

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, September 24, 1968

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

PUBLIC EXAMINATIONS BOARD 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.

QUESTIONS

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Attorney-General has been reported as saying publicly that the reason for the present Budget's being presented to this Chamber and for its increases in taxation was the financial situation occurring in South Australia under the Labor Government. The contentions he made, as reported, are that the Labor Government charged to the Loan programme work that had not previously been charged to the Loan programme and that this had placed the present Government in difficulties. As the reason for charging extra works to the Loan programme concerned the expansion in revenue expenditure on education, health and hospitals, law, order and public safety, and social welfare, will the honourable Attorney-General point to what expenditure in those areas should not have occurred under the Labor Government or, alternatively, to what taxes should have been imposed by the Labor Government to raise the necessary revenue for the expansion in expenditure approved of specifically by the present Government in its submissions to the Commonwealth Government at the last Premiers' Conference? If he will point to the latter, will he explain how he, as Chairman of the Liberal and Country League Publicity Committee, authorized—

Mr. McAnaney: The former Chairman.

Mr. Rodda: The Leader is not quite up to date.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am talking about the former one, not the present one. I am talking about the time when he was the Chairman: I am not referring to what he is now.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader cannot debate the matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am simply replying to interjections.

The SPEAKER: They are out of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am sorry about that: I will ignore them. Will the Attorney-General, as the former Chairman of the L.C.L. Publicity Committee, explain how, at a time when he well knew the financial situation in this State and the necessity for additional expenditure in the areas to which I have referred, he authorized the circulation of a pamphlet stating that State taxation was too high?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I can tell that the honourable Leader lay awake for a long time last night working out the question to ask me today. I based my comments at the Flinders University yesterday on the statement made by the Treasurer in introducing the Estimates a few weeks ago. The Leader could see the figures (and I hope he studied them) in the first few paragraphs of the statement. Regarding the rest of his question-cum-statement, when we were in Opposition we told the Government what we thought should have been done.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Raise expenditure, lower taxes, and balance the Budget.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Leader has made a long statement in asking his question; perhaps he will now let me reply to it satisfactorily. If the previous Labor Government had done what we have done (that is, deliberately set out to balance the Budget in this State), we would not have found ourselves in the difficulty in which we are. What the previous Government should have done, if it were (as it wanted to) to increase its expenditure, was also to have been responsible enough to increase its revenue.

Mr. HUDSON: I refer to the statement of the Attorney-General made at Flinders University and published in both the *News* and the *Advertiser* that, as a result of this infamous \$18,000,000 spent on Loan works to help build university buildings and non-government hospitals, an additional \$1,000,000 interest had to be found, and that this was the basic reason for the increase in taxation, although, of course, the Government hated having to increase taxation! I should explain that any idiot would know that, if \$18,000,000 of Loan money spent on hospital and university buildings had been spent in other ways, unless it had been loaned to a body such as the Electricity Trust there would be no recovery of interest and, therefore, the \$1,000,000 extra interest would be met by Revenue Account, anyway. Will the Treasurer find time to give the

Attorney-General a few simple lessons in matters of finance in order to prevent him from making any further schoolboy howlers such as the one he made yesterday?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In the course of my experience in this Chamber I have heard expressed a wide variety of curious views on finance. For example, I have heard the views expressed by members opposite that money can be spent twice and that increased expenditure can be incurred without a corresponding increase in revenue to balance it, and various other similar statements. I do not think it is in my province to educate the Attorney-General, because I think he has had an adequate education in all aspects of finance and law and in a wide variety of specific and general matters, an education far beyond my modest academic attainments. The Attorney-General is capable of assessing the situation as he sees it and, indeed, I substantially agree with his general statement.

Mr. Broomhill: But you are not in complete agreement, though.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: All I have read of the Attorney-General's statement is what is reported in the newspapers, and I have no doubt that that is not a complete report of what he said: he obviously said a number of other things as well. In substance, what the Attorney-General said was perfectly true. The facts are as he stated them: when we took over office we found that during the three years of the previous Government's occupancy of the Treasury benches the finances of the State had deteriorated to the extent of \$21,000,000 even though, whenever I made this statement, my predecessor as Treasurer invariably took up the legal position regarding the transfer of Loan moneys to Budget Account. I have, however, never disputed the Government's legal right to do this, although I have disputed the wisdom of it, and I still dispute it even though, due to the circumstances I inherited, I have been compelled to follow the policy followed by the previous Government in this regard. There was no choice, unless I was to introduce a Budget twice as harsh as the one which has been introduced and which, I understand, the Leader of the Opposition has been saying outside this House is the heaviest impost on the community in a very long period. I believe the Leader also referred in the House to the Premiers' Plan. I lived through the days of the Premiers' Plan and operated a farming proposition in those days, so I know something about the plan. The Leader was

probably a junior schoolboy at that stage, so that any comparison between the present Budget and the Premiers' Plan is completely out of order. Indeed, my research has confirmed the fact that in the Labor Government's first two years in office the total additional taxation and charges levied totalled \$14,000,000 a year, whereas in the present Budget I am bringing down proposals for about \$8,000,000 in a full year.

BOOL LAGOON

Mr. RODDA: The area surrounding Bool Lagoon has been built up and locked as a catchment basin in the complex of the South-East drainage scheme. Over the weekend, I have received complaints from nearby landholders who are finding that, as a result of the local restriction, their properties are wetter than they were before. Later, I will give the Minister of Lands the names of the people concerned. This position has caused these people some alarm. As I understand that some trial and error was expected immediately after the drainage scheme was implemented, will the Minister have his officers examine the problem soon (as the water tends to drop) with a view to alleviating some of the problems of landholders?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will discuss this matter with the Chairman of the South-Eastern Drainage Board, and I should like to know the names of the persons concerned.

WATER ACCOUNTS

Mr. HURST: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question about the payment of annual water rates at agencies?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The authorizing of agents to collect the full year's rates from persons desiring to pay annually in advance has been considered. However, this procedure would involve certain problems, as the rate accounts are prepared and printed on a quarterly basis. Where the annual amount is paid, the current charge must be multiplied by four and the result has to be adjusted by any outstanding credit or debit balance. Properly authorized alterations must then be made to both the ratepayer's section and the departmental remittance advice section of the account. The agreement with the Savings Bank of South Australia does not provide for these alterations and, because of the practical difficulties involved, this procedure has not been adopted. I emphasize that this relates to annual payments, not to quarterly payments.

RIVERTON-SPALDING LINE

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question about the Riverton-Spalding railway line?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It is considered that the present level of service on the Riverton-Spalding line is appropriate to the traffic offering. Consequently, it is not intended, at this juncture, to provide a more intense service than that now applying. Significantly, there has been a progressive drop in the level of traffic on this line over recent years.

HOUSE MAINTENANCE

Mr. JENNINGS: During the Loan Estimates debate I delivered myself of a few well-chosen words, advocating an increase in the period of maintenance for timber frame Housing Trust houses. I understand that the Minister of Housing took up this matter. Has he now a reply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The General Manager of the trust reports:

The trust's decision to build timber frame houses in the north-eastern suburbs was taken after a study of soils and of the behaviour of timber frame construction on soils known to move in varying seasonal conditions, both on the Adelaide Plains and elsewhere. From experience, timber frame houses are not only tolerant of normal soil movement, but, where movement does occur, compensating adjustments can be made by raising or lowering bearers. Soil movement that may cause doors and windows to jam cannot be correctly described as deterioration. The trust has already extended a concession to owners of timber frame houses in the north-eastern suburbs by extending the after-sales maintenance period to three years from date of completion of the houses.

WHEAT

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to my question of September 5 about the coming wheat harvest and the capacity of the silos in South Australia to hold that harvest?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture, who referred the matter to South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd., has furnished a reply dated September 17, in which the General Manager of the co-operative reports:

Given favourable weather conditions during the spring period, it is likely that wheat production could reach 65,000,000 bushels, which would be 20 per cent above the previous highest wheat production in South Australia. In these circumstances, it could be expected that there would be a delivery in excess of

60,000,000 bushels of wheat. Whilst the co-operative has employed all available funds on silo construction, and in recent months has embarked on a programme of constructing structural steel buildings with capacities from a third to half a million bushels at strategic centres on Eyre Peninsula and is providing for the temporary storage of a further 250,000 bushels of wheat at Jamestown in the Port Pirie Division to take the total wheat storage by the commencement of the coming harvest to 54,750,000 bushels, some concern is felt at the indication received from the head office of the Australian Wheat Board this week that there could be a carryover of 7,000,000 bushels of old season's wheat in the silo system at the commencement of harvest. The board has indicated that this may be a maximum carryover. It could be reduced to 6,000,000 bushels but is rather unlikely to be as low as a 4,000,000-bushel carryover.

Preliminary advice from the Wheat Board head office also indicates that it appears rather unlikely that there will be a heavy shipping programme during the wheat receival period. Consequently, I have appealed to wheatgrowers throughout the State for co-operation by the utilization of sheds and barns on their properties for the temporary storage of wheat in bulk for a period of from a few days to a few weeks pending space becoming available in silos as shipments permit.

Indications are that wheatgrowers are responding to the appeal and that many will assist by using the existing buildings on their properties for the temporary storage of bulk wheat if there is a carryover of old season's wheat and harvest shipping is below the annual average of the last six-year period.

GERANIUM SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of September 4 regarding drainage for the Geranium school?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: Investigations have been made and a scheme has been prepared to overcome the effluent disposal problems at this school. Funds have been approved for the scheme, which provides for the disposal of the effluent by means of a drainage bore. It is expected that the department will seek private offers for the work in about three weeks.

Mr. NANKIVELL: As it is now suggested that a bore be used to dispose of this effluent, will the Minister have his department obtain from the Mines Department an assurance that the township water supply will not be contaminated if this proposal is proceeded with?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: I would have assumed that this had been done before it was recommended that such a bore be sunk. However, to reassure the honourable member and his constituents, I will obtain a report for him.

MAIN ROAD No. 30

Mr. McKEE: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my question of September 18 regarding a Highways Department grant for work on the main road at Port Pirie?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No, but I will let the honourable member know as soon as it is to hand.

MUDDY WATER

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of September 18 regarding muddy water at the Cleve Hospital?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The situation is receiving full attention and water samples are being taken each week. While the colour factor is still high, this should improve in the next few weeks now that Yeldulknie water is being mixed in equal proportions with Uley-Wanilla water. The turbidity of water sampled this week is recorded as 10, which is not considered unduly high. With regard to the water rendering the steam sterilizer at the Cleve Hospital ineffective, trouble with the build-up of scale when generating steam is a constant problem everywhere, and in this regard the salinity of the water from Yeldulknie is such that the water should be much better than the Uley-Wanilla water with its high carbonate content. Every effort is being made to provide a reasonable quality water, but it is essential that use should be made of Yeldulknie water before it is lost by evaporation and seepage.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. VIRGO: I draw the Premier's attention to a statement headed "M.A.T.S. Plan's Hidden Costs" appearing in this morning's *Advertiser* which states:

The Professor of Architecture and Town Planning at the University of Adelaide (Professor R. A. Jensen) urged a complete reconsideration of the M.A.T.S. plan for Adelaide when he addressed the annual meeting of the Nuriootpa War Memorial Centre. He said that the cost of the plan, when hidden costs that were not quoted were added, could reach \$1,000,000,000. There were alternatives to the plan, which was based on American developments that had already proved inadequate. The meeting voted to convey to the Government its objections to the plan and to proposed changes in rail and passenger services.

Does the Premier agree with the statement attributed to this eminent professor, who says that the costs could reach \$1,000,000,000? Further, does the Premier agree that there

are alternatives to the plan and that the plan is based on American developments that have already proved inadequate?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study authority will be pleased, I am sure, to receive any representations that Professor Jensen may care to make about the proposals being publicized at the moment. Likewise, the authority (and the Government) will be happy to receive representations from any other interested body or person. However, I am sure that those concerned with the study would prefer a suggestion of alternatives to a straightout objection. Understandably, certain people may wish to object to the study, and, if their objections are accompanied by alternative suggestions, a useful purpose may be served. We shall be happy to receive any representations on this matter.

Mr. RICHES: Can the Premier say how thoroughly the Government has considered recommendations regarding the financing of the M.A.T.S. Report and what effect this will have on moneys available for developmental work in country areas? Concern is being expressed in country areas at the need for stepping up work on arterial roads, particularly in the north and western areas of the State, there being a fear that much money that should be available for this work will be transferred to implement the M.A.T.S. Report. Although I do not expect the Premier to have figures on the matter available now, will he have made available to members a carefully prepared statement that will show country people how much money will be transferred from country roadworks to implement the M.A.T.S. Report?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: If the M.A.T.S. Report is accepted in its present form or in an amended form, the Government does not intend to divert moneys so as to reduce the quality of maintenance and quantity of construction of roads in country areas. I reiterate that this matter is fully in the melting pot at present, the M.A.T.S. plan being considered (and rightly so) by the community as a whole. As the months go by, much more publicity will be given to the many aspects of the M.A.T.S. proposal with the object of explaining it as fully as possible to the public so that public debate can be of the highest and most informed quality. I will obtain a report on the financial implications for the honourable member.

AFRICAN DAISY

Mr. GILES: African daisy is a noxious weed that has spread at a fantastic rate throughout the Adelaide Hills. Unfortunately,

this weed grows just as prolifically in a crack in a rock on the side of a hill as it grows in deep black loam. As allocations to district councils for the control of noxious weeds in the Adelaide Hills have been decreased, and as this particularly prolific noxious weed is gaining a hold in this area, will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture to reconsider the sums that have been allocated to the councils, so that this noxious weed may be controlled more effectively?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will ask the Minister of Agriculture to comment on this matter.

M.L.C. ASSURANCE CO. LTD.

Mr. BROOMHILL: I refer to the interests of oversea investors in the Mutual Life and Citizens' Assurance Company Ltd. and to the proposed actions of the Commonwealth Government in regard to that company. An article in this morning's *Advertiser* headed "Life Officers Mostly Safe from Takeover" states, in part:

Thus, State legislation to complement Federal action would appear to be largely unnecessary. Has the Premier considered this matter and determined whether it is necessary for the State Government to interest itself in considering legislation complementary to that which may be introduced by the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: This is a matter more for the Attorney-General than for me. Certainly, any action that the State may take will have to be in concert with that taken by other States. I believe that it would be awkward in commerce, industrial promotion and many other avenues of Government operation to move unilaterally in this matter. If the honourable member cares to put his question on notice, I shall obtain a detailed reply.

BARMERA HOSPITAL

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Premier a reply to the recent question I asked about a visit by the Chief Secretary to the Barmera Hospital?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The financial implications of rebuilding the Lady Weigall Hospital at Barmera are being considered in detail at the present time. As soon as these financial investigations have been completed, the Chief Secretary and officers of the Hospitals Department plan to revisit Barmera.

DALGETY AND N.Z. LOAN LIMITED

Mr. CASEY: Several incidents have occurred in which Supreme Court writs have been served by Dalgety and New Zealand Loan Limited,

which is owned by oversea interests, on primary producers in this State who have just come through probably the worst drought that South Australia has ever known. I understand that in some cases extreme hardship will be experienced by these primary producers in their complying with the actions of this company. Will the Premier obtain a report on the matter and ascertain why the company has adopted this course of action? Will he also ascertain whether the company is losing confidence in the primary producers of this country when, I am pleased to report, none of our own Australian companies has taken such action?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased to obtain a reply for the honourable member.

MEAT PRICES

Mr. McANANEY: I noticed in today's paper that, despite a big drop yesterday in meat prices at the Adelaide abattoirs, it has been suggested that prices to the consumer will not drop, because these prices are based only on export quality. However, as a general decrease seems to have occurred, will the Treasurer ask the Prices Commissioner to ensure that this decrease is passed on to the consumer?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: There have been recent inquiries about the retail price of meat and, as I said in the House in response to a question asked last week, retail meat prices are not controlled. Various statements have been made, one of which the honourable member said had been attributed to the General Manager of Master Butchers Limited (Mr. G. W. Sneddon) and which was to the effect that the drop in prices of cattle was mainly confined to cattle to be exported and used for manufacturing purposes. Although I cannot say whether this statement is completely correct or not, I accept it, coming from a man of repute, as being substantially correct. My only comment is this: there has been a general fall, extending over a few weeks, in the on-the-hoof prices of lamb and beef in the abattoirs and in country markets, and I expect that some of that drop in wholesale prices should by now be benefiting the housewife. I believe that Master Butchers Limited sent out a circular to its members drawing attention to the situation and stating that proper allowances for killing and so on should be made and that the fall in prices should be reflected in the price of retail meat. I have not been idle in this matter and I intend to pursue it somewhat further.

I hope that action taken by butchers in the retail trade will reflect the fall in prices at the abattoirs market. I shall refer the matter to the Commissioner again, hoping that he is able to report to me, when he does report, that proper prices and margins are being observed. If that is not the case, the Government will have to consider what action it should take in the public interest.

STUDENT TEACHERS

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of last week regarding allowances for teachers college students? Also, can she say what transpired when the student teachers deputation waited on her today at noon?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: In reply to the first question asked by the honourable member, I have the following to report:

Students claiming for travel to sporting contests held on Saturdays: An examination of the travelling claims for the second term, 1968, reveals that the accountant disallowed claims for travel on Saturdays for 10 students (five students claimed for travelling to sport; five students gave no reason for claiming for travel on Saturdays).

Report on letters sent by the auditors to teachers college students questioning the validity of their travelling claims: Sixteen letters were sent to teachers college students: eight to Adelaide Teachers College students, five to Bedford Park Teachers College students and three to Wattle Park Teachers College students. An analysis of the students' replies is as follows:

- (1) Seven students admit to overcharging the Education Department. (In some instances, they travelled by their own vehicle and claimed daily public transport rates when a weekly rate would have been cheaper).
- (2) Six students' explanations are inadequate, and they are being asked for more detailed information.
- (3) Three students' explanations are satisfactory.

Regarding the second part of the honourable member's question, on September 11 in acknowledging a letter sent to me on September 10 (signed by Mr. Peter Mitchell, President of the Western Teachers College Students Representative Council, on behalf of the deputation, which consisted of the Presidents of the four other teachers college students representative councils, and which submitted to me, as I requested at an earlier deputation, submissions in writing) I stated:

As promised at the deputations I shall discuss these submissions with the Director-General of Education and give them my fullest consideration. I shall also bear in mind your request for a deputation to discuss these proposals.

Last Friday, my Secretary arranged that I receive the Presidents of the five teachers college students representative councils in deputation today at noon. They were accompanied by the President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers. We had a long and amicable discussion during which the matters that had been raised were dealt with very comprehensively. During the course of that deputation, I informed the students that I had done what I had said I would do: I had received their submissions, considered them thoroughly, discussed them with the Director-General, and fully and comprehensively discussed the matter with Cabinet. I told them that the Government's answer to the submissions made was that the allowance would be increased to \$105.

Mr. HUDSON: On September 18, I asked the Minister of Education to find out whether or not it was correct that physical education trainees at the Adelaide Teachers College had not in the second term of this year been paid travelling allowances and scholarship money. As the Minister has informed me she has a reply, will she give it?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The second term travelling allowances and tertiary scholarship payments for student teachers at all teachers colleges will be paid with the student allowance payments to be made on Thursday, September 26, 1968.

Mr. HUDSON: When the Minister announced the increase in the allowance from \$85 to \$105, it occurred to me that, if the Minister's purpose in this re-arrangement was to produce an administratively simpler scheme, this could have been done by introducing a system of zone allowances for travel so that an annual allowance was paid to trainee teachers, having regard to the distance that they lived from the teachers college they attended and taking into account, in the case of Western Teachers College in particular, the extent of travelling necessary between various parts of the college. Such a system would be administratively simpler, requiring only a supported statement from the student about where he lived. Then, according to the number of miles by the nearest route that he lived from the teachers college he attended, the appropriate zone allowance could be worked out and paid on the normal basis. This would avoid all the administrative work that was involved in the previous scheme. Will the Minister say whether she has considered introducing such a system of zoning and, if she has not, will she now consider doing so?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I thank the honourable member for his suggestion. I point out, however, as I have done before in the House, that the increased allowance of \$105, having regard to the increase announced today, is not regarded as being paid to meet every expenditure in which a student is involved during his or her years in training. It is paid as a help or aid to the student to follow a course of professional training as well as to help meet the expenses of the student and the student's parents. Regarding the travelling allowance, the Government and the department regard the amount to be paid as a composite allowance and not dissected into so much for textbooks and so much for travelling. As from January 1, 1969, the allowances paid to students will be increased by \$105.

PALMER ROAD

Mr. WARDLE: Several years ago, sealing was carried out on the Murray Bridge to Palmer main road. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport when the additional bituminizing of this road is expected to take place?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will find out as quickly as possible.

MODBURY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about Modbury sewerage?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: As the honourable member asked a question about sewerage proposals for several areas in Modbury, I intend to deal with the matter fully, as follows:

1. Area at Modbury and Ridgheaven, bounded by Jennifer Avenue, Hazel Grove, Hill Top Avenue, Highland Drive, Sunnyview Crescent, Leane Avenue, Selby Avenue, Keith Street and Fleming Avenue: Work on this area is almost completed, except for the sewerage of part of Leane Avenue, Meadowvale Road and part of Sunnyview Crescent. When the sewerage scheme was submitted for approval in 1967, it had been proposed that the sewer to Leane Avenue, etc., would be laid through a proposed subdivision between the end of Selby Avenue and Leane Avenue. The subdivision has, however, not been proceeded with and the sewer would have to be laid through an orchard. The owner is unwilling to provide an easement and, as no firm subdivision pattern can now be obtained, it would either require compulsory acquisition of the easement or deferring the completion of the sewers until the area is subdivided. As neither of these courses is desirable, an investigation was made to see if the area could be completed by any alternative means. It is now proposed that Leane Street, etc., will be seweraged by laying

a sewer through a reserve, adjacent to the creek and discharging into a sewer which will be laid in Sandland Avenue. This work can be done at no extra expense to the Government, as, although the route is slightly longer, the sewer will be shallower. The sewer in Sandland Avenue should be constructed by about October, 1969, and as soon as possible it will be extended to cover the areas referred to.

2. Area at Modbury on east side of the Main North-East Road, and including Elcombe Crescent and Modbury Avenue. This scheme has been approved and it is expected that work will commence in about April, 1969.

3. Ridgheaven, the area bounded by Ashley Avenue, Scenic Way, Penny Street and Lokan Road: The sewerage of this area has been approved and it is expected that work will commence in November, 1968. The work on this area will have to be interrupted to meet the requirements of subdividers in adjacent areas.

4. Modbury, Tea Tree Gully and St. Agnes—An area extending from the Main North-East Road adjacent to Victoria Drive, past the Tea Tree Gully council chambers and finishing adjacent to Sunnyview Crescent: The sewerage of this area has been approved and it is expected that work will commence in about mid-1969.

5. Highbury: The approved main Highbury to Hope Valley scheme is expected to be completed within the next month. Approval has been given for the sewer extension adjacent to Valleyview Road and Landscape Crescent; this work is in progress and is expected to be completed by the end of September, 1968.

6. Dernancourt: Sewers were approved for a small area adjacent to Parsons Road and Karingal Road and this work has recently been completed.

7. Sewer extension to Hope Valley Primary School: The work is partly completed and will be completed by the end of November, 1968.

In addition to the above projects, a considerable amount of work is anticipated for the sewerage of new subdivisions under agreement with subdividers, and the extent and timing of this work could affect the works programme, as the new subdivision work has to be done by the same gangs. Some variation in priorities may also be necessary to fit in with the Highways and Local Government Department's roadworks proposals for the Main North-East Road.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. VENNING: A recent press report indicated that agreement had now been reached with the authorities concerned regarding standardization of the railway from Cockburn to Broken Hill, and I understood from the report that our Premier was to sign the relevant agreement. Can the Premier say when he expects to receive the draft agreement and also when he expects work to proceed?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I expect to get the report tomorrow morning and I expect the work to proceed in accordance with railway

planning. I think that a timetable for the work has already been announced in the House (and the honourable member would be able to find that in *Hansard* if I am correct). However, I will have the records searched and, if the date when work will proceed has not been announced, I will get the relevant information.

Mr. CASEY: During the Loan Estimates debate I raised the question of converting the railway line between Terowie and Adelaide from 5ft. 3in. to 4ft. 8½in., and asked the Premier to obtain a detailed estimate of the cost of this conversion and an opinion whether it would be feasible. Unfortunately, the line between Terowie and Peterborough is being converted to 5ft. 3in., so that, too, would have to be considered. Will the Premier obtain this information?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will try to get it for the honourable member.

WHYALLA OCCUPATION CENTRE

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: On August 13 the Minister of Works, in reply to a question I had asked regarding the Whyalla Occupation Centre, said that a contract for ground works and fencing had been let to Arthur Hall, Ackson & Co., Port Pirie, on June 25 last. The Minister also said that the contractor had given an undertaking that, subject to favourable weather conditions, the work would be completed by the end of August. Apparently, the work is still unfinished, and a report in the *Whyalla News* of last Friday headed "A New School They Cannot Use" gives one to understand that the fencing cannot be completed because some dispute about road making has delayed the pegging of the fence line on one boundary. Upon inquiring of the Chairman of the Whyalla City Commission, I have been told that the contractor has made no contact with the commission and that he can go ahead and get the levels from the commission whenever he likes. Will the Minister of Works ensure that this work by the contractor is expedited, because there is no reason for further delay, and the school, which has been finished for some months, cannot be used until the fence is provided?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I share the honourable member's concern because this facility cannot be used, and I shall certainly find out what is delaying the matter and whether I can get finality as quickly as possible.

