transport, he said. Mr. Galleotti said he would visit Elizabeth with the Premier as well as areas "south of Adelaide" today.

Can the Premier say whether, in addition to arranging visits to the areas referred to, he brought before Mr. Galleotti's notice the potential offering at Wallaroo for such a company to establish its works?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am pleased that the honourable member asked this question.

True, Mr. Galleotti, representing the Fiat Motor Company of Italy, is at present studying possible sites in Australia, initially to assemble imported components of these cars from Italy, and eventually to manufacture a certain percentage of these components in Australia. Whilst in Europe, I learned of the interest of the Fiat Motor Company in this project and changed my itinerary in order to visit Turin to speak with leading officials of the company. I was assured that South Australia's case would be fully investigated, although I could put it only in a preliminary form while I was in Turin. However, Mr. Galleotti is now in South Australia, following my visit to his headquarters, to conduct a survey of the possible economics of operating in this State. I emphasize that this company has also shown an interest in other States; it has completed an exercise in New South Wales, and will now conduct a similar study in this State in order to compare conditions. I am pleased that I, and officers of the Industrial Development Branch, have had the chance today (and we will have another tomorrow) to impress on Mr. Galleotti the obvious advantages of South Australia in several important aspects, including land, factories, and the quality and availability of its work force. Balanced against these advantages is the fact that the largest market for Fiat motor vehicles is at present in New South Wales. I assure the honourable member that we are doing our best to impress on Mr. Galleotti the importance of the South Australian advantages, and that he is aware of all the interesting features in this State with relation to his possible operation here.

ROAD PASSENGER SERVICES

Mr. FREEBAIRN: In last week's edition of the *Barossa and Light Herald*, circulating in the Kapunda part of my district, appeared an advertisement under the heading "Transport Control Board—Road Passenger Services". The relevant part of the advertisement states:

Applications will be received at the office of the board up to 12 noon on Friday, October 11, 1968, for licences to carry passengers and parcels over the following routes as from December 1, 1968:

Subsection (2), which applies to the District of Light, states:

(2) Between Robertstown, Eudunda, Kapunda, Freeling and Adelaide.

Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport what time schedules this road service will maintain and whether pensioners' and periodic ticket privileges will be retained?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will take the matter up with my colleague.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: In July this year I, in association with the Hon. Boyd Dawkins of another place, introduced to the Minister of Roads and Transport a deputation on the proposed rationalization of rail services to the Barossa Valley and Truro. The Minister told me by letter recently that it had been decided to introduce an all-road service to Adelaide, in lieu of a former proposal to have road-rail co-ordination at Gawler. He also stated that it was intended to invite applications early in September for licences to operate a through road service to Adelaide as from December 1 this year. However, the letter does not indicate the frequency of the intended road service. Therefore, will the Attorney-General ascertain from his colleague particulars of the intended timetable for the all-road service and ascertain whether the privileges extended to pensioners and railway employees in connection with rail travel will be extended to cover road travel by these people in the bus service to be provided on this route?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall be pleased to do that.

FREE RAIL PASSES

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Attorney-General received from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about free rail passes for railway employees on Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: South Australian Railways staff on Eyre Peninsula are not now able to use passes and privilege tickets for travel by passenger train on the Port Lincoln Division. However, these concessions are available for travel on that division on certain goods trains in the brakevan, which has passenger and lavatory accommodation provided. It is intended to transfer additional brakevans with similar accommodation to the Port Lincoln Division. Some South Australian Railway employees on the mainland are unable to use their rail travel concessions on passenger trains in their immediate vicinity, but all concerned can use their passes on other South Australian and interstate railway lines.

GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS

Mr. ALLEN: In my district lives a pensioner, formerly a tradesman, who now carries out small jobs for various people, including some Government departments. He has complained to me about the slowness of payment

by some of these departments, particularly the Public Buildings Department and the South Australian Railways. As an illustration, even though the South Australian Railways owed him \$11.18 for more than two months, he was forced to pay cash for used railway sleepers during that period. In order to give further details I will read portion of a letter received from him, as follows:

Further to my discussion with you on non-payment of accounts by the South Australian Government departments, I would be pleased if you would take some action on the following details:

Public Buildings Department: On July 11, 1967, a temporary job was done to a heater in the infants classroom at the Spalding school. Correspondence on the matter has been ignored. An account was issued on June 26, 1968, at the request of the local Headmaster, for \$5. No reply was received by August 14, 1968, so I wrote asking for a reply, which is attached. No payment has been received to date.

I point out that the payment referred to has now been received. Will the Minister of Works take up this matter with his department with a view to ensuring the prompt payment of accounts?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will look into this matter for the honourable member.

MILITARY ROAD

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about any intention of the Government to repair Military Road at West Beach?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The West Torrens council maintains the section of Military Road referred to at cost to the Highways Department. This arrangement was entered into some years ago, because the council does not collect rates consequent on the construction of the Glenelg treatment works. The road was constructed as a deviation at the time the works were built; it is poorly drained, and of very light construction. The West Torrens council is constantly repairing potholes and will effect repairs again immediately. It will be inspected having in mind the possibility of resheeting it with asphaltic concrete as an interim measure. Reconstruction of the section is not desirable at present, as it is involved in the widening of the Patawalonga Basin, reconstruction, and possible resiting of Anderson Bridge and a study of local traffic patterns:

LICENSING COURT

Mr. RODDA: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I recently asked about the number of applications before the Licensing Court?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have discussed the position with the Judge of the Licensing Court (Judge Johnston), who has given me a report, part of which states:

Since the granting of new licences in this State had been greatly restricted for about 100 years, it was expected that there would be a rush of applications in the first year of the new Statute, and this has proved to be so. However, there have never been "170 applications . . . awaiting the pleasure of the Licensing Court", and there is certainly not this number at present.

That was the number, I think, quoted by the honourable member in his question. The report continues:

The total number of applications lodged has been 282. More than 150 of these have been disposed of (either by grant, refusal or withdrawal) and the total number awaiting hearing today is 125. These comprise: retail storekeeper, 36; wholesale storekeeper, 13; club, 8; restaurant, 21; vigneron, 25; distillers storekeeper, 9; five-gallon, 1; limited publican, 4; full publican, 1; cabaret, 1; removal of licence, 6. Of these 125, 36 are set for hearing between now and October 15;—

this report is dated September 13—

six have been offered a date for hearing and have declined; and 62 have been lodged since June 1, namely, in June, 9; July, 13; August, 35; and September, 5. In Mr. Rodda's district, at the date of his comments there were four applicants awaiting hearing. These were:

Restaurant licence: Krauss—lodged December 4, 1967. The applicant is already holding a permit to serve wines with meals, so that there is no severe hardship. The hearing has been fixed for October 28.

Vignerons licences: Brand and Brand—lodged June 19, 1968; to be heard September 26, 1968. Redman and Redman—lodged July 19, 1968. This was heard on September 12, 1968. The arrangements for the hearing were made some weeks ago. Since the vigneron's licence takes the place of the "cellar door sales" which can continue until the end of September, no hardship can have been caused to these applicants.

Concerning a retail storekeeper's licence, I understand the Skinner and Skinner application was withdrawn today. The report continues:

If there are any other applications Mr. Rodda had in mind I would be glad to give details of them. It will be appreciated that, while the consideration of new licences is a most important part of the court's duties, it is only one of a number of tasks which the court has. For example, more than 20,000 permits of various types have been issued. As

you know the difficulty of constituting a Full Bench earlier had caused some delays but as you have pointed out this has now been overcome by the appointment of Mr. McLaughlin, Q.C. He is available at all times and Full Bench sittings are arranged regularly and constantly. Accordingly, the appointment of another magistrate is unnecessary.

The court has been given a number of most important tasks amongst which are (a) to ensure that there is no undue proliferation of licences; (b) to ensure that "the paramount nature of the public interest" is safeguarded; and (c) to weigh the merits of the case put forward by both applicant and objector. Frequently these matters take some time but it is important that a just result is reached rather than that hasty decisions are made. I propose to continue to keep this well in mind and I am sure my colleagues will do so too.

I am satisfied that the Licensing Court is operating very satisfactorily now; it is getting through the work but, as the Judge says in his report to me, there is much work to be done and some delays are therefore inevitable.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. HUDSON: About two weeks ago I received an invitation to attend and speak at a meeting concerning the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study that was held in my district last Thursday evening. However, on arriving at the Pioneer Hall where the meeting was held I was informed that, as a result of the action of the Minister concerned (Mr. Hill), I would not be permitted to be on the platform to speak to the meeting in any way and that the Minister had instructed the Marion council that, if the member for the district spoke to the meeting, the officer of the Highways Department who was at the meeting had to be withdrawn immediately. I understand also that similar instructions had been issued in relation to three meetings to be held in the district of the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo). Will the Attorney-General take up this matter with the Minister of Roads and Transport with a view to providing an explanation of this extraordinary decision and also with a view to trying to persuade the Minister to alter the undemocratic and dictatorial attitude that he is currently adopting in respect of this matter?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will discuss the matter with the Minister of Roads and Transport.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked some time ago about the Metropolitan

Adelaide Transportation Study Report? I regret that circumstances have not permitted me to ask for this reply sooner.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have had this reply for some time, awaiting the return of the honourable member, and I am delighted to see him in the House and to be able to give the reply. My colleague reports that there is adequate machinery in the Local Government Act for a local government authority to request alterations to its boundaries. However, it would seem premature for any council to request such steps at this time, as the M.A.T.S. Report is not an approved plan, being subject to a six-month review. If or when the plan is approved, then further time will elapse before land is actually acquired. Furthermore, any council may wish to review the effect of any improvements to the transportation facilities within its area as the remaining land should be enhanced in value.

COORABIE SCHOOL

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I recently asked about the Coorabie Rural School toilets?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The provision of a septic system at the Coorabie Rural School has been under consideration for some time, but because of the high cost of obtaining a water supply the work has not been undertaken. The cost to drill the bore and provide equipment for the water supply is \$2,800, and the cost to convert the existing toilets to septic tank use is \$940, making a total of \$3,740. An officer of the Public Buildings Department has recently inspected the toilets at present in use. He states that the school committee is currently preparing a scheme for the supply of water to enable a septic system to be installed. The committee intends to submit this scheme together with quotes to the department shortly. The practicability of providing a septic system will then be considered again.

FISHING REGULATION

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of August 29 regarding the policing, in the South-East, of a recently introduced fishing regulation?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Tenders have already been called for the supply of a fast patrol boat for use by inspectors of fisheries, and these are now being examined. It is intended that this vessel will spend considerable

periods in the South-East, manned by inspectors whose duties will include the enforcement of regulations governing crayfishing.

WERRIBEE SEWAGE FARM

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question regarding the Werribee sewage farm?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The main function of the Werribee sewage farm is the treatment and disposal of the domestic and industrial waste from a major part of the Melbourne metropolitan drainage area. Pasture irrigation and stock farming at Werribee are incidental. The revenue obtained from the farm operations does not offset the full costs of treatment. It should be noted that where large sewage farms exist they represent a big capital investment and, naturally, authorities with such farms are forced to continue their use. Because of the difficulties involved in irrigating pastures in the winter months alternative means of treatment must be provided. The Bolivar treatment works was designed to produce an extremely good effluent that can be safely discharged into receiving waters or used for irrigation purposes. A report by a committee of inquiry into the utilization of effluent from the Bolivar sewage treatment works was forwarded to the Government in June, 1966. The decision was taken by the Government in mid-1967 that the effluent be made available to private landholders for private development. Approval was given to construct diversion works to provide two off-channel pumping sumps. Construction of these diversion works is now completed.

CORNSACKS

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to my question of August 29 regarding the present stocks of cornsacks and the possibility, if necessary, of these stocks being augmented soon?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Director of Agriculture reports that about 7,000 bales of cornsacks, in stock or on order, will be available for the coming harvest. This is about half the sacks that would be required to handle the estimated barley harvest or one-quarter of the requirements for the combined wheat and barley harvest expected in excess of bulk handling spaces. As it is not known what harvest shipping will be available, or

what quantities farmers will store on farms rather than purchase sacks, merchants are loath to import sacks that may not be sold.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question regarding local government elections?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: A short opinion was given by the former Crown Solicitor (Mr. J. R. Kearnan, Q.C.) in October, 1967. It arose out of allegations in connection with a local government election at Norwood. As the opinion mentions the names of individuals and canvasses their actions, I do not propose to make it available to the House. However, as a result of it, and on the suggestion of my predecessor, a letter was sent to councils setting out the conclusions of the Crown Solicitor. If the honourable member desires a copy of that letter I think I can obtain it for him. Since the honourable member asked his question, the Government has been considering the question of whether, under the present Act, the nominee of a company has a legal right to exercise a vote by post in his representative capacity. I think this is the particular matter that concerns the honourable member. There is some doubt legally as to whether or not nominees of companies and other corporate bodies do have this right. A Bill to amend the Local Government Act is now in course of preparation. It is hoped to introduce it later this session. In the Bill will be amendments to make it clear that nominees of companies and other corporate bodies do have the right to vote by post in their representative capacity.

LAMB INDUSTRY

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Treasurer a reply to my question of August 28 regarding lamb prices?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Prices Commissioner reports that surveys are periodically made into prices and retail margins of the various types of meat sold by butchers. The most recent survey reveals that although some market prices have fallen fairly substantially in recent weeks there has not been a corresponding adjustment in retail prices. Retail margins in many cases appear high, particularly on lamb and pork. This matter was taken up with the Meat and Allied Trades Federation, which has forwarded a circular to its members requesting that margins and prices be examined in view of the lower wholesale prices now prevailing.

TOURISM

Mr. BURDON: Representations have recently been made to me regarding the allocation of tourist moneys by the Government in the last 12 months. Can the Minister of Immigration and Tourism say how much was made available by the Government for tourist projects last year, and what portion of that sum was made available to the Lower South-East?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

RIVERTON ROAD

Mr. FREEBAIRN: When I was at Riverton last Saturday, representations were made to me that the Riverton road to the Tarlee turn-off was in poor condition and I was asked to inquire as to the Government's policy on reconstruction. Will the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, ask his colleague what he intends to do about the present poor condition of this road as far as the Tarlee turn-off?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall be happy to inquire.

HAWKER SCHOOL

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question regarding the additional land required at the Hawker Area School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Following the serving of a notice to treat under the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act on the owner of the land that is required as an extension to the Hawker Area School grounds, the owner has been allowed a period of six months to enable him to forward his claim for compensation for the land to be taken. No such claim was received by August 15, so the matter has now been placed in the hands of the Crown Solicitor. He is obtaining a formal valuation of the property from the Lands Department prior to putting the matter down for hearing for assessment at the Local Court of Hawker.

ROSEWORTHY COLLEGE

Mrs. BYRNE: I understand that the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, now has a reply to my question concerning hot water services for houses at Roseworthy Agricultural College.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: My colleague states:

On investigation I find that following the honourable member's original inquiry in December last, the then Minister took the matter up with his colleague. I have followed up her recent request, however, and I am pleased to be able to inform her that, having regard to the unusual circumstances pertaining to Roseworthy Agricultural College, approval has been given for the installation of hot water systems in all the residences at the college, as a special case. I am informed, however, that this departure from the normal departmental policy in this matter is not to be taken as a precedent; and it is not practicable, at this juncture, to extend these facilities to departmental residences generally throughout the State.

STAMP DUTY

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Treasurer a reply to my recent question about stamp duty on the transfer of land?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The situation is different according to whether the transfer is as a result of sale or as the result of a gift. If the transfer is as a result of sale, the stamp duty is upon the value of the property and takes no account of any mortgage that may be taken over as part of the purchase price. If the transfer is as the result of a gift, it is the value of the gift that is pertinent for stamp duty purposes, and therefore any mortgage actually on the property and transferred with it is deductible. In the case quoted by the honourable member, assuming that it involved a gift, the apparent anomaly has arisen because the original mortgage would appear to have been discharged before transfer and then re-negotiated after transfer. However, to abandon the simple criterion that the mortgage existed before the gift and was actually transferred with the land as a condition of the gift would lead to further anomalies and open loopholes for avoidance of duty.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS

Mr. BURDON: Has the Premier obtained from the Minister of Health a reply to my question of August 22 concerning country doctors?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Minister of Health reports:

From time to time, requests are made to the Minister of Health or to the Hospitals Department seeking assistance in providing medical practitioners to country areas. Such requests are relatively infrequent and generally follow the departure from a country region of a

medical practitioner who has been unable to arrange for a replacement through the normal medical agency sources. The Government, in common with the Australian Medical Association, the College of General Practitioners and our Health and Hospitals Departments, is definitely concerned that difficulties continue to exist in obtaining doctors to take up practice in certain country areas. Although the situation changes as doctors come and go in some areas, replacement difficulties are usually experienced most frequently in practices of small size or in regions remote from specialist services. Over the past 10 years there has also been the growing tendency for medical graduates to specialize or to take up salaried positions in preference to undertaking private general practice.

The medical cadetship scheme should provide some long-term relief to the existing situation. The first medical cadet to graduate has already taken up practice in a country region and a further four cadets are proceeding through their medical course. A new form of rotating experience for second-year medical graduates will also be introduced next year with the specific purpose of providing a broadly-based training to those wishing to take up general practice in the community. In addition, I understand that the College of General Practitioners, following the recent introduction of comprehensive training programmes and a new examination system for membership, is confident that the status of the general practitioner will be progressively enhanced and that an increasing interest will be shown by medical students and graduates in this important field of medical practice. It will be seen, therefore, that the present situation relating to medical practitioners in country areas is both complex and subject to future changes. At present, the majority of country towns receives adequate services from medical practitioners. In certain country areas additional medical practitioners are required, and the Government will continue its support of any practical measures designed to overcome these deficiencies. It must always be kept in mind, however, that, with the recent exception of medical cadets, the Government has no power to direct medical practitioners to undertake any particular medical career or to practise in any particular area.

