

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, September 25, 1968

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

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

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

QUESTIONS

CRIMINAL LAW

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked in August about what progress had been made with the investigation into the reform of substantive and procedural matters of criminal law in South Australia and about the state of activity of the committee I had established on this score?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes. When he asked the question, the Leader said that he had discussed the matter in detail (to use his own term) with the Hon. Mr. Justice Hogarth, whom he had invited to be the Chairman of the committee. The committee, which was set up by my predecessor, consisted of Mr. Justice Hogarth, Mr. King, Q.C., who was nominated by the Law Society of South Australia, and Mr. Kenneison, who was at that time a member of the staff of the Attorney-General's Department. When the Leader asked me about this matter on August 20, I thought the best course to take would be to ask His Honour, as Chairman of the committee, to let me know precisely what had taken place and what progress had been made. Mr. Justice Hogarth has now written to me the following letter, dated September 17, setting it all out:

I acknowledge your letter of August 30, which reached my chambers while I was away from Adelaide. The following sets out in brief the course of events with reference to the committee for the revision of the criminal law. At the outset I had a conference with the then Attorney-General (Hon. D. A. Dunstan), who asked me whether I would be willing to act as Chairman of a committee to consider revision of the criminal law. I told him that I thought it undesirable that a judge should be party to the decisions of such a committee on matters in which strongly and widely opposed views are likely to be held by members of the general public, and which relate to social and moral problems rather

than to purely legal questions. Mr. Dunstan said that what he intended was a revision of "lawyer's law", and he mentioned in particular the desirability of considering the reclassification of crimes and doing away with the distinction between felonies and misdemeanours. To the best of my recollection, the question whether the criminal law in this State should be codified was also mentioned. I said that I was very willing to be the Chairman of a committee to work along these lines. The constitution of the committee was then discussed, and it was agreed that the Law Society of South Australia Incorporated should be invited to appoint one member, and that the Attorney-General should appoint a member from his staff. Subsequently, Mr. L. J. King, Q.C., was appointed by the Law Society, and C. J. Kenneison by the Attorney-General. The precise terms of reference were not defined; but I understood that it was for the committee to make such recommendations as it saw fit, without being limited by any definition of the scope of the inquiry.

I had several preliminary discussions with the other members of the committee, and it was decided in the first instance to invite members of the public to submit their ideas with regard to revision of the criminal law; and to obtain copies of relevant legislation from other jurisdictions, including the other Australian States, other Dominions, and States of the United States of America; and this was done. I also discussed with the other members of this committee the desirability in the first instance of submitting an interim report to deal with matters of broad principle; and then, if the recommendations on these lines were accepted, to proceed in detail to the reclassification of crimes and revision of criminal law procedures within that framework. Soon after the committee was formed, the other two members became engaged in protracted litigation. I spoke to the Attorney-General early in September, 1967, and told him that the committee could not do very much until the litigation in question had been concluded. In fact, it was not concluded until March, 1968. In the meantime, submissions by members of the public were being received, and a large amount of material, mainly in the form of legislation in the other jurisdictions, was obtained. Consideration was also given to the side-effects of the removal of the distinction between felonies and misdemeanours. Prior to the last State election it was reported in the press that it was the intention of the Liberal and Country League, if returned to office, to set up one committee to consider law reform generally; and, when the result of the election became known, I thought it best to await your instructions as to the future activities of the committee. On your appointment, you will recall that we arranged to meet to discuss the matter at the first opportunity; and when we met in due course you confirmed my belief that it was your intention to set up one committee on law reform generally which, as I understand it, will take over the functions of my committee. In view of this, no meetings of my committee have taken place after the present Government took office. Indeed, before

the present Government took office only discussions of a preliminary nature had taken place, as described above. I hope that the foregoing gives you all the information that you require; but, if any further points arise, I shall be pleased to deal with them.

I think that that sets out completely the situation. It shows that the committee was set up, as the Leader has said on a number of occasions, but, in fact, it had not gone very far at all with its work and no precise terms of reference had been given to it at the time of the change of Government earlier this year. As I explained to His Honour when I called on him, my proposal was that the work of this committee should not continue. My present opinion is that its scope, as defined, is too broad to be of great value in the immediate future. I intend that the Law Reform Committee, which is in the process of being appointed (and I am looking forward to hearing from the Leader, I hope soon, on that matter, on which I wrote to him) will deal with some rather more restricted aspects of the reform of the criminal law, certainly in the foreseeable future. Subsequently, perhaps the scope will be extended.