COMMUNITY PLAN

Mr. RODDA: The Premier is reported in this morning's newspaper as saying that he has a plan, which he has called *Aims for South Australia*. Several people have spoken to me about the matter, which doubtless has been given much thought: obviously, the Premier did not think about the matter only yesterday. Will he say what he intends regarding this plan?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am not able to tell the honourable member or the House (nor do I want to tell them) any more than I told the Commonwealth Club luncheon yesterday. I suggest that my explanation contained enough detail to enable the public generally and anyone interested in such a scheme to decide whether they supported it. One of the reasons that I gave yesterday for the proposal was that it was apparent to those of us who moved among the community that goodwill and enterprise on the part of thinking people was going begging, if I may put it that way. There is an offer from the community to enter more fully into the matter of planning our future, and I told the Commonwealth Club yesterday about the programme being carried out in Dallas, U.S.A., with the endorsement of those actively associated with it. Only last week I spoke to an American visitor to this State who told me how valuable this plan had been, and continues to be, in the management, growth and development of the city of Dallas. Obviously, the extension of such a plan on a State-wide basis would carry with it difficulties that do not exist in the detailed planning for a city. I believe that, although we could adopt this plan in principle, we should vary the procedures used in Dallas to meet South Australia's needs. However, it would not be satisfactory to impose such a study on the community unless it saw the value of such a plan. If this plan is supported (and I believe it is), I will use my good offices to launch such a study on a non-political basis, because I believe the public today is looking for many things not contained in any one political creed. The study of the long-term prospects and aims of where we are going as a community would be valuable, but the community should express its desire to have such a project.

MARION LAND

Mr. VIRGO: On August 22, on behalf of a constituent, I brought to the Minister of Education's attention a problem associated with

a parcel of land in Marion owned by the Education Department. I described the block of land as a triangular block bounded by Sturt Creek, the railway line, Minchinbury Terrace, and Alison Avenue, Marion. The Minister was good enough to reply to my question on September 17, saying that the land to which I had referred was owned by Westminster School and was not the responsibility of the Education Department. I apologize to the Minister for my error in not describing the land accurately, although I am sure that, from the tone of her reply and the grimace of the Attorney-General, they both obtained much satisfaction from her being able to point out my error. The land I refer to, and should have described, is a parcel of land bounded by Shetland Avenue, Oakleigh Avenue, Malcolm Avenue, and Alison Street and contains a little over eight acres. I have taken the added precaution of checking with the authorities and find that this land is registered in the name of the Education Department. Will the Minister take the action I sought on August 22 in relation to this land?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I quoted from a report I had received concerning the land referred to, in error, by the honourable member, but I will certainly refer this question again to my officers and ask for a report. I assure the honourable member that I did not derive any great satisfaction when answering his question, but it seemed strange that the land to which he referred as belonging to the Education Department belonged to Westminster School. I merely accepted the report that was given to me. However, I will obtain a further report for the honourable member.

PETROL TAX

Mr. McANANEY: My question deals with the possible meeting of State Premiers to take place shortly, and the refund of petrol tax to the States for use on roads. At the weekend I was given an example of how council rates have increased and are rapidly becoming oppressive, for example, in Port Adelaide and in country districts. Figures I have are in respect of a farm on which a loss of \$6,000 was made last year, but on which rates of \$460 were paid, increasing to \$560 this financial year. Three vehicles are used on the farm, two of which are used only in the paddocks. Last year \$460 was paid in rates, \$110 in petrol tax, and \$30 in vehicle registration, a total of \$600. It was estimated that the vehicle used the roads to travel 15,000 miles, and this works out at 4c a mile. Allowing for admini-

stration the cost would be 3c a mile and, as the farm income is reduced, this cost is considered excessive. Will the Premier discuss with other Premiers the question of a common front against the Commonwealth Government in order to ensure that more petrol tax revenue is refunded to the States so that the cost of rates does not get out of hand?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As yet I do not know the exact agenda for the Premiers' Conference on October 4. In any case, I believe that no announcement will be made of the subjects discussed until the conference is concluded, because the conference may develop along lines that are not yet defined. If the matters discussed are more pertinent to Commonwealth-State financial relations, I cannot guarantee to introduce a subject that, although important, is subsidiary to the main question. On the other hand, the matter raised by the honourable member might be included in the discussion of the important and wide-range aspects of State-Commonwealth financial relations. Some years ago the return from the Commonwealth Government was related to a percentage of the petrol tax collected: more than 80 per cent of the petrol tax was refunded to the States at that time under a formula then agreed to. I understand that since then the formula has not applied to this tax, but that the reimbursement constitutes a return, if allied to this, of a substantial proportion of the petrol tax. It may not be a sound exercise to consider the example given by the honourable member, because the other taxation might not be reduced significantly even if a full 100 per cent return of the petrol tax were made to the States. However, if it is convenient I will raise this matter at the conference.

OAKLANDS TREES

Mr. HUDSON: On September 17 I asked the Attorney-General whether he would ask his colleague what was the intended action of the Railways Department at the Oaklands railway station yard and whether or not the Minister considered that the work intended to be undertaken in relation to removing certain trees and pruning others would interfere with the natural beauty of the area. I also asked whether or not the action to be taken was out of line with the agreement previously reached between the Minister and me. As I understand that the Attorney-General has done his homework and has a reply for me, will he now give it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: As the honourable member knows I always do my homework, and I am happy to be able to tell him that as a result of his question to me last week the Minister of Roads and Transport has again personally intervened in the matter and has requested the Railways Commissioner to restrict work on trees in the Oaklands railway station yard to the removal of dead trees and boughs and the pruning back of branches deemed dangerous to person or property.

SISAL

Mr. FREEBAIRN: As there has been a dramatic decrease in the world price of sisal over the last two years, can the Treasurer say whether this reduction in price has been reflected in a proportionate decrease in the price of baling twine in this State?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am unable to answer the question. In the last year or two, substitutes, notably synthetic products, have been found for sisal. I will obtain a report on the matter for the honourable member.

OUTER HARBOUR

Mr. HURST: Has the Treasurer a reply to my recent question regarding the Outer Harbour passenger terminal?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have a reply to this question, which was asked by the honourable member during the debate on the Loan Estimates. The omission of providing expenditure for this work was not overlooked when this year's Loan Estimates were being prepared. The next step in the project is the demolition of No. 2 cargo shed and the erection of the main building, but unfortunately it was not possible to allot any funds for the work this year. All available funds have been concentrated on what are considered to be more urgent works, such as the deepening of the Port River, the provision of a roll-on-roll-off berth, the new 1,040ft. diameter swinging basin at Port Adelaide and the Giles Point bulk loading facility. The matter will be considered again next year when the Loan Estimates are under consideration.

DRUGS

Mr. GILES: Has the Premier a reply to my question of September 5 regarding deleterious drugs that look like confectionery?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The New South Wales report that drugs look like lollies probably refers to those drugs currently being

abused—the hallucinogenic drugs such as L.S.D. and the stimulant or amphetamine group. The other commonly abused drug at the present time is marihuana, but this is not made up in tablet form or in a way which resembles sweets; it is controlled with other narcotics by the Dangerous Drugs Act with heavy penalties. I would point out that the Police Offences Act Amendment Act, 1967, makes it an offence for any person, without lawful excuse, to manufacture, prepare, sell, distribute and supply, have in possession or use any prescribed drug; the penalty is \$2,000 or imprisonment for two years or both. Both the hallucinogenic drugs and the amphetamines were declared, by proclamation dated January 25, 1968, to be prescribed drugs for the purposes of the Police Offences Act. The penalties provided were fixed by Parliament in 1967, and as new drugs of abuse can be brought under these provisions and penalties by proclamation it does not appear necessary to vary the penalty for the possession of prescribed deleterious drugs. At this stage I do not consider that any other drugs require to be brought within the provisions of this section of the Police Offences Act.

TUNA

Mr. CASEY: Recently, a draft agreement between Australian and Japanese delegates regarding future fishing operations by the Japanese by means of long-line tuna poles on tuna boats off Australia and its territories was being considered by the Commonwealth Government and the Japanese Government. Just prior to this, a meeting of Ministers of Agriculture was held in Canberra, at which the Ministers agreed that under no circumstances should Japanese boats use Australian ports. Will the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, ask his colleague whether he was consulted by the Commonwealth regarding this draft agreement and what effect this agreement will have on the tuna industry in this State?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes.

CLARE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of September 4 regarding the Clare High School toilets?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The progress on the construction of toilets at the school has been delayed for several reasons, including adverse weather conditions, and an extension of time was granted to the contractor.

It is now expected that the building will be completed on September 28, 1968. The department has been aware of the problems associated with the contract and every effort will be made to ensure that this completion date is achieved. The high school council has now been officially informed of the present expected completion date.

WILLSDEN PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. RICHES: My question relates to essential additions at the Willsden Primary School. The Minister of Education will remember that this matter was mentioned to her on her visit to Port Augusta for the opening of the Carlton school, but since her visit there has been an alteration in the situation which I hope will be considered by the department in its planning. The Minister will recall being shown an area where the Housing Trust is building a substantial number of houses and where a site had been selected for a new school. There has been a change as a matter of urgency, and before building can proceed at that site an additional building programme being undertaken in the Willsden area will result in pressure on the Willsden Primary School. I understand it is intended to erect two new timber buildings in the area. A few days ago, the Minister undertook to obtain a report on the situation at Willsden. Although I am not sure that this information would have been in the department's hands when the report was prepared, I ask the Minister whether, instead of two timber frame buildings being erected, some Samcon rooms could be erected as the first instalment of a gradual change-over from the timber building to a Samcon school?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I have a report, as a result of the honourable member's question of September 3, which states that there are many schools in South Australia which, like Willsden, are of wooden construction and in need of replacement as opportunity permits. Willsden has been placed on a list of primary schools which will be submitted for replacement, but because of the need to provide funds for new schools in developing areas it is not possible to say when a new school can be provided. The Education Department is aware of conditions at Willsden and has either moved or is moving to improve conditions there. A contract for painting the school was let to a local contractor on June 19. Although the present library measures 25ft. by 20ft., additional rooms have been erected to allow the headmaster to use a room, 48ft. by 24ft., for a

new library, and to vacate the staffroom, which is now too small, for a room 24ft. by 24ft. When the present woodwork room is no longer needed by secondary students, it will be converted to an art room. This will compare more than favourably with most other primary schools. The possibility of replacing, perhaps progressively, some of the classrooms at Willsden with Samcon construction buildings has been discussed with the appropriate officers of the Public Buildings Department. There is no real difficulty in the way of such replacement, except that the programme for the construction of Samcon buildings is such that available resources make it impossible to undertake the planning of any work of this nature at Willsden at present. While no definite date can be given at this stage, the needs of Willsden will be considered when future programmes are being drawn up.

SOIL DEFICIENCY

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on September 4 about further research into soils on the southern part of Yorke Peninsula?

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

Experimental work in 1963 and 1964 established that on calcareous sandy soils in the Warooka district yields are limited by lack of available manganese, copper and phosphate. Manganese, in particular, is rapidly rendered unavailable, and an interim recommendation was made that manganese be applied at seeding time and in two sprays during the growing season. This procedure resulted in very large increases in cereal production. Since 1965 work has been proceeding to examine the value of granulated fertilizers incorporating manganese, copper and sulphur in the granules. This mixture appears more effective than the use of the normal mixture plus sprays. It is expected that a recommendation on this product can be made after this season's work. Other work being undertaken includes trials concerning other trace elements and the most economic rates of phosphate. In the Yorketown district, trials with type of phosphate and time of application have been carried out in 1967 and 1968. Work is also in progress in the control of cockchafer beetle. A feature of work in this region has been the interest and co-operation of the farmers concerned.

MITCHAM GIRLS TECHNICAL SCHOOL

Mr. LANGLEY: On July 30, I received a reply from the Minister of Works to the effect that tenders had closed on July 23 for demolishing an old house and for other work at the Mitcham Girls Technical High School, at which are enrolled students from

the Mitcham and Unley Districts. As this work includes provision for a further playing field, and as it is now time for the grassing of new grounds, will the Minister ascertain whether a tender has been accepted and, if it has, when work will commence?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I shall be glad to obtain a report for the honourable member as quickly as possible.

VENUS BAY RAMP

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to the question I recently asked about the Venus Bay boat ramp?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The ramp at Venus Bay was provided at the suggestion of the local fishermen. The ramp is somewhat steeper in one place than it should be, and more excavation is needed at this point to give the whole ramp a grading of one in eight. Approval has now been given for expenditure to enable this work to be undertaken.

CHOWILLA DAM

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Works tell the House the outcome of the meeting, held last Friday, of the Chowilla Dam Promotion Committee?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: Last Friday, as a result of a meeting of the subcommittee of the Chowilla Dam Promotion Committee, I undertook to prepare for the committee certain technical detail requested by members of the committee. I hope that the material sought will be available this week. I think the meeting was a success. Incidentally, the Chairman appointed to the subcommittee was Mr. Dridan, a former Engineer-in-Chief. Representatives of this Parliament were the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) and me and, of the Commonwealth Parliament, Senators Bishop and Laucke. Also present were several other people representing various organizations, including you, Mr. Speaker, as the member for Ridley. Several matters were considered and the tone of the meeting was that people in South Australia, particularly, as well as people in other States, should be educated about the real need for the Chowilla dam, and that the fact that Chowilla is extremely vital to South Australia should be highlighted. The material now being prepared for the next meeting will be discussed by the committee and arrangements will be made concerning how this material may be distributed. I believe that a meeting will be arranged shortly.

ABORTION

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: During a recent session of *Today-Tonight* the Attorney-General, in replying to questions about abortion, said that when this matter had to be considered from the point of view of altering the law he would have in mind a committee comprising a legal representative, a medical representative and, I think, a representative of a church organization.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: A representative of the churches.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: As it is not altogether a man's world today, will the Attorney-General, when considering this committee, include at least two women with a wide knowledge of this matter?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I thank the honourable member for the suggestion. I am sure this will be borne in mind when the committee is appointed, if it is appointed.

CLOVERCREST SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: The Minister of Education is aware that the Public Works Committee rejected a proposal to build a new primary school at the corner of Wright and Kelly Roads, Clovercrest, because the site was unsatisfactory. The Minister will also be aware that officers of the Education Department have since inspected the area, searching for a suitable alternative site, and on one occasion I accompanied an officer in this regard. Can the Minister say whether any further developments have occurred in this matter?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: True, the Public Works Committee was critical of the site chosen for the Clovercrest Primary School. I discussed this matter with the honourable member and suggested to her that, as she knew the district so well, it would be in the interests of the district and the department if she were to have discussions with departmental officers and accompany them on a visit of the district. I understand that such a visit took place. There is literally no other site available for this school except that which was selected and purchased by the department and included in the reference to the Public Works Committee. I understand that the building of the school must proceed on the site reported on and the project will be referred to the Public Works Committee.

LAMB INDUSTRY

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on September 4 about the general condition of the lamb industry?

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

Departmental reports state that, of the New Zealand lamb imported into Australia, about 10 tons (daily consumption in South Australia is about 50 tons) reached South Australia, but this was at a time when supplies of local lamb were relatively scarce and the price was above 24c a pound. It seems unlikely that further quantities will be imported into this State unless there is a shortage of fresh lamb during the coming summer and autumn. However, importation of New Zealand lamb into the Eastern States could indirectly affect prices in South Australia. Normally, at times of shortage in those States, lambs are transported from South Australia. This competition from interstate buyers could be eliminated if imports from New Zealand were increased. Also, local wholesalers could be discouraged from buying and freezing lambs during the peak period, in the hope of feeding them back on to the market when fresh lamb is scarce and prices are higher. This could help to aggravate the seasonal glut situation which occurs in this State more so than in the Eastern States. The higher cost involved in transporting lamb into South Australia, and the fact that housewives are prejudiced against using frozen lamb, is likely to discourage large quantities of New Zealand lamb being imported into this State.

MILLICENT BY-ELECTION

Mr. VIRGO: On July 31, I asked the Attorney-General a question about the Millicent by-election and about whether the objections lodged in relation to persons whose names, it was claimed, should not have been on the roll were lodged under section 44 of the Electoral Act. He subsequently informed me that he had received a report from the Returning Officer for the State stating that the objections were not lodged under section 44. I therefore presume that they must have been lodged under section 43 (which gives the Returning Officer the right to lodge objections), because that is the only other way they can be lodged. I direct the Attorney-General's attention to the reply given on his behalf to my colleague in another place (Hon. D. H. L. Banfield), which appears at page 158 of *Hansard* and in which he states that the objections were made by the Registrar on information that originated from the Hons. R. C. DeGaris and F. J. Potter. Will the Attorney-General tell me the date on which the Registrar received the objections from Messrs. Potter and DeGaris; what was the extent of the investigations the Registrar was required to make in accordance with answer No. 1 on page 158; and what time elapsed before the objections were forwarded to the persons concerned?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will see whether the information is available.

BINNUM EXCHANGE

Mr. RODDA: My question relates to a Commonwealth matter that concerns many constituents living in the Binnum and Kybybolite area. With the advent of the new telephone book, it is intended that the Binnum exchange will be discontinued and that an automatic exchange will be established at Kybybolite. At this stage, that is all the information in the book on the subject. The Postmaster at Kybybolite presently directs all calls to Binnum and a general state of confusion exists. As I was inundated with requests over the weekend to have the matter rectified, will the Premier ask the Postmaster General's Department whether some advertisement can be inserted in the local newspapers drawing attention to the situation and stating when the automatic exchange is likely to be installed?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will see whether I can obtain a reply for the honourable member.

KINGOONYA ROAD

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked about two weeks ago about the condition of the Kingoonya road?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Pimba-Kingoonya section of the Stuart Highway is graded at regular intervals by the maintenance gang stationed at Kingoonya. Depending on the length of time that has elapsed since the last grading, the surface gradually deteriorates. This, of course, is rectified following the next grading.

SOCIAL SERVICES

Mr. HURST: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to my recent question about the number of people in South Australia receiving sickness benefits?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: According to the records of the Commonwealth Department of Social Services, the numbers of persons in receipt of sickness benefits in South Australia, close to the end of each month over the past 12 months are as follows: September, 1967, 947; October, 1967, 973; November, 1967, 932; December, 1967, 729; January, 1968, 824; February, 1968, 907; March, 1968, 925; April, 1968, 944; May, 1968, 987; June, 1968, 911; July, 1968, 873; and August, 1968, 815.

CROWS

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about crows' nests in telephone wires?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Director, Posts and Telegraphs, reports:

Crows' nests are a continuing source of annoyance to my department. In comparatively treeless terrain such as found along sections of the Port Augusta-Whyalla-Port Lincoln trunk telephone route the poles provide a convenient nesting place. Several methods of prevention have been tried but none has been completely successful. These measures have included the attachment of wire baskets to the ends of crossarms to encourage the birds away from wires and fittings and the coating of wires in the vicinity of crossarms with insulating material. The success of such measures has been marginal and has not justified the expenditure involved. Experience has shown that if nests are removed during the nesting season the birds very quickly replace them on the same or adjacent poles. Fortunately, however, nests do not often degrade the performance of telephone circuits. In view of these factors our policy is to remove all nests at the end of each nesting season and individual nests when linemen are in the area or immediately the presence of a nest causes degradation of circuit performance, a situation readily detected by frequent and regular testing procedures.

GLENSIDE HOSPITAL

Mr. VIRGO: I understand that persons who need treatment for the sickness of alcoholism and who live in the suburbs that are generally north and west of the Torrens River are catered for at Hillcrest Hospital but that people living in suburbs to the south and east of the river are required to go to Glenside Hospital. I am also told that, although Hillcrest Hospital has full facilities for treating people with this disease, unfortunately the Glenside Hospital has not the same facilities. Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary whether what I have said is correct and, if it is, will he have removed the embargo on people living south and east of the Torrens River going to Hillcrest Hospital or, alternatively, will he see that the equipment required for the treatment of this disease is provided at Glenside Hospital?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will first find out from my colleague whether the honourable member's information is correct and, depending on his reply, I will have him deal with the second part of the question.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Mr. HURST: Will the Premier obtain from the Chief Secretary the cost of the AA.12 machine that has been installed at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes.

SPALDING GOODS SHED

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my recent question about the Spalding goods shed?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The construction of the goods shed at Spalding is similar to that of other country goods sheds. It is not possible to make it vermin proof. Stationmasters are provided with poison for the purpose of keeping vermin in check and, in general, this procedure is satisfactory. Owing to the fact that Spalding is unattended when the Riverton-Jamestown bus arrives at night, the bus driver places parcels in a vermin-proof safe in the goods shed and, while this safe is not equipped with a latch, if closed it will remain so. However, arrangements are being made to have a latch fitted.

EGGS

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: This short paragraph is contained in the 1967-68 annual report of the South Australian Egg Board:

As at June 29, 1968, there were 16 producers who had refused to submit returns and levy, a further 39 who forwarded returns but refused to pay the levy, and 112 who forwarded the required returns, but withheld payment on the grounds of economic hardship. The total amount of levy unpaid was \$90,000.

Furthermore, in the last week or so many poultry farmers have received from the board a letter drawing attention to the fact that they are in arrears with the payment of the bird levies. Some of these farmers have spoken to me and I have found, after investigating their position, that in some cases there has been economic and financial hardship. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture whether in the case of economic hardship the board's policy is to release the poultry farmer concerned from payment of arrears in bird levies? Secondly, if that is not the policy, where a case of hardship or financial difficulty can be established will the Egg Board extend the time for payment of arrears in the cases to which I have referred?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will ask the Minister of Agriculture for his comment, and will refrain from commenting until I get the Minister's report.

MARION INTERSECTION

Mr. HUDSON: On August 6, and again on August 29, I asked the Premier to ascertain from the Chief Secretary whether he would consider the question of traffic at the intersection of Sturt and Diagonal Roads, whether

traffic lights should be installed, and whether police officers should be provided to control traffic at that intersection. As I understand that he has a reply, will he give it?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Chief Secretary reports that he is not prepared to override the decision given by the Commissioner of Police.

LIQUOR PRICES

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Treasurer a reply to the question I asked last week concerning the price of bottled beer at the 1968 Royal Show?

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

The Liquor Industry Council recommends a price in Adelaide of 38c for bottled beer sold through bottle departments. Where a bottle of beer is sold over the bar for consumption on the premises, that is, glasses are provided, an additional 10c is added. At the 1968 Adelaide Royal Show seven bars (not bottle departments) operated. All barmen were paid at casual rates, which are higher than the standard rate, and other additional costs were incurred in setting up these bars. As the basis of selling liquor at the show is from bars and as most people asking for a bottle required glasses (some of which were not returned), the licensee charged the accepted price for the sale of a bottle of beer over the bar counter for consumption on the premises. At 48c for a 26oz. bottle, consumers would pay less than they would for three 9oz. schooners of draught beer, which at the public bar price of 17c each would cost 51c.

AMPLIFIER SYSTEM

Mr. WARDLE: When going to and from my office in this building I have noticed several amplifiers distributed throughout the building through which can be heard the debate in this Chamber. As this is a great privilege and, undoubtedly, a necessity, can the Minister of Works say whether the installation of amplifiers in all members' offices has been considered?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will consider this matter and refer it to the appropriate authority.

TEA TREE GULLY LAND

Mrs. BYRNE: The Town Planner's Report on metropolitan Adelaide shows a section of land at Tea Tree Gully bounded by Main North-East Road on the north, Perseverance Road on the west, Range Road (Houghton) on the east and Lower North-East Road (Anstey Hill) on the south, to be a proposed reservation under open spaces. On August 24, 1965, in reply to a question in this House, I was told that this area had been considered,

in 1964, by the previous Government for purchase but that it had been unable to proceed for financial reasons. I was also informed that the National Park and Wild Life Commissioners had been asked to place land requirements on a priority basis. Can the Minister of Lands say what position this land has on the priority list and whether the Government has immediate plans to purchase it?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will examine the question, obtain a considered reply, and inform the honourable member when it is available.

DRAINAGE RATES

Mr. RODDA: I have been approached by several constituents concerning the recently announced increase in drainage rates. Can the Minister of Lands say what revenue will be derived from this increase and for what purpose it will be used?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will ascertain the amount of actual revenue to be derived from the increase. Under the provisions of the South-Eastern Drainage Act the amount received from the increase will be applied for the maintenance and management of drains and for depreciation of the board's improvements. The rate has been increased in accordance with the Act, which makes it compulsory for the board to raise enough money to cover the items to which I have referred. The board wished to change the method of calculating depreciation from a sinking fund basis to a straight line depreciation, which seemed more logical and which would have been better in the long term for the board's operations. However, it was found that changing to this method would require a heavier call on finances and, accordingly, the matter was carefully considered by the board, which decided that rather than increase the rates further and change to the new method of calculating depreciation it would continue using the present method but would increase the rates to 5 per cent of the assessed value. However, it is provided that in the next year or so the whole system of rating must be carefully considered, because if the present situation continues the rates are likely to increase further. The combined effect of maintenance and depreciation will mean that the rates will increase still further unless a new system or some modification to the scheme can be found. Accordingly, the board has increased these rates to 5 per cent. In the meantime, I have discussed this matter with the Government,

and there will have to be a proper inquiry into the financial aspect, not into the desirability of drainage or the agricultural effects of it, which is a matter for a wider inquiry. I am simply talking of the financial arrangements of the South-Eastern Drainage Board. In the circumstances, the board has increased the assessment by the minimum it can impose under the terms of the Act as it stands at present.

SEACLIFF INFANTS SCHOOL

Mr. HUDSON: In March, a contract was let for the terracing and grading of the Seacliff infants schoolgrounds. The schoolgrounds are on a sloping site, and this work is necessary to enable the grounds to be used effectively by the children. At that time I was informed that the work would be commenced by the contractor immediately after Easter. However, up to the present the contractor has done very little work on this project. A large quantity of dirt has been dumped at the school, and a certain amount of levelling has been done, but in no sense could the work be said to be half completed. As the need for this work is very great to enable the school to function properly and the students to make proper use of the grounds (thus avoiding excessive use of the interior of the buildings), will the Minister of Works look into this matter urgently to see whether the contract could be hurried up to the maximum possible extent?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will do that. Some projects have been slowed down because of the unusually wet winter which we have experienced and which commenced about Easter. I do not know whether that is the case in this instance, but I will look into this matter and see whether the work can be expedited.

BRIGHTON BOYS TECHNICAL SCHOOL

Mr. HUDSON: The Brighton Boys Technical High School was one of the new schools that came under the changed policy of the previous Government for the provision of ovals to be part of the Government's contribution to the school. Unfortunately, because of the water shortage, the school oval was not started last year. However, a bore was sunk. Will the Minister of Works consider the provision of an oval at this school and find out whether work on it is planned for the near future?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Yes.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. VIRGO (on notice):

1. How many booklets prepared by the Highways and Local Government Department have been printed, entitled *Your Highway, Your Property and You*?