MOUNT GAMBIER GERIATRIC CENTRE

Mr. BURDON: Has the Premier obtained from the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question about the establishment of a geriatric centre at Mount Gambier?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Minister of Health reports:

Whilst geriatric accommodation and the future use of the old hospital building have been listed for consideration, the Director-General of Medical Services has reported that his department has no proposal in its building programme to erect a 50-bed geriatric centre to be established separately from the main hospital building at Mount Gambier.

OAKBANK SCHOOL

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the Oakbank Area School swimming pool dressing shed?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: An urgent inspection of the Oakbank Area School swimming pool dressing shed has been made by an inspector of the Public Buildings Department, who says little can be done to maintain the building because of the extent of fracturing that has occurred. It is now proposed to arrange a joint inspection of the building by architectural and structural staff. This is an interim report pending receipt of the recommendations following the proposed inspection.

WATER STORAGES

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about water storages on the Murray River?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The volumes of water in storage, available to the River Murray Commission on September 1, 1968, were as follows: Hume dam, 1,493,000 acre feet (full capacity 2,500,000 acre feet); Menindee Lakes, 490,000 acre feet (of which 100,000 acre feet is available to the River Murray Commission); and Lake Victoria (which is full), 552,000 acre feet.

KULPARA SCHOOL

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the Kulpara school?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The Housing Trust cannot provide a building allotment for the proposed new Kulpara school residence. However, there are two other allotments available in Kulpara, and the Public Buildings Department has been asked to report on the most suitable site for a school residence. When this has been received, further action will be taken.

BUSH FIRES

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked some time ago about what additional publicity and what co-operation with Mr. Kerr and his department were expected in view of the bush fire hazards that appear apparent this year?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Bush-fire Research Committee is acutely conscious, as I hope the general public is also conscious, of the potential bush fire hazard this year

following the heavy growth of vegetation. The publicity sub-committee of this body has already made plans for an intensified publicity campaign and will use as media television films, posters, newspaper stereotypes, car stickers and more roadside signs. The committee is also promulgating to townships throughout the State the findings of the pilot project for township fire protection completed earlier this year at Williamstown. The Bushfire Research Committee and the Director of Emergency Fire Services maintain close collaboration in all matters of bush fire prevention and control. A joint committee consisting of representatives of the Bushfire Research Committee, Emergency Fire Services, Fire Brigades Board and the State Committee of the Australian Fire Protection Association has been formed to promote Fire Protection Week to be held next month.

NON-WETTING SANDS

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about non-wetting sands?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Director of Agriculture reports that water-repellant or "non-wetting" sands occur over a wide area in South Australia. The most seriously affected area is the upper South-East, from about Naracoorte to the vicinity of Tailem Bend. Most of the affected soils in this region are used for improved pasture. In the cereal districts, scattered occurrences of the problem exist in the southern Murray Mallee and Murray Plains, the Stansbury district, and Murdinga to Wharminda on Eyre Peninsula. It is believed that this phenomenon is brought about by the growth of fungi in these soils and is especially serious around the roots of perennial plants, such as lucerne. No satisfactory control measure has been found, although it can be alleviated to some extent by cultivation. The problem is being worked on by Mr. Roy Bond, of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, and small-scale field trials are in progress jointly with the C.S.I.R.O. and the soils branch of the Agriculture Department. The problem is a difficult one, as there are few positive leads towards an economic solution. The results of further research into the fundamental nature of the problem are needed as a basis for an expansion of the field experimental programme. Research work of this former type lies within

the field of the C.S.I.R.O. Attempts have been made without success to obtain support from wool research funds.

PENSIONERS' TELEPHONES

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to my recent question about the provision by the Housing Trust of telephones to serve groups of pensioner flats?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The General Manager of the Housing Trust reports:

The trust has 56 cottage flat groups, varying in size from four to 40 flats. It has been ascertained that there is a public telephone booth within reasonable distance of all groups; in fact, a great majority of the groups have this facility adjacent to the areas. The group mentioned by Mr. Hudson, M.P., at Oaklands Park is considered to be the most adversely served, as it is the largest (40 flats) and the public telephone is about 100 yards distant. The Postmaster-General's Department does install public telephones in premises such as large hotels, hospitals, etc., where the public has access, but small groups of flats such as those in question are not included in this category. The cost of installing red telephones in all of the trust's cottage flat groups would be \$1,680 installation fee to the P.M.G. Department, \$2,740 a year rental to the P.M.G. Department and \$5,040 a year rental to the Victa Company Pty. Ltd. Total yearly rental would, therefore, be \$7,780. This rental is a special one, based on the installation of red telephones in all trust booths.

A plastic telephone can be used in place of the metal telephone (referred to above) at a company rental of \$2,800 a year, making a total rental of \$5,540. Obviously, the plastic type would be easy game for vandals. In addition to the abovementioned installation cost and annual rentals, telephone booths would have to be constructed, as there is no suitable ready-made place for telephone housing. As yet, the trust has not obtained an estimate of the cost of such booths. The trust would be responsible for the maintenance of the booths, the collection of coins and the payment to the P.M.G., which would receive 4c of each 5c call fee. Trust cottage flats are already heavily subsidized and, should red telephones be installed, further subsidy must be borne by trust tenants and not the whole community. As previously stated, the trust's experience has been that the P.M.G. Department's siting of public telephones generally adjacent to cottage flat sites has been quite satisfactory, the case as pointed out by Mr. Hudson, M.P., at Oaklands Park being the exception rather than the rule. It is realized that this particular telephone does come in for some abuse, to the inconvenience of the occupants of the 40 flats. Over the years the P.M.G. Department has given special attention to requests for public telephones to be sited as close as possible to aged pensioners' homes groups, with due consideration of the needs of the locality. The trust will make special representations concerning the group referred to by Mr. Hudson.

MARION LAND

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on August 22 about Education Department land at Marion?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The triangular block of land referred to by the honourable member is the property of the Westminister School. As the honourable member knows, this is not a departmental school. Therefore, the problem of weed clearance is not one for the Education Department.

MOONTA MINES WATER SUPPLY

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked during the Loan Estimates debate about improvements to the water supply at Moonta Mines?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: A careful investigation of the area was carried out late in 1967 and as a result some 1,220ft. of new or replacement mains were completed in the area during April, 1968. While no specific programme has been prepared for the area at this stage, during the present financial year the Engineering and Water Supply Department intends to make an assessment of the area involved and carry out necessary work. The whole question of the condition of distribution mains in the Kadina-Wallaroo area is constantly under review, as indicated by the following: 12,000ft. of 3in. main replacing 2in. mains in the hundred of Kadina has been laid just recently; 17,900ft. of 3in. main replacing 2in. mains in the hundred of Kadina has been approved for relay; and 48,400ft. of 3in., 4in. and 6in. mains replacing 2in. and 6in. mains in the hundreds of Kadina and Wallaroo has recently been submitted for approval.

COUNTRY WATER DISTRICTS

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about country water districts?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The sum of \$63,000 provided for Whyalla under the allocation for country water districts during the present financial year includes \$40,000 for distribution mains, the remainder being shared between additional work at the maintenance depot and part-purchase costs of waterworks from the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited.

OLARY ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

Mr. CASEY: Has the Treasurer a reply regarding the provision of electricity for railway employees at Olary, which matter I raised in the Loan Estimates debate?

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

I have to advise that it is departmental policy to install electric light and power in its cottages at locations where electric power is available. However, there are many stations, including Olary, where such power is not yet available. While appreciating the desirability of providing employees with this amenity, it is regretted that the high cost of installation coupled with the very small demand for power at these places render its provision impracticable. Departmental generating plants are installed at Mannahill and Mingary, but this is primarily for the purpose of pumping water. At these stations the opportunity is taken to supply electrical energy to the railway cottages.

STRATHALBYN-MILANG WATER SCHEME

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the Strathalbyn-Milang water scheme?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The connection of the Strathalbyn-Milang pipeline to the Murray Bridge to Onkaparinga main will be considered on completion of this main but this is not expected before 1974. However, I point out that up to the present the existing scheme has satisfactorily supplied the Strathalbyn-Milang area and no problems have been experienced with the supply.

HARBOUR WORKS

Mr. BROOMHILL: During the Loan Estimates debate I asked a question about the reduction in the provision for sundry works under the line "Department of Marine and Harbors". Has the Minister of Marine that information?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The item "sundry works \$49,000", which appears as the fifth line under Marine and Harbors, is an abbreviation for "sundry small works carried over from 1967-68" and if all the works involved had been completed, the figure would have been zero and the line would not have appeared. The fact that it is less than last year's figure only indicates a smaller backlog of work on the department's books, and, if anything, is something to be commended. The works involved were:

Sundry Works Port Adelaide 1968-69	\$
Completion of Honey Street amenities building	2,000
Further marine work at Jervois bridge when required by Highways Department	10,000
Completion of mangrove clearing	8,000
Completion of armouring of North Arm embankment	25,000
Completion of numerous smaller jobs	4,000
	\$49,000

Further, the honourable member said, "whereas last year \$125,000 was expended". In actual fact he is quoting an estimated figure for sundry works at outports in the 1967-68 Loan Estimates. The correct figure is \$112,000, three lines higher up, but this is still an estimated figure not an actual expenditure.

"Minor works \$50,000". This is the figure for works "as may be authorized during the financial year 1968-69. It is, of course, to cover the expenditure on the many small jobs that crop up during the year that cannot be foreseen when the estimates are prepared. Inclusion of the container-trailership berth at \$1,060,000 in this year's Estimates has meant that less money is available for the line "works as may be authorized" quoted in the official Loan Estimates as "Minor Works".

The Loan allocation for 1968-69 is in excess of \$1,000,000 more than for 1967-68, and represents a 45 per cent increase over last year's actual expenditure.

RADIATA PINE

Mr. BURDON: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Forests to the question I asked on August 29 about radiata pine?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Conservator of Forests reports that the import of New Zealand sawn timber into Australia has not varied greatly since the commencement of the Free Trade Agreement in 1966. For the three calendar years, 1965, 1966 and 1967, the percentage of New Zealand imports to Australia compared with total imports has ranged from 7 per cent to 9 per cent. The actual quantities imported into Australia were about 30,000,000, 29,000,000 and 30,000,000 super feet respectively. Of this quantity, New South Wales received about 25,000,000 super feet in each of these three years, and Victoria received most of the balance. This is a normal pattern, and has caused virtually no interference with our normal markets in the Eastern States. South Australia's imports of New Zealand radiata pine over the same period have averaged only 250,000 super feet, in relation to a total local radiata production of about 112,000,000 super feet.

ECHUNGA SCHOOL

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the provision of a residence for the head teacher at the Echunga Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: It is agreed that it is generally better for the head teacher to live in the district where he can know the parents and children. For the following reasons, however, the erection of a residence at Echunga has not been given a high priority. Echunga is only 22 miles from Adelaide and the department at present has no power to insist that the head must live in the school residence or in the town. The Echunga head teacher lives in the Stirling East school residence, which is available because the head of that school lives in the metropolitan area. The department has provided, in near country towns, residences which have become vacant because the heads prefer to live elsewhere, and it is sometimes difficult to find tenants for these vacant residences. There is a need for additional and replacement residences in more distant country areas to which heads cannot travel daily. With the limited funds available it is more logical to build residences in these areas, rather than in towns in close proximity to the metropolitan area.

Mr. EVANS: As the children attending the Echunga Primary School do not have a resident teacher to whom they can refer their problems, will the Minister of Education say whether the department intends to build a library at this school so that students will be able to solve their problems with the help of books?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will obtain a report on the matter for the honourable member.

HIGHBURY SHOPPING CENTRE

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Attorney-General received from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on August 22 requesting the Highways Department to consider providing an entrance on the western side of the shopping centre at Highbury?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The land between Elliston Avenue and the Lower North-East Road at Highbury is reserve vested in the Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully. There is road access to Elliston Avenue from the Lower North-East Road at both ends of the reserve. A western entrance to the shopping centre is, therefore, in fact available. No reason is apparent why the Highways Department should make representation to the corporation for a further roadway.

WEED CONTROL

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Attorney-General received from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on August 14 about the control of weeds on railway property?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague has informed me that arrangements have been made to control weeds in the Melton station yard. It would expedite the handling of representations by the council if, in future, the Chief Engineer was notified. Such notification would ensure that the officers concerned were informed of the situation. The district foreman would then be instructed in the action to be taken and provided with the equipment necessary for the purpose.

MORPHETT ROAD

Mr. HUDSON: I understand that the Attorney-General has a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my recent question concerning the installation of traffic lights on Morphett Road to make it safer for horses crossing that road to and from the racetrack for training purposes each morning.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague has informed me that the suggestion to install crossing lights to enable racehorses to cross Morphett Road is a local matter which should, in the first instance, be directed to the Glenelg Corporation. The cost of such an installation would have to be met by the corporation.

GOVERNMENT LAND

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question about the purchase of Government land by charitable organizations?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Unless a specific instance is quoted, it is somewhat difficult to state the policy on pricing of Crown land. However, it is usual to fix a concessional price for the purchase of such land by a recognized charitable organization.

MARGARINE

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the use of margarine in home science classes?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The only specific reference to margarine in the home science syllabus is the statement "Manufacture of margarine—comparison with butter in food value" in the Leaving P.E.B. home science syllabus. The statement in the

preamble to the same syllabus "that stress will be laid throughout on the basic scientific principles underlying the processes and techniques involved" would apply equally well to all other syllabuses in home management or home science used in departmental secondary schools. With the widespread use of both butter and margarine for cooking purposes in the community, it is quite obvious that secondary students should be given instruction in the use of both ingredients and in their relative values. For purposes of economy margarine may be used, but it would certainly not be to the exclusion of butter. Dairy Board posters concerning the use of butter are displayed in most home science centres.

The nutritional and practical values of all fats used for cooking would be included in home science courses, and in this regard there would certainly be discussion of the relative importance of both saturated and polyunsaturated fats in relation to diet. Teachers are not directed as to recipes which their classes should use and, obviously, in using their discretion, will choose ingredients appropriate to the lesson being given. Butter and margarine both have their uses, and I would expect both to be used. If the honourable member would give me the name of the school to which he referred in his question a specific inquiry could be made to ensure that the general practice I have outlined is being followed there.

DENTAL HEALTH

Mr. CASEY: Has the Premier a reply to the question I recently asked about establishing dental clinics in country towns?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Plans are in hand for the establishment of a static dental clinic at Peterborough, together with clinics at a number of other country centres. These clinics are expected to be available for the treatment of primary schoolchildren by late June, 1969.

EGGS

Mr. ALLEN: As at Monday, September 9, 1968, the price a dozen of large first-quality hen eggs in the various States was as follows: New South Wales, 51c; Victoria, 49c; Western Australia, 49c; Queensland, 48c; and South Australia, 45c. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture to explain the differences in price in the various States?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes.

STUDENT TEACHERS

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on September 4 about the costs of travelling and of supplying textbooks under the present arrangements relating to student teachers? Does the Minister intend to meet representatives of student teachers this week to discuss this matter further?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Expenditure for the financial year 1967-68 on teachers college student textbooks and travelling allowances was \$126,500 and \$229,500 respectively, making a total of \$356,000. When I met the student delegation on, I think, September 6, I promised those present that, if they made submissions to me on the matters raised, I would consider them. I have now received those submissions and they are being considered.

RAILWAY LAND

Mr. BROOMHILL: My question concerns a strip of land, held by the Railways Department, that runs between Grange and Henley Beach. At one stage I believe that this land was intended to be used to extend the Grange railway line to Henley Beach. As this land is important from the point of view of development at Henley Beach, approaches have been made over the years to Government to make this land available for development. However, approaches made in recent years have been unsuccessful because it has been pointed out that, until the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report was available, it was not known whether the land concerned would be required for an additional railway line in the area. As the land does not seem to be required under the M.A.T.S. Report, will the Attorney-General take up with the Minister of Roads and Transport the matter of using this land, and will he provide me with a report?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

SEWERAGE CONNECTIONS

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I recently asked about sewerage connections?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The allocation of \$700,000 in the 1968-69 Loan Estimates is for normal connections in the Adelaide drainage area and, in addition to this, \$46,000 has been provided for advances under the deferred payments scheme for both the Adelaide and country drainage areas.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question about sewerage connections I asked in the debate on the Loan Estimates?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: During 1966-67, approval was given for 102 houses to be connected to sewerage under the deferred payment scheme and the total amount paid as advances for this work amounted to \$19,917. Although this amount exceeded the provision, it was possible to make funds available from savings in other lines, and no genuine application was refused. When sewerage schemes are submitted for approval, they are to some extent diagrammatic and are subject to variation when detailed field surveys and designs are made. Until detailed levels are taken it is not possible to state the exact extent of the scheme and it is not known whether certain properties at the extremities can or cannot be served by the scheme. It is therefore undesirable for plans of schemes to be issued, as they can be easily misconstrued and landowners can be misled as to the intentions of the department. Plans are available at the office of the Engineer for Sewerage. The honourable member is welcome to inspect these and any particular queries can be answered. Landowners can also have their queries answered by calling at or writing to the department.

RENTAL ACCOMMODATION

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I recently asked about rental accommodation? If he has, could he supply me with a duplicate copy of the reply, which is apparently supplied by other Ministers but, unfortunately, not apparently supplied by the Attorney-General?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Actually, I supply such copies but, regarding the last question asked by the honourable member, I answered only from rough notes that I had made myself, so there was nothing to give him. However, I will certainly oblige on this occasion. The Minister of Roads and Transport states:

The suggestion appears unrealistic, as the Highways Department is currently involved in many land transactions related to freeways and other road works, both within and beyond the metropolitan area. The honourable member is assured that the Highways Department has no intention of disposing of any land other than to the best advantage of the community. Where land currently held could be affected by any possible alternative road proposal, or where it could be of value for resettlement of

persons displaced by the Highways Department's proposals, such matters will be given due consideration before recommending disposal.