PETERBOROUGH RAMPS

Mr. CASEY: On August 14, I asked the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a question about the desirability of the Railways Department's providing handrails for ramps being constructed at Peterborough because of railway standardization. Unfortunately, the reply I received did not completely satisfy me, because it stated that the department did not provide handrails in certain cases, depending on the gradient of the ramp, as it was not its policy to do so. I emphasize to the Attorney-General (and ask him to convey this to his colleague) that the code of the Standards Association of Australia recommends forcibly that ramps with a gradient of one in 20 should at all times be provided with handrails in order to assist disabled and aged people. Will the Attorney-General ask his colleague to draw the attention of the Railways Commissioner to this fact so that the department can alter its existing policy?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall be happy to do that for the honourable member. My recollection of my reply was that the Railways Department would be happy if the handrail were provided by perhaps a voluntary organization in the town. I do not know whether the honourable member has been able to convey this suggestion to voluntary bodies

in his town and whether it is possible to do anything on these lines. I hope it is.

Mr. CASEY: It should be done under the standardization programme.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will bring the honourable member's remarks to the attention of my colleague.

GUMERACHA FACTORY

Mr. GILES: A milk factory in Gumeracha is used occasionally to receive a small quantity of milk, but no actual work is now done at this factory. Will the Minister of Industrial Development consider the possibility of establishing some industry in this section of my district?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I had received no request prior to this question on establishing an industry at Gumeracha but, if the honourable member will give me particulars of the location and size of the factory and any ideas he may have in relation to a suitable industry for the district, my department would be happy to examine the proposition for him and report on it.

ABORIGINES

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Earlier this session I asked the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs whether he intended to support the five-year plan, with regard to Aboriginal assistance from the Commonwealth Government, which I approved before leaving office, and the Minister said that he intended to do so. I understand that, a meeting of Ministers of Aboriginal Affairs having been held, the Commonwealth Minister has put forward a plan for Commonwealth assistance for this year. The sum for the first year in the five-year plan which was based on a minimum requirement for development in South Australia would have cost \$1,550,000 for this State. Will the Minister tell the House what the Commonwealth is going to provide for South Australia this year by way of financial assistance for Aboriginal affairs and to what ends he or the Government intends to devote that money out of the various items of pre-school education, secondary school hostels, transitional housing and conventional housing, children's institutions and institutions for working youths, transient houses, and old-age people's houses? Further, is the Minister satisfied that the sum to be provided by the Commonwealth is satisfactory and sufficient for the purposes?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member must have been out of the House when I made a Ministerial statement about this matter three or four weeks ago and

announced (and this was, I think, quite widely publicized in the newspaper afterwards) that our share of the moneys available from the Commonwealth was \$350,000. This is considerably less than the sum for which the honourable member, as the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, had asked and which I supported subsequently. The Commonwealth is providing in all for Aboriginal work in Australia \$10,000,000. Of this, it intends to provide \$5,000,000 for the use directly of the States and its own Territories and, from memory, the sum divisible among the States is about \$3,500,000. The rest goes to the Territory, and our share is \$350,000. My figures in relation to the total sum to the States may not be quite accurate, but \$350,000 is the sum we are receiving. The allocation, split up out of the sum going to the States, has been made on the basis of Aboriginal population. As the honourable member knows, our Aboriginal population here is about 8,000. The figure for South Australia is more exact than for a number of other States, because of our work on the census.

We are not receiving as much as I should like; we are providing from our own resources rather more than the honourable member had at his disposal last year when he was the Minister; I think it is \$1,700,000, and this means that we will have at our disposal a little over \$2,000,000 in all for Aboriginal affairs. I could spend twice as much if I could get the money. The Commonwealth Government has asked us to spend the \$350,000 on housing, education and health, and we are discussing with the Commonwealth Government the precise split-up. Mr. Wentworth (Commonwealth Minister-in-Charge of Aboriginal Affairs) told me when he came here that he would not lay down hard and fast conditions and that so long as we spent the money reasonably and in the best interests of Aborigines the Commonwealth would allow us to go ahead. However, he indicated that these were the three areas in which he would like the money spent, and this is in accord with my own thinking on the matter. We will be spending the bulk of the money, I expect, on housing. Concerning health, we are fairly well up compared with the other States, and I think we shall be spending less on health than on housing or education. In the field of education I am particularly keen to get something started at Armata in the pre-school field, but whether we shall be able to do this is uncertain because of the difficulties of spending money in the present financial year, as the Commonwealth

Government has asked us to do. However, I have asked my officers to plan for a pre-school centre for Armata out of these moneys. The figure is about \$350,000. I wish it was more, but I am glad that we got something.

GOOLWA BARRAGE

Mr. McANANEY: My question concerns the present river levels at the Goolwa barrage. At present, they are about 1ft. below normal pool level, but measurements at Blanchetown show that a considerable volume of water is coming down the river. Can the Minister of Works give me an estimate of the volume of water that has flowed out to sea this year?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I do not have that information at hand, but I will obtain it as quickly as possible.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I address my question to the Premier, because it may involve Government policy. Section 44 of the Constitution Act provides:

No judge of any court of the State, and no clergyman or officiating minister shall be capable of being elected a member of the Parliament.