2. What was the cost, and who authorized the printing?

3. Is it intended to distribute forthwith these booklets on a house-to-house basis, to all properties that will be affected, either directly or indirectly, by the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan?

4. Why were members of Parliament not provided with a copy?

5. As the booklet uses terms indicating that the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan will be implemented, does the Government still maintain that it has not decided to proceed with the plan and will not do so for six months?

6. If so (a) why has the Government permitted the production of a booklet advocating the implementation of the plan; and (b) why is the Government allowing and encouraging its officers to address public meetings advocating the implementation of the plan?

7. Why is the printer's name not printed on the booklet, as required by the Imprints Act?

8. If the requirements of the Imprints Act have not been met, does the Government intend taking action as provided in that Act?

The Hon. R. S. HALL:

1. Authority has been given to print up to 10,000 copies.

2. The cost is \$800. The printing was authorized by the Minister of Roads and Transport.

3. It is not proposed to distribute these brochures on a house-to-house basis to properties that may be affected by the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study proposals. They are available on request from the Highways and Local Government Department. The Corporation of the City of Marion requested and has received 50 copies, and the member for Barossa 12.

4. Not every publication, brochure or pamphlet published by a department is automatically forwarded to members of Parliament. The brochure is available if any member desires a copy.

5. Yes. The brochure does not indicate that the M.A.T.S. proposals will be implemented.

6. (a) The brochure solely explains the procedures for land acquisition, which is a part of the normal activities of the department. It does not advocate implementation of the M.A.T.S. proposals. (b) Officers are only explaining the proposals.

7. and 8. The requirements of the Imprints Act have been complied with.

BOILER AND PRESSURE VESSELS 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.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to consolidate and amend the law relating to boilers and pressure vessels and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

There have been tremendous developments in the use of pressure vessels and in their methods of construction since 1935, when the Steam Boilers and Enginedrivers Act was passed. The Government therefore considered that it was most desirable that some important amendments should be made to that Act. The Steam Boilers and Enginedrivers Act applies only to vessels in which steam or air is generated or stored above atmospheric pressure. There are now many gases, liquefied gases and liquids that are stored at high pressures, and in the interests of safety it is necessary that the scope of the Act should be extended. The Act, and also the Steam Boilers and Enginedrivers Act of 1911 which preceded it, provides that a person is not permitted to operate a steam boiler unless he has a certificate of competency from a board constituted under the Act, but there is no statutory requirement regarding qualifications for persons who actually manufacture these boilers. Representations have been made on several occasions by the Australian Welding Institute that only those welders who have reached a certain standard of proficiency should be permitted to work on the manufacture of pressure vessels. These representations had the support of the Metal Industries Association of South Australia. The Government considers that, with the present methods of construction and the

materials used in boilers, provision should be made to require persons who weld boilers during their construction to be properly qualified.

It is also considered desirable that the present provisions requiring the design of any pressure vessel to be approved before construction commences should be amplified, and also there are many administrative amendments that need to be made to the present Act concerning the registration of pressure vessels. As the Steam Boilers and Enginedrivers Act has been amended only once since it was passed in 1935, the Government considered that it would be preferable to repeal that Act and replace it with a new one with a more appropriate title in today's circumstances.

The Bill which has been drafted is for a Boiler and Pressure Vessels Act. As many gases and liquids are now stored at high pressures, the Bill requires the design of all boilers and pressure vessels, except those set out in the definitions of boiler and pressure vessel in section 4, to be submitted to the Chief Inspector of Boilers for approval. Provision is made in the definition of pressure vessel for the Governor, by proclamation, to exempt a pressure vessel from the Act if there are grounds for the Act not being applied to any particular class of pressure vessel. An example which has been suggested is that a gasholder, which would not normally be regarded as a pressure vessel, may be said to be within the definition. It is not intended to apply the Act to a gasholder of the traditional type and these can be excluded by proclamation but gas for reticulation to consumers is now being stored under high pressure in parts of Australia, and the design of these vessels should be subject to the Act.

Irrespective of the use to which any boiler or pressure vessel will be put the Bill provides that they must be manufactured and constructed to a standard which the Chief Inspector is satisfied is equivalent to that required by the Boiler Code of the Standards Association of Australia, and any boiler or pressure vessel may be tested by an inspector during the course of, or at the completion of, construction. The registration provisions of the Bill will apply only to boilers and pressure vessels to which the Minister, by a notice to be published in the *Government Gazette*, applies those provisions, and regular inspections will only be made of these vessels. However, the Bill provides that an inspector will have the authority to make an inspection of any boiler or pressure vessel, as defined, and

direct that repairs be carried out if it is, or was likely to become, dangerous to life or property or is not in good repair.

The provisions for inspection of boilers and pressure vessels, and those relating to the granting by the Enginedrivers Board of a certificate of competency to enginedrivers and boiler attendants are not in such detail as those in the present Act. It is more appropriate for many of the details to be prescribed by regulation. The Bill does provide for inspectors to have the authority to require any owner of an unsafe boiler or pressure vessel not to operate it, or alternatively enables an inspector to ensure that such a boiler or pressure vessel is operated subject to such restrictions as he considers necessary to ensure its safe operation. There is a right of appeal to the Minister or a person appointed by the Minister against such actions of inspectors. Clauses 1 to 3 are quite formal. Clause 4 inserts a number of definitions which are self-explanatory; and clause 5 repeals the old Steam Boilers and Enginedrivers Act, 1935-1952. Clause 6 provides that the Crown shall be bound by the Act; and clause 7 exempts certain boilers and pressure vessels used in agriculture and horticulture, etc., from the provisions of the Act relating to (a) registrations; and (b) the need to have certificated operators.

Clause 8 gives further power to exempt, by proclamation from all or portion of the Act, certain pressure vessels. Clauses 9 to 11 provide for the appointment of a Chief Inspector of Boilers and Inspectors of Boilers and continue in operation appointments made under the repealed Act. Clauses 12 to 15 reconstitute the Enginedrivers Board which is the authority for issuing the various certificates of competency for operators of certain boilers and pressure vessels. Clauses 16 and 17 provide that the design and construction of boilers and pressure vessels shall be in accordance with approved standards and authorize the making of tests and examinations in the course of construction. Clauses 18 to 23 set up the procedure for registering boilers and pressure vessels and continues in force registration of boilers in force under the repealed Act. Clause 24 vests powers of entry and inspection in inspectors under the Act; and clause 25 provides a penalty for persons who hinder, disturb or otherwise impede an inspector in the execution of his powers and functions under the Act. Clause 26 gives power to an inspector to inspect a boiler or pressure vessel; and clause 27 relates to the issue of certificates of inspection and in effect

provides that the intervals between inspections of registered boilers or pressure vessels shall not exceed one year and two years respectively.

Clauses 28 and 29 relate to the issue by an inspector of directions requiring boilers or pressure vessels to be kept in good repair. Clause 30 relates to the suspension of certificates of inspection while repairs are being made to boilers or pressure vessels. Clause 31 prohibits the use of a registered boiler or pressure vessel in respect of which there is not a current certificate of inspection but sub-clause (2) allows a period of grace of 28 days to enable the certificate of inspection to be renewed. Clause 32 provides for the inspection of documents held by the Secretary for Labour and Industry in relation to any boiler or pressure vessel. Clauses 33 to 38 relate to the granting by the board of certificates of competency of the classes set out in clause 35, and in clause 38 provision is made to continue in force such certificates as were held under the repealed Act.

Clauses 39 to 43 provide that after a day appointed under clause 40 (2) only holders of a welder's certificate or persons working under the supervision of the holder of a welding supervisor's certificate can carry out prescribed welding operations on a boiler or pressure vessel. These clauses also deal with matters incidental to the grant, etc., of such certificates. Clauses 44 to 50 provide for rights of appeal to the Minister or a person appointed by him and deal with a number of miscellaneous matters and are self-explanatory. Clause 51 provides for the making of necessary regulations.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS secured the adjournment of the debate.

THE BUDGET

The Estimates—Grand total, \$295,284,000.
In Committee of Supply.
(Continued from September 19. Page 1280.)

THE LEGISLATURE

Legislative Council, \$41,494.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): How fortunate it is that Parliament is sitting at this moment, that the Budget debate is proceeding, and that the people of South Australia have such a virile and courageous Socialist Opposition. I might ask "the member for darkness" (the anti-Christian, anti-Socialist) to heed what I am about to say.

Mr. Broomhill: And not with his back to the Chairman.

Mr. LAWN: He is so discourteous that he would not know whether he had his back or his front to the Chairman. At any rate, there is not much difference. Last week, as a result of the Government's announced decision (its parsimonious decision) to reduce student teacher allowances, the students themselves demonstrated their opposition and protested at the Government's action. The member for Whyalla (Hon. R. R. Loveday) made such a devastating attack on the weakest link in the Cabinet—

Mr. Rodda: You aren't going to start on that again? I thought the weekend would have cured you of that.

Mr. LAWN: I will tell the honourable member where I will start and where I will finish, and he will sit and listen whether he likes it or not. Last week the member for Whyalla made a devastating attack on the weakest link in the Cabinet and, indeed, the Education Department and the Government.

Mr. Rodda: You are talking about a very strong chain.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr. LAWN: Following the Minister of Education in this debate, I commended the students for the action they had taken. As a result of their action and of that of the Socialist Opposition, the Government, similarly to its brothers in the Commonwealth Parliament, fell flat on its puss.

Mr. Rodda: Give us a definition of "puss".

Mr. LAWN: It had to alter its decision about allowances to student teachers. In relation to the F111 aircraft, the Commonwealth Government made one of the biggest blunders it has ever made.

Mr. Corcoran: It won't have to worry about it much longer: another one went down today.

Mr. LAWN: I only hope members of the Liberal Party try out those planes, although I do not think they would have the intestinal fortitude to do that. Cabinet met last evening to alter its decision on student teacher allowances. Although it has unfortunately not retracted its decision completely, it has been forced to make some improvement in the position.

Mr. Broomhill: The Government couldn't do what we suggested: it had to make some other change.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, it could not admit that the Opposition was again completely correct, but it admitted its decision was wrong and announced today that it was increasing the

allowance by \$20. However, it has still not covered the situation that has been pointed out of some of these students having to travel a much longer distance than do others. Nevertheless, as a result of the actions of students and of the Socialist Opposition, the Government had to alter a decision it had made in the last week or two.

As a result of the remarks made by the member for Hindmarsh (Hon. C. D. Hutchens) and me, members (on this side, anyway) are receiving considerable correspondence on another proposed action of the Government in relation to the fluoridation of our water supply. I shall read one letter received by the member for Hindmarsh from a person living on Eyre Peninsula, which is represented by a member opposite.

Mr. Rodda: Worthily represented, too.

Mr. LAWN: Let us see what this person thinks of his representative. The letter, which is dated September 12, states:

I read with interest your comments in *Hansard*, and I want you to know that you are not alone in this matter of fluoridation of the water of all the people! I have written the health people trying to find out when the Government is going to add fluoride to our water system in Streaky Bay, but to date no answer is forthcoming! Do you know when this will occur on Eyre Peninsula? While overseas, I recall living in a community that experienced great difficulties of salting up of the water mains. In fact, great chunks of this salt would break loose from time to time and come through the water outlets. In fact, I had an extensive tropical fish collection and the water from one such cake killed all my fish in less than an hour! Do you know if the Government has taken any precautions against salting up of fluoride-containing-water? Also, why is the Government so slow at answering criticism of its fluoride policy? Any information you could provide would be very helpful to me here. Keep up your good work on this question. Something is rotten in the State of South Australia somewhere concerning this question!

There is something rotten—it is the Government that is rotten: the whole Liberal and Country League is rotten. People on Eyre Peninsula, which is represented by a Government member, are waking up to this. This man had experience of fish being killed. I have already referred (or I will refer today) to instances where fall-out from factories has killed cattle and sheep and made farming worthless. People affected in this way look to the Socialist Labor Party to help them escape the effects of the treatment they receive from the so-called Liberal and Country Party Government which is supposed to represent all sections of the community. Also as a

result of remarks by the member for Hindmarsh and by me, a member of the Party opposite, in the Legislative Council, gave notice of motion, as follows:

Mr. President, I give notice that on Wednesday, September 25, I will move that this Council disagrees with the decision of the Government to add fluoride to water supplies and considers that before such action is taken Parliamentary approval should be sought.

How fortunate it is that Parliament is sitting and that the Budget debate is proceeding so that we can have such virile Socialist Opposition on this matter!

Mr. Jennings: It is such a vile Government.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, it is a vile Government, but a virile Opposition. In fact, I should say it is a vile, impotent Government. One member opposite avails himself of all opportunities to attack us by calling us Socialists. This anti-Christian, anti-Socialist member should take note that the Opposition is obviously virile, whether Socialist or otherwise, and that people are taking notice of it. We are not ashamed to admit that we are Socialists. I do not know what will be the outcome of the motion to be moved in the Legislative Council. It could be that, as a result of the criticism of its proposal in this place, the Government has asked the member concerned to move this motion with the object of having it voted against, claiming this to be a justification for its attitude. On the other hand, it could be a sincere move by the member concerned. I hope it is and I hope the Council will carry it.

Mr. Rodda: We are not as rotten now.

Mr. LAWN: I said it was a rotten Government and that that was what was wrong with South Australia. When this Chamber adjourned on Thursday, I was about to refer to a pamphlet published by the London anti-fluoridation campaign, which states:

The London anti-fluoridation campaign has always opposed the artificial fluoridation of public water supplies on the grounds that it is a violation of human rights. Some people regard this question of principle as of little importance and say they are prepared to accept fluoridation provided there is no doubt as to its safety. This pamphlet provides evidence of doubt among authorities all over the world.

I have already referred to some medical opinion that is opposed to fluoridation and to other medical opinion that has grave doubts about the wisdom of fluoridation. This pamphlet lists eminent doctors all over the world who are in either of those categories, and the report states:

The following are among the steadily increasing number of authorities who have declared themselves to be against, or doubtful about, the artificial fluoridation of public water supplies. Twelve other research scientists have asked that their names be not used publicly although they are personally opposed to fluoridation. Part 1 of this list covers Australia, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Great Britain, India, Italy, Norway, South Africa, Sweden and Switzerland, and part of the United States.

I ask leave to have incorporated in *Hansard*, without my reading them, the names, qualifications and positions occupied by these authorities.

Leave granted.

AUTHORITIES OPPOSED TO OR DOUBTFUL ABOUT FLUORIDATION

Australia:

Sir Arthur B. P. Amies, C.M.G., D.D.Sc., L.L.D., F.R.C.S., F.R.A.C.S., F.D.S.R.C.S., F.R.S.E., F.A.C.D., professor of dental medicine and surgery; dean of the faculty of dental science; and vice-chancellor, University of Melbourne.

Colin P. Harrison, M.D., head, Chelmer Diagnostic Laboratories, Melbourne.

Sir Cedric Stanton Hicks, K.B., C.St.J., M.D., Ph.D., F.R.I.C., professor of human physiology and pharmacology, emeritus, and Sheridan Research Fellow, Adelaide University; editor, *Australian Journal of Biology*; member, editorial board, *Excerpta Medica*, Amsterdam; and scientific food consultant, Australian Army.

Paul Pincus, D.D.Sc., Ph.D., R.D.S., R.C.S., of the Dental School, University of Melbourne.

John B. Polya, D.Sc., F.R.I.C., F.R.A.C.I., associate professor of chemistry, University of Tasmania, Hobart.

Philip R. N. Sutton, D.D.Sc., L.D.S., senior research fellow, Department of Oral Medicine and Surgery, Dental School, University of Melbourne.

Canada:

Marcel Boulet, Ph.D., inorganic chemist, food and chemistry section, Division of Applied Biology, National Research Council of Canada, Ottawa.

Keith F. Box, D.D.S., specialist in periodontal diseases, Toronto, Ontario. (His father, the late Harold Keith Box, D.D.S. Ph.D., research professor of periodontology, dental faculty, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, was also opposed to fluoridation).

John Davison, F.L.S., F.B.S.E., F.R.H.S., professor emeritus of botany, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C.

William J. McCormick, M.D. F.I.C.A.N., of Toronto, Ontario.

John R. Marier, dairy chemistry technician, food and chemistry section, Division of Applied Biology, National Research Council of Canada.

Robert Newton, M.C., Ph.D., D.Sc., LL.D., F.A.I.C., F.R.S.C., former director, biology division, National Research Council of Canada; former director, Alberta Research Council; and former President, University of Alberta.

Charles T. Peterson, D.D.S., specialist in periodontal diseases and director Western Dental Foundation, London, Ontario.

James J. Rae, Ph.D., associate professor of chemistry, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario.

Dyson Rose, Ph.D., chief, food chemistry section, Division of Applied Biology, National Research Council of Canada.

M. Doreen Smith, Ph.D., F.C.I.C., professor of food sciences and head, Department of Food Chemistry, University of Toronto, and honorary director, Institute of Nutrition and Dietetics, University of Montreal, Quebec.

Denmark:

Dr. Richard Fge, professor of biochemistry, University of Copenhagen, Denmark.

Knud O. Moller, M.D., Ph.D., professor and director, Department of Pharmacology, University of Copenhagen.

France:

Dr. Michael Dechaume, professor of stomatology, Faculty of Medicine, University of Paris; president, Congress of Stomatology; and secretary of the *Stomatology Review*.

Jean-Marie René Fabre, M.D., D.Sc., professor of toxicology and pharmacy and dean emeritus of the faculty of pharmacy, University of Paris, and honorary President, Academy of Medicine.

Professor A. Gaillard, Faculty of Medicine and Pharmacy, Nantes.

Dr. M. Palfer-Sollier, French National Institute of Hygiene, Paris.

Dr. Truhaut, professor of toxicology, faculty of pharmacy, University of Paris.

Guillaume Valette, dean of the faculty of pharmacy, University of Paris.

Germany:

Dr. C. Beusch, former superior medical counsellor, Board of Health, Frankfurt-am-Main.

Professor Dr. Eichholtz, professor emeritus of pharmacology, University of Heidelberg.

Ulrich Rheinwald, medical director, Tooth and Mouth Clinic, Municipal Katherin Hospital, Stuttgart.

Fauzi Rozeik, D.D.S., associate professor of dentistry and director of research, medical faculty, Mainz University, and chief physician, Dental Institute of Mainz.

Professor H. A. Schweigart, President and Director of Research, International Society for Research on Nutrition and Vital Substances, Hanover.

Great Britain:

Roger J. Berry, M.D., Helen Hay Whitney Fellow in Radiobiology, Oxford University, and head, radiobiology laboratory, Department of Radiotherapy, United Oxford Hospitals.

Lewis John Beynon, T.D., M.B., B.S., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., member of the Council of the British Medical Association.

Charles S. Dillon, D.D.S., L.D.S., R.F.P.S., Caladh, Fort William, Inverness-shire, Scotland.

Charles Geoffrey Dobbs, Ph.D., A.R.C.S., senior lecturer (mycology), University College of North Wales, Bangor.

Hugh MacDonald Sinclair, D.M., M.A., B.Sc., F.R.C.P., L.M.S.S.A., vice-president and fellow and lecturer in physiology and biochemistry, Magdalen College, Oxford Uni-

versity, and former director, laboratory of human nutrition, Oxford University.

Wilfred Trillwood, F.P.S., director of pharmaceutical services, United Oxford Hospitals.

Herbert Edmeston Watson, D.Sc. (Lond.), F.R.I.C., M.I.Chem.E., professor emeritus of chemical engineering, University of London.

Dagmar F. C. Wilson, M.D., D.P.H., M.R.C.P., F.R.C.O.G., Institute of Social Medicine, Oxford University, Oxford.

India:

J. V. Bhat, Ph.D., D.Sc., professor of microbiology, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, Mysore.

Dr. S. C. Pillai, of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, Mysore.

Amarjit Singh, M.D., M.R.C.P., professor of medicine and principal, Medical College, University of Patiala, Punjab.

Italy:

Andrea Benagiano, D.D.S., dean and director, Dental School, University of Rome; director, George Eastman High Institute of Dentistry; president, Association of Italian Medical Dentists; and editor, *Annals of Stomatology*.

Sergio Fiorentini, professor of dentistry, University of Rome; principal, Department of Operative Dentistry, George Eastman High Institute of Dentistry; president, Italian Society of Children's Dentistry; and sub-editor, *Annals of Stomatology*.

Norway:

Harald A. Salvesen, M.D., chief of medicine, State Hospital of Norway; professor of internal medicine, emeritus, University of Oslo; and physician to the late King Haakon VII.

Republic of South Africa:

Dr. D. G. Steyn, B.Sc., Dr. Med. Vet. (Pharmacology-Vienna), D.V.Sc., (Toxicology-Pretoria), recently Chief Research Officer, Division of Life Sciences, Atomic Energy Board, Pretoria; formerly professor of pharmacology, University of Pretoria, and now member of the Poisons Committee of the Department of Health of the Republic of South Africa.

Sweden:

Alfred Aslander, Ph.D., director of agriculture, Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm.

Arvid Carlsson, M.D., professor and chief of Pharmacological Institute, Gothenburg University.

Allan Stralfors, D.D.Sc., professor of cariology, Royal Dental Institute of Sweden, University of Umea, Malmo.

Ulf S. von Euler-Chelpin, M.D., D.D.Sc., professor of pharmacology and physiology, Karolinska Institute, Stockholm.

Switzerland:

Anton Gordonoff, M.D., professor emeritus of toxicology and pharmacology and head, pharmacology department, Bern University School of Medicine, and member, Swiss Commission of Medicines and Drugs.

Dr. W. Minder, professor of physiology, Bern University School of Medicine.

United States of America:

William A. Albrecht, Ph.D., professor emeritus and retired chairman, department of

soils, University of Missouri College of Agriculture, Columbia, Mo.

L. A. Alesen, M.D., F.A.C.S., F.I.C.S., member, House of Delegates, American Medical Association; past president, California Medical Society and Los Angeles County Medical Association; and former chief of staff, Los Angeles County General Hospital.

Louise Bates Ames, Ph.D., F.A.P.A., director of research, Gesell Institute of Child Development, New Haven, Conn.

Cyrus W. Anderson, M.D., past president, Denver and Colorado Medical Societies; past president, Denver General and Mercy Hospital Staffs; past national director and past president, Colorado Chapter, American Academy of General Practice; and founder member, South-Western Surgical Congress.

Donald W. Baker, D.V.M., professor of parasitology, College of Veterinary Medicine, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., and president, New York State Veterinary Society.

Olier L. Baril, Ph.D., professor of chemistry, College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass.

Charles C. Bass, M.D., Sc.D., L.L.D. dean emeritus, Tulane University Medical School, New Orleans, L.A., and past president, Society of Tropical Medicine, Society of Clinical Investigation, and Southern Medical Association.

Simon Beisler, M.D., chief of urology, Roosevelt Hospital, New York City, and past president, New York Urological Association.

James Winston Benfield, D.D.S., assistant clinical professor, School of Dental and Oral Surgery, Columbia University, New York City.

Thomas R. Camp, M.S., of Camp, Dresser & McKee, Consulting Engineers; past chairman, American Sanitary Engineering Inter-society Board; and member, representing American Society of Civil Engineers, Advisory Committee of the USPHS for 1962 Revision of Drinking Water Standards.

Frederick Cunliff, Ph.D., former chairman, Chemistry Department, Columbia College, Columbia, South Carolina.

Fred Squier Dunn, M.D., D.D.S., head, Oral surgery Department, Lenox Hill Hospital, New York City.

Mr. LAWN: I now refer to this circular issued by the Anti (Water) Fluoridation League in South Australia, as follows:

We therefore think it is pertinent to draw attention to the recent (October 21, 1967) letter to the *British Medical Journal* by Dr. Roanald Kerr, one paragraph of which stated:

One also gathers that as time goes by increasing numbers of eminent doctors and scientists, too numerous to list here, are coming to have grave doubts about the wisdom of this policy. Few who study the case against fluoridation (and most do not) can fail to have grave doubts. Surely it is time that the whole question of the fluoridation of water supplies was reassessed.

I am not suggesting that the British, American or Australian medical associations, as organizations, are opposed to the fluoridation of water supply. I do not know

their positions as organized bodies, but I do know that, in those countries, as in all other countries, eminent members of the medical profession are either strongly opposed to fluoridation or gravely concerned because they claim that we do not know sufficient about its effects. The publication *Aqua Pura* of March, 1968, refers to the factory fallout of fluoride, as follows:

From the *Globe* and *Mail* Toronto, Canada, November 2, 1967, comes the sad tale of the effects of fluoride fallout from the local factories. The victims quoted in the *Globe* are Mr. and Mrs. Robert Paisley who persevered for a lifetime on their productive farm which netted them an income of \$1,100 per month. Now the farm is a wasteland. December 1, 1967, was the blackest day in the lives of the energetic couple who found life good doing the work they loved. On that day the last 45 of their dairy herd were driven away to be destroyed. The 70-year-old couple are now wondering what they will do for the remainder of their lives. They are too old to start again. The reason for the destruction of the herd was fluoride poisoning from the local factory fall out. The stacks of this plant, says Dr. Waldbott, have spread a pall of fluorine over this region which was supporting 8,000 people. Dr. Waldbott has said, reports the *Globe*, that this fallout "is not only killing the living, but may also be deforming the unborn." Last spring the vet called at the farm of the Paisleys and examined their cattle. Two months later he advised that all the cattle were suffering from fluorosis and had to be destroyed. Symptoms: Cattle stop eating, become weak, finally they just go down and can't stand up again. The Paisleys are finished at the age of 70 years. Their life's work is blotted out. What a tragedy for the winter time of life!

Three years ago, Mr. Jacob Vanderbeeck, a Dutch immigrant, bought a farm and with the usual industriousness of the Dutch worked hard and established a prosperous farm. Then, as with the Paisleys, he lost his herd due to fluorosis. Today his house stands empty and the once proud farmer lies ill in hospital at the age of 70. Residents in the area are complaining of aching joints and shooting pains in their bones. A Mr. Joseph Cassina, at 54 years of age, became aware of these symptoms and put it down to advancing age, along with some of his neighbours, who also had similar complaints. His neighbours also complain of sore tender feet, so sore at times that they have to use walking sticks to get around. Other symptoms complained of are sore, watery eyes, swollen tongues and intermittently swollen neck glands. Tests have shown that entire crops of baled hay are loaded with fluorine and an increasing number of calves are stillborn.