ORROROO-PETERBOROUGH WATER SUPPLY

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the Orroroo-Peterborough water supply?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The district council of Orroroo has agreed to continue its lease of the Orroroo water supply system for a further six months until June 30, 1969. However, the Engineering and Water Supply Department will be responsible for all major works and the sum of \$15,000 will be used for preliminary improvements to the supply system. In the case of the Peterborough supply system, the sum of \$60,000 is to cover the work in progress on the construction of a new tank and mains to maintain pressures and supplies at Peterborough.

RAILWAY SERVICES

Mr. CASEY: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my question of August 27 regarding the Peterborough-Orroroo-Quorn rail service?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The proposal to rationalize railway passenger services provides for the cancellation of all rail passenger train services beyond Peterborough on the Peterborough-Quorn line. Instead, a co-ordinated rail and road bus service will operate from Adelaide to Quorn via Gladstone and Wilmington. This will provide a more frequent service to Quorn for passengers, parcels and mails than is at present operating. Passenger accommodation will be provided in the brakevan of goods trains working between Peterborough and Quorn via Orroroo and no alteration to the frequency of this service is envisaged at present. It has not yet been decided when the changeover will take place.

DIESEL-ELECTRIC LOCOMOTIVES

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Treasurer a reply to a question I asked in the Loan Estimates debate concerning diesel-electric locomotives?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The six diesel-electric locomotives referred to will be obtained by contract. However, as this work will be integrated with the conversion to standard gauge of locomotives of a similar type that were acquired under the Railway Equipment

Agreement, certain modification work in connection with the bogies will be undertaken by departmental forces. This type of locomotive has not been manufactured at the Islington workshops. In fact, while we have fabricated 37 diesel-electric locomotives in the workshops, and seven more are under construction, the engines, transmissions and control gear have always been provided by contract.

PETERBOROUGH RAMPS

Mr. CASEY: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my question of August 14 regarding ramps at Peterborough?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The original ramps on the Peterborough pedestrian subway had slopes of 1-in-6 and 1-in-8 respectively but, as reconstructed, all ramps will be 1-in-6. It is not the policy of the Railways Department to provide handrails in circumstances such as these. However, no objection would be offered should the corporation or some other organization seek to provide handrails on the Peterborough subway.

At 4 o'clock, the bells having being rung:

ROAD GRANTS

Mr. CASEY (on notice):

1. What amounts of money were made available to the Corporation of the Town of Peterborough and to the Corporation of the Town of Quorn, respectively, for each of the financial years 1966-67, and 1967-68, under each of the following headings:

- (a) ordinary grants for main roads;
- (b) ordinary grants for district roads; and
- (c) grants in aid?

2. What amounts were made available, respectively, to the District Councils of Peterborough, Orroroo, Carrington, Hawker and Kanyaka in 1966-67 and 1967-68 under each of the following headings:

- (a) ordinary grants for main roads;
- (b) ordinary grants for district roads;
- (c) grants in aid;
- (d) machinery loans; and
- (e) grants advanced for work on departmental debit orders?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The replies are as follows:

I. Corporation

	Peterborough		Quorn	
	1966-67	1967-68	1966-67	1967-68
(a) Grants for main roads	\$ —	\$ —	\$ 300	\$ 300
(b) Grants for district roads	16,000	7,450	1,200	1,100
(c) Grants-in-aid	358	358	230	226

II. Council

	Carrieton		Hawker		Kanyaka		Orroroo		Peterborough	
	1966-67	1967-68	1966-67	1967-68	1966-67	1967-68	1966-67	1967-68	1966-67	1967-68
(a) Grants for main roads	\$ 30,200	\$ 23,400	\$ 28,000	\$ 24,000	\$ 12,800	\$ 13,300	\$ 22,200	\$ 24,600	\$ 24,400	\$ 24,400
(b) Grants for district roads	8,100	9,900	8,600	8,500	22,500	19,400	10,700	11,900	20,700	19,000
(c) Grants-in-aid	283	287	506	497	624	610	727	744	587	594
(d) Machinery loans	19,270	—	10,410	—	—	—	—	—	8,310	—
(e) Grants for work on departmental debit orders	—	1,418	24,615	35,367	18,487	9,855	—	—	9,536	972

THE BUDGET

The Estimates—Grand total, \$295,284,000.
In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 5. Page 1115.)

THE LEGISLATURE

Legislative Council, \$41,494.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): Rising to speak to these Estimates, one can reflect only that they are characterized by two features: first, a complete repudiation by the Government of the things it saw fit to say when in Opposition and at the time of the State election; and secondly, that this is a deflationary Budget at a time of need for stimulus to the economy, since there are resources unused in manpower and goods. At the time that the Labor Government was in office, we pointed out (as did the Governments of other States, regardless of political Party) that the States' Budgets were being clearly squeezed by the Commonwealth and that in order to maintain adequate services in the States we had had to expand revenue expenditure in South Australia. Indeed, although we expanded revenue expenditure at a record rate during our period of office, we were told by the Party opposite that we ought to have spent more on a number of heads.

At the same time, while we were pointing out that it was difficult to maintain this expansion in expenditure while the Commonwealth was refusing to the States a proper return of their fair share of growth rate taxes (particularly income tax), the Party opposite, instead of joining in what was a campaign on behalf of the State, as it should have done together with the Liberal Premiers of New South Wales and Victoria, proceeded to tell the people of South Australia that, in fact, State

taxation in South Australia was too high. In all the swinging districts of South Australia (mine, Millicent, Unley, Glenelg, Wallaroo, and so on) a pamphlet went out, which was headed, "The Voice of South Australia" (No. 3 of a series). It purported to be "the third of a series of pamphlets setting out what many of the people in South Australia are saying about the State Labor Government." It stated:

South Australians are saying this about Labor's policy of higher taxation: "State taxation is too high".

Inside the pamphlet, this sort of thing appears (and the statements are made by various anonymous characters—no names are given):

A 38-year old teacher: "Labor put up rates and prices which hit the little man they are supposed to protect." A 33-year old librarian: "The Labor Government has increased taxation, including stamp duties and land tax." A 29-year old housewife: "I don't like the Labor Government because it didn't mention before the election the putting up of land taxes, and then blaming the other Party for its mistakes."

Then they hit us as follows, saying that this was what they objected to:

Higher water rates; tram and bus fares up; land tax up; harbour charges up; and stamp duties up. Since assuming office in March, 1965, South Australians are now paying \$35.96 per head in State taxes as against \$29.23 under the former Liberal and Country League Government.

Of course, that was an outright untruth, because the amount proposed in State taxation in the 1964 Budget under Sir Thomas Playford meant that people in South Australia were paying a darned sight more than \$29.23 a head a year taxation under the State Liberal Government.

Mr. Casey: They never print the truth.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is what that Party was saying to the people of South Australia. It gave the people the impression that, if it were in office, State taxation would not be dealt with in this way. It said that State taxes were too high and that under a Liberal Government the people in South Australia would not be paying as much in State taxation.

Mr. Hudson: The only taxation they referred to was a reduction in the winning bets tax.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. Then it came to election time and, after various statements made by members opposite that we could not blame the Commonwealth, that State taxes were too high, that we should be financially responsible, and that we should expand expenditure, reduce taxation and balance the Budget, the Leader of the Opposition (as he then was) made the prime issue of the election financial responsibility in South Australia. He said we had to return to financial responsibility. He said that we had to have a balanced Budget in some way. However, no matter of taxation was referred to in the Budget except, as the member for Glenelg said, the winning bets tax (with which I will deal in a moment) which they intended to take off. The impression was then given to the people in South Australia that, as a result, there would be a reduction of taxation in that area. Members opposite said that the Labor Government had improperly used Loan moneys by charging to the Loan Fund the same items of expenditure as had been charged to Loan Fund by every reigning Liberal Government in Australia. They said that this was wrong and was a gross misuse of Loan moneys and that under a Liberal Government Loan moneys would be used for development and not for current expenditure.

Those were the things they told the people of South Australia. The people are entitled to expect that those who go to an election and put forward policies will put those policies into effect when they are in office. If they go before the people and say one thing and then get into office and do completely the opposite, not only do they do great harm to themselves (and, of course, they have done that already) but they also do great harm to the very probity of the Parliamentary institution. What have members opposite done as compared with what they told us they intended to do? Let us look at the

matter of State taxation, which they said was too high. Let me turn to the published figures for State taxation. Under the Labor Government, in South Australia the increase per capita in State taxation was lower than that in any other State in Australia (except Tasmania) for the same period, and lower than the increase in taxation in any State in the Commonwealth under a Liberal Government. Under the Labor Government, State taxation remained lower per capita than in any State except Tasmania, and it was only very slightly more per capita than that in Tasmania (less than a dollar more a head a year), whereas in New South Wales it was considerably more and in Victoria it was about \$16 a head a year more. We had maintained a cost advantage as compared with the other States.

What was said by members opposite and by their cohorts in the Chamber of Manufactures about this? They said it was necessary to keep down costs of industry in South Australia and that therefore imposts which would fall directly on industry and business in South Australia must not be imposed, so that we could have industrial expansion here by maintaining a comparatively low cost structure. That was what industry and commerce expected of the Party opposite. What has happened now? We have had imposed, in this Budget, apart from the measures that are forecast, an increase of \$8 a head a year, taking our per capita taxation in South Australia to \$49 a year. That is about \$4 a head less than the current taxation in New South Wales and only \$7 a head less than that applying in Victoria at the end of 1967. We have not the exact figure for Victoria at present, because the full effects of Sir Henry Bolte's last taxation impositions do not appear in any figure as yet published by the Commonwealth Statistician.

The margin between the per capita taxation in South Australia and that in Victoria and New South Wales has been drastically narrowed by this series of impositions and, in consequence, the people of South Australia have been hoodwinked by this Government. True, South Australia needed additional revenues. However, the Party opposite refused to say that to the people. Members opposite said that State taxation was too high and now, having got into office, they have made the biggest increase in per capita taxation in South Australia within living memory in one year. Regarding taxation reductions, they said they

would remove the winning bets tax. Well, I wonder what punters and racegoers will think of this one!

Mr. Hurst: She's a gem.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is. This is not one of the seven taxation increases in the Treasurer's original list, but when we examine what he intends to do about the winning bets tax we see precisely where we will get to. He says:

Accordingly, legislation is proposed during the current session authorizing the abandonment of the winning bets tax on a date to be proclaimed, and on present indication that date can be expected to be June 30, 1969.

That is all right: apparently the winning bets tax is to come off then. However, the Treasurer goes on as follows:

In that legislation the Government would also propose to secure authority from the same date to bring the levels of the tax on bookmakers' turnover and the stamp duty on betting tickets to the levels generally operating in the Eastern States.

Let us consider racing taxation according to the figures published by the Commonwealth Statistician. The latest State figures show that the tax in New South Wales is \$3.20, in Victoria \$4.33, in Queensland \$2.64, in South Australia (including the winning bets tax) \$2.30, the lowest in Australia, in Western Australia \$3.66, and in Tasmania \$2.99. The Australian average is \$3.33. The winning bets tax is to come off, but taxation on racing is to be imposed at the same level as applies in the other States, and that will result in an increase in the return to the Government from that taxation. We will have an increased return to the Government from the punters, by way of the stamp duty on betting tickets, apart entirely from the reduction of the winning bets tax, and, because of the increase of bookmakers' turnover tax, the punters will get shorter odds.

This is all a piece of what is now being done by the Minister of Education (Hon. Joyce Steele) in dealing with student teachers' allowances in South Australia. She makes a grand play, saying that the students are to get extra money, and then removes from them benefits that they now have so that they will be far worse off. That is exactly what will happen regarding racing taxation in South Australia. The Premier did not say a word about this extra taxation in his policy speech or during the election.

Mr. Hudson: Or in his broadcasts.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, he did not tell the people of South Australia about that. Despite this considerable increase

in taxation, we are faced with further forecasts about the future. As I have said, when we were in office, members of the present Government told us that it was quite improper for us to condemn the Commonwealth Government about the way in which that Government treated the States. However, now that they are in office, they are saying the most bitter things about the Commonwealth. The Treasurer says:

The Government considers that the stand of the Commonwealth towards the States generally and towards South Australia in particular has been most unreasonable and inconsiderate.

Mr. Corcoran: That was only a softener-up, for what came at the end of the paragraph.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, and I will deal with that later. Why were members opposite, as responsible politicians in South Australia, not prepared to say that while we were in office? The Attorney-General (who is now laughing cynically) said, when he was on this side, that it was improper for us to blame the Commonwealth because we were getting inadequate returns from Commonwealth taxation. That statement is on page 70 of *Hansard* of last year.

Mr. Corcoran: They weren't prepared to blame their friends in the Upper House, who threw our measures out.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. The Treasurer continues:

A mass of information and submissions has been placed before the Commonwealth indicating the relative gross inadequacy of the sources of State finance both in volume and in growth potential to meet the ever expanding State responsibilities.

That is quite right. That material has been presented to the Commonwealth, and what the Commonwealth has done to this State is grossly unjust. We entirely agree with those statements by the Treasurer. However, when we made similar statements while we were in office, we were ridiculed. Members opposite would not get together with us to defend this State's rights to an equitable proportion of Commonwealth revenues. However, Government members cannot get from the Commonwealth the moneys that they ought to be getting, because their friends in Canberra are not listening. During the election campaign the Premier appeared with the Prime Minister at the Adelaide Town Hall, when the Prime Minister said, "Vote for the Liberals in South Australia, because it's going to be so much easier if we are all in the one family. It will

be an easier road to Canberra." The Premier, however, has gone to Canberra and has found that it is rather a Mother Hubbard kind of family: the cupboard is bare. After going on in bitter fashion, quite justly and properly, about the way the Commonwealth is treating South Australia, the Treasurer says:

The Government would also be disposed, if necessary, to submit to Parliament supplementary proposals which would not only authorize the unavoidable expenditures but would propose ways and means to finance them. What those ways and means may be if the Commonwealth will not assist it is not possible to forecast, but it must be apparent that this State and the States generally cannot indefinitely concede to the Commonwealth a complete monopoly of all forms of income tax if it does not offer adequate alternative resources. This comment applies to the possible subsequent extension of the new receipts duty to wages and salaries as well as to other taxes of a like nature.

There we have held over us a threat that later this year we will have Supplementary Estimates to extend these indirect and regressive taxes which operate across the board and which are not really related effectively to the capacity of people to pay. Such taxes have already been imposed by Liberal Governments in Western Australia and in Victoria. The future looks black, but the immediate future look even blacker.

Let us consider what is being done in this Budget. Where this State has to raise additional finances, in the view of members on this side those finances should be raised in progressive taxation, as far as possible where we have progressive taxing capacity, and we should alter the incidence of our taxes to ensure that taxes are paid progressively in the same way, at least, as they are in other States. Now, South Australia is not receiving from death duties the sum that is being paid per capita in the Eastern States. What is more, the incidence of death duties in South Australia falls more heavily on the smaller estates than it does in other States, and less heavily on the larger estates.

Mr. Hudson: And the loopholes are a scandal.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course. Here is unused taxing capacity where taxes could be imposed which would not inhibit business and industrial expansion and which would not scale down business or dampen it at a time when it needs a stimulus and increased confidence. It is progressive taxation that is required. It is not taxation across the board that increases the costs of industry, yet the

Government will not impose it. Rather it will use flat-rate taxes, definitely and clearly designed to get money out of the pockets of the average wage and salary earner, the average consumer, and the average small business man, because these are the people on whom the imposts, with one exception, will fall.

The first measure proposed, a receipts duty of 1c in each \$10 of business turnover, will not worry some of the larger concerns much (it will worry them to some extent and none will like it), but it will certainly worry the smaller concern and the average business man considerably and, naturally enough, he will try to pass the extra cost on to the community. He will not be able to do it by a special increase on every good that he sells but, overall, it will have its effect on prices in this State. Meanwhile, until he can increase prices he is faced with finding this money, and when he increases prices he will find, in the present atmosphere of business in this State, that this inhibits an increase in his turnover.

The next proposal is a stamp duty of \$2 on certificates of compulsory third party motor vehicle insurance designed to assist in public hospital operations. It is all very well to say that this is designed to do that, but it is payable into the Treasury. It will support the money paid out of the Treasury for one purpose or another. The Treasurer may find it necessary to get extra money for hospital expenditure in South Australia, but let us not conceal the fact that this \$2 tax is a straight impost that goes into the Treasury and is not designed to improve insurance: it is designed to improve revenues. A \$2 impost on every car owner in South Australia is a flat-rate impost that falls much more heavily on the poorer people of the community than it does on the others.

The third proposal is a gift duty at rates comparable with those levied in the larger Australian States. This is a tax with which we entirely agree, and we support it. It is proper to impose it, and it is one means of closing some loopholes in the succession duty laws in South Australia. It is important that it should be introduced and we have no critical comment in relation to it: if we had been in office we would have imposed it.

Another proposal is the extension of the present hire-purchase duty of 1½ per cent to cover other forms of time-payment, leasing and like transactions. We do not know now how far this is to extend but, if it is to extend to all forms of time-payment other than hire-purchase, it will interfere radically with the

operations of many businesses in South Australia, because it will mean that budget accounts, the ordinary time-payment arrangements which are made extensively in larger businesses in South Australia and on which our consumer durable goods industry relies, will have a direct impost on them.