Does the Premier know the reasons for the prohibition on ministers of religion from becoming members of Parliament, and does he consider there is a necessity to retain this provision in the Act?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I do not know why clergymen are prohibited from becoming members of Parliament. At times of heated argument they might be a good influence here. No doubt there is a reason for this prohibition, and I shall be happy to obtain a report on this matter, but whether it will constitute Government policy is another matter.

COACH BOOKINGS

Mr. EVANS: Has the Premier a reply to my question of September 19 regarding coach bookings for Government departments?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Director of the Tourist Bureau reports that Chief Secretary's Office circular 941 directs that all travel bookings for Government officers travelling on official business are to be made through the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau. The purpose is to save the Government money, since the bureau receives commission from transport operators on such bookings. The engagement of passenger coaches by Government departments, where the cost is met from Government funds, comes within this direction.

The Education Department frequently hires passenger coaches for educational day excursions or extended tours by students. Where all fares are paid by the students, the instruction for bookings to be made through the bureau is not enforced. However, if the Government is to make any contribution towards the cost, paragraph 3 of Education Department circular 16 applies, directing the head of the school concerned to communicate with the Director of the Tourist Bureau before making arrangements for transport. That paragraph reads as follows:

If the Government makes any contribution towards the cost of the trip, whether within South Australia or interstate, the head of the school is instructed to communicate with the Director of the Tourist Bureau before making arrangements for transport. The Director of the Tourist Bureau will then advise the head of the school whether it is necessary for the arrangements to be handled by the bureau or locally by the school. (This instruction does not apply to school trips, such as local educational excursions and sporting trips, for which the parents pay in full.)

Mr. EVANS: Can the Premier say when the circular on tourist buses was issued and what percentage of the charge for hire of buses is collected by the Tourist Bureau?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will get that information.

MEAT INSPECTION

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about service and inspection fees charged at country abattoirs?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: My colleague states that the General Manager of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board reports that the service fees received from country slaughterhouses bringing meat into the area pursuant to section 78b of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act, 1936-1964, amounted to \$16,692.51 up to and including September 10, 1968. The cost of inspection of shops served from the country works forms part of the total cost of supervision of some 900 shops in the metropolitan abattoirs area and cannot be dissected at this stage of the board's accounts.

WALLAROO HARBOUR

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my recent question in which I requested further information about the work to be done at the Wallaroo harbour?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I am pleased to inform the honourable member that, on last Monday at a meeting of the State Cabinet, approval was given for the expenditure of \$482,550 for the renewal of decking, girders, etc., of the main shipping pier at Wallaroo. This expenditure will be spread over the next four financial years. During 1968-69 it is expected that \$100,000 will be spent. Expenditure over the past seven years on the rehabilitation of the main shipping pier (pile replacement and so on) has been \$1,263,587.

WINKIE BASIN

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked recently about the Winkie evaporation basin?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Release of saline water from the Berri evaporation basin (Winkie) is normally made when the river flow is in excess of 10,000 cusecs. The released water from B bank outlet enters a complex creek system, but essentially follows Eckert Creek, enters the lagoon area known as "The Splash" and continues to the river via Cragg Creek (Katarapko Creek). Eckert Creek is normally fed from the Murray River upstream of lock 4 and discharges through Cragg Creek below lock 4. There are some five divertees who irrigate from the creek in the vicinity of the evaporation basin, and one who diverts from the lower end of the system. Release has always been made when no diversions are being carried out and is stopped some days prior to subsequent irrigations being started. Water was released from the basin on Monday, September 9, and ceased on the morning of Friday, September 13, when it was known that diversions should take place on September 16, 1968. River flow in this vicinity at the time approximated 12,000 cusecs. The salt level of Cragg Creek on September 9, with the river at 135 parts per million, was 910 p.p.m. and on September 17, four days after closing, was 2,780 p.p.m., despite a strong fresh flow across the river flats and down both Eckert and Cragg Creeks. Natural water quality from backwaters and creeks can never be guaranteed for all river conditions and the Eckert Creek system is no exception, particularly when salt-impregnated low flat areas are reached by inundation from a high river. The interest of irrigators in the vicinity of the Berri evaporation basin has been safeguarded as fully as is practicable at all times of release, and advice has always been given to divertees prior to the opening and closing of the basin.