It must be admitted that the owners of the factory causing all this distress to the residents of Dunville are doing all that is physically possible to overcome the position. The farmers used Ontario Agricultural Representative findings to get more than \$200,000 in awards from the company. Also, the company has spent

\$750,000 for equipment to filter the fall-out from the smoke stacks and in addition has also built some of the finest roads in the district.

According to the *Globe* and *Mail* dated October 23, 1967, the people of Dunville fear that entire families may be dying from incurable fluorosis caused by fluoride fall-out which is sweeping through the area from a chemical plant. Dr. G. L. Waldbott, it is said, has stated that "chemical fall-out from the plant is not just killing cattle and crops, but has started claiming human lives." He said that "two of nine farmers living within three miles of the plant are dying from fluorine poisoning".

Professor L. Dutton, Chairman of the Anti-Fluoride Citizens Health Association, says fluoridation must be halted if citizens in Winnipeg are to escape the fate of those near Dunville. He said that 15 per cent of the people of Winnipeg are being poisoned by fluorides in the local water supply. In a telephone interview, the professor said that he had accumulated facts of studies conducted in Canada and U.S.A. which prove that fluoridation leads to poisoning. Professor Dutton was in favour of fluoridation until he looked more closely into it (would to Heaven some of our "experts" would follow his example).

Last Thursday I referred to Dr. Waldbott, who is mentioned in that report. I intended to refer to much more in that pamphlet, but I will by-pass some of it because the evidence which I have given and which I will give is sufficient to indicate that the Government should not fluoridate our water supplies.

Mr. Rodda: Are you in favour of fluoridation?

Mr. LAWN: The Government's policy has been announced and members opposite, irrespective of their opinions, are bound to support the fluoridation (or poisoning) of our water supply. They cannot say, and they have not during this debate said, one word about fluoridation, not even to the extent of supporting their own Government.

Mr. Rodda: Are you in favour of it?

Mr. LAWN: I am certainly not in favour of fluoridation, but members opposite apparently do not know enough to express an opinion whether they favour it or oppose it.

Mr. Clark: They have not bothered to study it.

Mr. LAWN: Of course not. I have tried to inform myself on the subject, and have concluded that if I wanted attention to my teeth I would go to a dentist: if I wanted to know something about my health I would visit a doctor.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Why won't they attack the cause of dental decay? Is it because they are engaged in private enterprise?

Mr. LAWN: This may be why they support fluoridation. In reply to the member for Victoria, I have found during my studies that many doctors oppose fluoridation of water and that many eminent doctors have said they have grave doubts about the wisdom of fluoridation and that we should wait until further experiments have been done before we fluoridate water for human consumption. Sir Stanton Hicks and Sir Arthur Amies are titled medical officers, and surely the Queen would not knight these gentlemen unless they were entitled to it. The opinion of these doctors has created a doubt in my mind. I do not know, and neither does the member for Victoria know, whether fluoridation will kill us, will eventually kill cattle, or will cause other disorders and side effects to human beings. If the member for Victoria studied the question he would find that after a few years the pipes carrying fluoridated water were absolutely corroded by whatever was going through them and would burst and have to be replaced. If fluoride does this to pipes what would it do to our stomachs? I do not know whether the honourable member has got it or an ulcer.

Mr. Ryan: He has a "Liberal" stomach.

Mr. LAWN: Of course. We should consider the opinions of doctors about the ailments that we may suffer.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: You say that it will not provide a silver lining.

Mr. LAWN: It would not do that. First thing in the morning I drink milk to put a lining on my stomach in order to combat the poisons I have to take during the rest of the day. However, I would want more than milk as a lining on my stomach to withstand fluoridated water. The World Union for the Protection of Life rejected fluoridation, and the general meeting he'd at Bayreuth on September 5, 1966, adopted the following resolution:

Fluoridation of Drinking Water: The World Union for the Protection of Life having regard to the present state of scientific knowledge positively rejects the fluoridation of drinking water for dental decay because of the dangers inherent in it and its transitory effect. Caries (dental decay) is mainly attributable to errors in diet, and therefore an effective prophylaxis (preventing and arresting decay) can be brought about by the right methods of nutrition which involves the intake of all the important vital substances including the fluorine naturally present (for example, in whole meal, fish, potatoes in peel).

The Board of the German Association of Gas and Water Experts stated in 1958, confirmed February 1967, as follows:

Irrespective of the experiments at Kassell and its results, the board confirms its first statement (of 1955) with the following declaration of principle: it cannot be the duty of public waterworks to deliver to their consumers together with the drinking water substances to prevent or to cure disease. An exception could only be considered if drinking water were the sole possible vehicle for such substances. This is not so in the case of fluorides as a prophylactic against dental caries. On principle, additions to public drinking water would appear to be permissible only if their purpose is to alleviate harmful properties of the water itself. This attitude is based on ethical considerations which result from the duty of supplying the public with a pure water and are supported by legal aspects.

Mr. Riches: Do you think people should have a say on this matter?

Mr. LAWN: Yes, I would welcome a referendum on this question but, obviously, the Government intended to do this without any public discussion or discussion in this House, except as in this debate. The Government stated that it would be more than 12 months before water was fluoridated, but it did not say (as we did when requested by Sir Thomas Playford) that it would give members the opportunity to debate this action. The Government did not intend to make time available to enable Parliament to express an opinion. I would welcome the Government's testing its action by a referendum.

Mr. McAnaney: What would that cost?

Mr. LAWN: The Treasurer could inform the honourable member.

Mr. McAnaney: We wasted enough money in the last three years with your referendum.

Mr. LAWN: I did not have a referendum.

Mr. Corcoran: In other words, the member for Stirling says we should not let the people have a say on any subject merely because cost is involved.

Mr. LAWN: That is a valid comment. The member for Stirling is saying that the people should not be consulted on any matter because it costs money.

Mr. McAnaney: Why didn't you have a referendum on 10 o'clock closing?

Mr. LAWN: We knew what the people thought about social legislation. We had a referendum on the lottery, and the result would have been the same on 10 o'clock closing. Does the honourable member suggest that a referendum would have had any other result?

We were elected on our policy speech, but fluoridation was not referred to in this Government's policy speech. I quote a statement by Albert Schatz, Ph.D., D.Sc., F.R.S.H., at the Radburn Research Institute, New Jersey, U.S.A. The article is headed "The Failure of Fluoridation in Chile: A Critical Analysis after Eleven Years." Here is a place that has had it operating for 11 years, and this is what Dr. Schatz has to say about it:

Each country differs in certain respects from other countries. These differences must be recognized, considered, and evaluated before any public health measure that is used in one country is adopted by another country. Unfortunately, the National Health Service of Chile introduced fluoridation into that country without previously studying conditions that are unique to Chile. In other words, the National Health Service first began to fluoridate. Then when it encountered criticism, it attempted to justify what it had already done by conducting the kinds of studies that it should originally have carried out before it went ahead with fluoridation. But the results which are now available after 11 years conclusively show that fluoridation is a complete fiasco.

The Chilean population was fluoridated long before 1953, when the National Health Service began to artificially fluoridate the community water supply of Curico. A nutritional survey of Chile, carried out in 1935 under the League of Nations, reported that tea consumption was unusually high in Chile, especially among poor people whose teeth are particularly rotten. Even young children in Chile drink tea daily. According to the International Tea Committee, the consumption of tea has doubled since 1936-38. A single sup of tea can provide one milligram of fluorine. It has been shown that the amount of fluorine in human bones is directly related to the amount of tea that is consumed. But Chileans also drink, on the average, 137 grams of wine per day. This quantity of wine alone can provide up to 4.9 milligrams of fluoride. The coffee which Chileans also consume in large amounts may be prepared from coffee beans containing as much as 243 parts per million of fluorine, 31 per cent of which is extracted during the percolation process. Seafood, which many Chileans eat, has a high fluorine content.

From these and other sources, the Chilean population had therefore been getting one milligram or more of fluorine per day for many years before the fluoridation programme was started by the National Health Service. Consequently, the very high incidence of caries in Chile, which is why fluoridation was introduced in 1953, conclusively proves that fluoridation does not and cannot prevent caries, at least in Chile.

This is consistent with the opinions which were expressed by authorities in countries other than Chile and to which I referred last week. It goes on:

This is understandable since one would not expect artificial fluoridation to do what natural

fluoridation had been unable to accomplish. This, in turn, poses an interesting question: Since fluoridation does not prevent caries in Chile, why would it be effective in any other country?

I pose that question to the Minister of Works. Mr. Chairman, subject to your permission and that of the Committee, I ask leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* a list of cities in the United States of America and elsewhere that have tried fluoridation and abandoned it after a trial. I ask for leave to have incorporated, without my reading it, not all the typewritten matter but only the names of the places.

Leave granted.

A PARTIAL LIST OF COMMUNITIES THAT HAVE ABANDONED FLUORIDATION AFTER A TRIAL

- California*—San Diego, La Jolla, part of Coronado, Rio Vista, St. Helena, Belmont, San Carlos, Lincoln, King City.
- Colorado*—Johnstown, Cortez.
- Delaware*—Middletown.
- Florida*—Mount Dora, St. Petersburg, Pinellas Park, Gulfport, Oldsmar, Pensacola.
- Idaho*—Coeur d'Alene, St. Maries, Lewiston Orchards.
- Illinois*—Geneseo, Pleasant Hill.
- Indiana*—Tell City.
- Iowa*—Knoxville.
- Kansas*—Wakeeney, Horton.
- Louisiana*—St. Martinville.
- Massachusetts*—Williamstown, Northampton, Hudson, North Andover, Reading, Andover, Wilmington, Cambridge.
- Michigan*—Ishpeming, Saginaw, Grosse Pointe Farms, Grosse Pointe Shores, City of Grosse Pointe, Lake Odessa, Mancelona.
- Minnesota*—Faribault, Austin, Okabena, Kenyon, Aitkin.
- Mississippi*—Bay Springs.
- Missouri*—Kansas City.
- Montana*—Fort Belknap, Chinook, Polson.
- Nebraska*—Beatrice.
- New Hampshire*—Concord, Rochester.
- New Jersey*—Morristown, Hanover (part), Morris Township, Mendham Township, Harding Township, Sayreville.
- New York*—Fulton, Amsterdam, Riverhead.
- North Carolina*—Burlington, Brevard, Sylva.
- Ohio*—Akron, Canton, Alliance, Sebring.
- Oklahoma*—Claremore, Ardmore, Tonkawa, Mangum.
- Oregon*—Eugene.
- Pennsylvania*—Monaca.
- South Carolina*—Greenville, Fountain Inn, Marietta, Mauldin, Simpsonville, Slater, Travelers Rest, Donaldson Air Force Base, Renfrew, Rural.
- Tennessee*—Frayser.
- Texas*—Tyler, Wichita Falls.
- Virginia*—Blackstone.
- Washington*—Kennewick, Grand Coulee.
- West Virginia*—New Martinsville, Hinton.
- Wisconsin*—Stevens Point, LaCrosse, Elroy, Bloomer, Highland, La Farge.
- Wyoming*—Sheridan, Cody.

Canada—Sillery (Quebec), Kingston (Ontario).

England—Andover.

Scotland—Kilmarnock.

New Zealand—North Havelock.

Switzerland—Aigle.

Mr. LAWN: Lastly, I refer to another pamphlet containing reprints by the National Committee against Fluoridation, Washington, D.C. The pamphlet is headed, "Say 'No' to Poison-Fluorine in Your Drinking Water". I wish to make one or two references only. The first question posed in this article is as follows:

Is sodium fluoride a cumulative poison? Will it store up in your body?

The answer given is as follows:

Definitely so . . . Fluorine is a cumulative poison and long continued consumption of relatively small quantities causes fluorosis. Dr. Paul H. Phillips, biochemist at the University of Wisconsin, says: "It is an accumulative poison which accumulates in the skeletal structures, including the teeth, when the body is exposed to small daily intakes of this element. In this respect, it is like lead accumulation in the bone until saturation occurs and then lead poisoning sets in."

Many years ago action was taken by the various Parliaments to ban lead from paints because of the danger of lead poisoning. Another question posed and replied to in this pamphlet is "Does artificially-fluoridated water affect goitre?" I promised the member for Victoria earlier that I would give him this information. The reply is as follows:

Dr. T. Gordonoff of Bern, Switzerland, said fluoridation of drinking water tends to aggravate thyroid conditions in people afflicted with goitre. He has recommended to Swiss health authorities that they stop fluoridation. He bases his findings on extensive experiments with rats having thyroid conditions.

To a further question "Are many cities rejecting fluoridation?" the answer is as follows:

About 3,000 communities in the United States have rejected fluoridation so far, with more being added all the time.

I have already had incorporated in *Hansard* a list of some of these places. In conclusion, I want to say that years ago we were always told that if we used aluminium saucepans or frypans we should not leave food in them any longer than necessary because the aluminium affected the food and was harmful to the human body. Fluoride is a by-product of aluminium, and putting it in the water supply is one way of disposing of the by-product at a profit. This is the medical evidence that I have already quoted. If these doctors tell me that these are the reasons why we should not use fluoride, at least until it has been experimented with for some time, then I am doubtful of it.

I would prefer the experiments to be carried out in other parts of the world rather than in our own community. If I have anything to do with it, I will oppose the fluoridation of our water until such time as it is undoubtedly proved safe.

Mr. EVANS (Onkaparinga): Mr. Chairman, in opening I would like to refer to a statement made by the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) last Thursday evening in relation to my following him in this debate. He said:

I will tell the Government Whip something. When the member for Whyalla, the former Minister of Education, was listed to speak, the Government Whip had the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Evans) listed to follow the member for Whyalla, and I was to follow the member for Onkaparinga; but, during the course of the remarks of the member for Whyalla, the Premier went and sat alongside the Minister of Education, and we can only assume what transpired.

I am glad the honourable member only assumed that, because what he has said is not true. I called the Whip over long before the member for Whyalla spoke and asked him whether I could change positions. It was at my request that the alteration was made on the card. It makes very little difference whether one follows immediately or two speakers later. I just thought I would clarify the point, because it was not an act of the Whip, the Premier or the Minister of Education; I merely asked whether I could change positions because I was not prepared to speak at that stage.

Mr. Clark: A very wise decision, anyhow, whoever made it.

Mr. EVANS: The member for Adelaide commented that between 1965 and 1968 (I remember his repeating this only last session) the people were "living better with Labor". I disagree with that. He may have said that, but the people of South Australia did not believe it. Many people who voted for the Australian Labor Party in 1965 voted against it in 1968. If they were "living better with Labor", surely they would have voted for Labor in 1968. In fact, some people left this State and went to other States because they were not satisfied to "live with Labor".

Mr. Burdon: They are certainly not coming back under a Liberal Government.

Mr. EVANS: It has been said that overall the A.L.P. had a majority of 53 per cent compared with the L.C.L.'s 43 per cent at the last election. Earlier on, members opposite stated (I will not mention where) that this gave them an overall majority, and that they were voted

in by the people. The Constitution of this State provides that a member must win the majority of the votes in an electorate. There are 39 electorates and the Liberal Party had the support of 20. We had a majority. One of the members opposite used to participate in Test cricket. He knows full well that if one side polls 1,000 runs in a Test cricket series and the opposition polls 2,000, the former wins the Test series if it wins more matches than the latter. We polled the most members in this House and so, by the Constitution of this State, we govern.

Mr. Clark: Surely the votes required are not equivalent to runs made in Test cricket.

Mr. EVANS: We have a majority of one: so far, the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott) has supported this Party, although he may change later. The member for Adelaide also said, "The Minister of Education is the weakest link in the Cabinet." He said:

Only last evening we saw the weakest member of the Cabinet get up following the former Minister of Education to reply to some of his remarks.

I disagree with the member for Adelaide on this point, although it is hard to gauge who is the weakest and who is the strongest member of any team, Cabinet, Party or group of people with whom one may be associated.

Mr. Hudson: When the Cabinet as a whole is fragile, it is difficult to know.

Mr. EVANS: Last Thursday afternoon the Minister of Education rose in this Committee under severe criticisms and interjections from members opposite and stated her case concisely and strongly. If she is the weakest link in the Cabinet, the Cabinet must be very strong. The member for Adelaide also stated:

When she got up she was as red as a turkey cock. She said she could not answer the speech of the member for Whyalla: she would have to get a report.

I assure members opposite that, when the member for Adelaide rose to speak, he was not a pale face, by a long shot: he was nearly bursting his boiler. The member for Adelaide said that the Minister of Education "would have to get a report". I should like now to read the comment made by the Minister at the beginning of her speech:

I shall do nothing tonight but reply to the last matter, on which he spoke at considerable length—

she is referring here to the former Minister of Education, the member for Whyalla—

although I could adequately reply to the comments he made in general on the Education Department, and in particular on the decreases that he says have taken place, and his assertion that the Government is not doing what it proposed to do when it came into office.

At no time did the Minister say she would get a report. She specifically stated she would reply only on that one specific point, on student teachers' allowances. That is the only comment I wish to make about the speech of the member for Adelaide, except in regard to fluoride. So far, I have had no opportunity to speak on fluoride. I make only one quick comment now. My children have over the last nine years been given fluoride tablets and, as far as my family is concerned, I believe in fluoride being given to children. If there is a further debate on fluoride in this Chamber at a later stage, I shall be happy to make some further comments then.

Mr. Clark: You can still go on giving your children fluoride.

Mr. EVANS: I did not say I would not go on giving it to them: I shall do so. I refer now to the Treasurer's financial statement and congratulate him upon his Budget. I know it is a harsh Budget and that it was introduced at a difficult time. The reason for its harshness is that we inherited this state of affairs from the A.L.P. Government which governed this State for three years prior to our Party's taking office. The Treasurer states:

At June 30 last the deficit disclosed in the Consolidated Revenue Account was \$8,365,000. This was built up over a three-year period during which expenditure increased without a fully compensating increase in taxation and other revenues. During the period immediately prior to June 30, 1964, surpluses aggregating \$3,844,000 had been built up. During 1964-65 a current deficit of \$2,621,000 left a balance of \$1,223,000 in hand. During 1965-66 there was a current deficit of \$6,834,000 so that Revenue Account was \$5,611,000 overdrawn at June 30, 1966. During 1966-67 a surplus of \$106,000 was recorded but only after—

I emphasize this—

debiting to Loan Account a net \$6,902,000 of expenditures which it had been customary to debit to Revenue Account. During 1967-68 a deficit of \$2,860,000 was recorded but again some \$5,015,000 of expenditure normally charged to revenue was in that year charged against Loan Account. 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. 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. In addition, Loan funds to the extent of a further \$5,658,000 were unspent at June 30, 1968, and these are being held as an offset to the overspending on Revenue Account.

The Treasurer was put in such a position that he had to introduce a harsh Budget to try to balance the Budget. We could not go on overspending. There is only one way to rectify overspending: the money has to come from the people. It is money that belongs to the people of the State and, if we have a deficit, they will have to be asked for more money to make up the deficit so that we can balance the Budget.

The member for Millicent referred to tourism. I, too, believe that we should be fostering this important industry, and I congratulate the Deputy Leader on what he said in this respect. The Mount Barker summit area in my district could be developed as a tourist attraction; it is the second highest point in the Adelaide Hills area and is within 20 miles of the city. Money has recently been allocated to help improve this particular area, but I hope that much more will be spent in the future with a view to making the area a pleasant tourist attraction.

I have often asked (before becoming a member and since becoming a member) why the Mount Bold reservoir and other reservoirs cannot be made tourist attractions, although I am informed that, as the water in these reservoirs is used for human consumption, the pollution resulting from their use would present a problem. I know that any foreign solid matter in water is easily filtered out, whereas any soluble matter or bacteria in water is difficult and expensive to remove. However, I believe that in the future we should consider making one or two of our reservoirs available to the public as a tourist resort, even allowing for the use of speedboats, as is the case in other countries.

I have already stated in this Chamber that the approach road to the Mount Bold reservoir is in a bad condition; as it is an unsealed road, many of the nearby residents complain of the dust that is disturbed by motor cars and tourist coaches taking people to inspect the reservoir. I hope that this road (extending from the Kangarilla main road to the reservoir) will soon be sealed. Some people who come to the hills intending to collect blackberries and mushrooms or to kill rabbits completely disregard the need first to seek permission from the landowners, most of whom

are amiable and co-operative, provided those entering their properties ask whether they may do so. People who enter such properties must bear in mind that anything worth having is worth asking for. The Mount Barker High School may be said to resemble a highways camp: although it has good playing fields, its buildings, which have existed for many years, were originally intended only as temporary structures and are definitely inadequate. The Mount Barker people need to have a new high school built as soon as funds are available. Let us hope that funds will soon be available to build all the schools that the State requires.

My predecessor has referred in the past to the lack of sporting fields at the Heathfield High School, and I have raised this matter in the Chamber myself. We are still awaiting the provision of playing fields at this school and will keep fighting for them until the department can supply them. I was disappointed by the action of the Education Department in selling the Upper Sturt Primary School which, although not really in my province (it is in the district of the Attorney-General), is a primary school which I (indeed all of my family back for practically 100 years) have attended. The school, which is 100 years old, has been disposed of by the department, although it is actually right opposite the National Park, and I believe it should have been retained, particularly in view of the meagre sum for which it was sold, as a monument to the pioneers—

Mr. Hudson: That is sentimentality at its worst. The money from the sale could have been given to the student teachers.

Mr. EVANS: Once such a building has been sold to private enterprise it is lost to the State, yet we are spending thousands of dollars at present on buying reserves. I am sure the Australian Labor Party believes in the policy of preserving some of the old buildings constructed by our pioneering forefathers, and the Upper Sturt School is a classic example of such a building. I think the member for Glenelg will agree that the \$4,000 received from the sale is a meagre sum for a building of such historical value. Requests have been made for two areas in my district to receive a reticulated water supply, one area being Piggott Range along the top of Chandler Hill and the other area being Chandler Hill itself. These are the only two areas around Happy Valley that do not have reticulated water, and I hope that the position will soon be remedied.

The member for Gumeracha (Mr. Giles) earlier today asked a question about the Weeds

Act and about the decrease in grants to district councils in the hills in this regard. The Stirling District Council is one of the councils suffering as a result of this action on the part of the Agriculture Department. It is disappointing that, whereas last year the Stirling council was granted \$1,200 and it asked this year for \$1,600, the allocation is only \$600. The council needs 100 per cent more than has been granted in order to be able to carry out a programme similar to that of last year. If a council cannot continue with its weed eradication programme, efforts that have been made in the past will be wasted. Many people have said we should preserve the hills face. I too, believe that this should be done, provided that the landowners concerned are not made to suffer financially: in other words, they should be compensated for the sums lost as a result of their areas being declared a reserve or part of the hills face zone.

A person may own a property that includes 20 acres on the western side of the hills, and his neighbour may own 20 acres on the other side. The latter may gain the benefit of any appreciation in the value of land, whereas the person owning property on the western side of the hills may lose. That is an unjust situation that must be examined by this Government and by future Governments.

We have heard much about the drought which affected the State last year. We know that the State has suffered a recession and still is suffering, up to a point. I heard it said earlier in the debate that the building industry was still suffering, but I notice in the stop press in today's *News* the following reference which gives the answer to comments made by members opposite during the last fortnight:

Building approvals for privately-owned houses and flats in South Australia show an upward trend in figures released today. During the three months ended August, the number of private houses and flats totalled 1,833—an increase of 177 on the previous three months.

As I have said before, it took the Labor Party about nine months to slow down the State. At the time it took office in 1965, the economy of the State was buoyant and moving ahead rapidly. However, immediately the Labor Party's policy began to have an effect, the economy became depressed and the unemployment figures increased. I heard it said last week that this State's unemployment figures were the highest in Australia during the Labor Party's term of office, and that is correct.

I point out that early in 1965 the Labor Party had the benefit of the previous Government's policy.

Mr. Burdon: What about your record in 1961?

Mr. EVANS: However, immediately the Labor Party's legislation started to take effect, South Australia slowed down. I will deal with the 1967 drought.

Mr. Burdon: Go back to 1961.

Mr. EVANS: I do not have figures here for that year, but if the honourable member gets them for me I will use them. In May and June 1964 (the last year before the Labor Party took office), the unemployment figure compared favourably with the Commonwealth average—in fact, they were identical, both the percentage of unemployed in South Australia and the Commonwealth average being 1.1 per cent. In July of that year the figure for South Australia, as well as the Commonwealth average, was 1 per cent. We were then in a better position than the other States, some of which had percentages such as 1.6 per cent and 1.7 per cent. In May and June, 1965, just after the Labor Party took office and when it still had the benefit of the L.C.L. policy carrying over, South Australia had .8 per cent of its work force unemployed compared with the Commonwealth average of .9 per cent, and in July, South Australia had .9 per cent and the Commonwealth average was the same. In other words, our figure was still comparable with the Commonwealth average. Immediately the Labor Party's policies took effect in 1966, the percentage of unemployed increased. In May, 1966, the State percentage was 1.5, and the Commonwealth percentage 1.2. We were then .3 per cent above the Commonwealth average and the State had not yet experienced the drought. In June, 1966, the South Australian figure was 1.7 per cent and the Commonwealth average was 1.3 per cent.

Mr. Casey: What was wrong with our policy that caused this unemployment?

Mr. EVANS: I will come to that. In July, 1966, South Australia had a figure of 1.7 per cent unemployed compared with the Commonwealth average of 1.2 per cent—we were .5 per cent above the Australian average. In 1967, the State was affected by the drought, as were many other States, and our figure was still above the Commonwealth average. In May, the South Australian figure was 1.9 per cent and the Commonwealth average 1.4 per cent; in June, South Australia's figure was 1.9 per cent and the Commonwealth average

1.5 per cent; and in July, the South Australian figure was 1.9 per cent and the Commonwealth average 1.4 per cent. Therefore, South Australia still had a figure .5 per cent above the Australian average. However, in the corresponding months in 1964, when the L.C.L. Government was in office, and in 1965, when the effects of the L.C.L.'s policy were still being felt, the percentage of unemployed in South Australia was about the same as the Australian average.