The fifth proposal is an increase in the fee for liquor licences from 5 per cent to 6 per cent, which is the rate applicable in most other States. True, this is the rate most applicable in other States, but I do not know what discussions the Treasurer had with the Australian Hotels Association beforehand, because there is one feature of this that falls unjustly on some people in this State. A provision of most hotel leases (and a large proportion of South Australian hotels are leased) is that the turnover tax is paid entirely by the lessee, and the owner pays no proportion of it. This is unlike the lease provisions in other States. The lessee, having to find this extra impost, will, in the smaller hotels, be placed in a difficult position.

Mr. Hudson: The price of beer must go up straight away.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Exactly: this immediately affects the price of beer, because the Prices Commissioner, when investigating the price of beer, makes recommendations. I know we have a Liquor Industry Council, but it is the Prices Commissioner who reports to the Treasurer, and his report is considered when judging the submissions from the Liquor Industry Council. The Prices Commissioner's investigations are based on what is the overhead, the cost of running of the least efficient hotels. The more efficient make a fair margin, but he must show that the price for beer will cover the cost of operating the least profitable hotel business. When an extra 1 per cent impost is added and is payable by the lessee of the least efficient hotel business, or the least profitable one, that affects the price of beer immediately, because it has to increase to enable this lessee to cover his overhead and make a living. This means that some organizations will make a large profit, far more than the extra cost to them of this 1 per cent turnover tax, but the public gets hit.

The other proposal is for an increase in public hospital charges in line with charges elsewhere. I am amazed. Last year, when we had to increase public hospital charges less and later than did the other States and kept our public hospital charges lower to the public than they were in any other State, there were protests from members opposite,

including the Attorney-General, that we should not have an increase of any kind. He said that this was hitting the poor people.

Mr. Broomhill: What does he say now?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What is being done is to increase hospital charges to bring them into line with charges elsewhere. Why? It has been the proud boast of members opposite that, in order to maintain a cost structure competitive with other States, money wages in this State have been lower than they are elsewhere but real wages have been kept at the level of those in other States because charges to be met in household expenditure and public services have been lower than elsewhere. This, we were told, was why we kept the difference in money wages compared with other States. Now, people in this State on a lower money wage than people in other States will have to pay more in hospital charges in proportion to their wage than anywhere else in Australia. This is a direct impost on the public. One can only say that this is a Budget, in consequence in this area, which hits the public hard and which takes a considerable sum out of the public coffers in an area where money ought to be spent in order to keep the demand for the goods that we produce here as high as possible. The moneys that have been taken in have not been from areas where we can reasonably get revenue without inhibiting the demand for our products or interfering with the staple items of household expenditure.

In addition to hitting household budgets with these imposts, the Government has proceeded (I do not know whether or not through the doctrinaire views of the Attorney-General, but I assume that this is likely to be the case) to do two other things that would only derive, in my view, from people who were so attached to the garbled version of Adam Smith's writings over 100 years ago that they could carry on this way: it has removed from price control a number of staple items of household expenditure.

Mr. Broomhill: A large number of them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: For instance, let me turn to one thing that affects my own district: the Government has removed soft drinks from price control. The soft drink manufacturers are mostly in my district. We increased the price for soft drinks last year, and, as a result, soft drink manufacturers in my district were not only able to carry on satisfactorily but also to increase their dividend this year and to say in their public statements to their shareholders that they had been able,

as a result of increased turnover from seasonal conditions, from the changes in the Licensing Act, and from the increase that we had granted, to absorb the whole of the extra costs to them and to pay an increased dividend to their shareholders. We do not quarrel with their doing that but why, in those circumstances, remove price control? The excuse for this was that soft drink manufacturers had had to absorb a 10 per cent increase in wage costs, but they had already told their shareholders that they had been able to absorb these costs in increased turnover. Of course, now there is no specified price, and each manufacturer can fix his own.

Mr. Ryan: Some drinks have gone up 12c a dozen.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This, of course, is only one small item. I have already had many complaints from workers who had provided for their children a number of soft drinks a week, and they had regular orders of this kind. This was a standard item of their household expenditure, and they now find it difficult to meet the item, which they have previously met. The removal of a whole series of other items, including areas where there is an association of manufacturers in South Australia that are able to agree prices among themselves, in addition to the imposts here, will mean a change in the pattern of costs to the average family in South Australia. But the measures do not stop there: the Government said that it would do something about stimulating business in South Australia, but there can be no stimulus whatever to business in this Budget. In addition, the Government has made provision for taking out of the State Bank \$370,000, and the reason given for this is that it is constitutionally free of Commonwealth income tax. Again, here is a completely doctrinaire view. The State Bank represents a means of our providing in South Australia moneys for assistance to industry and to housing. This Budget is taking money out of the State Bank, on the grounds that the private banks pay income tax, although they cannot be required constitutionally in South Australia to give anything approaching the same kind of assistance.

The Minister of Aboriginal Affairs well knows that we went to the State Bank for a specific sum for the Aboriginal Lands Trust, whose report he has just tabled, in order to develop Block K. To which private bank could we have gone to get that money? The State Bank moneys are there as a State instrumentality to assist the development of this

State, and the State Bank works closely with the Treasury on this basis; yet, while last year the Chairman of the State Bank told me that this year the State Bank would almost certainly require additional assistance from the Budget in order to be able to meet the kind of industrial assistance and housing assistance we wanted (and it would probably have to be in the nature of about an extra \$200,000), the Government has taken out \$370,000 here, and this reduces the amount available for industries assistance and housing assistance in the hands of the State Bank.

The Government said it would stimulate housing, but the combination of the measures in this Budget, together with the Loan Estimates, means that the housing industry in South Australia will be hit by a reduction in the available State finances as it has not been hit since the war. Not at any time by any Government has there been a reduction in the sum available for housing as there has been this year. Why was it necessary? Again, the Government has not only charged to Loan Account (completely contrary to what it told the public before the elections, in its election broadcasts, and in the Premier's policy speech) all the items we previously charged to the Loan Account but also some hundreds of thousands of dollars concerning other items that had never been charged to Loan Account by any previous Government. The Government has reduced the amount of money in Loan for the works previously paid for out of Loan, and we have no expansion in the overall works programme in South Australia as a result. I will refer in a moment to some of these items that have been transferred to Loan.

In addition, the Government has taken \$6,000,000 out for holding against the consolidated deficit to this stage, despite the fact that it is clearly shown in the Treasurer's statement and in the Auditor-General's Report that the deposit and working accounts of the State have more money in them than they had before the Labor Party took office, and despite the fact that every bill coming into the Treasury for the working accounts or trust accounts could be paid for. This \$6,000,000 could have been used to expand activity in South Australia in order to call unused manpower and resources into play. The result has been that this measure does not provide for a balanced Budget. In a time of unused manpower and resources, this is a Budget for a large surplus; it is a Budget to take a considerable sum out of the pockets of consumers (not out of the pockets of those who would

be spending large sums of money in personal consumption), hitting the average household budget hard. The effect of that is grossly deflationary in this State. South Australia still has a need for a stimulus to business and industry. Members opposite said they were going to get industry moving again, but this is the kind of Budget that a Treasurer might have introduced before the 1930's. It is apparent that it has not been realized by the Treasurer that a Budget is not only a means of raising sufficient cash to cover outgoings but also an instrument of economic policy to determine the level and nature of economic activity in the community.

In 1962, the Metropolitan Adelaide Development Plan was introduced in this House. One of its major proposals was the acquisition of areas for open space, which it pointed out were desperately short in the metropolitan area. It stated that, if we did not take urgent action to preserve and obtain open-space areas in the metropolitan area, we would not have adequate recreation and open space. The report of the National Fitness Council pointed to the kind of rate of acquisition we needed here and the plan set forth a number of areas needed for acquisition. No action was taken by the Liberal Government between 1962 and 1965 to give effect to that report, whereas our Government did take action: it introduced land use regulations in 1965, and these held the position until we could get the Planning and Development Act through this House after a lengthy and difficult debate and through another place after considerable difficulties and lengthy conferences. We at last got the means of acquiring open space, but how were we to do it, because in the previous budgetary measures of the Playford Government no provision had been made for money for the acquisition of areas of this kind? There were no moneys adequately available for the kind of costs involved, yet meeting those costs would be vital to any sort of planning for the Adelaide metropolitan area.

We then investigated how other States had gone about it. Western Australia provided a considerable proportion of its semi-governmental loans to its planning authority and it was able, out of a special impost in the metropolitan area on the land tax, then to finance those loans and to pay off principal and interest on them. So, it was proposed that amounts would be made available in semi-governmental loans in South Australia

to the planning and development authority to the limit each year of the amount which would not need approval of the Loan Council, and we would provide to the planning and development fund each year sufficient revenue moneys to be able to meet the costs of these loans so that we would be able to proceed to acquire the areas for open space that were recommended in the Metropolitan Adelaide Development Plan.

At the elections, therefore, we proposed a special extra impost and it would have to fall on those people who were going to use the open space or have it available to them: it was not fair to put it on the country. No proposal of that kind appears in the Budget Estimates. We find that the revenue moneys that had previously been made available under the existing limited schemes for the acquisition of reserves and public parks have been cut off the Estimates, that the total cost of acquiring land throughout the State in either national reserves or public parks has been put on to the Loan Account, and that \$450,000 of Loan money has been set aside for this purpose. That is the general Loan works money, instead of such money being used for works and the acquisition of open space being financed out of semi-governmental loan, which it could have been without approval of the Loan Council.

Instead of that, we have taken \$450,000 of our cheapest money and put it in for the acquisition of national reserves. But that is not going to be effective or sufficient. How are we going to be able to provide a fund and pay the interest on it constantly to get the total of these areas recommended in the Metropolitan Adelaide Development Plan? Certainly there is not enough money set aside here under these schemes for this purpose, because the \$450,000 is only replacing the \$370,000 of revenue money previously applied to other purposes of acquisition of national parks and reserves (that is, the joint scheme with local government) and the acquisition of general reserves by the National Parks Commission.

In these circumstances, there is no adequate provision in these Estimates for doing the things that the Metropolitan Adelaide Development Plan says is pretty well a No. 1 priority for planning in South Australia. It is now desperately late to acquire these areas. We need to reserve them. We need to be able to meet demands for acquisition when these demands are made by people who have had their land reserved for later acquisition and are

in a position, as a result of the Planning and Development Act, to demand acquisition within a limited period.

When we were in Government, a number of questions was raised by the Opposition about what was being done regarding the development of old people's services, particularly in infirmaries. The development of infirmaries in a way that would attract the maximum amount of Commonwealth Government subsidy was a matter of considerable concern to our Government and, as a result of a report made through the Director of Public Health, we agreed to a special extra amount being made available for the appointment of a geriatric physician who would prepare a plan under which we could proceed to put up these buildings and gain the maximum amount of Commonwealth Government support, both for their establishment and their running. At the time we left office applications had been called for the appointment of a geriatric physician. I find, however, in looking through the items under the Department of Public Health that no geriatric physician is listed and that no money is being made available this year for that appointment. This means that the plan to provide infirmaries for people who are in dire and grave need now in South Australia is going out of the window, because there is no-one to run the service, to recommend the plan, and to go through the necessary investigation to see that we get the best plan possible with the maximum Commonwealth Government support.

What is happening about this? It would appear that this has been one of the things that has been axed by the present Government and, instead of an expansion in service in the areas of greatest need to the people who are in need of help, there is a reduction in the proposed service that was to be given by the previous Government. The overall effect of the Budget is one that must have grave secondary effects on the people in South Australia, not merely the effects I have outlined of hitting hard at the individual's budget, of hitting each householder's budget in a way which each household can ill afford to bear: it must have an effect on confidence because, when a Government takes office on fair and unequivocal undertakings (which this Government did) as to the way in which it will deal with Government finance in the State and then completely repudiates what it proposed to the people and produces the kind of back-door method of taking in more than it lets out (as in the case of the winning bets tax), what sort of confidence can the people of the State have

in a Government of that kind? They can only conclude that it is not to be trusted, and that, I fear, is what has happened in South Australia. A great many people have concluded this about the Government. Although, for political purposes on this side of the Chamber, one might smile, for the sake of the State one realizes that this is something that does grave harm to South Australia. The Government should be able to be trusted to stick by its word and to stick by the policies it has put forward.

When a Government comes in and cynically repudiates what it said to the people, as this Government has done in these financial measures now put before Parliament, then it is time the people had an opportunity to express their views on the subject. I hope that the people will have an opportunity shortly to express their views, because there cannot be the slightest doubt, after these measures and those that the Treasurer has outlined that he is likely to introduce before the end of the year, what the people would say about it. I do not mean that the Government should go to the people and say "We do not need extra revenue." The Government in South Australia does need extra revenue, but it should go to the people and say clearly how it intends to get it. We did this at the election and as a result we obtained an overwhelming majority of people voting for us. Members opposite did not, and now even those who voted for them find what the result is.

Mr. Virgo: Much to their sorrow.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. It is not only to their sorrow but to the sorrow of all the people of the State that this should occur, because what has been done by this Budget is to strike a grave blow at individuals in the State, at businesses, at employment and at confidence in the probity of Government.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): The Leader struggled to make out a case and did not get anywhere, nor did he introduce anything constructive. Over the last six months he has travelled Australia belittling South Australian methods and the position in South Australia at present, and this has not been good for South Australia or the confidence of other States in it. However, there is already in the employment figures an indication of renewed confidence in South Australia. When these figures improve they bring back confidence in a State. In August last year the number of unemployed in South Australia dropped from 8,463 to 8,006, a reduction of 457.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you think that is because of the Budget?

Mr. McANANEY: I am talking about confidence in South Australia and the confidence of industry in supporting the State to go ahead again. In August, 1968, the number of unemployed dropped from 8,018 to 7,107, a reduction of 911, which shows things are moving forward again in South Australia. It always amuses me when the Leader talks about Keynes's theory for stimulating industry. I admit that the Leader seems to know what Keynes suggested, but his Government never put it into practice: all it did in three years was to show how that theory worked in reverse. That Government did everything wrong in regard to making money available at certain times; that is what one of its failures was.

I congratulate the Treasurer on the presentation of the Budget. It is an indication that he is a sound businessman that he will make an effort to balance the Budget. The Leader suggested that we did not tell the people that we were going to tax them in certain ways but, when a Party is in Opposition, it does not know exactly what are the commitments and how much money will be required. The people of South Australia are very intelligent and know that, if a State is getting into debt at the rate of \$3 a head for three years, taxation must increase.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you admit that you misled the people?

Mr. McANANEY: Taxation has to increase.

Mr. Casey: A moment ago you said—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! As there was silence while the honourable Leader was talking, I think similar courtesy should be shown to other members while they speak.

Mr. McANANEY: We have to make up at least \$3 a head for the three years the Labor Government was in office, and naturally taxation has to increase. If the Leader had been as honourable as he made out he was, he would have made some constructive suggestions as to how we could liquidate this debt of \$8,700,000. This is more than a group of figures in a book: it is the sum to which the Labor Government committed the funds of South Australia. The Leader said that the increase in taxation proposed in the Budget this year would be a record. We only have to go back to 1966-67 to see that the increase in

taxation collected was \$5,400,000, whereas this year the increase is \$4,900,000. However, in his characteristic fashion, the Leader said that this year's would be a record increase.

Mr. Corcoran: Are you talking about a full year or part of a year?

Mr. McANANEY: We are dealing with a full year.

Mr. Broomhill: Whom are you trying to kid?

Mr. McANANEY: We must balance the Budget this year, and this shows sound business sense. The Leader said this would be harmful to South Australia. He talked about using surplus Loan funds which the Labor Government was too lethargic to spend last year. We intend to keep these funds in reserve against this loss to a certain extent. I do not necessarily agree with the Treasurer on this matter. I think that possibly, in the next month or two, we should spend Loan moneys as quickly as possible to give South Australia the stimulus required. We have given it a little stimulus now, and we must give it a little more and then a snowballing effect will follow.

Mr. Casey: Especially in the building industry!

Mr. McANANEY: We will get on to that. Because less money has been made available to it, it has been said that the Housing Trust will go backwards. At the end of June the Housing Trust had a balance of \$2,700,000, but I suppose members opposite will say that that was because the Liberal and Country League Government had been in office two or three months. However, certain planning is needed in the building of houses and in the letting of contracts. At the beginning of the last financial year, the trust had only \$600,000 balance so that during last financial year it received \$2,000,000 which it did not spend, because the then lethargic Government was more interested in providing an extra week's leave and so on rather than in spending this money.

The Leader boasted today as he has in previous public statements that the deposit accounts and trust accounts had increased by \$5,000,000 during the time of the drought. There has been record unemployment. If he believed in Keynes's theory, he would have seen that this money was spent and put into circulation in an effort to prevent thousands of young schoolchildren who left school last January being unemployed. The Leader's Government was not using the money available to it.

Mr. Langley: See how the people go under this Government.

Mr. McANANEY: If we can continue what we are doing at present, we will not have to worry. Because of the good judgment of our Treasurer, people will get the jobs that have been vacant previously.

Mr. Langley: According to this morning's press, building in South Australia is at its lowest ebb.

Mr. McANANEY: I am speaking about the Socialist Government and the number of houses it built. Our last year in office was 1965, and the figures are:

Year Ended June 30	Under Construction at Beginning of Year	Construction Commenced During Year	Under Construction at End of Year	Completed During Year
1965	2,591	3,946	3,220	3,317
1966	3,220	2,691	2,661	3,250
1967	2,661	2,629	2,062	3,228
1968	2,062	1,819	1,506	2,375

Is that a record of which to be proud? Can members opposite say that we will spend on housing less money than they spent? We can spend at least about \$2,000,000 to get housing going. With will and drive, we will get things going again. The member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson), when speaking in the Loan Estimates debate about a month ago—

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is out of order in referring to another debate of the present session.