MAIN ROAD No. 30

Mr. McKEE: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about highways grants for road construction at Port Pirie?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am very happy to have a reply for the honourable member, although I do not know how he will take it. Unfortunately, no provision was made in the current financial year for work on the junction of Main Road No. 30 and Main Road No. 387 with Main Road No. 23 at Port Pirie. At the time the 1968-69 schedule of proposed works was finally reviewed, it was still expected that the job would be completed in 1967-68. However, delays occurred and some problems arose and the work is not yet completed. Arrangements are being made to seek approval for the transfer of funds from projects of lower priority to enable reconstruction to be completed. Subject to approval of the transfer, it will be possible for work to proceed in the fairly near future.

RAILWAY CROSSINGS

Mr. EDWARDS: While I was on Eyre Peninsula this weekend, I was shown what I believe to be the best method of combating the problem confronting motorists at railway crossings. As amber coloured lights at crossings can be seen from a long way off, motorists know when they are approaching crossings. Also, these lights clearly illuminate trains, which can thus be seen by motorists on their approach. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to examine the possibility of having these amber coloured lights erected at railway crossings throughout the State?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: As this sounds like a worthwhile suggestion, I shall be happy to refer it to my colleague.

RAILWAY LAND

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about land held by the South Australian Railways at Henley Beach?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report recommends that the railway line to Grange should be closed between Woodville and Grange. However, no decision will be made on the report until it has had six months' public consideration. Disposal or

otherwise of railway land at Grange is dependent on final decisions made on the report.

Mr. BROOMHILL: On page 1154 of *Hansard* is reported a question I asked the Minister about land between Grange and Henley Beach that had, at one stage, been reserved for the continuation of the Grange railway line. As the reply he has given me concerns the railway line itself and not the land to which I referred, will the Minister reconsider this question and provide me with another reply?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not know about another reply but I will discuss the matter again with Mr. Hill.

LAMB INDUSTRY

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

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: My colleague has informed me that, because of the good season, a big percentage of lambs are over-finished and of heavier weight than usual at this time of the year. Heavier lambs are always discounted and this problem will tend to increase during the spring months. The export market is very uncertain and will not be favourable towards heavyweight lambs. Competition from other meats has been sustained. Pig meats have maintained their increased level of consumption, beef is now coming forward in good quality, and poultry meats are much cheaper and more readily available. As this information came to me on September 18, it might be slightly out of date in relation to beef. However, I doubt whether variations since then would require much alteration to what I have said. These conditions also prevail in other States, and the usual interest of Victorian buyers in early season lamb did not materialize. Lamb prices are now at a level at which exporters can operate; but, unless they are able to place substantial quantities overseas, it is likely that the local market will be over-supplied for some time. I have been furnished with a somewhat more detailed report on this matter by the livestock adviser of the Agriculture Department, and I shall be pleased to supply a copy to the honourable member if he so desires.

CITRUS

Mr. BURDON: On the evening of Thursday last, September 19, I had the pleasure of attending a public meeting of about 350 citrus

growers in the Waikerie Town Hall. I consider that the meeting served the very useful purpose of enabling growers to air their grievances and make some extremely sound suggestions about how their industry should be conducted. Although the Citrus Organization Committee was criticized, there seemed to be a strong feeling that such an organization was necessary in the interests of the future of the industry. Seven resolutions were passed during the evening, six dealing with the citrus industry generally and one dealing with the Chowilla dam. One resolution associated with the citrus industry provided that every effort should be made to establish in other States organizations such as C.O.C. so that the citrus industry could act as a united body in the interests of the growers. Will the Minister of Lands find out whether, in view of that resolution, the Minister of Agriculture intends to consult with his colleagues in the Eastern States soon so that every effort can be made to ensure the setting up, with complementary Commonwealth Government legislation, of an organization similar to the one in South Australia so that the organization can really work in the interests of the growers?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will discuss this question with my colleague.

EGGS

Mr. FREEBAIRN: This statement appears in the 1967-68 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. As three months has elapsed since June 29, will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the number of producers unable to pay their levy because of economic hardship has increased, and will he also find out the present total amount of unpaid levies?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will discuss this matter with my colleague. I draw the honourable member's attention to what I think was an almost identical question asked yesterday.

Mr. Freebairn: It is a supplementary question.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Anyway, the same extract from the report was read

yesterday by the member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner) and I am getting a report on that.

STUDENT TEACHERS

Mr. HUDSON: It was reported in the *Advertiser* this morning that the student teachers intended to hold a one-day strike, boycotting lectures and teaching practice in schools. However, a report in today's *News* indicates that this is not correct and that the students will not in fact be on strike, but they intend instead not to sign the attendance book, whilst at the same time attending classes on the particular day. Of course, this action will mean they will not be paid for that day. The *News* report is as follows:

The teachers' spokesman (Mr. Mitchell) said student teachers would lose an average of about \$2 each, with a total of about \$7,000. "We will request that the money saved by the department be used to increase the number of books in teachers college libraries" he said. "This is not intended to be disruptive in any way to students' third term studies, as this would be acting unreasonably."