In 1968, the L.C.L. took office and, in May, when the effects of the A.L.P. policies and actions were still being felt, the unemployment figure was 1.7 per cent of the work force compared with a Commonwealth average of 1.3 per cent. Figures for June were the same. In July, the South Australian figure was 1.6 per cent and the Commonwealth figure 1.2 per cent and, in August, the South Australian figure was 1.4 per cent and the Commonwealth average was 1.1 per cent. Therefore, this State has now only .3 per cent unemployed above the Australian average; it is returning to the position in which it was when the L.C.L. Government was last in office in 1964 or when the effects of its policies were still being felt in 1965. The State figure is close to the Australian average, and we can only expect to correspond to the average.

Mr. Jennings: The markets are improving.

Mr. EVANS: If they are, that is because we have an L.C.L. Government in power that is promoting industry.

Mr. Casey: What was wrong with our policy?

Mr. EVANS: When this country or any other country can afford to give to the people working in the community (and I do not mean only those who work for wages and salaries) 364 days' holiday a year and only one day's work, we shall all be happy. However, I believe that what the Labor Party did when it gave a certain section of the work force, by an act of Cabinet, an extra week's leave and other incentive payments, at a time in which it admits the State was in the middle of a drought that was causing it concern, was bad government. The Labor Party did this in the middle of the worst drought the State has experienced. I do not say that this extra week's leave was not deserved but the Labor Party provided for it at a time of strain, and it provided it for no purpose other than to win votes.

Mr. Hudson: Why don't you take it away?

Mr. EVANS: I believe it has been the past practice in this State that no Government

retracts benefits granted by a previous Government. Therefore, this Government and the people of the State must bear the burden of this impost. I say "Good luck" to those receiving this benefit, but I say it was wrong to grant an extra week's leave during the worst drought the State has experienced.

Mr. Jennings: I wonder whether the time will ever be right.

Mr. EVANS: I believe it will be. Over the years the working hours have been reduced from 48 to 44 and now to 40 (not everyone works 40 hours nowadays), and I believe they will be reduced to 35 or less. We know this will happen, but such reductions can be introduced only when we can afford it. I have always favoured such reductions. However, the small man, whether in business or in the street, must be protected along with other men who may be enterprising and may attempt to make money in another way.

Mr. Casey: This Budget is not helping the small man.

Mr. EVANS: The Budget hits everybody equally: no section of the community has been singled out. I will leave it to the honourable member to say later how any one person is affected more than another. All Governments have fallen down in the past in the field of youth clubs and youth activity in the community. I am pleased that the Premier has promised that the Government will look into this matter. In assisting Meals on Wheels and in subsidizing the cost of buildings, we are helping aged people, and rightly so, but we ought also to help the younger people by giving them the opportunity to engage in youth club activities under the supervision of their seniors. To accomplish this, clubrooms must be built under subsidy by the Government. I hope that this Government and future Governments will continue the policy of promoting youth club activity so that we can reduce the rate of juvenile crime, which last year increased by 41 per cent because many young people had no opportunity to get rid of their zest for living.

It would be helpful if school buildings could be used throughout the year for youth club activities. At present, however, most headmasters prefer not to permit youth clubs to use school buildings during school vacations because the headmasters are responsible for ensuring that departmental property is looked after. I believe, however, that this responsibility should be taken away from headmasters and that the caretaker or a departmental inspector should be in charge of the use of depart-

mental buildings for youth club activities. It is foolish to allow magnificent school buildings to lie idle while young people walk the streets looking for something to do. I notice that the member for Unley (Mr. Langley) is laughing at my remark.

Mr. Langley: I'm not laughing.

Mr. EVANS: He said, "Ah!" as though to show disgust, but I point out that a youth club with 120 members meets every Monday in my area. During the school vacations, however, the club must go into recess because the headmaster does not want to be responsible for club activities carried on in school buildings while he is away. Consequently, at the very time when the club really needs the buildings, it cannot use them. We are falling down in this field.

Mr. Langley: Subsidies are paid now for buildings.

Mr. EVANS: There is not a big subsidy for buildings: if a building costs \$30,000, one would be lucky to receive \$15,000.

Mr. Langley: What about the subsidy for elderly citizens clubs? They are paid only \$6,000.

Mr. EVANS: Meals on Wheels receives \$8,500 for a specific type of kitchen. I have been accused of criticizing Government departments. I am sure the average person believes that at times we waste money and do not make full use of money collected from taxation. Consequently, we must ensure that we spend wisely the money collected so that the man in the street can rest assured that the taxation he pays is devoted to a useful purpose. I believe that a suggestion scheme should be implemented whereby an employee of a department such as the Highways Department or the Engineering and Water Supply Department could put forward an idea that might save his department much money. He should then be compensated with a bonus, as is done in private industry. We should encourage people to report on what is happening and what is wrong in senior circles. Some of my colleagues think that this would encourage pimps, but there must be supervision, because the money the Government spends belongs to the people.

The Highways Department must soon consider giving some of its work to outside contractors. In this way it will prove whether private enterprise—or should I say free enterprise, to suit the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson)?—can compete with the department, make better use of the plant and machinery available and make better use of the money

obtained from the people. I congratulate the Treasurer upon the Budget, which he had to bring in at such a depressed time. We know it is harsh, but we have already seen the impact of the Liberal and Country League Government: the building trade is on the upgrade and the unemployment figure is decreasing. It is now five months since the present Government took office and the State is starting to see the benefits of the change of Government. It took the Labor Government nine months to drag this State down to its lowest level and two years and three months to keep it there. We are now on the upgrade, and I congratulate the Government on bringing in this Budget, which will put South Australia back on the road to progress.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): One of the unfortunate consequences of rising to speak in this debate is that one is forced to listen to the remarks of the previous speaker.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: He will have to suffer yours.

Mr. HUDSON: The Minister of Works made some clucking noises during the honourable member's speech. I was disappointed that the Minister should have reacted in this way, because the honourable member's speech was largely that of a Party hack. He gave us hackneyed arguments about local responsibility for the recession. Many hackneyed and phoney arguments alleging this or that malpractice on the part of the previous Government were regurgitated this afternoon in the usual uncritical fashion of the honourable member.

What has been demonstrated first by the Loan Estimates and now by this Budget is that members of the present Government, when they were in Opposition and during the election campaign, said anything that they thought would gain votes, irrespective of whether it was true or not. The present Government has demonstrated clearly to the people of South Australia in both the Loan Estimates and this Budget its complete lack of credibility, which throws automatic doubt on the kind of argument we have heard here this afternoon from the member for Onkaparinga. How can we believe members of a political Party who, prior to an election, criticized the previous Government for alleged incorrect transfers from Revenue Account to Loan Account, yet when they attain Government do exactly the same thing, and more of it? They also criticized the previous Government on the basis that taxation was too high and

that it was not spending enough, and they also alleged financial instability, but as soon as they got into office and brought down their first Budget they introduced a whole series of new taxation measures to obtain additional revenue. The Budget and the Loan Estimates give the complete lie to everything that was said by L.C.L. members when in Opposition.

Many people in this State will no longer listen to honourable members opposite and this is a sad circumstance for this Government and for the overall standing and standard of politics. I think it is bad for politicians to be caught out so much as the Premier, the Treasurer and other prominent Government members have been caught out in making statements before the election that turned out to be completely unreliable and untrue. The general opinion of people that one cannot trust politicians, that they will do anything to gain power, has been completely confirmed, so far as the L.C.L. is concerned, by the actions of this Government before and since the election. I, for one, regard the whole situation as causing the greatest degree of alarm. Government members have dragged down the name "member of Parliament" so far as the whole community is concerned by their actions and unfair criticisms. We have heard more of this today, and I shall deal with those matters.

Mr. McAnaney: How would you have got rid of your deficit?

Mr. HUDSON: I will deal with that. First, I want to refer to the people who are evading taxation because of a rotten Act which is full of loopholes, which should have been amended ages ago, and which is an open scandal in the community and in comparison with the position in any other State. The actions of the Legislative Council in rejecting the succession duties legislation on two occasions was absolutely appalling and disgusting, as are the attitudes of members opposite. The Hon. Frank Walsh, when introducing the 1966 Budget, said that the refusal of the measure dealing with succession duties meant the absence of revenues which were expected in 1965-66 and which might have resulted in revenue of about \$500,000 in that year. He went on to suggest that about \$1,500,000 would have been lost in a full year. At least \$5,000,000 additional State revenue would have been available from 1965-66 until the end of this financial year if that legislation had been passed.

The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Evans) said that the drought last season was the worst on record. I do not think that is so.

I do not think our records are good enough to show that it was the worst we have ever had. However, it was an extremely serious drought and had an impact on the revenue of this State much greater than did the Commonwealth assistance we received. The combined effect of succession duties legislation being rejected and of the drought explain entirely the existence of the deficit on Revenue Account of more than \$8,000,000. Members opposite have the hide to make statements of the kind they have made here when most of them went to the country areas promoting opposition to the succession duties legislation of the previous Government by misinterpreting the Act and not having a proper appreciation of the revenue needs of the State. Now, in Government, those honourable members complain about what the previous Government did, although they well know that, because of the actions of the rotten borough system in the Legislative Council, the previous Government had no guarantee that any revenue measure would be passed.

Succession duties legislation was not the only revenue measure rejected. I think the actions of the present Government in financial matters show clearly to the people that the L.C.L., as a State Party, was prepared to do anything before the last election in order to gain power. They did not care whether what they said was true. That has been demonstrated, and the Minister of Works, whose interjection I cannot hear, knows it. I hope that he, as an honest man, at least has been embarrassed privately by what was done during the last election campaign and what was said by some of his colleagues, even if he will not admit it in this House.

The Treasurer spoke about an allegation of transfers from Loan Revenue and the alleged withdrawal of between \$17,000,000 and \$18,000,000 of borrowed money from the normal function of providing for works and development expenses to meet current needs, and he talked of the debt service fee of nearly \$1,000,000 a year that will persist as a consequence. That statement was completely and utterly false. Does the Treasurer regard non-Government hospital buildings and university buildings as current needs, not public works, because that is implied in this statement? These transfers were used by the previous Government to finance the buildings to which I have referred but, apparently, these are not public works and developmental expenses!

Apparently, according to the Treasurer, the building of a Government hospital with Loan money is a public work and a developmental expenditure, but the building of a non-Government hospital through the use of Loan money is not; the building of a school with Loan money is a public work and a developmental expenditure, while the building of a university is not. That comparison alone is sufficient to show the nonsense that the Treasurer spoke when he made that statement. Secondly, the suggestion is that, as a result of these transfers, we have \$1,000,000 a year debt service commitment that we would not otherwise have had. Does the Treasurer suggest that all of this \$17,000,000 or \$18,000,000 should not have been spent at all and not used for this purpose? If these transfers had not taken place and this money had been available for other uses would not the \$1,000,000 debt service commitment have arisen anyway?

Mr. McAnaney: Not entirely.

Mr. HUDSON: Only to the extent that these sums had been made available, say, to the Electricity Trust or to someone who made a direct recovery of interest to the Loan Fund. Only in that circumstance can it be said that these transfers cost \$1,000,000 of debt service commitment that would not otherwise have taken place, but it is not possible to say that. In fact it is not even likely that an extra \$17,000,000 or \$18,000,000 available for Loan money in the last three years would have caused a significant increase in the Loan money made available to the Electricity Trust or to other kinds of public works that lead to debt service recoveries being made to Loan Fund. The likelihood is that more money would have been available for school buildings, for Government hospital buildings, or for the duplication of the Mannum-Adelaide main—all matters that do not give rise to a recovery of interest to the Loan Fund.

In those circumstances it is absolute nonsense for the Treasurer to say in his statement (and this was repeated this afternoon by the member for Onkaparinga) that the transfer that took place on capital items from Revenue to Loan resulted in \$1,000,000 extra in debt service commitment, which he said would persist in the future as a consequence and which implies that they would not otherwise have occurred. The facts are as they are in most of these things: if Loan money is not spent one way it will be spent some other way. Concerning the spending of Loan funds and the areas in which shortage exist, at

present, the additional spending would not, in the main, have given rise to recoveries of interest and capital repayment to Loan Fund. The same, or largely the same, debt service commitment would have arisen whether or not these transfers had taken place. I challenge the Treasurer with having uttered a falsity by this whole paragraph in his Financial Statement accompanying the Budget. I have made clear (and other speakers on this side have done the same) our views on the existence of the revenue deficit. I believe that the present deficit, or a large part of it, would not exist had the previous Opposition taken a responsible attitude over the question of succession duties.

Mr. Nankivell: Would you fund it now?

Mr. HUDSON: Not at present, because I believe the need to amend the succession duties legislation is still a paramount question for Parliament, despite the croaking that goes on about the farming community and despite the fact that representatives of the farming community dominate the current L.C.L. and that city Liberals are just a little part of the tail that is being wagged by the country dog.

Mr. Broomhill: There are only three of them.

Mr. HUDSON: Of course.

Mr. Corcoran: The member for Stirling agrees that there is a need to amend the Succession Duties Act.

Mr. HUDSON: As it stands at present and as it has been interpreted by the courts, the Act does not allow the farmer to indulge in large evasion of duty. Let us be clear on that. It is not the farming community that was to be hit by the previous succession duties legislation but, for political purposes, members opposite stated around the country that it was the farming community that was to be hit. It is the commercial and industrial world that escapes the larger amounts of succession duty by using the loopholes available to it, because these loopholes arise particularly where property is divisible, where assets are held in a form where they can be readily divided into separate lumps, and this can be done where one's assets are in the form of shares and where the assets are paper assets, as it were.

Where the assets are in shares, particularly in public companies, they can readily be split time and time again into separate bundles valued at \$9,000 each. By the simple process of making gifts, with reservations, it is possible to pass assets to a wife, to a widow, or to children, either under or over 21 years of age, without paying duty. This is possible under

the present law, and there are people in the community who are making money out of advising people how to take full advantage of these loopholes.

Mr. Nankivell: What they are doing is not improper. The loopholes should not be there.

Mr. HUDSON: I am glad to hear the honourable member say that.

Mr. Nankivell: Why not close the loopholes?

Mr. HUDSON: That requires aggregation, and it was aggregation about which the Opposition kicked up all the fuss when we were in office.

Mr. Broomhill: And they don't know why, apparently.

Mr. HUDSON: No. They do not understand the Act and the number of ways a man can leave his property and the number of separate successions there can be to the one person. Members opposite, when in Opposition, did not understand the whole basis of the way in which succession duty was levied in this State, and swallowed the story, hook, line and sinker, that the previous Government's Bill was directed at the farming community and that the farmer would pay the bulk of the tax. However, that was contrary to the truth. We are paying for this now in terms of having this deficit, which is the consequence, and these taxes are partly the consequence of the actions of the L.C.L. when in Opposition. It should be made clear that the L.C.L. in Government has demonstrated that just about everything it said in Opposition was a lot of hogwash. The Government might even go a step further and introduce decent succession duties legislation and demonstrate what everyone knows to be the case: that what it said in Opposition about succession duties was hogwash. Then we might be able to avoid one or two of the more pernicious of these proposed taxation measures. I believe that this Government needs extra revenue, that it must have it, and that certain taxation measures are justified at present. I state that clearly as an Opposition member. Extra revenue must be obtained. The Government's responsibilities in the expenditure field are so important to the future development of this State that adequate revenue must be provided to ensure that these activities are continued at an adequate standard, and that the standard is improved over a time, because in many fields in which the State Government operates the standards of this community are simply not good enough.

Mr. McAnaney: You don't achieve it by giving an extra week's leave and then taxing other people to pay for it.

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Stirling has certain bugs in his head and certain bugs that apply in relation to the standards of Government service. One of the basic problems, if the honourable member really cares to investigate the position of the railway employees and other daily and weekly paid employees of the State Government, is that in almost every case their standards are lower than those applying outside the Government service. In almost every case within the Public Service itself the standards applying to employees, even the standards of accommodation and the conditions of work, are worse than those outside and those under the Commonwealth Government. The honourable member simply regards standards entirely independently of the position of the Government employees. The employees of this Government in particular are regarded by the member for Stirling and by other members opposite as second-rate citizens.

Mr. McAnaney: Where do you get that from?

Mr. HUDSON: Apart from the instances of service pay—

Mr. McAnaney: You are being a hypocrite.

Mr. HUDSON: That is the way you have treated them. Apart from the instances of service pay, Government employees do not have access to over-award payments or the same access to overtime as applies in the case of outside employees. If we checked with the railways employment, we would find a regular transfer of employees from the railways.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HUDSON: I request you, Mr. Chairman, to keep the member for Stirling in order!

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Glenelg will address the Chair.

Mr. HUDSON: I am addressing the Chair.

Mr. McAnaney: You always scream for help when you are in a hole.

Mr. HUDSON: I do not scream for help because I am in a hole but, when we get a further speech from the member for Stirling which comes in a stream of unintelligible babble, it is difficult to reply to it. The standards applying to Government service—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the member for Stirling to cease making interjections.

Mr. HUDSON: I suggest you name him, Mr. Chairman. I am afraid the Minister of Works is out of order in interjecting, too. I have to put up with this stupidity coming across the floor all the time.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: You should get on with your speech.

Mr. HUDSON: I am trying to but, as soon as I try to get on with it, some coon on the other side interrupts me. At least, I am trying to make my comments intelligent and pertinent to what is being said about the standards applying within the Government service. Look at the semi-government undertakings: look at the Highways Department and the Electricity Trust, which is in that category, and the Savings Bank of South Australia. We immediately observe standards above those applying in the State Public Service. For example, the standards of accommodation within the Highways Department, the Electricity Trust or the Housing Trust are such that they leave almost every other Government department for dead. In fact, some officers of the State Public Service work under what can only be described as slum conditions, and one of the big problems we are currently faced with in the State Public Service at all levels, down to daily and weekly paid employees, is that it becomes difficult to attract and retain anyone with any ability because so many employees of the Government as soon as they get the opportunity to move elsewhere to a better job, with better conditions and better salary, take the opportunity to move. If we persist in the current system, the only way in which we shall retain employees within our Public Service is by providing better fringe benefits—and an extra week's annual leave is one of those fringe benefits.

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

Mr. HUDSON: Prior to the dinner adjournment I was moving to a consideration of the Government's need for additional revenue and, of course, as you may remember, Mr. Chairman, I was interrupted by a series of rude and ill-mannered interjections from members opposite.

Mr. Jennings: Uncouth, too.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. I think that the position in which the Government finds itself with respect to Commonwealth-State financial relations (and I wish to say more about that particular subject later on) means that an increase of revenue similar to that for which the Treasurer has budgeted is necessary, and

I think that anyone who examines the accounts of the State will admit the need for this. The question arises, however, concerning the way in which this revenue should be raised. I have already said that in our opinion the Government should introduce amending legislation with respect to the Succession Duties Act and that through moderate changes in the rates, coupled with concessions to primary producers and the elimination of loopholes in the existing legislation, an extra \$2,000,000 a year could probably be raised by means of succession duties without impinging in any serious way on the farming community. I believe this could be done, and I believe it badly needs to be done in order to ensure that the current evasion of duty does not continue.

Of course, from the Opposition's point of view, having attempted to do something similar to what I have suggested on two separate occasions while in Government with respect to succession duties, and having announced prior to the last election that action would be taken with respect to succession duties, we regard the fact that nothing is proposed under this particular heading as a serious omission in the Budget. And the fact that our record demonstrates clearly that in Government we would increase succession duties revenue, I believe, gives us the right to criticize severely some of the revenue measures that this Government is considering. First, let me indicate two points: one is that the Opposition agrees with the imposition of a gift duty. This is necessary, first, because this is an area of State taxation which is open to the State and which has not been used so far. The Opposition announced prior to the election that if it were returned as a Government it would do just this.

The Opposition will look carefully at the particular legislation introduced by the Government on this matter, because I think it is necessary to design it in such a way that it catches up with some of the loopholes in the Succession Duties Act. One of the main ways in which succession duty is currently avoided is by the process of making a gift to a beneficiary who would otherwise be the successor to one's estate and reserving the income from that gift to oneself during one's own lifetime. Under the existing Succession Duties Act, it is possible to make such gifts to the one person on a number of separate occasions, reserving the income from the property to oneself during one's own lifetime so that one

gets the full benefit from it and avoids succession duties.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: That is not possible under Commonwealth gift duty, is it?

Mr. HUDSON: I am not sure whether such a gift is caught by the Commonwealth gift duty.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I think it is.

Mr. HUDSON: All we know is that to avoid succession duties in this way is prevalent in South Australia, because the Commonwealth gift duty per capita paid by South Australians is much higher than for any other State. This is an indication of the extent to which gifts are made in South Australia out of line with the tendency that exists in other States and is therefore an indication of the extent to which gifts are used as a means of avoiding succession duties. I give advance warning to the Treasurer that, as an Opposition, we will be most concerned to see that the definition of "gift" that he applies in relation to his gift duty is a definition that will catch all gifts with reservations.

Mr. Broomhill: That will be in the Treasurer's own interests.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, and in the interests of the State. Here I appeal to the self-interest of the farmers we have on the benches opposite. These gifts with reservation are best available to someone who has his assets in the form of shares. Under the existing Succession Duties Act, each separate gift, even though it is made to one person, if that person is one's wife or prospective widow, of \$9,000 or less is treated as a separate succession and is subject to an exemption of \$9,000, so each time one makes a gift to one's wife of \$9,000 and reserves the income from this asset to oneself during one's lifetime—

Mr. Edwards: Where do all these \$9,000 keep coming from?

Mr. HUDSON: There are people in the community who have large and extensive assets in the form of shares that enable them to do this.

Mr. Rodda: You are not talking about farmers.

Mr. HUDSON: The honourable member should listen a little longer and he will see the point. A person with industrial interests who has large portfolios of shares can make separate gifts, with reservation, to his wife, each of \$9,000 and, when he dies, each of these separate gifts is subject to an exemption of \$9,000, so that the wife pays no succession duty at all on those gifts. The point I was making is that mostly farmers do not have

assets in a form that is readily divisible to enable them to do this. Most farmers have their properties in joint tenancy, in their own name, or in the form of a company where only one or two shares are held. Therefore, they have their assets in a form that is non-divisible, so they cannot take advantage of this particular loophole. To take advantage of it, one would have to establish a proprietary company with a significant number of shares and proceed to give these shares bit by bit to one's wife, and take advantage of the loopholes in the Succession Duties Act in that way.

Mr. Giles: In the aggregation proposition your Party put forward, you wanted the total assets of a farmer put up for succession duty before they were divided.

Mr. HUDSON: The honourable member has just put forward one of the misunderstandings peddled by his Party throughout country districts. It was still a succession duty. We proposed that if a farm, for example, was left to three children, with a life interest to the widow, this counted as four separate successions and there was no aggregation as amongst those four individuals. The only thing aggregated under our proposal was different bits of property going to the one person. I am glad the member for Gumeracha interjected in that way.

Mr. Giles: What about insurance policies?

Mr. HUDSON: There was no change in what was subject to duty with respect to insurance policies. There are three types of insurance policy that must be considered in this connection. One is the type where life insurance is in one's own name and it is left to one's wife by means of a will. It passes to the wife under section 8 of the Succession Duties Act. The second type of insurance policy is that where one takes out a policy, nominates his wife as the beneficiary in it, pays the premiums himself and then that insurance passes to the wife by survivorship under section 32 of the Act.

The third type of insurance policy is that where one takes out an insurance policy on his own life but his wife has sufficient income to pay the premiums. Under the existing Act that is not dutiable and under the proposal we put forward it would not have been dutiable. There was no change in the definition of what was dutiable: all that would have happened was that where an insurance benefit passed to one's wife partly by will and partly by survivorship, it would have been aggregated into one. In that case, if it passed to the one person, it involved aggregation. The

principle of aggregation that was involved was that when different pieces of property passed to the one person in different ways they were aggregated for the purposes of calculating the amount of duty that had to be paid, but there was no aggregation as between property passing to a number of different successors. In other words, it still remained a succession duty.

Mr. Giles: On the divided amount?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. It was unlike the estate duty of the other States and of the Commonwealth: it was still a succession duty. The honourable member will find that what I am saying is completely correct. If he cares to contact the Under Treasurer and ask whether what I am saying is correct, he will find that it will be completely confirmed. There is a principle of equality of treatment here. One can consider a farmer—and this applies in relation to the farming community—whose main asset is a farm in his own name or in a joint tenancy. Under the present arrangements the bulk of the property passing to his wife on his death is in one form and is one succession. If it is a joint tenancy, and that is one's only asset, then everything goes into form U, and one has everything in one lot.

The point members opposite have failed to appreciate is that the great benefits that arise from the loopholes in the existing Act do not go to the farming community: they go to the extremely wealthy business and industrial community. These are the people who have their assets split up in several ways and have the greatest opportunity to pass the property to their wives, partly by means of gift, partly by estate, partly by survivorship, partly by trust, partly by settlement and partly by these other gifts with reservations.

Mr. Edwards: You'd look silly if your wife died first, wouldn't you?

Mr. HUDSON: No. I do not think the honourable member understands that, if the wife died and the husband was still living, the property being in the husband's own name, no succession duty would be payable. On this occasion I am being more specific and more detailed than I have ever been in this Chamber about the methods of evading duty under the present Succession Duties Act, because these methods are not well known throughout the community. They are known only partially, even among the legal fraternity. True, some smart cookie lawyers have an extremely good business because they have a complete knowledge of all the ramifications and advantages of the Act.

Mr. Corcoran: But you can't blame them, can you?

Mr. HUDSON: No, I blame the Act that allows the evasion. At present the loopholes in this Act are taken advantage of only partially and the extent to which advantage is taken varies throughout the community, so different people are treated in different ways. Why should farmer Joe's wife pay more in duty when farmer Joe dies just because farmer Joe did not know as much about how to evade succession duties as businessman Bill knew? Is it not really the case that one person who succeeds to \$200,000 should pay the same duty as someone else who succeeds to the same amount? It should not be the position (although it is under the present Act) that one person who receives \$200,000 should pay \$50,000 in duty while a second person who receives the same amount should pay nothing. Surely that is not just and not equality of treatment.