Mr. McANANEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have heard it said that it would be necessary for us to increase our collections by from \$15,000,000 to \$16,000,000, and possibly by \$18,000,000, if we were to do our job by South Australia. We have got \$8,000,000 from the Commonwealth and we will collect about \$5,000,000 in taxation, so we have not gone as far as has been suggested. Instead of being told that we are raising taxes unduly, we are being told that we should have raised them much higher. Regarding the attack on the Commonwealth Government and the statement that that Government is squeezing the States, many of us agree with that but will try to submit something constructive about it. In 1965, the first year in which the Labor Premier and Treasurer went to Canberra, the Commonwealth Government suggested an improvement to the taxation reimbursement formula but the States refused to accept that. The following report shows what they refused:

State Governments looking to the Commonwealth for more help to absorb increased wage bills without increasing taxes can expect little sympathy in Canberra. The Premiers' Conference and the Loan Council meeting in June were conducted with a full appreciation of the fact that the basic wage would rise, and probably by \$2. Even with this knowledge the Premiers, by and large, returned to their home States proclaiming that they had been successful in all their negotiations.

They do that every year. The report continues:

Nor is the N.S.W. Premier, Mr. Askin, likely to receive much satisfaction from his demands for drought relief. The Federal Government feels that it has acted in an enlightened and benevolent manner towards Queensland and N.S.W. over their drought problems by advancing them some \$21,000,000. Of this, \$13,000,000 has gone to N.S.W. Mr. Askin had every opportunity of raising his problems at the June meetings but did not really do so.

Any further substantial relief, say in the form of a grant to offset the unexpected railways deficit is most unlikely. It is possible that the Treasurer, Mr. McMahon, might include some grants for specific projects in his August 16 Budget but these would in no way relieve Mr. Askin's own budgetary problems. The declarations yesterday by Mr. Askin and Victoria's Acting Premier, Mr. Rylah, of the problems now confronting their States because of wage increases reflect more the conditioned response of Australian financial management than a mature assessment of the real situation. It again underlines the ritual nature of Loan Council meetings where the initial Commonwealth offer is met with theatrical disbelief, followed by a counter suggestion from the States, a Commonwealth compromise offer, then agreement. The State Premiers return home as conquering gladiators.

Even last year the present Leader of the Opposition said, when he came back, that he could manage. This report continues:

Then as State Budget time approaches the rumbling begins about the possibility of State tax increases because of Commonwealth control of the purse. Despite the overtones of pantomime, the States' problems are real ones. Major wage increases are not quickly reflected in their grants from the Commonwealth and frequently revenue derived by the States from their own resources is not fully sympathetic with increased cost movements.

The States, especially N.S.W., are to a certain extent harvesting their own ill-considered plantings. When the Premiers' Conference was held last year the system of financial assistance grants was up for review. The Commonwealth

then proposed that the time lag incorporated in the old formula be reduced. Under that system the formula for grants for any one financial year was calculated on wage and population increases recorded in the previous financial year. The Commonwealth proposed that the increase in average wages used to determine the grant for a financial year should be that for the year ending March of that financial year (instead of that for the preceding year).

Had this been adopted the current basic wage increase would be taken into account in the current year's reimbursements. More importantly, however, any inflationary pressure caused by this increase, or stimulatory action in the Federal Budget, or upward pressure on wages arising from the improved circumstances of the rural sector which manifested itself before March, would also be taken into account in this financial year. As it is the States will have to wait until 1967-68 to pick up the full benefits of the increased wages they are now having to pay to their own employees. The States' refusal to eliminate the time lag arose from the possibility of their missing out on the large rise that occurred in average wages in 1964-65.

However, rather than insisting on their due increase from this source as well as the elimination of the time lag they plumped for the continuation of the old system. Consequently, they perpetuated a system which operates to their disadvantage. In times of rising average wages, as at the moment, and increased economic activity they do not have the resources to meet increased costs. Then when the additional money arrives they pump their new found wealth into an economy where resources are stretched. This cumulative process unleashes inflationary pressure as available resources are bid up in the open market. Consequently, less mileage is obtained for given expenditure. And when there is need to dampen down activity Federal controls of the economy are not as direct as desirable because the States remain highly liquid as a result of the average wage increases during the upswing.

Elimination of the time lag in the reimbursement formula would have reduced the cyclical pressures which handicap efficient economic management and also confront the States with embarrassing Budget problems whenever wages jump suddenly. Unfortunately, the economic arguments of the Federal Treasury were either unappreciated or not understood by the Premiers last year.

If the time lag could be eliminated when the taxation reimbursement grant is worked out at the end of June, the increase in the average wage would be based on a period three months earlier. If it were considered as at the following March there would be an adjustment in the taxation reimbursement according to the average weekly wage rise in Australia, so that the reimbursement to the States could be considered in the year in which the Budget was presented, otherwise there would be a

wait of a year. The average wage rate is increasing at between five per cent and 10 per cent a year. If a similar increase was made to the States each year, many of their problems would be overcome. The State Premiers did not agree to the formula being altered, but the change would have been greatly to their advantage. The States are in a difficult position because of the way in which the Commonwealth Government raises money in taxation and then spends it on capital works or lending it to the States. State land tax has increased by 2.7 times and stamp duty by 4.5 times in the last 10 years.

This form of taxation is not good and a more direct form of taxation would be more beneficial, particularly if a better relationship with the Commonwealth Government could be established. Succession duties have doubled and it has been suggested that we should raise finance by this method of taxation. Possibly there could be some increases in the tax on large estates, but in the Bill that was rejected two or three years ago the increase was heavy on the small and middle range of estates. If this legislation had been passed it would have placed an undue burden on thrift and would not have encouraged production. Commonwealth taxation has increased—company tax by 2.2 times and income tax (possibly the best way to increase taxation) by 3.1 times. On the lower and middle range incomes the taxation is higher in Australia than it is in many other countries. It is difficult to increase taxation without killing incentive. Company taxation is an inflationary measure and results in an increased cost of goods. Today inflation is causing great harm to Australia's future, because costs are out of hand. It is necessary to have some control over these inflationary trends.

Mr. Broomhill: What do you think about price control?

Mr. McANANEY: Basic items in this State have been under price control. Other States have not controlled these prices, yet in the last three years the consumer index price in South Australia has increased as rapidly as, if not more rapidly than, that in other States. Competition always ensures a reasonable price level. I understand that an application was made to increase the price of soft drinks, although I do not know whether this was allowed, but the Prices Commissioner merely legalizes any increase in costs. Generally, costs in States without price control have not increased to the same degree as they have in South Australia.

Mr. Broomhill: Are you opposed to price control?

Mr. McANANEY: I have voted against it, but I agree that some action should be taken to ensure that increased prices do not result when people combine to fix prices. When considering the relationship between the Commonwealth Government and the State Governments, I think that, if the State Treasurers were united in their approach to the Commonwealth and were not brushed off in a day as they are now, many problems would be solved. Most of the Treasurers claim an increased allotment and some horse trading takes place, but I have a list of what was said by the various Treasurers when they went to Canberra this year. There was nothing constructive in the attitude expressed in this regard other than that the States wanted more money, provided the Commonwealth Government levied the taxes. The Commonwealth tax collections, as estimated for 1968-69, totalled \$5,414,000,000, and other income is estimated at \$189,000,000, totalling \$5,603,000,000. Expenditure to take place in connection with revenue measures and which should be attributed to the Budget amounts to \$3,606,000,000, leaving a balance of \$1,997,000,000. Out of that sum, \$1,022,000,000 is paid to the States in taxation reimbursements, \$104,000,000 is paid in specific purpose grants and \$340,000,000 in grants of a capital nature.

In line with the normal taxation reimbursements, the Commonwealth makes specific purpose grants to universities, and those grants will be increased considerably this year for the benefit of the States. Also included are research grants, and sums relating to road safety practices and a housekeeping service. All these grants are of a revenue nature. Regarding items of a capital nature the Commonwealth will spend \$26,000,000 on universities this year, an increase of \$10,000,000 for the benefit of the States; colleges of advanced education, \$10,000,000; teachers colleges, \$10,000,000; and science laboratories, \$10,000,000. Commonwealth aid road grants total \$170,000,000, and there are items such as \$15,000,000 in connection with the natural gas pipeline in South Australia, and \$14,000,000 for the hydro-electric scheme in Tasmania.

Many of these grants of a capital nature will have to be repaid by the States. I have not had time to work out just how much is represented as a definite grant and how much is represented as a loan

that will have to be repaid. The deficit of which the former Government was accused last year cannot be compared with deficits that the Commonwealth Government has had. At present, out of an estimated surplus of \$590,000,000, provision for Commonwealth capital expenditure amounts to \$490,000,000. The States' net loans, after repayment of the national debt fund, total \$647,000,000 which brings the total capital expenditure to \$1,137,000,000, and that will result in a deficit of \$547,000,000. I think this would be much better set out if the system allowed for a current affairs section and for a separate Budget relating to capital expenditure.

The Commonwealth will lend \$222,000,000 to the Postmaster-General's Department, which is now run on business lines, and interest will be received from that loan. In addition, \$30,000,000-odd is loaned to the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electricity Commission, which also functions on a business basis. Last year, \$118,000,000 of the \$644,000,000 deficit related to United States defence credits (a refund is received on defence expenditure), and \$14,000,000 related to "other overseas borrowings". Further, \$59,000,000 was repaid into the International Monetary Fund. Other sums involved related to borrowings from the Reserve Bank (\$51,000,000) and other financing transactions in Australia (\$39,000,000). Some of this money is free of interest and some of it bears interest from 3 per cent to 5 per cent. Bearing all this in mind, we realize that it is not a matter of Liberal politicians versus Labor politicians: it gets back basically to what the States should receive out of taxation moneys, so that more can be provided (either free of interest or as a direct grant) for projects such as schools, etc.

It is debatable just how much should be provided by this generation in the way of facilities for the next generation, and how much should be spent out of current income or borrowed at a certain rate of interest. If it could be decided how much should be raised by the States in taxation money and how much should come from the Loan Fund, the problem might be solved. Trouble is being experienced at the State level at present not through current expenditure occurring on the various services but through having unserviced debts. I agree with the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) that if we educate people we have a definite asset, although we do not necessarily service the

debts that exist. If the States were not paying \$35,000,000 in interest to the Commonwealth Government, the latter would be that much worse off.

Mr. Corcoran: You are in favour of Social Credit now, are you?

Mr. McANANEY: Definitely not. The Deputy Leader does not understand the principle of Social Credit. This would improve the State's position. Taxpayers in South Australia have paid this tax. It would mean that this year and next year the Commonwealth Government would not get this money back and could argue that we should get less taxation reimbursement for this reason. It will be some time before it uses up this credit and gradually there would be more and more money to be raised at interest. It would be relying more on loans than on surplus. The States would be better off and the Commonwealth Government would not be able to build up this great asset. It now has the Snowy Mountains scheme, and at present the Commonwealth Government is receiving more than it is paying out in interest on loans and is getting wealthier and wealthier.

The Social Credit policy is to meet all capital expenditure out of credit, but that is impossible. The Commonwealth Treasurer (Mr. McMahon) has said that the Australian economy is in a fine balance and that we must do this and that to maintain the balance; there must be no excessive demand for goods, as that increases inflation. If we do not have that demand we get unemployment, and that leads to trouble. Over the last 10 years Australia has tried to keep this balance in many different ways—some disastrous. One way it tried to do it was in regard to personal taxation. If there was an excessive demand for goods in a boom period, taxation was increased to drain money off to the Government. The Government generally spends the money and does not save much of it. This policy broke down, because many people are on provisional taxation: by the time they pay provisional taxation in 12 months' time, the correct action might be just the opposite. An impetus of employment and business activity is needed, and this would have the wrong effect.

In the 1961-62 fiasco the Government decided to damp down the economy by the imposition of heavy sales taxes and taxes on petrol, etc., and this swung the pendulum the other way and it took a long time to get it back. In the last Budget the Commonwealth Treasurer said that we had to get the demand

down and not force costs up. His way of achieving it was to increase company and sales taxes, thus keeping the finely balanced adjustment. It is guesswork how much we must increase tax to dampen the economy. This causes cost inflation, which has caused trouble to our exporting primary and secondary industries. Increases in company taxation and sales tax have led to cost inflation. This Budget will do the same thing, but at our level we have no alternative.

The Leader of the Opposition said earlier that a state of full employment existed if only 1.3 per cent of the work force was unemployed. The unemployment figure in this State is now only 1.4 per cent, so perhaps he will agree that, for all practical purposes, we have full employment in South Australia. Three years ago, when the Playford Government was defeated, the unemployment figure was 0.9 per cent, and I do not think it can be much less than this, because there is always the problem that some unemployed people are not in the right place at the right time.

The finely adjusted balance in respect of employment must be adjusted from week to week and from month to month. When the economy is slack, credit can be used to stimulate it, but in boom conditions credit can be made tighter. In boom conditions the savings banks do not advance as much money as they do in slack times and, consequently, the rate of activity is reduced. Treasury bills can be used efficiently and quickly to counteract an increase in unemployment; when this method is used, the planning of individual businesses is not thrown into disarray.

I believe that private enterprise should be allowed to do the planning and that the Government should simply create the conditions in which there is full employment. Private enterprise continually keeps consumer demand under surveillance. The Labor Party believes in central planning and that the Government should decide what the people will want in the next five years, but I point out that this cannot be done quickly.

Mr. Corcoran: Give us an example.

Mr. McANANEY: I am dealing with the Labor Party's avowed policy.

Mr. Hudson: You didn't state publicly during the election campaign that you would increase taxes.

Mr. McANANEY: We have already exploded the social credit myth. I point out that Commonwealth-State financial relationships should always be on a fair book-keeping basis.

Mr. Hudson: Do you mean that, if it is on a book-keeping basis, it is fair?

Mr. McANANEY: It is the only true basis. Of course, humanitarian considerations apply when we are considering the provision for education, social services, hospitals, etc., but when we turn to the basic services provided by this State we must get down to a book-keeping, competitive basis. The younger generation will demand that our financial policy be scientifically based, and I believe that we should create the conditions in which the private sector can continue in its own sweet way without hindrance and without being kicked about by Governments.

Mr. Corcoran: You ought to tell your boss all about this, so that he can make out a good case when he goes along to see Mr. Askin.

Mr. McANANEY: I forecast that we will not get anywhere until we put forward a case that has a scientific basis. I have been told that the Commonwealth Treasurer (Mr. McMahon) is a fairly tough negotiator, so we must know the answers. I have met him only once, when I asked him a question. He could not come up with an answer and, when I was talking to him afterwards, he said that he had not thought of my question before. If one goes to him with a fair and reasonable case one can get somewhere with the Commonwealth Treasurer. However, the State Premiers are just hurling bricks. The former Premier saw him last year and, when he spoke at a seminar a month later, he said that things went so fast at the meeting that he still had his written submission in his pocket when he left.

No-one has suggested how we can eliminate the accumulated deficit. Should it be left as a floating sum against the suspense and deposit accounts, or should we fund it? There are screams when the latter suggestion is made that that would result in penalties, but it would be one way of getting rid of the deficit. It has been said in this place that if the deficit were funded the State would suffer great penalties, but all I have been able to find out is that it would lose 50c a year which the Commonwealth Government contributes to the national debt fund and that it would have to be paid off in 17 years instead of 53 years. If there is no asset in this respect, it is common sense to get rid of it as quickly as possible; either we do that or we will have to increase taxation to clear off the deficit.

The Leader has said that, if we raise money to pay off debts, we withdraw purchasing power from the consumer and that this will

lead to a depression. This does not seem to be the way to go about it. However, we must get rid of the deficit in some way: we must not let it float as was done in the case of the general revenue deficiencies which occurred between 1926 and 1934 and in relation to which \$9,000,000 is still on the books on which is paid interest at 5 per cent and which results in a capital repayment of \$440,000 this year. That is not an intelligent way of dealing with these matters. On the one hand, we are taxing the people to provide many income-producing assets for the future, but at the same time we are still trying to pay off a debt accumulated between 1926 and 1934. It would be interesting if someone could suggest how to get rid of this deficit. It is the obligation of those who created it to tell us how we can get rid of it rather than to criticize the things we are doing.

The biggest difficulty with the Budget is that on services provided to the public there is a deficit of \$39,000,000. Money must be raised to repay capital and interest on this debt. We should see whether we can eliminate some of the losses made in connection with these services rather than increase taxation to make up for them. We talk about things being on a competitive basis. It seems to me that people who use water should pay for what they use rather than that the deficiency on water provided should be made up by imposing a tax on those who take out third party insurance on their cars.

Mr. Hudson: You agree that Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited should pay its water duty.

Mr. McANANEY: We could look through the Budget, work out where the losses have occurred and charge for the services what they cost. If money has to be raised because of losses in one direction, why should it be raised on something else?

Mr. Hudson: The Auditor-General says at pages 3 and 4 of his report that the B.H.P. Company is not paying enough for its water. Would you agree with that?

Mr. McANANEY: The Engineering and Water Supply Department made a loss of about \$6,300,000 last year. Undoubtedly the loss is larger than usual because of the drought.

Mr. Hudson: According to the Auditor-General's Report, the B.H.P. Company receives a subsidy of \$250,000 on water.

Mr. McANANEY: The Morgan-Whyalla and Iron Knob water supplies cost the State \$2,000,000 last year. An agreement was made

with the B.H.P. Company, and I do not know to what extent the State is committed to provide water to this industry at a cheap cost.

Mr. Hudson: It is 40c for 1,000 gallons.

Mr. McANANEY: It is in the interests of South Australia to provide water to attract industries and, perhaps, to assist them. However, the department's cost was \$2,000,000 last year. When the second main to Whyalla was installed, the B.H.P. Company said it would use a certain quantity of water. Figures about this appear in the Auditor-General's Report which show that the company uses only a fraction of the water that it said it would use.

Mr. Hudson: Not even half.