If this intended action by the student teachers results in the saving of money by the department, and as there will be much greater pressure on teachers college libraries as a result of the Minister's decision on allowances, will she consider sympathetically and favourably the request of the student teachers that that money be allocated to increasing the number of books available in teachers college libraries?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The student teachers are not employees and, therefore, they will not be docked one day's pay.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I draw the Minister's attention to what she said as reported on page 1243 of *Hansard* in the recent debate on this matter, as follows:

What other employee in any State, except Western Australia where the Government pays the same as we do, would receive this allowance? . . . They are potential employees of the Education Department. . . . Employees are not paid to travel from their home to their place of employment, yet this is what student teachers are being paid today in excess of 20c a day.

Will the Minister persist in trying to have it both ways, or will she make plain whether, in her present opinion, they are employees or not?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: When speaking in that debate I was dealing with travelling allowances and, in making comparisons, applied the term "employees" in a general sense. The member for Whyalla knows as well as I that

student teachers are not employees: they are potential employees of the department.

Mr. HUDSON: It has always seemed to me that it is an archaic practice to require students at teachers colleges to sign on; it is not a particularly dignified procedure and, of course, other students on tertiary awards at a university or elsewhere do not have to do this. Someone in receipt of a living allowance under a Commonwealth scholarship, for example, is not required to sign on. In view of the Minister's desire to treat all teacher trainees equally with Commonwealth scholarship holders and the holders of other tertiary scholarships; in view also of the Minister's desire to uphold the dignity of students; and in view of the fact that on this occasion if student teachers do not sign on they will not be docked, will the Minister consider removing altogether the necessity for teacher trainees at teachers colleges to sign on every day?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: First, if it is such an archaic provision, why did not the honourable member's Government alter the provision when it was in office? Secondly, this is a condition that is not strictly adhered to.

GUAGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. VENNING: Yesterday, after I had read a press report that the Premier would receive for signature an agreement with the Commonwealth Government on rail standardization, the Premier told me that he expected to get the agreement today. Can he say whether he has received the agreement, and whether it was previously perused by the appropriate authority?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: This morning I signed three copies of the agreement that will enable the building of the standard gauge railway between Cockburn and Broken Hill. Of course, the agreement was extremely important because it formalized the situation in which the last link in a standard gauge connection between Fremantle and Brisbane will become a fact. I understand that informal work, such as pegging, surveying, and so on, has already commenced, and it is possible that this rail link will be completed by October, 1969. I am pleased to say that the agreement is in full accord with the wishes of the Government.

WHYALLA RAILWAY

Mr. RICHES: For many years I have considered the construction of a railway between Port Augusta and Whyalla to be important.

Members who have been here for a long time will remember that a former Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) considered the matter so important that he offered to build the line as a State line, provided the Commonwealth Government would allow operation over the section between Port Augusta and Port Pirie. Reports now current seem to indicate that the Commonwealth Government is willing to build the line but that the State will not give it a priority. It seems that business offering is sufficient to warrant the construction of the line forthwith and that known traffic would enable the Commonwealth Government to make the line pay. Will the Premier confer with his colleague with a view to telling the Commonwealth Government that there is no objection to the construction of that line and no reason why it should not proceed forthwith?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I agree (and I am sure that the Government agrees) that the construction of a line from Whyalla to the standard gauge line would be most desirable from the point of view of the products of Whyalla as well as of those of the State, especially as we are now approaching finality in the construction of a link between Fremantle and Brisbane. As I understand, the present approaches to the Commonwealth are on the basis that both Governments would like this construction to proceed in conjunction with the construction of the series of standardization procedures to link Adelaide with Port Pirie. However, I understand that, if a choice must be made and priorities allocated, we would at this stage say that the Adelaide to Port Pirie line was the more urgent of the two propositions. Within that province, I reiterate that we should like to see both projects proceed together but, if there is a technical reason for holding up one and not the other, we should like to see one go ahead. However, we should like approval for both. At present we are considering these projects in this way and are pressing ahead—

Mr. RICHES: There's no reason to hold up the Whyalla line for the other one.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Except that we first have to obtain Commonwealth approval. We have to have financial resources to build the line; therefore, if the State is to build it, we need finance and, if the Commonwealth Government is to build it, we have to have its approval for it to be built. We will approach this problem in the best way and continue to press the Commonwealth Government to build the line.