I give fair warning to the Treasurer (and, if he conveys my remarks to the Under Treasurer, the Under Treasurer will have a fit) that I intend to publicize the methods of avoiding the payment of duty under the Succession Duties Act, and I hope that my remarks tonight about the ways of evading the duty will receive publicity. I consider the matter so important that even now it may be necessary to force this Government to amend the legislation because more and more people will gain knowledge of the ways in which duty can be avoided, and more and more revenue will be lost to the State each successive year.

I give fair warning to the Treasurer that my approach will be as I have explained, and I hope to convince others of the necessity for so acting. I think the position regarding the Succession Duties Act and the loss of revenue to South Australia is so serious that whoever is in office has a basic responsibility to the community to ensure that these loopholes are removed and that there is equality of treatment.

I point out one further matter to the Treasurer. In the election in 1971, as he and most other members opposite know, the L.C.L. Government will probably be defeated and the Labor Party returned to power with a mandate to do something positive about the Succession Duties Act. If the Treasurer wants to ensure that the farming community is properly protected by amending legislation and if he does not really accept, because of being convinced by his own propaganda, that a Labor Govern-

ment would provide that proper treatment, then he had better amend the legislation himself. I point out to the Treasurer that if his Government put through amendments that removed the basic loopholes a future Labor Government would have great difficulty in getting amending legislation through a hostile Legislative Council. However, if there is no amending legislation and the extent of evasion increases year by year and becomes more of a problem and better understood by the people of this State, then a future Labor Government would be in a strong position to force through legislation under its mandate. I say these things about succession duties in all seriousness. It is not a question for me of Party politics: it is a question of the basic revenue needs of the State, a question of equality of justice and treatment of different individuals, and a question of having good legislation and good law with respect to taxation.

It is not right that one individual taxpayer should pay more than another because he has not taken full advantage of an Act where, in order to take full advantage, one must either be a real expert or be advised by an expert. This principle, if applied to income tax, would be completely offensive. In fact, one virtue of the income tax laws that now apply to most ordinary people is that the claims that can be made as concessional deductions are known and publicized and are there to be seen on the form used for taxation purposes. Therefore, there is a basic equality of treatment in regard to every taxpayer. This involves an element of equity in treatment that people accept as right and proper, but it does not apply in relation to the Succession Duties Act in this State.

The first and major new tax item of this Government is what has been called, in a rather peculiar way, a receipts duty. Some people have been misled by this title into thinking it is a duty on the issue of a receipt. It would be better described as a turnover or purchase tax, and is a movement towards what exists in every State of the United States of America, that is, a State tax on the turnover of business usually varying from 3 per cent to 5 per cent. The proposal for South Australia is for a tax of .1 of 1 per cent, but I suspect that one or two States in the U.S.A. started off in that way but their revenue needs built up to such an extent that gradually the rate of tax became 1 per cent, then 2 per cent, and so on until in some cases it is now 5 per cent. In America one pays a tax on every purchase over \$1: it is automatically

added and one knows one is paying it every time. The 5 per cent is added to the hotel bill, to the purchase of groceries, and to any purchase one makes of a value greater than \$1 and there are not many purchases of less than this amount. This is a fairly short-sighted way of gaining revenue. As the community grows and business turnover increases, the State Government gets more revenue each year even without an alteration in the rate; so, from that point of view, it is again an attractive tax—from the Treasury angle: there is a growth component in it. However, the position that the States of Australia find themselves in is such that the growth component in any of our State taxes, together with the extra we receive by way of income tax reimbursement, is simply not enough to meet our extra expenditure in each year; so we have had a more or less continuous process over the last 10 years of the weight of State taxation collection in South Australia becoming heavier and heavier.

This is particularly noticeable from the year 1962-63. I want to provide the Committee with certain figures. In 1958-59, which was the year before South Australia ceased to be a claimant State, State taxation represented, as a percentage of Commonwealth income tax reimbursement grants and special grants under section 96, 41 per cent. We got a very good deal in South Australia out of ceasing to be a claimant State, because in the one year from 1958-59 to 1959-60 our Commonwealth grants rose by almost 20 per cent, and the percentage of State taxation to Commonwealth grants in 1959-60 fell to 37.4 per cent. This bit of extra cream that came South Australia's way when we ceased to be a claimant State held rises in State taxation in check more or less for the next few years. In 1960-61 this State's taxes were 37.3 per cent of the Commonwealth grants; in 1961-62, 36 per cent; in 1962-63, 36.1 per cent; and from 1962-63 onwards the rot set in. In 1963-64 State taxation became 37.4 per cent of Commonwealth grants. In 1964-65 that figure (and this is the result of the actions of the Playford Government) rose to 43.9 per cent; in 1965-66, 41.9 per cent; in 1966-67, 44.1 per cent; and in 1967-68, 42.7 per cent.

Mr. Rodda: This is a percentage of what?

Mr. HUDSON: This is the percentage of State taxation to the Commonwealth income tax reimbursement grants and the Financial Agreement grant of roughly \$1,500,000. For the last four years we have been hovering

around the 44 per cent mark but we increased from the 36 per cent figure that applied in 1961-62. For 1968-69, if we add on the revenue proposals of this Budget and say that the full year effect of the Budget is to increase revenue from State taxation by \$8,300,000—

Mr. McAnaney: That is not logical. It will not come on until the next full year.

Mr. HUDSON: I am pointing this out. I shall do it in two ways. First, taking the projected State taxation for this coming financial year, it will be 44.5 per cent of the Commonwealth grants. If we add on the full year's effect of the tax proposals in this Budget, State taxation will rise to 48.5 per cent of the Commonwealth grants. Having hovered around the 43 per cent or 44 per cent mark for a few years, it now shows signs of a further shift up, and within a year or two it will be close to 50 per cent unless the Commonwealth Government comes to the party on a complete reorganization of Commonwealth-State financial relations.

Mr. McAnaney: That's a fictitious argument though, isn't it?

Mr. HUDSON: What is?

Mr. McAnaney: You're saying what is going to happen next year.

Mr. HUDSON: I am saying that we are now witnessing a further upward trend and that within a few years the ratio of State taxation to Commonwealth grants will be about 50 per cent. We are still witnessing this upward trend.

Mr. McAnaney: I do not agree with you.

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Stirling may disagree with me if he wishes, but every sign at present is of a further movement in this direction. The pressure is on every State to go for extra revenue to a much greater extent than hitherto, because the Commonwealth income tax reimbursement grants provide for a betterment factor of 1.2 per cent. The State Budgets, because of the demands of the community, need a betterment factor of about 2 to 2½ per cent a year in addition to the need for increased expenditure because of expanding population and because of increased costs. The demands of the community for higher standards are putting the pressure on State Governments to find extra revenue from some other source.

As I pointed out in my preliminary remarks, we will find that turnover tax is an attractive tax from the Treasury angle; the costs of collection will not be excessive, it has this regular growth component in it, and it is a sure-fire way of obtaining revenue. I think

that unless there is a reorganization of Commonwealth-State financial relations we will find every State moving towards the American position, where these turnover taxes are about 3 to 5 per cent. After all, South Australia will have a turnover tax on liquor of 6 per cent after this Budget, and that will be true of every State of Australia. It is not an impossible figure. If it can be done in relation to the liquor industry, why cannot it be done in relation to all industries?

It seems to me that the Commonwealth has taken an unfortunate attitude over the whole question of State Government responsibilities. Let me illustrate this unfortunate attitude: I refer to the Commonwealth Government's latest announcement regarding schools, namely, the grants to be made for school libraries. This is a nice, dramatic little announcement; everyone likes, or pays lip service to liking, libraries, and politicians like to be able to get up and praise the standard of libraries throughout our schools. We will be able to do this in a few years' time, for when we look at our schools at that stage we will see, as a result of the actions taken by the Commonwealth Government, fine libraries and fine science laboratories. However, we will still see the same problems of class sizes that are too big, inadequately trained teachers, and all sorts of other problem that now exist. What I am putting is that the Commonwealth Government, partly for political reasons, is picking out one or two isolated points, making grants to produce a rapid improvement in these areas, and partly determining the priorities of the State Government Education Departments. I say that it is wrong for the Commonwealth Government, which does not have administrative experience in relation to primary and secondary education, to pick on particular aspects of that education, make grants that lead to a startling improvement in standards, and leave the States to fight as best they can for the necessary revenue to raise standards in relation to other aspects of primary and secondary education.

This sort of proposal is a change from the technique adopted in relation to tertiary education where, apart from teacher-training, the Commonwealth Government has, by means of the Universities Commission and the Wark Committee, established priorities as a result of thorough investigation. As a result of a build-up of administrative experience in the field of tertiary education, the Commonwealth Government now makes grants in such a way that the priorities as between different univer-

sities in the one State or among universities in different States are established by the Commission, and the Commonwealth makes grants so that the priorities within a university, if they are not established by the Commission, are influenced by it. Despite all its limitations, I believe the Commission has done a useful job in forcing university after university to think clearly about its own priorities. Therefore, the result of the Universities Commission's action in relation to universities over about seven or eight years and the result of the Wark Committee's recommendations in the field of technical tertiary education has been to produce a uniform improvement of standards, an improvement that has applied fairly uniformly throughout all aspects of university education. The Universities Commission has not administered grants in such a way that only certain aspects of tertiary education are improved and other aspects are left to rot.

This is common sense, and it has produced an ordered and consistent policy. However, that does not apply to the Commonwealth Government's attitude towards the provision of assistance to primary and secondary education. I believe it is completely wrong for the Commonwealth Government to pick out one or two spectacular items in a field where it does not have any administrative experience, make grants for political reasons in relation to those spectacular items, and then let the States sink or swim as best they can in relation to the other matters. Where the Commonwealth has administrative experience (for example, in the field of social services) it moves in a direction more and more to try to raise the standard of what the States are doing—in this field, particularly in respect to deserted wives, it tries to raise the State's standards to the Commonwealth standards. The proposals it has put up are as a consequence of its administrative experience, and the result has been valuable for all States because of the regular meetings of State administrators and of State Ministers, because the various State Social Welfare Departments have been forced to think about their policies to a much greater extent and because, as a result of this action, there has been a more uniform improvement in standards.

The field of Aborigines is another field that the Commonwealth Government is entering through making grants. I know that members hope that it will be a process of making grants to the States where the Commonwealth has its

own experience to back its judgment. However, in relation to aspects of the needs of Aborigines where the Commonwealth Government has only limited experience, it should leave it to the States to determine priorities: it should make overall grants and allow the administrative officers who have the necessary experience to determine the priorities. I make this suggestion in relation to specific grants under section 96, and I think I have said enough to indicate my attitude, which is that we must urge the Commonwealth Government, where it is giving assistance in fields where it has had no administrative experience, to make a general grant and leave it to the States to determine priorities.

I think it has been a tragedy that throughout the years income tax reimbursement grants have operated in such a way that they have not contained a betterment factor of 2 per cent. The figure of 2 per cent is the magic figure in respect of the betterment factor, or increased productivity. Every economist automatically assumes 2 per cent and, indeed, some statistics are so worked out that the assumption of a 2 per cent increase is built into the statistics. Consequently, if one works on these statistics to find out the productivity increase, one ends up calculating what some statistician assumes it will be.

Mr. McAnaney: In that case he ought to be sacked.

Mr. HUDSON: No economist gets the sack. It is almost automatic for the Arbitration Court to assume that the productivity increase each year is 2 per cent. With respect to improvement in productivity, or real production a head of population, 2 per cent is appropriate for South Australia and for Australia. This is the kind of answer that one invariably arrives at, but the income tax reimbursement grants for many years contained, not a betterment factor of 2 per cent (in line with the increase in productivity), but one of only 1.1 per cent. A couple of years ago this was altered to 1.2 per cent in a very magnificent gesture by the Commonwealth Government!

If the Commonwealth Government altered the formula for income tax reimbursement by making the betterment factor 2 per cent, in a few years, many of the problems of Commonwealth-State financial relations would be solved. If the 2 per cent figure had applied even for the last eight or 10 years we would not have the problems that confront us today. When one analyses what has caused the Commonwealth Government over the years to take

a niggardly attitude with respect to the States, one is forced to two conclusions. The first is that the Commonwealth Government, as presently constituted, will not face up to the need for a partial switch of emphasis from the private sector to the public sector. That Government has not recognized that the areas of shortage throughout Australia are in the public fields. There is no shortage of motel or hotel accommodation, nor is there a shortage, in general, of capacity to manufacture motor cars (although there is no local manufacturing capacity for Fiat cars). There is no lack of capacity to manufacture television sets, washing machines, refrigerators, radios or radiograms. In almost every manufacturing field, there is no shortage of capital capacity.

This was not true immediately after the Second World War, when the real shortages were in the private field. There was excess demand because of insufficient capital capacity for almost every product privately produced. However, in the years since that war a great change has taken place. Now, when we consider the areas of shortage in the community, we do not find them in the private sector. There is not a lack of ability to produce in the private sector, where the goods are demanded. The shortages of capacity are in the public sector. There are not enough hospital beds, because there are not enough hospitals.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: There's inferior office space and accommodation.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, there is inferior office space and accommodation for State public servants. There is also a shortage of capacity in relation to school buildings and teachers' colleges, teachers' colleges being particularly bad. The other day the Minister of Education (Hon. Joyce Steele) told Senator Nancy Butfield, during a radio programme, that she was satisfied with what the Commonwealth was doing in education. Senator Butfield probably will tell Mr. Gorton that the State Government of South Australia is satisfied. However, Western Teachers' College is a slum, and Wattle Park is incorrectly sited, being too far away.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: And overcrowded.

Mr. HUDSON: It is also overcrowded. Adelaide Teachers' College has no capacity for expansion. We are building Salisbury (or Northern) Teachers' College, and we still have problems at the Wattle Park and Western colleges. We have an extremely long way to

go before we catch up regarding teacher training. One or two members opposite have suggested that some school buildings are too lavish. However, one can be only appalled at the general run of school buildings in South Australia. At most metropolitan schools, 50 per cent of the students are accommodated in temporary classrooms. That is the position at the Brighton High School, and the temporary wooden buildings are crowded together, unsatisfactory in both summer and winter and noisy, making the problems of teachers more difficult than they should be, because of the large classes.

The field of roads is one of great shortage. Our roads are not good enough and we need more; most people agree that we have not enough freeways or expressways. In considering public transport let us imagine the reformation in the railways system that would come, if we had the money to invest in capital expansion and could spend on the railways what is spent by the Electricity Trust each year on capital expansion. Within five years there would be a dramatic change in the nature of the railways system.

Electricity is about the only field of public enterprise in South Australia where there is no real shortage of capacity, and the basic reason has been that in the last 15 years there has been a declining price of fuel so that the heavier interest cost component in electricity generation has been offset by a falling fuel cost. Also, there have been accompanying advantages through generating electricity on a larger scale. Electricity has been a profitable undertaking and in almost every State has allowed the re-investment of profit in further expansion, to such an extent that today in South Australia, it is common for the Electricity Trust to have an expansion programme of between \$25,000,000 and \$30,000,000 a year, almost as much as the Highways Fund expenditure each year, and only \$6,000,000 is financed through the Loan Fund. About \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 comes from semi-Government borrowing, the remainder coming from the internal sources of the trust.

That sort of expenditure is overcoming the shortage of capacity in electricity generation. However, this is about the only field in which the State Government is involved where there is not a shortage. It is this characteristic of shortage, therefore, that basically justifies the need for some shift of resources from the private to the public sector. The Commonwealth Government is the agency that can

effectively produce such a shift: it has the main taxation power and has financial control over the States. It has not been prepared to produce this shift, first, because it is against its philosophy to say there should be a switch of resources from the private to the public sector and, secondly (and probably in these circumstances, more important), because the Commonwealth Government's control over the economy of Australia is only partial.

The Commonwealth Government does not have sufficient weapons effectively to control the overall movement of the economy, and it is this lack of adequate control that has been partially responsible for what has been characterized as the stop-go economic policy of the Commonwealth Government. This lack of economic control has produced the occasional harsh credit squeeze, for example, in 1951, in 1955-56, again in 1959-60, and (for the benefit of the member for Onkaparinga) in 1964-65. He has probably forgotten that the Commonwealth Government put the clamp down and there was a drought in the Eastern States, and the combined effect was to cause a serious reduction in motor car production in South Australia. However, when an expansion period in Australia starts to get out of hand and inflationary pressures start to build up, the Commonwealth Government has to control the economy but, because of its limited number of weapons, it ensures first that it controls things that it can control. Through the operations of the Banking Act, the Commonwealth Government via the Reserve Bank of Australia can effectively control the operations and the level of activity of the private banks. Through the federal set-up in Australia the Commonwealth Government can effectively control the level of activity of the State Governments, both in their Budget and in their Loan programmes. The Commonwealth Government, however, cannot with its current policy weapons effectively control the amount of expenditure that is financed through the fringe banking institutions—the hire-purchase companies and the sources of credit other than bank credit. The Commonwealth currently finds that, when it has to bring expansion under control, it has to apply the brakes sharply via bank credit and the States before it can effectively bring hire-purchase under control.

Expenditure financed through hire-purchase has on two occasions during recent years got well out of control. It is my view that, if the Commonwealth adopted the sensible policy of declaring hire-purchase companies equivalent

to banks and bringing them under the general control of the Reserve Bank of Australia, requiring reserve ratios to be held by hire-purchase companies and requiring minimum deposits and maximum terms of lending from them, when the time came the Commonwealth, through its more adequate control of the overall level of expenditure financed through hire-purchase, would be able to let go, so far as the States were concerned, to a greater extent than it had been willing to in the past; but, while it does not have that control over hire-purchase, I am sure the Treasury advisers in Canberra say, "You have to keep the States under control. If you are not going to control hire-purchase you must control the things you can. Keep this under wraps. Do not let this get out of line." This is the policy that has been followed, and we are now faced with the consequences of that Commonwealth Government policy in this Budget.

Certain revenue measures in this Budget are pernicious. They involve a contradiction of the important principle of taxing according to capacity to pay—not that everyone should pay the same. That is not the policy that should apply in relation to taxation, nor is it the principle that applies, by and large, in relation to Commonwealth Government taxation. By and large, income tax is a progressive tax based on the principle of taxing according to an individual's capacity to pay, and capacity is measured in terms of the responsibilities of an individual with respect to his dependants. This is basic to the whole conception of income tax. No account of this is taken, however, in relation to these taxes. I ask the Treasurer (who, unfortunately, is not here, so I cannot at the moment ask him, but I will at least put it on record): what does his receipts duty mean? For example, is the business that supplies newsprint to the local newspapers subject to the turnover tax and, if it is, is the newspaper again subject to the turnover tax on its total turnover, all over again, so that the newsprint element is counted twice? Clearly, this receipts duty could lead to an effective tax on turnover of more than a tenth of 1 per cent. Where there is an integrated concern that supplies its own materials, employs labour and equipment and turns these raw materials into a manufactured product, has its own retail organization, and sells the final product to the customer, the turnover tax applied would be at the rate of one-tenth of 1 per cent.

However, imagine one firm supplying raw materials to another that manufactured the product: the firm supplying the raw materials

pays the turnover tax; the firm manufacturing the product pays the turnover tax on the raw component again, and the retailer who receives the manufactured goods and sells them to the public pays the turnover tax again. Therefore, the raw material supplied has had the turnover tax applied three times, and the labour and capital contribution from the manufacturer has had the turnover tax applied twice, while the retailer's contribution has had the turnover tax applied once. The Treasurer has not told us anything about this, yet is he going to frame the legislation in such a way that this sort of multiple counting will be avoided?

Mr. Corcoran: What about a person who goes into the business of primary production and sells a mob of sheep; does he pay the tax?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, so far as I can judge at present.

Mr. Corcoran: And if a stock firm sells the sheep to someone else, it pays the tax again?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, and if the butcher sells the meat to the public at his own margin, the tax is paid again. Or is this multiple counting avoided? Surely we are entitled to have a little more information from the Treasurer than the bald statement that "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" will be introduced. A similar position exists regarding a stamp duty of \$2 on certificates of compulsory third party motor vehicle insurance. Is that a stamp duty on the certificate? If it is, then the poor person who takes out his certificate every six months will pay \$2 every six months (\$4 a year), and what happens to the person who takes out a certificate just for a few days or a month? Again, we are not told. The member for Stirling does not know and we, as members of this Parliament supposed to be responsible people discussing this Budget, have not been told. We have not been told about a number of things regarding the gift duty. We have the vague statement about an extension of the present hire-purchase duty of 1½ per cent. The only thing that is really clear is an increase in the turnover tax of 5 per cent to 6 per cent on liquor. Everyone is clear about what that means and about the consequences: the price of beer went up immediately. The sixth point to which the Treasurer referred is clear, although it stinks!

Mr. Corcoran: Of course it does; every one of them stinks.

Mr. HUDSON: Not the gift duty.

Mr. Corcoran: Members of the Government!

Mr. HUDSON: The levy on the State Bank, in view of what the Government has done to the State Bank already—

Mr. Rodda: What were you going to do with it?

Mr. HUDSON: We were going to do something sensible and rational, something that would have saved the State much money. However, we had evidence that some members opposite were prepared to organize a run on the deposits of the Savings Bank of South Australia. Certain transfers of deposits took place. Certain statements were made outside this Parliament by members of another place, and, in 1965, deposits from the Savings Bank of South Australia were switched to other private savings banks, and that is true.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Oh!

Mr. HUDSON: Could we, as a Government, take the risk, by going through with the amalgamation proposal, of a large run on the deposits of the Savings Bank? The Minister of Works is trying to make out there is nothing in this. He may not have heard about it but I can tell him that it happened.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: The honourable member is more fanciful every day.

Mr. HUDSON: If the Minister goes to the Savings Bank and asks people there whether they were worried about this and what they thought would happen if the amalgamation proposal went through and finds out that what I have said is correct, will he come back here and make a public apology? I do not expect that he would do that. To return to the matter of the 45 per cent levy on the profits of the State Bank which will give to the Treasurer a sum of \$370,000 in a full year, I point out that this is an additive effect on the reduction of Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement moneys in the State Bank of \$1,150,000. I have been informed that the Savings Bank of South Australia, in the last few months, has cut back its rate of new approvals. A constituent told me that he was called up by the bank three months ago and, because of the decision in the intervening period cutting back the rate of new approvals, although he had been called up and told that his loan was going through, he had to wait another three months. Even though the valuer had been to the house and so on, he had to wait another three months.

This levy on the State Bank is completely and utterly immoral in circumstances where

this Government has already cut back the State Bank to the tune of over \$1,000,000. The total cut-back, as a result of this Government's action, on the funds available to the State Bank for additional lending, mainly to the housing industry but also for important purposes such as advances for settlers, loans to producers (many of them primary producers) and moneys under the Rural Advances Guarantee Act, is a little more than \$1,500,000. The member for Eyre, for example, should be concerned about that, because the State Bank is an important lender on the West Coast.

Mr. McAnaney: What happened under your Government?

Mr. Corcoran: What have you done about it? You've made it even worse.

Mr. HUDSON: There was no cut back in the rate of lending under the Labor Government. Finally, I come to the increase in public hospital charges. We are not told what the increase will be but only that it will be in line with charges elsewhere. We are told it will produce \$600,000 extra revenue in a full year. If it is in line with charges in Victoria, it will be more than \$600,000 in a full year. Why are we not told the proposed increase in hospital charges? Could not the Treasurer and the Premier trust members of their own Party? Have they got to break the news to them gradually? Is there more bad news to come? Have any members opposite said to the Treasurer, "You are not going to put them up in line with Victoria. We will have our throats cut if you do"? Have they said that? They had better start saying it!

Mr. McAnaney: Didn't you put them up?

Mr. HUDSON: We did not put them up in line with the other States: we kept them well below the level of the other States. The Treasurer has referred to an increase in public hospital charges in line with charges elsewhere. Where else? In Australia? The Premier of this State has a record of misleading statements, particularly prior to elections, that puts him in much the same kind of situation as that of a good friend of mine, Mr. Arthur Calwell. Soon, it will not matter what the Premier says: he will be able to say that the most sensible thing in the world, but nobody will listen. The Premier had some goodwill in the community but he has eaten into it very rapidly.

The Premier, accompanied by all other members of Cabinet, during the election campaign and afterwards led South Australians into

believing that State taxes were too high and that they would be reduced. The one thing that the Premier would say about taxes during the election campaign was that the winning bets tax would be removed, and he said that only for political reasons, not because he cared two hoots about the punters, not because he had made some judgment about the amount of tax punters pay *vis-a-vis* the rest of the community. The Premier thought that, if he made these promises, he would have a good chance of winning my seat and the seat of the member for Unley (Mr. Langley). The reason the Premier said nothing about any other form of taxation during the election campaign was that he thought it would cost him votes.

Mr. Rodda: What about the Glenelg jetty?

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Victoria should have gone to the meetings addressed by the Premier and by the Liberal and Country League candidate for the seat of Glenelg. The issue was fairly effectively neutralized. It affects only the northern third of the electoral district; it does not affect the southern two-thirds of the Glenelg District. I have referred several times to the Premier's promises about the Chowilla dam. I suggest that not only has the Premier's credibility been called into question in recent months but also that of the whole Government. It is perilously close to running into a solid attitude in the community and amongst its own supporters that will result in people thinking, whenever a public statement is made, no matter how honest it is, "There they go again. You cannot believe a word they say." The situation is extremely sad when the political leaders of a State such as South Australia cannot communicate with the community because they have misled the people too frequently.

I now want to speak briefly about the student teacher allowances. The Minister, in response to great public pressure, has announced today that the increase in the allowance will be to \$105, not \$85. This change certainly will not quieten the students. Although in the weeks to come they may appear to be quiet, that will be because of examination commitments. Many students, particularly in my district, spend \$200 or more a year on travel alone, and this change will place a heavy burden on the parents of students. A couple of students that I have met on the train from Brighton have to travel from the southern part of my district to Wattle Park or Magill, and they may have to travel again during the day.