Mr. McANANEY: Yes. The department's cost was \$2,000,000 and, as this industry is making terrific profits at the moment, this matter should be taken up. If the rebate on water was increased, some people would certainly use much less water and therefore not as much water would be wasted. We would not need the Murray Bridge to Onkaparinga main so soon, because less water would be used. Therefore, capital would not be required in this connection until later. This gets back to bookkeeping, which is something we seem to have got away from completely.

Mr. Freebairn: Do you think the B.H.P. Company would make a profit out of its Whyalla enterprise?

Mr. McANANEY: I do not know but, knowing the B.H.P. Company, I do not think it would be involved in something out of which it was not making a profit. However, I had better not deal with that sideline in this debate. The Railways Department lost about \$12,700,000. As it loses 25c on every passenger it carries in the Adelaide area, surely some action must be taken in that direction. For 10 or 20 years the Municipal Tramways Trust made big losses. Now it carries (from memory) 47,000,000 passengers a year at a small cost, a large amount of overhead being allowed in that cost. Surely action must be taken to eliminate the loss made by the Railways Department. As country passenger services involve a loss of about \$3,000,000, surely a cheaper form of transport could be used.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Mr. McANANEY: Before the adjournment I was dealing with the railways. I had said that there should be more competition and that the railways should make an effort to pay their way. We know that there is a big loss on the railways because of the interest pay-

ments involved, and this has been caused mainly because depreciation has not been written off to the extent that it should have been over the years. If these amounts were written off to a reasonable degree and the railways were put on a businesslike and competitive basis with road transport, I think it would be in the interests of South Australia as a whole.

At present there is keen competition between the railways and road transport. The railways have reduced their charges considerably, and are getting much more business than they were previously. If this is genuine competition, that is very good, because it is good in every way to use the cheapest form of transport. However, if the railways are competing only by cutting rates and making greater losses, the taxpayer has to subsidize them even more, so I do not think that is really putting the railways on a competitive basis. At present the Public Works Committee has to decide whether a certain railway line should be closed. It is only when we get to a really competitive basis, with people who use the roads paying for the roads and with the railways paying their way, that we get real competition and thus are able to decide which is the best service.

It is disappointing that we had to increase certain charges in the Budget, but those increases were inevitable because we had this deficit landed on us. It is necessary to get back to having a balanced Budget. It has been said that Sir Thomas Playford did not always balance his Budget during the last 15 years, but when we add the total deficits and surpluses we find that they more or less come out even. The Leader of the Opposition has talked about the proper way to handle money. Sir Thomas Playford always kept a little in reserve and had a surplus that he could use when necessary, and that is why he kept South Australia on a stable basis. In fact, the population increased rapidly over those years, and when South Australia was not first amongst the States in its rate of increase it was second.

We have a problem to overcome in this regard. The taxation reimbursements this year are only the same as they were last year, and that is because our population growth rate has dropped back to more or less half what it was and therefore we do not get such a large share of the taxation returns. The Leader claimed that South Australia did not get a fair deal out of taxation reimbursements. However, although our population is only about 9 per cent of the Australian total we have been getting up to 11.4 per cent of the

taxation reimbursements, and this is definitely an advantage to us. This year the average increase in taxation reimbursements was 9 per cent, although it was only 7.6 per cent in South Australia. Therefore, we must concentrate on regaining our previous growth rate so that we can receive more money and therefore prosper.

I was talking earlier this afternoon about the situation in 1965 when the States could not agree on the attempt to bring the average wage rate, where it was determined, up to the present financial year. I have since noticed that in 1967 the Commonwealth Government agreed to this, and the States have had an advantage, compared with their previous position. I think the betterment rate of 1.2 per cent a year is greater than it was.

I commend the Minister of Education for including in the Budget an additional \$2,000 for the Workers Educational Association, in which I am very interested. I understand that the association asked the Labor Government for an increase during the three years that that Government was in office but that the increase now granted is the first since Sir Thomas Playford gave \$10,000 to the association about four years ago for capital improvements at Graham's Castle. The association does good work, because it enables people, who missed opportunities in their younger days, to get together and improve their knowledge. I do not agree with statements that this Budget will be harmful. No money will be taken out of circulation as a result of these taxes, because we intend to spend the money received. The rate of expenditure will be even, whereas during the last three years we have had a stop-go system, an accumulation of Loan funds, an over-drawing of revenue, and a failure to proceed with development work. With this Government's stable way of conducting the State's affairs South Australia will progress in the way it progressed previously.

Mr. McKee: You'll be sad and disillusioned.

Mr. McANANEY: The member for Port Pirie would be pleased if we did not progress during this period, but other South Australians hope that we achieve that progress. I congratulate the Treasurer on his preparation of the Budget. Each section of the community has received more. Recent expenditure on hospitals and education was an increase over previous expenditure merely because natural growth required that. However, there was not that physical progress that we had had before.

The Leader of the Opposition complains about this backward State, but Adelaide is being held up to the people of Perth as a pattern of proper attitude in the matter of sewerage, an unusual distinction and a record not likely to be deliberately sought, although something of which one can be proud. Statistics quoted show that 98 per cent of the population of Adelaide is served by sewerage. That is the highest percentage in Australia, but the corresponding figure for Perth is only 47 per cent. In Sydney (where a Labor Government was in office for many years) 700,000 houses are unsewered. It is this physical progress that we can be so proud of. It has been claimed that another place refused to agree to certain taxation increases during the last three years. However, that action is balanced by the rejection by that place of one or two measures that would have increased expenditure.

We cannot say to the Commonwealth Treasurer, "We want more money to enable South Australia to do such and such." We do not produce anything if we go outside the industrial tribunals of this State and tell some people that they can have another week's leave. People in Australia desire more hospitals and better education, and the only way in which such improvements can be achieved is by everyone pulling together, realizing that greater production means more for the people. Looking back over the last 10 or 20 years, we find that the proportion of wages, salaries and bonuses paid is a more or less fixed proportion of the gross national product. Australia's production at the moment is only the seventh highest in the world but it should be higher than that, bearing in mind our great natural resources and the fact that we have fewer problems, except transport problems, than has any other country. In addition, the degree of efficiency in relation to primary production is higher in Australia than it is anywhere else in the world, yet with increased costs our primary industries are becoming desperate. We hear that we must eliminate the small farms and have only larger farms.

Mr. McKee: What will happen to the small farmers?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. McANANEY: The member for Port Pirie will know, Sir, that, as a result of the operations of the Tariff Board, and of decisions made by the Arbitration Commission, wages are increasing and costs are becoming inflated without any advantage accruing to a particular

section of the community. At present we have a gentleman here in connection with "National Export Week" stating that jobs depend on exports. Unless primary and secondary industries can export—

Mr. McKee: Who was responsible for keeping rural industry going?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr. McANANEY: If more products are exported, our living standards usually improve and at the same time we are helping backward countries develop by trading with them. Although members of the Commonwealth Parliament are trying to encourage primary production, nearly everything done so far has been to help the man on the bigger farm. The man on the smaller farm does not make much of a saving in depreciation allowances, etc. If an individual buys land and builds on it a home for himself, he receives no taxation concession, whereas a businessman may develop land building a house for an employee and save perhaps \$2,000 in income tax. The average small farmer does not receive the concessions that are received by those who are developing new land and establishing dams, etc., the cost of which is written off against income. However, as the proceeds of the sale of properties are not subject to income tax, the individual concerned is making a sheer profit, whereas the smaller farmer who is buying his machinery writes off his depreciation over five years; but when he sells out he has to write back that taxation. Every handicap has been placed in the way of the smaller farmer, who really gets no concessions at all.

Mr. Broomhill: Are you advocating Government policy or one of your own?

Mr. McANANEY: We have just moved to one of the problems facing South Australia, where we are in grave trouble indeed. I commend the Treasurer for this Budget. He has tried to get money from as wide a section of the community as possible. This is not the best level at which to raise money but it is the only way in which we, as a State, can levy taxation. The Treasurer has been as fair as possible in deciding where these taxes should be levied. Some new fields have been entered into on the expenditure side of the Budget. There will be considerable extra services and goods for the people of this State in the next three years, and I am confident South Australia will experience considerable growth in the coming year.

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): Having listened to the member for Stirling, I think we can say his attitude has changed now that he is sitting behind the Ministry. He is a little more responsible and competent now than he was when he sat on this side of the Chamber and shot words across at us when we were in Government. In fact, it was enlightening to hear him say this afternoon that he thought there was some room for further increases in succession duties. I give him full credit for that. At last we have a glimmer of hope that members opposite will realize it is high time this sort of measure was given serious consideration by the Government. Indeed, it is a pity the Government did not consider it when the individual items of the Budget were being prepared. The member for Stirling also said it was true that people in the lower and middle income brackets in this country are taxed more highly than their counterparts in most other countries. He made this statement this afternoon: I heard him and I agree with him. That statement would be correct but surely in the light of it he could not possibly agree with the measures that have been put forward to raise revenue in this Budget; but he did not disagree with them. He said it was necessary for the Government to raise revenue—and we on this side of the Chamber do not deny that: we know it is necessary for the Government to raise additional revenue. Not only do we know it but we knew it and said it before March 2 last, which is more than the Government did. Let me tell honourable members what the present Premier said, when he was Leader of the Opposition, in delivering his policy speech at Para Hills prior to the last general election. Under the heading of "Finance" he said:

When we are elected to government our first task will be to restore stability in the State's accounts . . . We will do this by arranging a careful priority of spending, by making sure we get value for our money in our spending, and by securing more money as a result of increased activity in industry and commerce.

I want to repeat that, because it is important:—and by securing more money as a result of increased activity in industry and commerce.

Did the Government give industry and commerce an opportunity to create this increased activity before it set about imposing on the people of this State one of the most vicious Budgets that have ever been implemented in our history? What the Leader of the Opposition said this afternoon is perfectly true: the increase in revenue in a full year as a result

of the measures proposed by the Government will be of a magnitude never before achieved by any Government in the history of this State. Yet it was members of the present Government who were going to secure additional money from increased activity in industry and commerce! The present Government has given industry and commerce no encouragement whatever to increase the level of activity. So, I agree with the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) on two points: first, that the people in the lower and middle income brackets in this country are taxed at a higher rate than are people in similar brackets in other countries; and, secondly, there is a drastic need for revision of the Succession Duties Act in this State.

Let us consider the section on finance in the policy speech made by the present Leader of the Opposition prior to the election. He recognized that the Government would need additional revenue during the following financial year and he was prepared to tell the people how he planned to secure that revenue. He did not deceive the people: he told them plainly. I can well recall the present Leader of the Opposition telling the present Premier that he was presenting the people of South Australia with a brown paper parcel marked "Secret, to be opened after March 2", a parcel that was full of nasty surprises. If ever true words were spoken, the Leader of the Opposition spoke them on that occasion, because that is exactly what was done. In his policy speech the Leader of the Opposition said:

It is the Government's intention to maintain South Australia as the State with the lowest per capita State taxation on the mainland—

Mr. Broomhill: That was important.

Mr. CORCORAN: We have often heard what an important factor this was in attracting people and industry to this State. Sir Thomas Playford often said so in this Chamber, and there were good reasons for his statements. We had set out to maintain the lowest per capita State taxation on the mainland. Per capita taxation in Tasmania is, I think, about a dollar less than it is here. The Leader of the Opposition continued:

It is clear that if we are to maintain services we must have more money. It is therefore proposed that the extra money be raised in some areas in which we raise markedly less than the other States. These are succession duties and stamp duties. At the last elections, the Government had a mandate to reduce succession duties to the average widow and dependent child in South Australia, but to increase death duties on the more wealthy.—

and this is what the member for Stirling suggested this afternoon—

It is apparent that this could only be done if the various methods of evasion of succession duty obligations under the L.C.L. Government's legislation as a result of which the widow of an average wage or salary earner would pay \$200 to \$300 at least on an estate of small dimension, whereas it was possible to pass on an estate of \$100,000 without paying any death duties to the State at all, would have to be brought to an end.

Of course, this still applies and will continue to apply, because I do not believe that this Government, judging from the attitude it has adopted in this Budget, will take any steps to close up the sort of loophole that exists in the Succession Duties Act. The Leader also pointed out in his policy speech that it would be necessary to have a special tax in the metropolitan area in order to purchase the sort of open spaces that would be required for future planning of this city. The point I make is that the present Government must indeed feel guilty for deceiving the people of South Australia in the way it did. It could not do what it has done without feeling something about it.

Let us look at where this taxation has been placed and who it will affect. The Leader dealt with the receipts tax this afternoon. We know this will affect small businessmen, and those who can probably least afford it. Of course, it will also affect big companies but I think it is reasonable to assume that they will pass on this impost to the consumer. Therefore, the people to whom the member for Stirling referred in the lower and middle income brackets will have to pay this tax.

Mr. McKee: They can't hand it on.

Mr. CORCORAN: True; they have to take it continually on the chin. As the Leader pointed out this afternoon, it is perfectly clear that if the Commonwealth-State financial relationships do not improve we shall be pelted in regard to wages and salaries. The Treasurer has not deceived us in this respect: he has told us bluntly that this will happen. I have no doubt it will, if not before the end of the year, then very early next year.

Mr. Lawn: Probably that is why we are sitting until Christmas.

Mr. CORCORAN: Yes, and we could come back early in the new year. In his policy speech, the Premier said that his Government would work with the Governments of every State of the Commonwealth to hammer out a better Commonwealth-State financial agreement. He knows, as well as Messrs. Askin,

Bolte, Brand, Bjelke-Petersen and Reece know, that this will not happen. He might as well have said straight out, "We will give you a little bit of grace but at the end of the year we will drop it on you." He knows and the Treasurer knows that, with the new financial agreement to be negotiated, along with the other State Premiers they will have to kick as hard as they can in order to put a case to the Commonwealth. I do not believe that the proposal referred to by the member for Stirling in relation to an alteration in this relationship will be acceptable to the Commonwealth.

I shall now refer to the stamp duty of \$2 upon compulsory third-party insurance certificates. This insurance is compulsory and therefore people have no option: if they want to drive a motor vehicle they must have third-party insurance. We know that most people in the State who own a motor vehicle probably cannot afford it. They have it not because it is a luxury but because today it is almost a necessity. If a man has a large family, surely he is entitled to the pleasure of having a motor vehicle to convey his family to the places to which they need to go. Surely this is not to be considered a luxury. However, it seems that the present Government thinks that if anyone owns a motor car he must be able to pay through the nose to own it. I consider that this \$2 impost is most unjust and unfair.

Mr. Casey: Particularly when we have had an increase in insurance rates.

Mr. CORCORAN: Yes, and that will not be the last increase. It is said that it is necessary for this money to go to public hospitals because the fees payable in public hospitals for road accident patients cover only a portion of the total cost. I did not know that there was any difference in the fees paid for road accident cases and those paid for normal cases in public hospitals. However, I live and learn. I know that the money raised from this source will not go to the hospitals direct. It has not been said that this money will be paid into a special fund, so obviously it will be paid into general revenue and whether the hospitals get it is another question. It seems that they may not do so, because we see that there is to be an increase in public hospital charges in line with charges in other States. Therefore, it appears to me that the money from this increase also will go to general revenue.

Mr. Hurst: How will the average person afford it?

Mr. CORCORAN: We know that the people who can least afford illness are the ones who have the most illness, and this causes tremendous hardship. We also know that the public hospitals in this State are pretty reasonable and that they make allowance for people in these circumstances. However, many people on average incomes cannot afford any additional impost in payment for health services, so again it will hit the average person. People who have been evading taxation for years have been allowed by this Government to go on evading taxation, and this is what upsets and worries me.

The next increase is an extension of the present hire-purchase duty of 1½ per cent to cover other forms of time payment, leasing and like transactions. One would not have to be a genius in order to know who indulges in this type of agreement: the person who obviously cannot afford to pay for anything outright and therefore is never in a very sound financial position is the one who will have to pay this additional 1½ per cent.

The next item is an increase in the fee for liquor licences from 5 per cent to 6 per cent, which is the rate applicable in most other States. We saw recently the fairly rapid action of the Australian Hotels Association, which announced on Thursday an increase of 1c on a butcher or a schooner and 2c on a pint of beer in the metropolitan area, to take effect on the following Monday. That association did not waste any time, and it had no hesitation in passing the increase on to the consumer. I do not think there is any reason to believe that where such an increase can be passed on to the consumer it will not be passed on.

It was said today that these increases were necessary because of the actions of the previous Labor Government. If members opposite were fair, if they stopped to think and if they cared to add up the amount of finance that we would have raised from our financial measures that were rejected in the Legislative Council, they would realize that the deficit on the Budget today would not be nearly as great as it is. I would not even hazard a guess at how much we would have raised with the measures which we introduced and which were rejected by the L.C.L.-dominated Legislative Council. The deficit would not have been nearly as great. However, we on this side are held entirely to blame for the situation. No responsibility at all has been placed on the people in the Legislative

Council who rejected measures for which we had a mandate from the people in 1965 to implement.

Mr. Rodda: Doesn't this Budget rectify the position?

Mr. CORCORAN: No. Apart from the Treasurer's explanation of the Budget, I have not heard one member opposite (certainly not the member for Stirling) say how that will happen. The member for Victoria thinks that the position will be rectified because the Budget will raise \$8,300,000 extra taxes in one year. The member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) told us that this was not so, that the Budget would raise only about an extra \$4,300,000 and that this was not the steepest increase in taxation in one year, because in a previous year we had raised an extra \$5,000,000. The member for Stirling, of course, did not say that the amount of \$4,300,000 related only to raisings in the remaining part of this financial year. It is estimated that the figure for a full year will be \$8,300,000. We have now increased our per capita rate of taxation by about \$8. We are certainly ahead of Queensland and Tasmania and we are not far behind New South Wales and Victoria, so we are rapidly losing the low-cost structure that both Parties have always spoken about.