NARRUNG WATER SUPPLY

Mr. NANKIVELL: The Minister of Marine, as Minister of Works, would know that I have asked many questions concerning the water supply scheme for the township of Narrung. I am informed by the Clerk of the Meningie council that this work cannot proceed until permission is given by the Marine and Harbors Department for the old jetty at Narrung to be used as a point for the suction pipe for this scheme. Will the Minister continue his efforts to expedite the completion of this scheme by discussing this question with officers of the Marine and Harbors Department?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: Recently, as Minister of Works I agreed that a water supply scheme should be provided to supply this town. I was not aware of the problem raised by the honourable member but, as Minister of Marine, I will see whether both Ministers can co-operate to expedite this scheme.

BURRA COPPER

Mr. ALLEN: On Monday of this week I visited the Burra copper mines with the Minister of Mines, the Director of Mines, and a representative of Mines Exploration Limited. As it is known that a reasonably large body of low-grade ore still exists in this area, but that technical difficulties are being experienced in recovering this copper, will the Premier ask the Minister of Mines for a report on developments up to the present?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Government regards the search for further economic copper deposits in South Australia as most important, and I assure the honourable member that the Minister of Mines is taking a personal interest in this search. I shall be happy to obtain a report on the current possibilities of the Burra area.

GAS

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I understand that natural gas is an extremely important requisite for manufacturing plastics, and that by September or October next year South Australia is expected to have natural gas reticulated from the almost unlimited supplies that have been discovered at Gidgealpa and nearby localities. In these circumstances can the Premier say whether action has been taken to secure for this State a plastics manufacturing industry?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: This is one of the range of industries that the Government is continually considering in relation to industrial expansion. I have told several industrialists that the Daralingie field adjacent to Moomba-

Gidgealpa contains gas with about 12 per cent ethane content, which is a basic element of plastic production. I use this example to assure the honourable member that the Government is continually considering such propositions, and will take every opportunity to stress the advantages to industry of natural gas and its derivatives. However, following this question I shall have the matter considered.

SUPERPHOSPHATE DEPOT

Mr. RODDA: As there is enormous interest in the building of the proposed bulk superphosphate depot at Penola can the Premier say whether, in addition to the bulk supply of superphosphate (which is the main reason for constructing the depot), adequate facilities are to be provided for bagging?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will inquire and obtain that information for the honourable member.

CLARE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. ALLEN: On August 14 last, I asked a question of the Minister of Education concerning the new Clare High School, and asked whether, because of the increased attendance at the existing high school, it was intended to enlarge the plans for the new school. On August 22, the Minister replied:

A recommendation has been made to the Public Buildings Department that the existing preliminary sketch and estimate for Clare High School should be revised to provide an efficient school for the enlarged enrolment. It is expected that the extent of the alterations will make it necessary for the project to be referred again to the Public Works Committee.

Will the Minister of Works say what progress has been made by the Public Buildings Department in this regard?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: Provision has been made on the 1968-69 Estimates for work to commence on the Clare High School undertaking. The planned target dates are as follows: tender date, March, 1969; occupation, mid-1970.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. RYAN: As it is now some time since Mr. Ramsay was appointed Director of Industrial Development, will the Premier say whether this position will be part-time or otherwise, and will he say what salary has been arranged for Mr. Ramsay in this capacity?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: No arrangement has yet been made about the salary, but it

will be made soon. I will tell the honourable member when it has been made and refer to its extent.

RETAIL DISCOUNTS

Mr. McANANEY: An article in this morning's *Advertiser*, headed "Retailers Left on the Outer", states:

Retailers have been complaining strongly to the Trade Practices Commissioner about prices and supply agreements which leave them on the outer. The Commissioner (Mr. Bannermann) says in his first report to Parliament today he has received 150 complaints of inability to obtain supplies or to obtain them except on disadvantageous terms. They are largely from retailers, but there have been some from wholesalers and industrial users. Mr. Bannermann said many complaints are clearly outside the scope of the Trade Practices Act. A supplier broadly is left free to decide his terms of supply and the person to whom he will supply, provided he does not act under collective pressure or under pressure from a dominant company.

The complaints have generally been laid against wholesalers, manufacturers or trade associations. Mr. Bannermann says that in a few cases his office has been able to obtain, by discussion with the parties, immediate improvement in supplies for some individuals. The complaints have mostly come from small businesses with apparently little knowledge of the legislation.

Bearing in mind that the Prices Act contains a provision dealing with discrimination in discounts, etc., as between suppliers and retailers, can the Treasurer, as Minister in charge of prices, say whether there have been many complaints in South Australia about such discrimination or whether, conversely, our Act has worked effectively?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Frankly, I cannot answer the honourable member in any detail off the cuff, but I will have the matter referred to the Prices Commissioner for a report, which I will make available to the honourable member. As I did not see the article from which he has quoted and which appeared in this morning's paper, I do not know the background of the statement, although I get the general drift of it.