I do not see the Minister's point about equality of treatment, that when the individual expenses of travel can vary so much (more than \$200 a year in one case and as low as \$20 in another) there is justification for the kind of change that the Government has made. I do not think that the students see the justification, either. If the Minister really wanted administrative simplicity (and I agree that, administratively, the former system was fairly horrendous) there was nothing to prevent the introduction of a zoning system, the allowance payable to each student being assessed on the basis of the nearest number of miles he lived from the college and a system of zone allowances worked out, a little more money being paid to a student who had the misfortune to attend Western Teachers' College (because of the internal travel required) and also to any student who had to travel from Wattle Park Teachers College or Western Teachers College to the university. That system, in its effects, would not have been so indiscriminate as the change that has been made and it would have been sensible to the students.

The current system regarding books has been working fairly well and has provided an effective method by which trainee teachers could get cheaply all the books they needed, because the books were on loan and had to be returned at the end of the year, for re-use. I am not satisfied that the Minister will be able to make the necessary administrative arrangements to stock libraries because the space available is limited and students have a limited time in which to have access to the library. I am not even satisfied at present with the Minister's statement that the department will sell a large percentage of books to students. Before any books are sold, the department had better make sure that the libraries are well stocked. It would be the greatest folly to give present students the benefit to getting books cheaply, and to find in a few years' time that, although it had been thought that, say, 12 copies of a certain book would be needed in the Western Teachers College library, 30 copies were needed.

I hope that the Minister will ensure that the libraries are properly catered for. I am sure that the Minister may have learned something from the political experience through which she has gone in connection with this matter. Politics is the art of the possible, and that depends on how much of a row any proposal creates. One of the unfortunate things that has happened as a result of student teachers'

allowances is that the Government, the Minister, and the department have been discredited in the eyes of student teachers, who have developed an attitude of hostility that will take a long time to overcome. It is important that it be overcome, because one of the greatest problems in education is the question of morale.

Mr. Broomhill: They were justified in being upset.

Mr. HUDSON: I agree. Concerning the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report, it seems to be to be an extraordinary situation where the Government presents a report without commenting on what part it accepts and so upsets the lives of so many people, and expects to get away with it, particularly when a most cursory reading of the report shows many inconsistencies about the financial proposals.

Mr. Corcoran: I believe it thought it would get away with it: it realizes it has made an error.

Mr. HUDSON: I hope it has, but we have had no sign of it yet. Does any Government member believe that its country members will be satisfied with a 2½ per cent increase spent each year on country roads? Does any Government member believe that it will get away with dropping the limit from eight tons to four tons for the ton-mile tax? Does any Government member believe, particularly after this Budget, that it can say to the people of South Australia, "We want more from you, from your electricity and gas bills, from drivers' licences, and from registration fees, in order to build freeways in the city"? What will the farmers of Owen think? Will the farmers of Bull Creek take it? What will they say about paying extra registration fees so that the member for Stirling can drive on a city freeway? If it turns out in five months that, because of the financial inconsistencies in the report, the Government only partially accepts the report it will have done a terrible injustice to those people who are let off the hook because they have been through an unnecessary nightmare for six months. I am sure that the Government will accept partially the report in some respects. How does the Government justify the report?

Why cannot the Government consider it for a few weeks and then say, "This is a report and we adopt these parts, which are financially feasible, and we are prepared to modify the extent to which we have adopted the report in response to objections and where reasonable

alternatives are available"? Why was that not possible? In my view, that at least should be done. What about these farcical meetings that have been held? What they have done, if anything at all, is to demonstrate the gross unfairness to Mr. Hill in appointing him Minister of Roads and Local Government, in appointing a real estate agent to the Government department most involved in land transactions, because, whether or not the Government likes it or whether or not I like it, this is the kind of situation of which people tend to believe the worst. In his reply to me last Thursday the Premier said:

I hope that the honourable member himself did not in any way lead the meeting on to this state.

The answer is that I certainly did not.

Mr. Corcoran: And he knew you did not, too.

Mr. HUDSON: He knew very well that I did not and, if he cares to see Mr. Flint or Mr. Clements, the Highways Department officers at that meeting, they will tell him so. At every single mass meeting held whenever the Minister's name has been mentioned it has been booed, jeered, and catcalled. If anyone should get that treatment it should be not the Minister but the Government, for it is the Government, not the Minister all on his own, that is responsible for this. I am afraid that what has happened has been the consequence of two things—the appointment that has been made and the natural suspicion that many people in the community have.

I do not know how the current situation extending throughout the community wherever the M.A.T.S. scheme is under discussion can be rectified, but it is a poor and serious situation and I suspect it is completely unfair to the Minister concerned. The Premier also accused me last Thursday (and I should like to reply to this) when he said:

I well remember that the member for Glenelg becomes quite political at some of these meetings and that during a meeting at Berri about the Chowilla dam he did so in a most uncalled for manner.

I suppose the Premier did not call for it, and that is why it was uncalled for.

Mr. Corcoran: He made a major statement you should not question.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, and I made a certain criticism (and said I was going to) of the actions of the Government, and I was fully entitled to make my criticisms known. Should I go to a meeting and not say what I felt to be true? Because I was following the Premier (the member for Chaffey can confirm this;

he knows it to be true) before I made the criticism I said specifically to the Chairman in front of everybody at the meeting, "Mr. Chairman, I am going to make certain points of criticism and, because I am following the Premier and he will not in the normal course of events have a specific right of reply to me on these matters, I request you to give him the right to reply." That is true, and the Premier knows it is true; he knows he took his right of reply.

Mr. Broomhill: It was more than fair of you to offer.

Mr. HUDSON: He knows why the criticism I made was uncalled for from his point of view, because I pointed out that what was said prior to the election was much different from what was said by the Premier in Government.

Mr. Broomhill: Everybody already knew that.

Mr. HUDSON: I also pointed out that we had a certain difference of opinion as to the tactics to be adopted in relation to the Commonwealth to get the Chowilla dam, and I pointed out how the Premier's views of these tactics could change from when he was in Opposition to when he was in Government. The Premier (I gave him credit for this) made, I thought, a fairly effective reply to me on these points. But he got the opportunity to reply, because of the specific request which I had made of the Chairman in front of the whole meeting and to which the Chairman acceded. For the Premier to come out and say this last Thursday is just a joke. Although many other matters in relation to this Budget deserve detailed comment, I think that in the main, by confining myself to the general matters, I have made the essential points that need to be made.

I have no doubt that when the relevant financial legislation is introduced many other points of criticism will have to be made. I give notice that the Opposition will guard the interests of the people carefully, because obviously they will need to be guarded and protected from a Government which does not play straight with the people, which does not tell them the truth and which acts in a rapacious manner.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I, like everyone else, dislike the situation in which taxation must be increased and, indeed, I dislike having to pay that increased taxation. However, just as individuals concerned with their own private affairs in their day-to-day living have to come to grip with financial problems as they arise, so must the Government, as the authority

responsible for the finances of this State, take certain action. It has been said that a deficit Budget is necessary at times to stimulate a depressed economy. True, but surely common logic demands that this state of affairs must not continue year after year, especially if there is no improvement in the State's financial situation. We have inherited this situation, and positive steps will have to be taken to correct it, no matter how distasteful to us those steps may be.

We have heard much from the member for Glenelg about succession duties and about the various sections of the community on which they should be levied, but little has been said about the previous Government's theory concerning the sections from which additional finance should be raised. If we examine what was said during the 1965 debate on the Road and Railway Transport Act Amendment Bill, we learn of the reactions of various organizations. Referring to a report of a recent Berri Chamber of Commerce meeting, the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) at page 3,039 of *Hansard* said:

Members of the committee were unanimous in their opposition to the legislation, and it was agreed that a letter summarizing the feelings of members be forwarded to the South Australian Road Transport Association, offering all possible assistance at future public meetings to be held in Berri and State-wide to arouse opposition against the Bill.

This was the type of legislation that the previous Government intended to introduce to correct the financial position. This is purely sectional taxation; it is aimed at only one section of the community. I commend the Treasurer for having faith in his own convictions in introducing these steps necessary to get South Australia back into a sound financial position. Expenditure proposed in the Budget for education is \$53,267,000, which is an increase of \$4,140,000 or, excluding the \$200,000 provided by the Commonwealth for science and technical training purposes, of \$3,940,000 above payments in 1967-68. Necessary increases such as these cannot be maintained year after year if the State is to run continually at a deficit. Most sound thinking people realize this. The greater the debts, the less usable money that is available for these purposes.

The Social Welfare Department is also important, if we are to face up to our responsibilities in this regard. I am pleased that an increased allocation has been made to this department, and I hope this will enable the department to provide a permanent officer

in the Upper Murray area. As this area now has a population of more than 25,000, I believe it is absolutely necessary that an officer be permanently situated there. Many serious social problems could have been greatly alleviated in recent years had such an officer been resident in the area. Problems constantly arise in this respect. We certainly do not have a lack of voluntary organizations in this field, and I believe that this work could be done effectively if there could be co-operation between a permanent officer of the department and voluntary organizations.

Tourism needs to be promoted for all its worth, for in this field we are at the beginning of the road. In the Upper Murray there is the basis for an excellent tourist industry, as we have the river, a lake, bird life, sporting facilities, and accommodation available in modern motels, community hotels renowned throughout Australia for their standard, and caravan parks. One of the main factors that will assist the tourist industry in the Upper Murray in the next year or two will be the Kingston bridge. The ferry crossing, especially at long weekends when delays of up to two or three hours occur, has had a detrimental effect on the tourist industry in the area. Chowilla dam is still the most important project concerning the State, and I am confident that in the next year we will see the recommencement of work on it. However, in the meantime it is essential that we make the utmost use of the water available to us. Careful consideration must be given to private irrigators, particularly those experiencing hardship caused through the cancellation in 1967 of further water licences. Considerable quantities of wine grapes will have to be produced if we are to keep up with the rapidly increasing demand for wine. Much of the increase in production could be carried out on land that is irrigated at present under the supervision of the Lands Department and is used purely for growing vegetables. It is important that growers along the Murray River be given the opportunity to make the utmost use of the available water.

Information from the 1968 wine industry symposium indicates that within the next 10 years the consumption of wine in Australia will double. In 1965, when Australia's population was 11,411,000, the consumption of wine a head of population was 1.23 gallons and the total consumption was 13,845,000 gallons. In 1968, when the population is 12,176,000, the consumption of wine a head of population is 1.55 gallons and the total

consumption will be about 18,873,000 gallons. So, in 1975, when it is estimated that Australia's population will be 14,869,000, the symposium estimates that consumption will be two gallons a head and the total consumption will be about 29,000,000 gallons, virtually double our present consumption.

This means that we will need about 1,500 acres of new plantings of wine grapes under irrigation a year if we are to keep up with the required increase in grape production. We must see that the biggest portion of the required increase is produced in this State. In order that South Australia can prosper and that every South Australian can share in this prosperity, basically we need adequate water for development and a financially stable Government in order to impart confidence to prospective investors. It is unfortunate that South Australia's finances reached such a stage that only positive action could correct it. I commend the Treasurer on taking the steps that had to be taken, but it is with regret that I support the first line.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): Although I have been a member since 1952, I do not think I have heard a speech on a Budget to equal that made this evening by the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson). I consider his points instructive and valuable to all members, and I suggest that those members who did not bother to listen would be well advised to read and digest his speech.

During the few weeks since the Budget was introduced, I have spoken to many people, particularly in the country, about it, and there is general disagreement on how to describe it. All sorts of adjectives have been used, and I think the best word to describe it by would be either "horrible" or "deplorable". Other people, who have good memories and are able to recall the sort of thing that members of the present Government said before the last election, have described this Budget as hypocrisy personified, because when we were in Government and the election campaign was in full swing we were told that our State taxes were too high, that our spending was too low as well as too high, and that we had no financial policy at all.

Some honourable members will remember the leaflets that were disseminated widely and the accounts given by an 81-year-old wombat trapper, a 54-year-old bookmaker and a 25-year-old fan dancer of the faults and failures of the Labor Government, although no names

were mentioned. In that propaganda, all those people joined in chiding the Labor Party for its faults and its policy. The people who have described this Budget as being hypocritical remember that before the last election the present Premier gave no financial policy at all. We have now found out what the Government's policy is. The people remember that, just before the election, on February 26 the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister spoke at a meeting in the Town Hall.

Mr. McKee: He called it a "meet the people tour".

Mr. CLARK: Yes, but the main reason for the tour, as the member for Port Pirie knows, was election propaganda. The meeting was reported in the *News* of Tuesday, February 27, as follows:

At a noisy State election meeting—
I have no doubt that it was noisy, having regard to what was said there—

Mr. Gorton said it would be easier for a Federal Liberal Government to carry out its national policies if there were Liberal administrations in all States.

Imagine what we would have heard if a Labor Prime Minister said that! The Prime Minister continued:

Working with the same Party, it has given the advantage of a more confident exchange of ideas and a closer discussion of the matters at issue.

This Budget is the direct result of a more confident exchange of ideas and closer discussion.

Mr. McKee: He was flying a political kite.

Mr. CLARK: Of course, or else a political balloon, but unfortunately the kite crashed and the balloon burst. The Prime Minister then said:

The State must take action in certain fields but it should not inhibit the opportunity for individuals to develop themselves.

In the light of these words we should take a really good look at the Budget. The Treasurer has my sympathy for having to introduce such a Budget but, after all, he was happy to accept the Treasurer's job. I wonder whether he realized when he took it just what odium it would bring upon him. In view of the statements of the Prime Minister what is contained in the Budget seems to be rather peculiar, but we must remember that the Government is not expecting an election for some time. It is generally accepted that if a Government has to be tough it is better to be tough in its first year of office. It could be the last year, of course. I quote what the Treasurer has said

in his statement in relation to the Commonwealth Government, things that seem inapposite after what the Prime Minister said. The Treasurer said:

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

Sir Henry Bolte put it much plainer last week when he accused the Commonwealth Government of being plain dishonest. I am sure that an analysis of the Treasurer's words would find that they mean the same thing. The Treasurer then said:

This inadequacy is high-lighted even more by the extent, flexibility and growth potential of the Commonwealth's own resources, which are such that the Commonwealth is able to finance its works and functions at standards which are much higher, and increasing at a much more rapid rate, than is possible with State standards.

True, but it is so wide of what the Prime Minister said before the elections. The Treasurer continued, and I think this is in the shape of things to come and a warning given by the Treasurer that everyone inside and outside Parliament should note, when he said:

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.

He continued:

However, at this stage I make the general point that if the community is to have the expanded and improved services which only Governments can provide, then it will continue to be necessary for taxation and other revenue-raising measures to be brought into effect from time to time.

That is true, but I do not think that the means by which we intend to raise revenue are correct. The Treasurer then spoke about conditions obtaining a few months after I first came into Parliament and I know how things were at that time. He said that the Education Department's running expenses in 1953-54 were \$9,300,000 and that this year they were expected to reach \$53,300,000, a six-fold increase. However, does the Committee remember just what the condition of the Education Department was at that time? I shall have something to say later about this. Anyone with any memory at all knows that in that particular year most things were neglected, but I trust it is different now—or I did trust until a few weeks ago. We are reminded that in 1953-54 the running expenses of the Hospitals Department were \$5,700,000,

whereas this year they are estimated at over \$25,000,000. Again, the same thing applies: we know that those particular services were grossly neglected for many years. Indeed, the Hon. Mr. Dunstan, the present Leader of the Opposition, in those early days reminded Parliament constantly of the deficiencies in this respect.

I turn briefly now to the thing that the Treasurer proposes as an excuse to raise money—the receipts duty of 1c in each \$10 upon the pattern of the measure recently implemented in Victoria. As the member for Glenelg has said this evening, that is all we know about it. It is significant (so I shall deal with it now as most people I meet do not know much about it) that on the very day when it was proposed in the Budget to have this duty of 1c in each \$10 upon the Victorian pattern, a long list of articles decontrolled from price control appeared. I suggest that the main reason for the decontrol was so that the sellers of those articles although they had to pay the 1c in each \$10 would not suffer. Here was an opportunity of passing the charge on. Let me read the list of decontrolled goods. Whenever I asked people in my district which things were released from price control, they could name three or four but they did not bother to go to the *Government Gazette* to check the whole list. If they had done so, they would have had to do some detective work anyway to find out which things were decontrolled. When one honourable member here went to the Treasurer, the Treasurer was happy to provide him with the list, but not every member of the community has the opportunity of doing that. Therefore, in order to get it on the record and for the information of members of the Committee, although it is a lengthy list and not merely four or five articles I intend to read it. The articles that were decontrolled on September 5, 1968, the very day on which the Treasurer introduced his first Budget, are as follows:

Item No.

- 50(a) Sauce, tomato.
- 141 Cooking, kitchen utensils.
- 154 Water tanks.
- 156 Glass, namely—
 - (a) Bent, bevelled and blasted or engraved.
 - (b) Bottles, flasks, jars, vials and tubes.
 - (c) Louvres.
 - (d) Plate.
 - (e) Sheet, figures, rolled, cathedral, milled, rough cast or wired cast.
 - (f) Sheet, plain or fancy.

Mr. Langley: And “butcher” glasses?

Mr. CLARK: Yes. These are the things which I want the Committee to note, because they are important. The list continues:

- Item No.
- 159 Bricks and building blocks, including refractories.
- 161 Builders' hardware of any material, including hinges, locks, fasteners and casement catches, and builders' small hardware.
- 162 Building boards, including caneite and masonite.
- 163 Cast-iron porcelain enamelware, and substitutes therefor made from metal or plastic.
- 168 Earthenware and stoneware other than ornamental or decorative.
- 172 Fibrous plaster sheets.
- 173 Fibrous plaster, mouldings, cornices and cover battens.
- 175 Fittings and equipment of a type used in the installation of water, drainage or sewerage systems in buildings.
- 178 Joinery and joinery stock.
- 188 Roofing sheets.
- 189 Sleepers.
- 190 Tiles of all kinds, including roofing tiles, wall tiles and floor tiles.
- 195 Galvanized iron and zinc anneal sheet—plain or corrugated.
- 201 Galvanized steel pipes and fittings.
- 202 Malleable pipe fittings.
- 277 Poisons, drenches and sprays, namely, (b) arsenate of lead.
- 292 Patent dryers and putty.
- 295 Resins, including synthetic resin.
- 296 Shellac, sanderac, mastic, and other dry gums, other than yacca gum.
- 298 Thinners.
- 299 Mineral turpentine and turpentine substitutes.
- 302 Whitelead.
- 303A All raw materials used in the manufacture of paints, colours, varnishes, enamels and lacquers.

I wish we had been warned about this, because I have a certain amount of painting to do myself. The list continues:

- Item No.
- 352 Any process in respect of timber including kiln drying, sawing, planing, milling and machining of all kinds and descriptions—

this would obviously affect the private builder to some extent—

- 352(a) Any manufacturing process in respect of clothing, fabrics and textiles.
- 356 Building of dwellings—

I am sure that will interest some members as well as their constituents—

- 371A Manufacture of bricks or blocks of cement or cement concrete.
- 376 Public utilities—communications.

I am not too sure what that means. It has been suggested to me that the chief apostle in this place—

Mr. Corcoran: Most vicious, at any rate.

Mr. CLARK: To use the Deputy Leader's words, the Government's most vicious supporter of private enterprise (the man who is always opposed to price control and who now bears the title of Attorney-General) is having some influence. I am deeply grieved to think that he has so much influence on his Party. The list continues:

- 382 Supply and fix fibrous plaster.
- 386 Non-intoxicating drinks of the following kinds:—

nothing needs to be done about intoxicating drinks, because they have already been dealt with—

- (a) aerated waters;
- (b) mineral waters; and
- (c) drinks made from fruit juice, cordial, cordial extract or syrup, with the addition thereto of water or aerated water and with or without the addition thereto of any other ingredient.

Mr. Hudson: They are going to sting the kids.

Mr. CLARK: Yes, and sting the parents, too. Of course, the lifting of price control will also mean that everyone who wants to build a house will be stung, for almost every type of material, including tiles or galvanized iron for the roof, cement and bricks for the wall, and paint, will be affected.

Mr. Rodda: Will you build me a house?

Mr. CLARK: As I am not supposed to answer interjections, I think it would be even less correct for me to answer idiotic interjections. Without naming any names, I notice that this particular member has got into the habit of making silly, asinine interjections, and usually not from his own seat. My friend and colleague, the gentleman who should still be the Minister of Works, has just reminded me—

Mr. Hudson: The people's Minister of Works.

Mr. CLARK: —that, under the heading "Treasurer and Minister of Housing—Prices Branch" there is a decrease in expenditure this year of \$90, so at least there is that much of a saving. Apart from the long list I have presented of these items, there is also a full page list (list B) of items which are controlled but the prices for which are not fixed. This includes many important things such as boots and shoes, electrical goods and so on. I take it that these items are under price control but that the Prices Commissioner does not do anything about them unless some overcharging or something of that kind is brought to his notice.

Mr. Hudson: No, I think those things have been price controlled but are now decontrolled and that the proclamation giving the Prices Commissioner power to institute a controlled price has not been revoked.

Mr. CLARK: Frankly, I would not have a clue about it. It would be wise for me to ask the Treasurer a question about what this list means. Whatever it means, many items are mentioned and apparently they are not under price control now. It appears to me that practically nothing is under price control today. I should say that this pleases the Attorney-General greatly. From year to year, legislation has been introduced to extend the activities of the Prices Commissioner. However, my tip is that soon he will be another prominent public servant who will be almost out of a job. As I have said, I believe that most of this decontrol was a direct result of the tax of 1c in each \$10. Therefore, it seems obvious that the people who will pay the contributions to the Budget and the State to increase our revenue will be the ordinary people who can least afford to do so.

Mr. Broomhill: They could pay it a number of times.

Mr. CLARK: They could, as was accurately pointed out by the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson).

Mr. Rodda: Are you talking about the future Minister?

Mr. CLARK: Even now, the member for Glenelg would be closer to being a Minister than the honourable member would ever be. The second slug the Treasurer imposed was a stamp duty of \$2 on all compulsory third party motor vehicle insurance. Everyone who owns a motor vehicle will be hit by this tax. Again, the well-to-do man will not find this as hard to pay as will the labourer on a building project or the man on the basic wage who owns a motor vehicle. I realize that each person will pay the same amount.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Many poorer people pay this kind of insurance every six months.

Mr. CLARK: Yes; this point is open to checking with the Treasurer, but I suggest that the poorer man who does this will pay \$2 on each occasion. The third taxation measure proposed is that of gift duty. I thoroughly support this proposal; indeed, I would increase it along the lines suggested this evening by the member for Glenelg. The fourth taxation

measure is an extension of the present hire-purchase duty of 1½ per cent to cover everything, as far as I can gather. Again, the people who will be hit the hardest are those who use hire-purchase most, and they are certainly not the wealthiest members of the community. The next taxation measure is an increase in the fee for liquor licences from 5 per cent to 6 per cent. This was passed on before the ink on the Budget document was dry.

The sixth taxation measure—a gem—is a contribution to Consolidated Revenue of 45 per cent of the profits made by the State Bank. I have tried to visualize the looks on the faces of the then Opposition if the previous Labor Government had even hinted at a measure like this. The Attorney-General's eyeballs would have stood out on his forehead and the hair of the Minister of Lands would have stood on end, yet the Treasurer's followers meekly accept it. The Premier took a back seat when the Budget was presented. I did not blame him for not being Treasurer when I heard the Treasurer's Budget speech. I realize only too well the main reason why the Premier allowed another man to take some of the odium for the Budget, but I do not think all the odium will fall on the Treasurer.

Mr. Hudson: Do you think he will later sack the Treasurer and take the portfolio himself?

Mr. CLARK: No, because I think he would admit he would have a difficulty. The last nail that the present Government is driving into the coffin of the people of South Australia and, incidentally, into its own political coffin is an increase in public hospital charges and, in appropriate cases, the imposition of mental hospital charges. We know that those who mainly use public hospitals are those who cannot afford anything else, and that those who use mental institutions are not able to do anything else.

Mr. Lawn: The increase is a shame.

Mr. CLARK: What a shame it is that we should be discussing a Budget that seeks to raise revenue by hitting the sick and mentally ill!

Mr. Lawn: Isn't this the first time this has been imposed regarding mental institutions?

Mr. CLARK: It is, as far as I know. I think the Committee will forgive me for saying that I have a real interest in education. In fact, I think I could claim that education was in my blood. Two of my aunts, and my brother and sister were teachers, and I was a

teacher for 25 years. I have often wondered why I gave it up: however, there were reasons. I came here in 1952, and the Treasurer has reminded us that the running expenses in 1953-54 were \$9,300,000 whereas this year they are expected to reach \$53,300,000, a six-fold increase. What a ridiculous statement that was! The Treasurer forgot to tell us that it was vital that expenditure on education be increased.

When I became a member, I and my colleagues constantly raised certain matters regarding deficiencies in education. At that time the position regarding promotion for teachers was hopeless: conditions in schools were bad, and the schools were poor in almost every way. Classrooms were so crowded that the second to last primary school class that I taught comprised 80 students. Teacher recruitment was then at its lowest ebb. Therefore, it is obvious that the main reason for the six-fold increase in that time has been that such increase was necessary. I am pleased that most of the matters I have referred to have been changed, although there is still much to do. With the growth in population and the enormous increase in the birth rate since the Second World War, this expenditure has had to increase. I am concerned about the changes being made regarding student teacher allowances. In the last week or two we have heard much debate on this matter, as well as searching questions asked by the member for Whyalla (Hon. R. R. Loveday), a former Minister of Education, and an extremely good one.

Mr. Corcoran: The people's Minister of Education.

Mr. CLARK: That is so. If the wishes of the majority of the people of South Australia were given effect to, he would be doing this job still, with the same dignity and ability as he showed while he held the portfolio. The questions asked and the replies given are interesting, particularly the Minister's remarks the other night in the course of what I took to be a reply to the fine and comprehensive speech made by the former Minister. Frankly, I thought the present Minister made the best speech I have heard her make.

Mr. Corcoran: But it wasn't a reply.

Mr. CLARK: That is the point I am making. Surely it was not a reply to the exhaustive attack made by another honourable member regarding student teacher allowances. What the Minister seemed to do was give a

statement that she had had prepared and more or less learnt by heart. She was completely on the defensive.

Mr. Corcoran: She hardly gave a reason and did not answer the arguments of the member for Whyalla.