I shall deal now with several specific matters, the first being tourism. We have heard much from the Premier about the need to attract industry to South Australia. I have no argument about his recent oversea trip. I think the trip was most desirable and that much benefit can accrue to the State, and certainly to the person going, from such visits. However, I draw the attention of the Premier and that of the Treasurer to an existing industry that has been neglected by this Government and by previous Governments. Already tourism is big business in this State. I have often said publicly that South Australians are far too modest about the tourist attractions of their State, that we do not talk enough about them, that if anything we tend to write them down. I hope that every effort will be made by South Australians to tell the people of other States that we have much to be proud of, and that our people, by travelling within the State and seeing what it has to offer, will equip themselves to sell South Australia.

Spending by visitors from other States and overseas is estimated at about \$30,000,000 a year, not a small sum, and South Australians spend a further \$30,000,000 on travel within the State. Thus, about \$60,000,000 is being spent in this State in the tourist industry at

present, but no effort has been made by this Government to increase expenditure in this important industry. The Premier should agree that tourism is vital to the State, because of his interest in industrial development. This is as much an industry as is any other industry and it should be so regarded. While the figures indicate a substantial increase (I think it is \$64,075), an analysis shows that that is not the case. There is an increase of \$121,049 in the amount proposed for subsidies for swimming pools and sundries. As, no doubt, a substantial portion of the sum allocated relates to the swimming pool in the north park lands, this is not really the sort of expenditure that we expect in this field. Certain allocations included in this item last year will not be repeated this year, namely, "illuminations and decorations" for the Festival of Arts and expenditure in connection with National Flower Day. Therefore, there is a saving on those items this year of more than \$68,000. However, what concerns me most is that we find an increase of only \$5,828 in the sum allocated to the Tourist Bureau to advertise the State.

Having been Minister in charge of the Tourist Bureau for nine months, thoroughly enjoying my association with the department, I know the situation: we are already the Cinderella State in advertising for tourist purposes. South Australia spends less than half the sum spent by any other State on advertising tourist facilities. Everyone must agree with me when I say that the best way to sell anything is to advertise it and, of course, the best advertising possible is to have a satisfied customer. We must provide much more to advertise this State before we can expect any substantial return. An industry as important as that of tourism requires research and planning. I sought to appoint a research officer to the department while I was Minister, but apparently no suitable applicant was available. That is a pity, because we need to undertake research in this field; we need to have people going into country areas and telling people how they can best make their towns and surrounding districts more attractive to tourists. I hope the Government will heed what I am saying and take stronger action in future than it has taken hitherto.

I hope that it will secure the services of at least one research officer and that the value of such an appointment will be so apparent that it will be necessary to appoint more research officers. Regional tourist committees function successfully in New South Wales, and

there is no reason why they cannot function successfully here. The establishment of these committees means, in effect, that those who gain directly as a result of tourism can make some contribution to the industry. These people can make their own contributions, financially and otherwise, to promoting their particular region. The Government should render assistance in this regard. I know there has been a recent move in my district and in adjoining districts in this regard.

I am pleased to say that in the first instance I promoted this thing. I hope the Government will give every encouragement to people such as those who met in the South-East the other night, to go ahead and form regional tourist committees. In fact, tourism is considered in the South-East to be of such importance that a local government conference at Penola last Monday week saw fit to move that the Government be requested to devote 2 per cent of the Highways Fund to the promotion of tourist facilities in this State. That, coming from local government, is not a bad effort, because those people realize that that 2 per cent would be diverted from road-making to the provision of tourist facilities; but, unless something like that is done, the money that should be available for the provision of tourist facilities in country areas will not be forthcoming for many years.

It is distressing to see that even in this Budget the money available for subsidizing local government authorities for developing tourist resorts has been reduced by \$6,155. This is not right. This is the sort of field we should be entering; we should be giving local government authority throughout the State the sort of encouragement it needs at least by maintaining what we spent last year or by substantially increasing it, if possible. I am not saying here that we need to spend more money (I realize the Government would have to take it away from somewhere to do that) but more emphasis should be placed on this matter than has been by the Government, even at the expense of something else in the Budget.

The Government needs more co-operation and support from private enterprise, particularly those people with a direct interest in the industry, such as the accommodation industry, transport, tour operators, restaurateurs, retail traders, etc. They need to play their part because they directly benefit from this activity. I am sure that, given the sort of encouragement they should be given, they would respond,

if they could see that a positive step was being taken by the Government and that it meant business in this industry.

Even the Tourist Bureau office in Adelaide will shortly need replacing; it is not as good as it should be. Certainly, the office in Sydney needs replacing. I have been there, examined it and recognize that it needs replacing. We shall not get from the State of New South Wales the customers that we should get if this office is maintained as it is and is not improved or replaced. The benefits to be obtained from the tourist industry are not only economic: we benefit in decentralization. We can do this, and the Government can in this way do much towards decentralization. For so many years decentralization has been a political football kicked around by both Parties for their own use whenever possible, but this is a positive step towards decentralization because in our country areas we have scenic attractions and beautiful spots that can be developed and publicized for people to come and see. I praise the initiative of people like Reg Sprigg who is developing a motel at Arkaroola, and those who have developed projects even farther north in this State, which has tremendous tourist potential. We have lost to Central and Northern Australia because they have cashed in on it, but it is not too late for us to do something about this State, particularly with the advent of the jumbo jet, which can bring 200, 300 or even 400 people at a time to this country from places like North America, to the conditions we have in the northern part of this State which has great appeal for these people. We have to sell it and have the facilities there for them to use. They can be of varying grades. Therefore, I am pleased to see the sort of development that has been commenced by Mr. Sprigg, and I hope he receives the encouragement he deserves. I believe, too, (and the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs may be interested in this) that the Aborigines themselves can, without any loss of dignity, cash in on this industry. I believe they are capable of setting up the sort of activity that would attract not only oversea visitors but also Australians. The Aborigines have the opportunity to show these visitors how nomadic people exist.

Further development of the city of Adelaide is necessary. The soil science convention recently held here was one of the largest conventions ever organized in Australia. I believe that between 1,200 and 1,400 people attended, and such an influx must have posed difficulties.

While I was Minister of Immigration and Tourism I approached the Lord Mayor and suggested that we should promote the city of Adelaide as a convention city. This, of course, cannot be done piecemeal: it must be thoroughly organized. I am convinced, however, that it can be done with the co-operation and financial assistance of the business people who would benefit directly from such promotion.

In the United States of America cities such as Chicago have set themselves up as convention cities and they really seek business. If a convention is held in another city, a representative of the city of Chicago is present to see that the next convention is held in his city. If Adelaide was vigorously promoted in this way, business people would have the incentive to construct the necessary facilities for conventions, and this could be done without great expenditure by the Government. I believe there is scope in the West Beach area for a hotel of world standard, and I do not see why it should not be built. I want to strongly impress on the Government the need to develop the tourist industry, because I am sure the benefits would be far greater than we expect at this stage. About \$60,000,000 is turned over annually in South Australia as a result of tourists. The amount of leisure available to people will increase in the future, so they will travel more and spend more, and we must not lose this opportunity.

Mr. Burdon: What about Port Pirie?

Mr. CORCORAN: I could mention many other places, including the South-East, but I wish to deal with the State as a whole. I appeal to the Government to make more money available to advertise this State and to make more money available to councils to create the improvements necessary to attract tourists and to send them away satisfied. That is the important thing, because we want them to tell their friends what a good place they have been to and what good facilities they have enjoyed. I hope that the Government will listen to what I have had to say about this matter and that it can see the benefits that will accrue to the State as a result of paying more attention to this extremely valuable industry.

I join with all my colleagues when I say I am not at all happy about the Budget. I know the Government's financial difficulties, but I think it could have tackled them in another way. I agree with the member for Stirling that it should have hit succession duties. In spite of its actions over the last three years and in spite of the silly things it said about State finances, it should have had the courage

to increase succession duties. The Government must be greatly embarrassed at present that it has had to do the sort of thing it has done in this document.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I rise to make a reasonably brief contribution to the Budget debate but, before I speak to it, I wish to compliment the member for Millicent on his most excellent discourse on tourism. In the six years I have been in this Chamber, I do not believe I have heard a finer speech on that subject. Of course, the honourable member was the Minister in charge of this portfolio for a period, so he is naturally well versed in this field. As he was speaking, I could not help thinking that once I read that the United Kingdom and the Republic of Eire gained almost a quarter of their export credits from their tourist industry. This indicates what a magnificent contribution tourism can make to a country's economy when it is promoted fully and effectively. The member for Millicent went on to discuss the possibilities Adelaide has as a convention centre, and I agree wholeheartedly. He said that in the United States of America there is great competition among cities to be the venue for conventions. While he was speaking, it occurred to me that the Swiss really make their living from running conventions.

Mr. Corcoran: South Australia has little competition: Surfers Paradise is about the only place that has gone into this.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, and I believe this may be a good time for the Government to consider some of the ideas presented to the Committee by the honourable member. One or two modest towns in my district must look towards tourism as their principal source of outside income. In this connection I think of Morgan, a small town on the north-west bend of the Murray River, which has a magnificent future in tourism. I am happy to say that the Morgan council is well conscious of the possibilities and is doing a good job in promoting this important industry. Also, the Kapunda council is doing a most excellent job in this field. Kapunda is one of the most historically interesting towns in South Australia. As honourable members know, it was the copper mines which began at Kapunda and Burra that put the infant colony of South Australia on the map. Now the history of copper mining, as personified as a tourist attraction, could greatly assist towns like Kapunda and like Burra, which is well represented by my colleague behind me.

I now wish to discuss one or two aspects relating to the Budget. First, I should like to compliment the Treasurer on this his very first Budget. It must be a fine experience to be the Treasurer of a sovereign State and to have the responsibility of managing a State's affairs.

Mr. Virgo: Particularly when you are doing it with a minority Government!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I have made up my mind to be very kind to my friends opposite in my Budget speech. I know the member for Edwardstown is only trying to provoke me in the most friendly way. Although I compliment the Treasurer on introducing his first Budget, I point out that as a practical businessman he is well able to face a task like this.

Mr. Ferguson: He is a businessman.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes; he learnt how to balance a Budget by running his own business successfully. I think that for a Treasurer of a State to be successful he must at least have had some record of successful experience in the business world. On May 2, when he was very new to the job, the Treasurer forecast that trouble was in store for the taxpayers of South Australia. It is recorded in the popular press of May 2 that he said quite clearly that the State finances were not in very good shape. The newspaper article, headed "Treasurer Surveys State Finances", is as follows:

The Treasurer (Mr. Pearson), in his first survey of State finances yesterday, said that about \$17,000,000 in Loan funds had been withdrawn from its normal and proper use in developmental and capital projects. This had been used to cover what had become during the past three years "a chronic excess of current expenditures over current revenues." Mr. Pearson has been engaged in a study of State finances since taking up the Treasury portfolio. After referring to the \$17,000,000 diversion of Loan funds to finance revenue deficits, Mr. Pearson said:

"The community has been deprived to that extent of highly desirable, if not essential, works.

"It is not surprising that the local economy has at the same time suffered a serious recession in activity and growth.

"It is vital that steps be taken to restore Loan funds to the greatest practicable extent to their normal purposes."

Mr. Jennings: When is he going to do it?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: In his opening remarks on September 5 the Treasurer said:

The revenue and expenditure proposals of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1969, have been prepared under conditions of considerable financial difficulty, and as a consequence the Budget involves extensive revenue measures without which it would be impossible to provide for the proper maintenance of essential works and services and restore financial equilibrium.

Those remarks are well worth repeating. It is now a fortnight since they were made, and I think they must be repeated to emphasize them to members here. The Treasurer went on to say:

Without these changes in accounting procedures the last three years would have shown deficits—

Mr. Jennings: Why don't you deliver your own speech?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: We have listened to the Treasurer and to the Leader in silence, and I now expect members opposite to listen to me. The Treasurer went on to say:

Without these changes in accounting procedures the last three years would have shown deficits on Revenue Account of \$6,834,000, \$6,796,000 and \$7,875,000, or an aggregate of \$21,505,000.

Members opposite do not like this constant reiteration of the fundamental mistakes that their Administration made when in Government. I do not altogether blame them, because the Government was inexperienced, having had no experience in business administration at all. Only one or two members of the Government Party had had any practical and successful business experience, and neither of those two members was elevated to the Ministry, except that one served for a few weeks after the March election. If the advice of those members had been taken, I do not think the Labor Administration would have got into the bother that it did encounter.

Mr. Langley: What experience has your Premier had?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: My Premier has had long experience as a most successful farmer. I quote again from the fine speech made by the Treasurer a fortnight ago, as follows:

Since those three years commenced—

Mr. Langley: We're back on the Treasurer's speech again. Why don't you make your own speech?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: This is merely the preamble. By interjecting, my friends opposite are only extending the time taken for my speech. The Treasurer said:

Since those three years commenced with \$1,223,000 in hand the net deficit upon the basis of accounting formerly adopted would, at June 30, 1968, have been \$20,282,000 in place of \$8,365,000 as actually shown. The \$11,917,000 difference was actually paid for out of Loan funds.

I recall the former Premier and Treasurer (and also the holder of many other portfolios) describing this as a most remarkable

achievement—how to balance the Budget, or how to cook the books. If anyone is to take blame for the financial troubles in which the Australian States in general find themselves at present, it is the Australian Labor Party. As long ago as 1942, it used the excuse of wartime financial stress to swipe off about two-thirds of the revenue of the Australian States.

Mr. Lawn: Where was your Prime Minister then?

THE CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: We can see how Labor thinking began and worked. I shall quote, from Commonwealth *Hansard* of 1942, the speech of the then Treasurer of the Commonwealth (Mr. Chifley) at page 1,286. I do this to reveal to my new colleagues some history and to show them the damage that has been done by Labor Administrations to the sovereign States of the Commonwealth.

Mr. Langley: Are you their tutor?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am as good a man as any. I am quoting now one of the distinguished Labor Prime Ministers, Mr. Chifley (although he was not then Prime Minister).

As Treasurer, Mr. Chifley said:

The Government has decided to adopt the recommendations with a view to bringing about a single taxation authority for the period of the war and one year thereafter.

I ask the Committee to note "one year thereafter".

Later Mr. Chifley said:

The Government does not seek to take away from the States their power to impose taxes on income but proposes to make a payment of financial assistance to any State which agrees to suspend that power. Another Bill will provide for the payment of that financial assistance.

Of course, what the Commonwealth did was to increase Commonwealth income tax, both personal and company income tax, to such enormous levels that the States were forced out of that field. I remind members opposite that Mr. Chifley promised that this unified taxation would apply for the duration of the war and one year thereafter, but when the war was over the Labor Government refused to return to the States their taxation power.

Mr. Clark: The Liberals have been governing in the Commonwealth for 19 years; why haven't they done something about it?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The Liberal and Country Party coalition, when it came into power, offered to return to the Australian States their income tax power, but the Labor-governed States refused to have it back, because under

their A.L.P. constitutions all powers must go to the Commonwealth; their constitutions did not allow them to take back personal and company income taxation powers unto themselves. Therefore, the Commonwealth now has two-thirds of the taxation capacity, which the Australian States ought to have, namely, personal and company income taxation. Let members opposite, when they contribute to this debate, refute what I have said. When he replied the then Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Fadden, as he then was) said:

When I as Treasurer, on November 21, 1940, delivered the Budget speech covering the financial year 1940-41, I drew attention to the position as the Government of that day saw it. I stated that income tax on individuals had hitherto been only a minor element in Commonwealth taxation and that if it were to become a major instrument of war taxation it was obvious that radically different standards of taxation would have to be adopted. I pointed out that the tax rates imposed by the States had been respected when the Federal rate proposed in the Budget was being framed.

He added:

This has very considerably hampered Commonwealth taxation at all points of the scale, because of the great variation in State rates. It is a matter for consideration whether under the increasing pressure of war we shall be able to maintain this principle. Some greater uniformity in State income taxation may become a war-time necessity.

Following this clear declaration to the States and the people of Australia, the Federal Taxation Commissioner, Mr. Jackson, made a comprehensive survey of the incidence and grades of State taxation, and analysed the position generally. Early in February, 1941, I submitted to the States a memorandum outlining possible methods of achieving taxation uniformity. These proposals, which were in the hands of the States at the beginning of February last year, were made the subject of discussion in order that the possibilities of the position might be revealed. They were not hard and fast proposals; I made it clear to the States that they could suggest alternative means of tackling the problem.

He continued:

The States were informed in the clearest terms that the Commonwealth had no desire to usurp in any way their functions or their sovereign rights.

Notice clearly that the Opposition Leader at the time (Mr. Fadden), the Leader of the Liberal Party and the Country Party coalition, made it clear that the Opposition had no desire to usurp their functions or their sovereign rights. He continued:

In fact, in some respects, the Commonwealth proposals were not dissimilar in principle to the voluntary Loan Council, voluntarily set up in 1923, under which, in order to avoid

competition on the loan market, the Commonwealth and the States agreed that there should be only one borrowing authority.

Members opposite and my own colleagues who are listening to me with rapt attention—

Mr. Clark: You should look at them: they look bored stiff!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I turn now to what Mr. Curtin, the then Prime Minister and another of our great Australian Prime Ministers, had to say. In the same debate he said (at page 1577):

Whatever be the character of the Australian political structure—a structure which consists of a Federal Government and six State Governments—the fact is that all these instrumentalities are the agencies of the one people. Our people, as a whole, have to make available the resources needed for the conduct of the war, and, as State electors and Federal electors, they constitute the whole taxpaying community for both forms of government. We must look at this matter not only in the light of immediate requirements but also in the light of the evolution of the federal system.