MODBURY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: In reply to a question that I had asked, the Minister of Works yesterday referred to areas that were to be sewered in the next financial year in the districts of Modbury, Tea Trea Gully and Highbury. Part of the list read out by the Minister is as follows:

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 . . .

However, the statement made yesterday did not explain that existing subdivisions were to be sewered. On November 4, 1966, I received from the then Minister of Works a letter to which was attached a plan of an area to be sewered. The letter stated:

The area coloured blue, to the east of the pink area, indicates the area which can be drained by an extension of the approved 15in. diameter sewer mains in the Hope Valley and Highbury scheme.

If the Minister examines the map to which I have referred, he will find that the area concerned includes such streets as Amber Road and adjoining streets such as Sapphire and Zircon Avenues. Can the Minister say whether the area to which I have specifically referred is included in the sewerage scheme that he outlined yesterday?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Having given the honourable member a full and detailed explanation yesterday, I regret that some areas were apparently missed. However, as the honourable member has now asked such a jewel of a question, I will try to obtain this additional information for her.

WHEAT

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yesterday, the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, replied to a question about wheat receipts this year at silos controlled by South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, and said:

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.

In the District of Light there have been complaints for several years that the silos in the district have been unable to cater for much more than an average harvest in the area and, bearing in mind the big construction programme the co-operative has undertaken in other parts of South Australia, will the

Minister ask the Minister of Agriculture what plans the co-operative has for silo construction in the District of Light for the coming year?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will convey the question to my colleague.

WATER RIGHTS

Mr. GILES: A constituent of mine intends to sell a smallish dairy in the Adelaide Hills and move to the irrigated Murray River swamps. The property he intends to buy is not large. It carries a water licence that would enable him to irrigate a certain area. He has been told that there is a property adjacent to this one which can be bought and which also carries a water licence covering an area. If my constituent buys the adjoining property will the Minister of Works say whether my constituent will be allowed to take the water licence that belongs to the property, or will he have to re-apply for it? Also, if he buys only part of that property will he be allowed, in conjunction with the seller of the second property, to take part of the second property's water licence?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I appreciate the honourable member's question, which concerns one aspect of the whole question of water licences, which I am reviewing now. As soon as a decision is made, I will inform the honourable member.

KIMBA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. EDWARDS: There have been bounteous rains in the Kimba district this year and prolific growth of pastures, in addition to a record sowing of cereal crops which promise heavy yields throughout the district, but stock numbers are down as a result of last season's drought in the first instance, although mainly because of the lack of a permanent water supply. Apparently, a considerable volume of water is held in dams and tanks in the area which are now near capacity. In some measure this indicates to graziers some security to stock their abundant pastures. Can the Minister of Works say how much water is held in storage in the catchment area at Kimba and surrounding districts?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: If I am able to obtain the information I shall do so.

CONCESSIONAL FREIGHT RATES

Mr. VENNING: During the drought period last year concessional freight rates operated on the movement of grain from Western Australia to South Australia. At present, a large movement of stock is taking place between the two States. Will the Attorney-General,

representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, say whether concessional freight rates now operate on the movement of stock from Western Australia to South Australia?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will find out.

RIVERTON ROAD

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, has informed me that he has a reply to my question of September 17 about the Riverton road. Because the Attorney is an energetic and zealous Minister, he has reminded me a couple of times previously about this reply. Will he now give it to me?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Naturally, I am anxious that the member for Light should have this valuable information as soon as possible. Additional men are being engaged to ensure satisfactory maintenance on roads in the Riverton area. The main Riverton road will be included for more attention. Reconstruction of the Tarlee to Black Springs road is scheduled to commence next financial year.

AGE OF MAJORITY (REDUCTION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 18. Page 1231.)

Mr. EDWARDS (Eyre): Today, most 18-year-olds are still at university or are studying under some other advanced education course and, therefore, are still under the influence of teachers. This could cause a definite opinion opposite to that which students may have of their own at this stage of their career. I meet young people in all walks of life, on both sides of the gulf, both in the city and the country. As far as I can ascertain each year about 20,000 people reach the age of 21. If we bring 18-year-olds under the Bill we will have about another 60,000 voters on the roll, and this I do not agree with. Therefore, if this came into being it would grossly upset the electoral reform Bill.

A considerable number of these young people will have returned to country areas, settled into good jobs, and will have a fair idea of where they will live. I think it is very unjust to expect students who are giving all their time to serious study to have the burden of voting rights thrust on them. At this stage they can be excited and led into a way of thinking that is not their own. It seems that the Opposition is hoping to capitalize on this project. That is the only conclusion I

can come to. I certainly trust that our young people are not going to be used as political footballs. This is the last thing I want to see happen to our good-hearted young people of South Australia. If the age limit is to be altered, let it be uniform throughout the Commonwealth. Otherwise, we will have confusion among our young people at Commonwealth election time. I hope we can protect our young people for a few years to come from the radical changes proposed by the Opposition. We have many good youth movements. I have worked with several, and I am sure young people do not want this responsibility placed on them at 18 years of age. Would the member for Whyalla like to see a few more Andrew Jones's. I certainly have the greatest respect for the youth of today and I will endeavour to help them in any way I can. As they have a greater opportunity to study and learn than people had a few years ago, they should take every opportunity to learn all they can and become worthy citizens of the State. Young people today are the citizens of tomorrow.