Mr. CLARK: No, and some of the information was rather misleading. We were led to believe that one of the chief reasons why the regulation was altered was that student teachers, in claims for travelling expenses to and from the college, had practised abuses. The Minister said:

One reason why this regulation has been introduced, and why the Under Treasurer and the Auditor-General drew attention to the matter, was the fact that the old system was being abused. I received a delegation the other day in my office from the five Presidents of the teachers college associations and they admitted that it was being abused.

She continued:

Students can claim for travelling expenses based on the daily rate for travel on public transport, and whether or not they travel by public transport they can claim. Where they travel by car or as a group in a car they still base their claim on the daily rate paid on public transport.

Further, she said:

Also, we do not know and there is no means of checking, but students could go to sporting activities in connection with the colleges on a Saturday morning and claim for this travel and no-one would know whether it was claimed for travelling in the course of their studies. There have been abuses.

Anyone listening would have taken for granted that the number of abuses was colossal, but today in reply to a question the Minister said:

An examination of the travelling claims for the second term, 1968, reveals that the accountant disallowed claims for travel on Saturdays for 10 students (five students claimed for travelling to sport; five students gave no reason for claiming for travel on Saturdays).

There would be about 3,500 teachers college students and one would expect the percentage of abuses to be high. The Minister continued:

Sixteen letters were sent to teachers college students: eight to Adelaide Teachers College students, five to Bedford Park Teachers College students and three to Wattle Park Teachers College students.

It seems that 16 dreadful characters have abused their privileges. I do not support their abusing of their privileges, but I suggest that whatever the scheme there, someone will abuse it. In this case there were 16 out of 3,500 students. The Minister continued:

- (1) Seven students admit to over-charging the Education Department. (In some instances, they travelled by their own vehicle and claimed daily public transport rates when a weekly rate would have been cheaper).
- (2) Six students' explanations are inadequate, and they are being asked for more detailed information.
- (3) Three students' explanations are satisfactory.

I have looked at the yellow form used by students for claiming travelling expenses and for the normal itinerary it shows Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday. The daily itinerary, however, shows Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. I suggest that, if a column for Saturday is shown on the form, students can hardly be blamed for using it for something they do on Saturday that relates to college work. I suggest that that is what the column is for. Other details are shown on the back of the document, which seems to be causing so much administrative work. I think it would cause such work. It states:

- (1) It is recognized that students may not travel by public transport;

There is not a full-stop after that, merely a semi-colon, so it does not mean that students must not travel by public transport. It continues:

but, whatever form of conveyance is used, they may claim the cost of travelling by public transport from home to college and return in excess of 20c a day.

Therefore, that clause seems to be encouraging students to travel by public transport or by whatever form of conveyance they like. It makes me wonder just how it was ever found out that this was being abused at all, as this provision invites students to use any form of transport.

Many young people have written to me about allowances for teachers college students. I am sure the Committee will realize the reason for this. My district extends from Gawler to the Parafield railway crossing and for people travelling from Gawler, Salisbury or Elizabeth who have much to pay to travel perhaps as far as Wattle Park the alteration that the Minister began to make and then decided to change a little is really damaging. I should like to read just two of the many letters I have received from students, one of whom is more belligerent than the other. This letter, from a student in Salisbury, states:

As a member of your constituency I feel it is with you that I should register my extreme dismay at certain educational actions of the present Government.

I do not think they are educational but they are certainly to do with education. The letter continues:

The proposed \$85 increase in student teachers allowances is an insult to the intelligence of people who attend teachers colleges. To that I say, "Hear, hear!" The letter continues:

The students who are doing university courses (the majority of the Adelaide Teachers College students) are well aware that \$60 out of the \$85 is not nearly sufficient to cover the cost of necessary text books. Because of the distance of many students in your area—the Salisbury, Elizabeth and even Gawler districts—from their various colleges, they are appalled at the proposal of the remaining \$25 being used to cover travelling costs. Since you will yourself realize the disadvantage of living so far from their places of study, I am sure you will appreciate the dismay and indignation of all student teachers. It is a poor enough idea to have had no increase in our meagre allowance since 1965, without having a pay change which will make existence even harder for many students. I would appreciate your attention being given to this deplorable matter.

The other letter, in a slightly more moderate tone, is from a student teacher living at Gawler. It states:

I am a student at Adelaide Teachers College doing my first year of a four-year course. According to the *Advertiser* of August 30, 1968, page 4—

as a matter of fact, that is where most people first got the announcement, from the *Advertiser* of August 30, 1968—

an \$85 rise has been granted to all students; but now we will be expected to pay for all books and travelling expenses.

On the best information that I can obtain, our books will cost us approximately \$85. Consequently, we will be paying our own travelling expenses.

This seems simple arithmetic to me. The letter continues:

Due to the fact that I travel to and from Adelaide by train each day, even at concession rates, I will be out of pocket at least \$60 per year. Having signed a three-year bond with no right of release I am dismayed to find myself \$60 poorer than I had planned. I am writing to you in the hope that something can be done about this situation.

Mr. Lawn: That is the result of a Liberal Government.

Mr. CLARK: The direct result. The former Minister of Education will tell us that on two occasions it was suggested to him that this action be taken, but he had the good sense and the welfare of the students at heart not to take such action. However, we find that within a few months of the present Govern-

ment's taking office this sort of thing has come along, in addition to many other things.

Mr. Hudson: Do you think it is because of inexperience?

Mr. CLARK: That may be so, but if a Minister is prepared to take on the job, inexperience is no excuse. Going back to the days when I was a student teacher, I recall that many of us, who were badly off financially, used to share a packet of cigarettes between two or three people, and I have known two fellows to smoke the same pipe in turn. But we obtained a most valuable thing (something I probably would not have obtained had I not been a student teacher): the sons and daughters of poorer people had the opportunity to obtain a university education. I suggest that many young people enter the teachers colleges at present with a love for learning whose parents cannot afford to provide them with a university education, and some of these students make the best teachers.

Many of these people have budgeted obviously on the assumption that they will be paid a certain sum, provision for which is set out in the bonds which their parents have signed as guarantors. I suggest that it will be difficult for such people to make ends meet, and it will be particularly difficult for the parents concerned, many of whom regard the allowance granted to student teachers as a real godsend. Although I know that legally the change that has been made does not constitute a breach of contract, I strongly suggest that it constitutes a moral breach of contract and will be regarded by many as such. I have always admired the teachers' recruitment scheme. I think the member for Whyalla, who was the former Minister of Education, will agree that the literature put out by the Education Department in this regard has been first-class. I suggest that many young people have entered the teaching profession because they have become aware of the prospects referred to in the books distributed by the department. Indeed, at present we have never had a better standard of young men and women training as teachers of the future.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Very good indeed.

Mr. CLARK: I am sure that is correct. These people are bonded, and if they cease to be student teachers someone has to pay the cost of the bond. I fear that the admirable system that has given us the type of student teachers that we want will be adversely affected by this issue; we will be hindering future recruitment merely to save a few thousand

dollars. Honourable members know I was a teacher for many years (I am proud of it). During that period I served under many Ministers of Education and I say frankly that all of them, quite apart from their politics, were admired and respected generally by teachers in South Australia. Therefore, I never thought I would live to see what happened last Thursday when the gallery of this Chamber was filled with young student teachers who made obvious their distaste and lack of respect for the present Minister. This is a sad thing, but I do not think the students in this instance were to blame.

I can remember such Ministers of Education as the Hon. Sir Shirley Jeffries, who I believe was the best Minister while I was a teacher. I can well remember that when I first entered this Chamber Sir Shirley, although he was not then the Minister, was one of the first members who came up to me in the lobby. He said it was probably a good thing for Parliament that someone would be here to put the point of view of teachers. He said this because he had been a Minister of Education and was still intensely interested in the subject. Following Sir Shirley Jeffries there was the Hon. Reg Rudall, who lived in Gawler and had known me since I was a boy. He was a first-class Minister who had the respect of and was honoured by every teacher in the service. Unfortunately this feeling seems to have gone. I regret the decision that has been made. I realize that another announcement was made today that the Minister, after due consideration (I suppose it was mainly due to political pressure of some type, pressure that has done some good in this case, although not enough) was prepared, out of the goodness of her heart (or of the department's heart or the Auditor-General's heart or somebody's heart), to give student teachers \$20 more. Obviously this is not enough. The students think it is not enough because they believe they are still being robbed of something they thought they would get. I understand there was a demonstration today and that something more is going to be done about the matter. I agree that \$20 is not enough. This is a sad, pitiful and parsimonious story about which the Minister and the Government could well be ashamed, and it is not yet finished. The life of the Government is not yet over.

Mr. Edwards: It won't be for a long time.

Mr. CLARK: The honourable member seems to be concerned about fauna and flora, and wombats and crows in his district. If he thinks it will be a long time, I can tell

him that the time will come when he will think it has been for too long. I examined the Budget carefully but without success for reference to transport from Elizabeth and Salisbury to the city. Unfortunately, I found much about it in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report, a document at which many people are looking with certain suspicion, some even with horror. Honourable members who have been here long enough know that I have hammered away unsuccessfully at both Liberal and Labor Governments to have something done about this matter. All members know the part of the metropolitan area where both buses and trains operate, but apparently the word has gone forth that this is not to be allowed in the Salisbury-Elizabeth area. Members know that many parts of Elizabeth are a long way from the railway line and that such parts are the most desirable areas.

Unfortunately, up to the present—and I feared this from the start—at least 75 per cent of the work force of Elizabeth works away from that city. These people must catch a train, and for many of them the railway line is a long way from their homes. Most people catch a bus to get to the railway station, provided the bus runs at a suitable time. They then catch a train to Adelaide and then another bus to their place of employment. In the evening they have to do this again, but in reverse. Apart from the expense involved in paying two sets of fares there is much waste of time during the changes from one form of transport to another. Consequently, many people are forced to buy a motor car even though they cannot afford it. I know many people who have got into financial trouble in this way.

In 1961 I contacted the Transport Control Board and asked that buses be allowed to operate from this area. I approached Sir Thomas Playford, who I stress was then both Premier and Treasurer, but in reply he quoted a statement from the Chairman of the board: "My board will continue to keep this matter under review, but it does not consider that the present time is appropriate." The time never has been appropriate. I, and the people of Elizabeth, have been waiting all this time for the appropriate time, but we have not been waiting quietly. After this announcement a public meeting was called, following which a deputation waited on the then Premier. He told us, however, that the time was not appropriate. It still is not appropriate.

I believe the difficulties associated with the transport system at Elizabeth have recently hindered its growth. Many people came to me over the last two or three years and asked what I believed the M.A.T.S. Report would recommend. All of them have been very disappointed, because it advocates closing down several railway stations and transporting everyone in buses to the nearest railway station remaining. This is not the answer regarding transport so far as the majority of the people in the area are concerned. The M.A.T.S. Report may not be adopted and, as we are invited to submit objections to it, I submit an objection regarding the system in that area, because I do not think it will work.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Could I ask you a question?

Mr. CLARK: No, because that would interrupt me.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: I wanted to ask you whether you were for or against it.

Mr. CLARK: I do not think I will answer that, but I ask the Minister the same question, and I understand that he will be able to reply after six months. The M.A.T.S. plan is like the curate's egg, good in patches but not very good for most people. I think I have said sufficient for the Committee to realize that this Budget is a horrible document. I do not like it at all, and I think the people will find out more about what kind of Budget it is. I have calculated that the increase in taxation in three years of Labor Government was less than 4 per cent, yet this minority Government has imposed an increase of almost 20 per cent already. The 43 per cent of electors, the proud people who voted for and celebrated the election of the L.C.L. Government, must have mixed feelings about the Budget. I do not know whether they are angered, alarmed, ashamed, antagonized, or absolutely stumped. Who could blame them, because in pre-election speeches the Government said nothing about L.C.L. financial proposals. It seems that the present Government had no financial plans then. I doubt that they expected to win the election, but, unfortunately, in this Budget we have seen the post-election plans.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I am in a dilemma, following the dismal utterances of the member for Gawler, who found it difficult to say anything nice about anything. The paradox is that the situation that that honourable member has been talking about is one that he helped create. He was one of the principal contributors to the situation that the Treasurer is in.

Mr. Broomhill: What did he do?

Mr. RODDA: We are concerned about what he did not do.

Mr. Broomhill: What didn't he do?

Mr. Langley: Give us the reason.

Mr. RODDA: In this debate members of the Opposition, and particularly the member for Gawler, have indulged in an acrimonious outburst, and the Government and the Treasurer have been subjected to long blasts of ballyhoo. Members opposite have been castigating the Government, but they are responsible for the position in which the Treasurer found himself when preparing the Budget. At June 30, 1964, the State surplus was \$3,844,000.

Mr. Burdon: What about your last year of office, when you spent all of the uranium fund, which amounted to several million dollars, yet made no attempt to increase revenue?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nankivell): Order!

Mr. RODDA: I am fond of the member for Mount Gambier but I dislike his dislike for uranium.

Mr. Burdon: I want you to answer the question about the uranium fund.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I ask the member for Mount Gambier to keep quiet and allow the member for Victoria to speak.

Mr. RODDA: The member for Mount Gambier seems anxious about uranium, but I should like to know something about the Cape Barren geese in which he is interested. In the first year of Labor Administration there was a current deficit of \$2,610,000, leaving a balance of \$1,233,000 in hand. In 1965-66, after living better with Labor, this State was in the red with a current deficit of \$6,834,000, leaving the Revenue Account overdrawn by \$5,611,000 at June 30, 1966. At this stage we had quick action by the political acrobats opposite with a change in accounting, and for some strange reason we had a surplus of \$106,000, after debiting the Loan Account with \$6,902,000 of expenditure that had previously been charged to Revenue Account. That is the situation in which the Treasurer now finds himself. In 1967-68 a deficit of \$2,860,000 was recorded. Here again the Labor Treasurer had charged to the Loan Account \$5,015,000 which by the previous accounting procedures should have been charged to Revenue Account. It should be emphasized to the people that without these changes in the accounting procedures the Revenue Account under the three Labor Budgets would have shown respective deficits of \$6,834,000, \$6,796,000 and \$7,875,000.

Mr. Broomhill: What did you emphasize during your policy speech?

Mr. RODDA: If the Opposition Whip would consult the Parliamentary Librarian, he would find out. As the Labor Government commenced office with \$1,233,000 in hand, the net deficit in terms of the previous orthodox method of accounting would have been \$20,282,000. I do not know how members opposite can be so unkind to the member for Stirling, but all the unkind things they are saying about the Government, and the Treasurer in particular, have the backdrop that they mishandled the finances of this State, and now we have a great heap (one cannot describe it otherwise) of castigation from members opposite.

Mr. Langley: What do you think the public are saying?

Mr. RODDA: We have some idea of what the public are saying. We heard a little about it in March, too.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Unley will have his say later.

Mr. RODDA: I now want to say something about my district, as I know the member for Wallaroo is waiting to take up the cudgels to set us right. Some difficulty is being experienced, not only in my district but also in other districts, because of the use of the Bruce box. I do not decry the Bruce box, but I want to say something on behalf of those good people in my district and those represented by the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon). I have a report of a survey about citrus containers conducted in the Sydney fruit market in July of this year.

Mr. Broomhill: You should conduct a survey about what the electors in your district think about you.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. RODDA: There are 20 agents in this market concerned with the marketing of South Australian-grown citrus. Some of these firms are combined but still operate under their old name. For this market there has been set up a marketing panel of 18 under the chairmanship of Mr. Jack Kelloway, who is assisted by a Deputy Chairman, Mr. Ken Miclass. Both these gentlemen have been co-operative throughout this survey made by the case-makers of South Australia, and they have this to say:

The panel have at least on two occasions unanimously directed South Australian Citrus Sales that citrus be not sent to the Sydney market in the Bruce type containers. The panel has been told by people representing South Australian Citrus Sales that there was

an extreme shortage of pine in South Australia and that there would be no more wooden cases available by 1969 or 1970.

Mr. Burdon: Don't you think there should be a return to the dump bushel box?

Mr. RODDA: I am coming to that. As an added interest to the survey, the stacking contractor for the market, Mr. Ron Hall, was interviewed. His men stack upwards of 80,000 cases in one form or another each weekend. Mr. Hall said that the best to handle is the Cel-pack, although if the standard bushel were handled in lots of 50 or more it would take first preference. The results shown represent a 75 per cent survey of the relevant marketing agents, there being 12 agents interviewed, representing 16 firms (one abstainer, who was directly associated with South Australian Citrus Sales). The result shows unanimously that the two wooden containers (dump and standard) are preferred as the citrus container. Cartons take second place, with the unanimous last place (comments including the word "dangerous") for the Bruce box. The impression gained is that the agents and the buyers do not like the Bruce box and would prefer not to have it but, as one agent said, "This thing has been forced upon us and, although we raised objections, it appears we have to accept it whether we want it or not."

Several agents were quick to point out that a Bruce box or carton damaged in transit could not be repaired and, therefore, before the fruit was inspected for damage the price of that box dropped. On the other hand, a wooden case can be repaired quite easily by replacing the broken board. An added comment from Mr. E. J. Milne (Sydney delegate to the Commonwealth Chamber of the Fruit and Vegetable Industry) was, "It is about time somebody considered the requirements of the buyers." A summary of the results of the survey conducted on the Sydney market is based on a points system, allocating eight points for first, six for second, four for third and two for fourth; wooden boxes received 140 points, cartons received 58, and the Bruce box received 32. Casemakers are at present in a precarious position. Discussions have taken place with and deputations have been made to the Minister, who is negotiating with the Citrus Organization Committee with a view to informing those concerned that they may use the box. Much employment revolves around the manufacture of boxes; for instance, the Penola mill of A. W. Donnelly employs about 55 people, and the economy of Penola depends largely on the satisfactory state of employment

existing at this mill. However, orders have fallen off to such an extent that the mill has had to retrench many of its employees. The survey shows clearly that the trade wishes to use the dump bushel box, the commodity which is being produced at this mill. Although I believe the Citrus Organization Committee has indicated no preference in this regard, some packing sheds use only the Bruce box, so there are some difficulties in this respect. I put this thing on the line: that this is an important matter for the timber industry in the South-East. I want to say many other things but I can deal with them during the debate on the lines. In conclusion, I commend the Treasurer. He has not had an easy task in bringing down a Budget that will get South Australia moving.

Mr. McAnaney: Keep it moving—it is already on the move.

Mr. RODDA: Yes, the stop press of today's *News* shows that building approvals in South Australia have increased, and one of my colleagues has pointed out that the employment position in South Australia has improved. Despite what members opposite have said about these eight impositions in the Budget (as the member for Glenelg described them), they will get the State moving. There is nothing like everybody pulling on the rope. I am sure that time will prove that the learned exposition given by the member for Glenelg this evening is wrong. I have pleasure in supporting the first line.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I think the member for Victoria is to be congratulated on stating, as a backbencher, that he wants to have this thing put on the line. I do not know what thing he was referring to, because he talked about many things without specifically saying what he wanted on the line. However, he is to be congratulated because, up to date, he is the only member opposite who has had the audacity to disagree with the lines presented by the Treasurer. Therefore, I believe he will go down in history as the first member of this Government to say that he disagreed with the Treasurer's financial statement. The honourable member looks somewhat setback by what I am saying, but he will be surprised when he reads *Hansard* tomorrow to realize that, during the course of his speech, he disagreed with the Treasurer's statement. The mere fact that he said he disagreed with the financial statement is heartening to me, because I thought only Opposition members had the courage to point out weaknesses in the Budget.

Mr. Burdon: It was an accident, though.

Mr. HUGHES: I know, and from the look on the honourable member's face I think he is beginning to regret that he allowed himself to get carried away and say just how he felt about the financial statement. Up to date members opposite have been very guarded regarding the Budget, but the member for Victoria, having been egged on a little by the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney), quite unknowingly disagreed with the statement presented to this House.

Mr. Rodda: What was the point of disagreement?

Mr. HUGHES: You will read it in *Hansard* tomorrow, where you said, "I want this thing placed on the line." This Budget will go down in history as the shock Budget. Never before in the history of responsible Government in South Australia have so many imposts been placed upon the lower income groups in any one year. The underlying cause of the crisis can be found in the bankruptcy of ideas in the leadership of the Liberal and Country League Government, which was elected on a minority vote of the people.

Mr. Ferguson: Not for the first time.

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member is being outspoken in admitting that this is not the first time that an L.C.L. Government has been elected on a minority vote. I do not think members opposite realize that the Treasurer is now back in the Chamber, because this is the second occasion when a Government member has made a statement that could be embarrassing. The majority vote for the Labor Party indicates that South Australians were pleased with the legislation and the financial administration of the three years prior to March 2.

Mr. McAnaney: Why did your own vote in Wallaroo go down so much?

Mr. HUGHES: That does not matter, because it has no bearing on this point at all. When the member for Stirling and other members of the present Government, including the member for Yorke Peninsula, were on this side they prophesied that the vote in the Wallaroo District on March 2 would be on Party lines. If it was on Party lines, there is apparently a vast majority of Labor people in the Wallaroo District, in comparison with L.C.L. people.

Mr. McAnaney: Then why did you lose so many votes?

Mr. Broomhill: While we were in Government the then Opposition made some very misleading statements.

Mr. HUGHES: Exactly. Further, the people of the Wallaroo District were so misled before March 2 that they recorded a vote against the Labor Government, to a degree. I now challenge the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) to influence the Government to go back to the people tomorrow! If an election were held tomorrow he would see the increased vote for Labor, because of the misleading statements made by his Premier and other members on the Government side in the district of Wallaroo and elsewhere. Many extremely wide statements were made, some being untrue and others intended to mislead the people. Because those statements were made in a district that was grasping for opportunity to have industry established, the people listened. However, what happened about having the Wallaroo harbour improved and used more?

The member for Stirling should read *Hansard*, because there he will find the opposite of what was stated before March 2. *Hansard* of only about two weeks ago shows that the people were misled in connection with low-rental houses in the District of Wallaroo. It is a tragedy and a disgrace that members opposite will go to the district of Wallaroo and mislead elderly people about the building of houses for low rental. When I asked the Treasurer a question about the advertisement that had appeared in the press, he dissociated himself from it. He was honest. He was not one of the members concerned in making the statement. I have respect for the Treasurer, because I know that he would not be a party to trying to mislead elderly people in Wallaroo, or anywhere else.

Mrs. Byrne: Don't be too sure.

Mr. HUGHES: I have had many dealings with the Treasurer and I do not think he would be a party to trying to mislead elderly people.

Mr. McKee: You haven't much respect for the Budget.

Mr. HUGHES: No. This Budget will not assist this State as was promised in the eight points published in practically every newspaper throughout South Australia prior to the elections in March. The points made then by the Liberal Party are much different from the seven disagreeable methods by which taxation will be increased in this State. I did not notice in any report of a speech made prior to the last elections that the then Leader of the Opposition said that if the Liberal Government were elected it intended to increase taxation.

Mr. Rodda: This Government did not realize the state of the Treasury then.

Mr. HUGHES: It did, only too well, and appreciated how the State's finances were being handled by the Labor Government in creating employment in country districts in particular. When Government members were in Opposition they did not blame the Commonwealth Government for unemployment that existed during the period of the Labor Government, and they strongly criticized the Labor Party for being critical of the Liberal Commonwealth Government. Now, the Treasurer has gone to great lengths to blame the Commonwealth Treasurer for his lack of support for this State.

Mr. Broomhill: He also said that State taxation should be kept at a low figure.

Mr. HUGHES: Exactly, and Government members know that. As Leader of the Opposition, the Premier told people that if the L.C.L. Government was elected it would spend more money, balance the Budget, yet not increase taxation. We do not hear any interjections now from members opposite that that is not true, because they know it is true.

Mr. Rodda: When did he say that?

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member knows that as well as I do—prior to March 2. All the member for Victoria can do when he is discussing the Budget is to say, "This is a very valuable document" or "I commend the Treasurer on his presentation of it." All the presentation in the world will not help those people on lower incomes who will be vitally affected by increased taxation. The honourable member should be the last one to cry poverty but he should be one of the first to honour the promises made prior to March 2. It was amusing for me to sit in this Chamber and hear some of the evidence given at the Court of Disputed Returns in respect of the Millicent by-election. It appears that some of those witnesses had been prompted by the member for Victoria to plead that they did not know whether it was on the Saturday before lunch-time or whether it was on the Sunday. Now we understand why, because the member for Victoria, who comes from the South-East where those people were concerned, was so used to repeating what those witnesses should say parrot-fashion that he found himself saying it today.

Mr. Jennings: Not parrot-fashion but galah-fashion.

Mr. HUGHES: You can have it whichever way you like, but the honourable member should be careful because he has made one

bad slip tonight in opposing what the Treasurer brought before this Committee. If he keeps going, he will readily admit that he was a party to influencing certain people during a certain inquiry to say certain things. Our economy is one in which Government spending on development has come to play a crucial part. It is all very well for the Treasurer to laugh and talk about sausages. I know many people in South Australia who will not be able to eat sausages after this shock Budget: all they will be able to eat is the skin. That will not surprise the Treasurer, because he has plenty of hide and he and his family will be able to feast fairly well while many people in South Australia will not be in a position to sit at a table and eat the delicacies of life, as the Premier does. I am concerned to think that the Premier is making fun, as he is often apt to, of the increased taxation that vitally affects people on lower incomes. The idea that if Government capital expenditure is increased private capital expenditure may be reduced is hardly correct; rather, the contrary seems to apply. Heavy public spending on capital projects results in heavy capital expenditure in the private sector. After reading through the

Treasurer's explanation, one could not charge him with budgeting boldly or with any element of risk: one can only view with concern the lack of Government spending planned at a time when inflationary forces are increasing.

I am concerned that, at June 30 last, Loan funds to the extent of \$5,658,000 were unspent and, what is worse, the Government intends to hold this money in reserve when there are urgent financial requirements arising from large-scale development works already under way, when there is a public clamour for more spending to remedy the serious community deficiencies in roads and education, and when there are unavoidable increases in expenditure on social services. It is clear from the text of the Treasurer's explanation that there is a need for a large increase in public spending again this year. However, despite this, the Treasurer has not only intimated that spending will be curbed but has stated that he wishes to save money.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.5 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 25, at 2 p.m.