See how clearly the late Prime Minister (Mr. Curtin) was hinting that the Australian Labor Party regarded uniform taxation as a stage in the evolution of our federal system, and that what the Treasurer (Mr. Chifley) had said about the taxation powers being given back again to the States after the war did not really mean a thing. Members opposite know that this is A.L.P. policy. This is the fundamental reason why the Australian States are suffering financial disabilities, because they have not the taxation powers that the founding fathers of the Constitution intended they should retain. The member for Enfield knows it, and the member for Gawler knows it, too. I shall now quote more from what the Labor Prime Minister said, at page 1579:

The Commonwealth Government is proposing to pay to the State Governments, in compensation, annually the average of the money which they have collected from State income taxes during the last two years, which have been taken as the basis of calculation.

Mr Holt interjected:

The problem is not only one of "buying" the States.

Mr. Curtin replied:

The Commonwealth Government is not proposing to "buy" the States.

Mr. Holt interjected:

The objection of the State Governments to this scheme is that it takes away their ability to discharge their obligations of Government.

And how right Mr. Holt was. I am sorry if members opposite do not like this: I am trying to be as civil as possible. This is the

weakness of our State financial structure, and members opposite must take responsibility for it. Mr. Curtin then said:

In what way does it do that? From what sources do the States derive moneys for the discharge of their functions of government? From certain revenue sources, including income tax. What does the Commonwealth Government's plan propose in this regard? It proposes to leave to the State Governments all the revenue resources previously available to them with the exception of their resources of income taxation.

What he did not say was that when the income taxing powers were taken away, there was not very much left of the accepted taxes for the States to work on. I realize that members opposite are finding this rather trying, but I should like to make one last quote, because I want it to go on record, so that members on this side can use *Hansard* as their Bible. Mr. Archie Cameron, part of whose electoral district I now have the privilege to represent, said:

We had a statement from the Treasurer this afternoon that separate pickings had already been given to two of the sparrows which come up here every now and again.

He was referring to the Australian States. He continued:

One of my colleagues interjects that they are Labor Governments. I shall not press that point except to remark that a man will not always take a certain course of action because he is a member of a particular political party. It is interesting to note that some of the strongest opposition to this measure has come from a man whose orthodoxy as a member of the Labor Party is unlikely to be challenged even in this place. I refer to the Premier of Queensland, Mr. Forgan Smith.

One of the strongest critics of the Australian Labor Party's seizure of the States' powers in respect of income tax and company tax was Mr. Forgan Smith, the distinguished Premier of Queensland for a number of years. Several times since I have been a member of this Parliament I have heard Sir Thomas Playford praising the contribution made by Mr. Forgan Smith at Loan Council meetings. Like all members opposite we regret that taxation increases must be imposed, but we have lost our separate income taxing powers. Turning to the Budget, I am very pleased that the Treasurer clearly set out the proposed increases. Regarding the first taxation measure the Treasurer said:

A receipts duty of 1c in each \$10 upon the pattern of the measure recently implemented in Victoria, but not extending to wages and salaries.

Here is something where I may not entirely agree with the Treasurer. He continued:

It is expected that this will raise about \$4,800,000 in a full year and \$1,600,000 this financial year.

I thought a super tax on wages would at least have appeal to members opposite, because I believe they pay a 3 per cent or 4 per cent surcharge tax to the Trades Hall in Grote Street. If they are prepared to pay a 3 per cent levy on their Parliamentary salaries to support an institution like the Trades Hall, how much more would they be prepared to finance the State Budget to meet all these commitments which only taxation can enable it to meet?

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: That is another lie.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Perhaps it is a 2 per cent or a 4 per cent levy: I do not know the precise levy.

Mr. Langley: You should make sure.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It is at least 3 per cent. Perhaps members opposite, when they speak, will tell us precisely the levy they pay.

Mr. Clark: What business is it of yours?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It is of vital concern to me that members opposite should garnishee their wages.

Mr. Venning: To an outside organization.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes. I now wish to deal with the second item of increased taxation, and I do not know that I agree with this item to the same extent that I agree with some of the others.

Mr. Ryan: Do you agree with any of them?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, to varying degrees.

Mr. Ryan: Why are you supporting the Budget?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am supporting the Treasurer generally.

Mr. Ryan: You don't want it yet you are prepared to support it.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: If the member for Port Adelaide tempts me, I might vote against one or two of the taxation measures. I now refer to the stamp duty of \$2 upon certificates of compulsory third party motor vehicle insurance. I appreciate that we have to increase revenue to pay some share of the hospitalization of road accident victims, but I do not believe motorists should pay the whole lot. However, perhaps not even with the increase of \$2 stamp duty will they be paying the lot. I now turn to the third item

in the list of increases, which is a gift duty at rates comparable with those levied in the larger Australian States.

Mr. Clark: Is that the Labor Party rule book you have in your hand?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: No, this is a publication of the Taxpayers' Association of South Australia, which I use because it tabulates the various rates of gift duty applying in the various States and saves me the trouble of looking at all the State Acts to make an assessment of them. The point I want to raise is that the gift duty applying in some States is quite high. I do not think members opposite understand the incidence of gift taxation. Before I refer to the various State taxes, I wish to point out that the Commonwealth is also interested in this field, but only to the extent of about 3 per cent. The severe taxes are being applied in other States by way of State duties. This booklet was prepared in 1967, and I have not checked whether the rates have been altered since then. However, members opposite can check this if they wish. These figures indicate a general trend. In Victoria, there is no Victorian duty on gifts unless the document becomes liable for stamp duty, and the rates there apply to gifts made on and after January 4, 1965.

Mr. Broomhill: Why do you worry about that?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I think it is rather relevant. If the member for West Torrens had listened with some care to the Treasurer's explanation, or had read it, he would know that the Treasurer proposed striking an average rate. In Victoria, up to \$2,000 the rate is 2½ per cent; over \$2,000 and up to \$10,000 the rate is 3½ per cent; over \$10,000 and up to \$20,000 it is 4½ per cent, and so on up to the maximum scale, where the rate is 22 per cent. In New South Wales, stamp duty is charged on the document or instrument by which property is transferred. If there is no document, then no duty is payable. Again, the rates start at the \$2,000 level. It is 3 per cent up to \$2,000; over \$2,000 and up to \$4,000 it is 3½ per cent; over \$4,000 and up to \$6,000 it is 3¾ per cent; over \$6,000 and up to \$8,000 it is 4 per cent, and so on up to the maximum scale of 27 per cent.

Mr. Virgo: Are you advocating an increase here?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Rather than read out the figures for the other States I will now quote the Tasmanian scale. Tasmania is the

one dreary spot in the sunny Australian political landscape, for it is the only Labor Administration in the whole of Australia and no-one can understand why the Tasmanian people have not tossed that Government out. Tasmania is a mendicant State, so it is happy to draw on the charity of the other Australian States, and the Government there can afford to keep its taxation rates a little below those of the other States. In Tasmania, where there is a document the stamp duty is incurred on the settlement, deed of gift, or declaration of trust. Up to \$2,000 the rate is 2 per cent; from \$2,000 to \$10,000, the charge is \$40 plus 4½ per cent of the excess over \$2,000. It goes on up to a maximum rate of 24 per cent. Members can see that the rates of gift duty applying in most of the Australian States are substantial.

Mr. Broomhill: So what?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It is all very well for the member for West Torrens to say "So what?" I will develop this argument in my own way. It is inequitable that the gift duty applies on the total amount of gifts made by one donor. I believe that that principle is wrong and that gift duty should be applied on the gifts in the hands of each individual donee. This is the principle that we have maintained in our succession duties legislation, and I think it is an important principle that a man with a large family is not penalized in an inequitable fashion. If necessary, the total rate or general rate could be increased so that large families would not be unfairly penalized.

Members opposite, of course, are not interested in equity. Their book says that certain taxation should apply, and they aim to apply it, regardless of the effect.

Mr. Broomhill: Are you saying you don't agree with what the Treasurer has done, then?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I consider that the Treasurer could have found a fairer and more equitable way to apply gift duty, and if he thinks about this he will concede that the principle that we apply in relation to succession duties, where the receiver of the legacy pays the duty, is the most equitable and the fairest way.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you consider that the Treasurer has made a big mistake?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I do not, but I think he could be more equitable. The member for West Torrens can make his own speech, although he knows nothing about finance. At page 1102, the Treasurer refers to the contribution to Consolidated Revenue of 45 per

cent of the profits of the State Bank. Members opposite will be delighted to support that, because banking is one organization that the Labor Party wishes to control. So greedy are members opposite to get their hands on banking funds that they intend to alter the charter under which the Savings Bank of South Australia has been established so as to make that bank part of our State banking institution. Perhaps the major plank of the Party's platform is the amalgamation of the Savings Bank and the State Bank, but the Labor Government was strangely quiet about that during its three years in office.

When the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) was speaking, I tried to prod him on social credit. He is a graduate economist, but he also has the overwhelming advantage of practical experience. I suggest that he is one of the best financial brains in our Parliament, if not the best. He dismissed out of hand the social credit system of finance. In the A.L.P. constitution, in the finance and taxation clause, the policy provides for the elimination of public borrowing and the utilization of national credit. I hope members opposite will explain that. I am financially interested in a farm in my district; I am one of the capitalists there (as are the rest of my constituents) who would like to know how to run farms without borrowing or by using national credit. Therefore, if members opposite would like to make a real contribution to the State's finances, I suggest that they tell our Treasurer how they would run the State by "eliminating public borrowing" and "utilizing national credit". Concerning succession duties, the Treasurer said:

In the past three years collections of succession duties have been well above the original estimate twice and well below the estimate once.

It always interests me that the Australian Labor Party is so anxious to get succession duties out of a person who inherits a small estate (perhaps a small farmer or businessman), completely forgetting about the inequity that arises from other forms of transference of capital to people who succeed to an estate. It occurred to me that one member defeated in the last Parliament is now happily enjoying, at the expense of the public purse, a pension of about \$40 a week. This gentleman is strutting around, enjoying—

Mr. Hudson: Cut it out.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Surely other former members of this Parliament are equally enjoying a superannuation benefit.

Mr. Hudson: He contributed to it.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Members opposite can make their contributions.

Mr. Hudson: You shouldn't say that about someone who isn't in a position to reply. We know who you mean.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I did not quote anyone's name, and it will not appear in *Hansard* unless a member opposite quotes it. Members opposite are hoping that I will mention the name. This particular member is making a fool of himself in his district, because he goes around not talking to the man who defeated him; he cannot take a beating, and he has now become a joke in his own district because of it. If members opposite wish to do this member a service, they will quietly tell him to grow up and behave himself.

Mr. Langley: Have a word with the ex-member for Unley, and see what he thinks.

Mr. McKee: That's who he's talking about!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: An income of \$2,080 a year is the sort of revenue this former member concerned would derive from a capital sum of \$33,000-odd. One would need to invest \$33,000-odd in bonds to enjoy a \$40 a week pension. That is what this gentleman has had provided for him out of public funds.

Mr. Hudson: How much would he have contributed over the years he was in Parliament?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Not much. I doubt whether he would have contributed more than \$600 or \$700.

Mr. Hudson: Rubbish!

Mr. Langley: Turn it up.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Members opposite can tell me. When he joined the superannuation scheme he was paying a low rate.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: He couldn't get that pension from what you are saying. You are misrepresenting the whole situation and slandering a former member who is not in the Chamber. You have a filthy tongue.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am trying to point out that it is most unfair to apply high rates of succession duty to the smaller farmers and businessmen. Members opposite forget that their own kind are enjoying high pensions paid for from the public purse.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: That's a lie.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I shall tell them one or two other truths, now that I have their interest and attention.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: It's a filthy slander.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Now I have their interest—

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: You are a filthy slanderer.

Mrs. Byrne: You would take it yourself.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: If there is nothing else I shall do in this Chamber, I will oppose vigorously any increases in salary or superannuation for any member of this Chamber—and that includes myself and my colleagues. I shall give members opposite some further home truths and point out to them the injustice of their insistence on high pensions and how their own beneficiaries, in effect—

Mr. Hudson: You ought to finish slandering now. Turn it up.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I want the attention of members opposite for two more minutes while I make one or two further points that I hope will sink home. Let us consider the case of a member who has been in this place long enough for his widow to qualify for a weekly pension of \$40. (I have these figures tonight from a life assurance representative.) If a member dies and leaves a widow aged 50, for that widow to be able to enjoy a pension of \$40 a week the equivalent of a capital sum of \$33,387 would have to be put up.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nankivell): The honourable member is referring to the Superannuation Act, but there is nothing in the Estimates about that.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: With the greatest possible respect, I did make a passing reference to what the Treasurer had said about the collection of succession duties, and I pointed out to members opposite that the anticipated revenue from succession duties this year would be slightly above the estimate. I was also pointing out to members opposite that they, in effect, are enjoying high superannuation payments from the Treasury and that those pension and superannuation benefits have a present capital value. I do not deny members opposite these benefits; yet they take succession duties from the small businessmen and farmers and would deny them these benefits. I have given members opposite much good advice, which I hope they will take.

Mrs. Byrne: Will you advise your own ex-members not to take their pension?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I have touched members opposite on a sensitive spot. They are happy to get benefits from the State taxpayer and the Treasury, yet they would deny similar

benefits accruing to the widows, loved ones and dependants of small businessmen and farmers who die.

Mr. Hughes: Why don't you cry?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: If I may give one further example, for a widow of 60 to enjoy a pension of \$40 a week for the rest of her life, a capital sum of \$27,000 has to be put up. Those are capital equivalents of the super-annuation benefits that members of this place enjoy—and I say they are entitled to enjoy. I have given sufficient information to members opposite to let them know the way my thoughts run on various lines. I stress that one of the greatest disabilities that the States suffer is their loss of taxation powers, both on personal and on company income, and for this they must blame the Australian Labor Party, which was in power in Canberra from 1941 to 1949. With some regret I support the Budget.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): I heard the member for Light say he would be very kind, and I was astounded that he would even consider being kind. I have never known in my 18 years in this Parliament a member so little who claimed to be so much. He said he was writing a Bible for new members but, having claimed to be a Messiah, he made a filthy, downright, low attack on a man who was not here to defend himself. The honourable member is trying to suggest to his new colleagues that he is a man of great experience and that he knows all things, and I am amazed that he has the audacity to stand up and talk as he does about uniform taxation. I challenge him to show where a Liberal Premier at any time was willing to take back taxing powers and abolish uniform taxation.

When the abolition of uniform taxation was offered to State Premiers 10 years ago I challenged the then Premier to say he was prepared to abolish uniform taxation and take back the taxing powers, but he evaded the issue. I can quote from local and interstate newspapers: at no time was any State Premier willing to support the abolition of uniform taxation. For the member for Light to have the audacity to say that only the Labor Party wanted to retain uniform taxation is false and ridiculous, and no-one, other than a person with the ego of the honourable member, would have the audacity to say so. It is the ego of a simple soul.

One of the greatest advocates of national credit was Mr. Quirke, the previous member for Burra. He preached national credit repeatedly but, of course, the member for

Light does not want to hear anything that does not suit him. He went on to make some ridiculous suggestions about uniform taxation, but I remind him that a Liberal and Country Party Government has been in office in Canberra for 19 years, yet it has never attempted to abolish uniform taxation.

In 1942, when the Commonwealth Government, with the agreement of the State Governments, established uniform taxation the amount of tax levied in South Australia was reduced by nearly two-thirds of the amount previously paid under State taxation measures. Does the member for Light say he wants the previous state of affairs again? No, of course not. He must always blame the Labor Party and quote from its platform. It is time Opposition members had a few words to say about the L.C.L. The member for Light made the ridiculous suggestion that members on this side made payments into the Labor Party's campaign fund, but that Government members did not have to contribute to their Party's campaign fund. Every Government member knows that he must pay into his Party's campaign fund, and we pay into our Party's campaign fund. Indeed, we are pleased to do so, and we make no secret about it. Members opposite try to give the impression that they do not pay into a campaign fund. Of course they do. I have had just about all I can take from the member for Light. If he continues with this attitude, I promise him that I will deal with him more severely than he deals with us. He is utterly ignorant, arrogant and absolutely ridiculous in his statements.

I intend to speak briefly and only on the broadest line at this stage. I am pleased to associate myself with the remarks made by the Leader and Deputy Leader. I agree wholeheartedly with every word they said and I do not intend to repeat them. This 1968-69 Budget will go down in history as the "steal-all" Budget: the Premier will certainly steal all from those in the lower income bracket. The Budget will take away from many people their initiative and all hope of improving their position in life. I say most emphatically that it is a disgrace that a minority Government can be granted authority to steal from the majority of the people that which is rightly theirs, namely, the right to advance to a greater degree of security. Such a Budget as we are considering must create a feeling of insecurity in commerce, industry and in the individual.

On these points I will enlarge as I develop my remarks.

However, at the outset I wish to say I have no quarrel at all with the total sum it is proposed to raise in the Budget. I sincerely believe that it is necessary to raise every cent proposed because of the Commonwealth Government's attitude towards the States in the present financial framework. I sincerely hope the Premiers will have some success flowing from the meeting on October 4, although I fail to see how they will. Nevertheless, it is strange to see that this Government is a party to a Premiers' Conference with the idea of bringing pressure to bear on the Commonwealth Government, for when the Labor Government was in office we were considered to be a little short of criminal by the Liberal and Country League when we claimed that the Commonwealth Government should accept a greater share of responsibility towards the

development of the State. However, this is so like members opposite.

Whatever the Labor Party does or says is wrong and yet, when circumstances change, we find them doing and saying some of the very things our Party has already said and done. They cannot help this because, like the member for Light, they hate the Labor Party and the people who support it—and 53 per cent of the people support it. Being correct in their statements is the last thing members opposite consider necessary. They work on the basis that a half truth is most damaging to those to whom they are opposed: the whole truth would damage them beyond the state of recovery.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 18, at 2 p.m.