The member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) did not contribute much to the debate. I point out to him that there is a vast difference between driving a tractor and driving a motor car, motor cars today having such great horsepower. In any case, this has nothing to do with the voting age, about which he spoke at great length. I oppose the Bill.

Mrs. BYRNE (Barossa): I support the Bill, which provides for reforms in voting, drinking and entering into contracts. It is fitting that the Leader of the Opposition should have introduced the Bill, for the Australian Labor Party is a Party of reform. The age of 21 survives as the age of maturity more because of legal convenience and medieval custom than because of biological necessity. Under the present laws, persons 18 years of age are treated as adults if they commit a criminal offence, as they are dealt with by the criminal court. Also, they can enlist in the armed services, own land, make a will or marry. In fact, by the time many young women reach 19 they are mothers. I have particularly noticed this in the Barossa District, where I see many young husbands (usually around the age of 21) whose wives are invariably younger (about 18 or 19). I have met some young women aged 19 or 20 who have even two or three young children. They are certainly accepting the responsibility of adulthood.

Legally binding hire-purchase and mortgage contracts entered into by people under 21 are made out in the names of such persons' parents or guardians, who act as guarantors. This happens after the company that is to provide the credit has made a search and is assured that the person concerned has sufficient means to make regular credit payments and has suitable employment and earns sufficient income to ensure no difficulty in making repayments. As young people under 21 can usually fulfil these contracts, they make many purchases in this way. In fact, many people go to work at the age of 15 and, overall, they have more money to spend than young people in this age group had to spend 20 years ago. Manufacturers realize this, and many advertisements appear that are designed to appeal to the younger generation, statistics showing that heavy sales are to people in this age group.

I believe the present system leaves much to be desired. A few young people are caused by the system to make light of their responsibility, as they know (especially in respect to hire-purchase agreements) that their parents or whoever guarantees the contract have to fill the breach if default occurs. I have had personal experience of a case in which the husband of the sister of the young man concerned acted as guarantor when the young man purchased a car. Subsequently default occurred, and the husband was responsible for the debt and was eventually summoned to appear in court. I contend that the reason this young man avoided his relatives when they called on him to try to get him to fulfil his obligations was that he well knew that someone else (in this case one of his relatives) had to pay his debt. If young people between the ages of 18 and 21 could legally sign documents without someone having to act as guarantor they would become more responsible, not irresponsible. It cannot be suggested that young people are more likely to get into difficulties in this respect if they are given this greater responsibility: many adults at present get into difficulties with hire-purchase agreements. There are no statistics of age groups in this respect, but defaults will always occur no matter what the age of the person concerned.

At present, when young couples purchase houses, normally the husband has the house in his name because, as his wife is not 21, her name cannot go on the title. When the wife turns 21, invariably the couples go to a land broker and follow the necessary procedure to have the title altered. This means that the young people are forced to go to extra

expense. If the Bill is passed, this will not be necessary.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: They can put a house in joint names.

Mrs. BYRNE: Many people have come to me to witness documents in these circumstances. Perhaps they have been given incorrect advice.

Mr. Ferguson: They can have a property in joint names.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: The legislation was altered by the Legislative Council, wasn't it?

Mrs. BYRNE: Not to my knowledge. Countries such as Israel, Uruguay and Brazil have a voting age of 18 and no trouble has been caused by young voters in those countries. It is mooted that, if this Bill is defeated, the Commonwealth and State Governments expect next year to adopt a reduction in the voting age to 18 years. If this happens, I wonder what will be the attitude of some members opposite. In this connection I refer to the member for Eyre (Mr. Edwards) who said he was opposed to people in this age group voting. However, I consider that he will be forced to capitulate. The member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) agreed in principle with these reforms, but said that he would not support the legislation until there was uniformity with other States.

Mr. Clark: If everybody adopted that idea, it would never be introduced by anybody.

Mrs. BYRNE: That is so. One State has to move first. I doubt that similar Bills have ever been passed on any matter by all Parliaments on the same day.

Mr. McAnaney: What about the companies legislation? They have their committees.

Mrs. BYRNE: Yes, but eventually one State must pass the legislation before the other States do, regardless of what agreements are made. I cannot understand why South Australia should not be first in this field. I contend that the young people of today are better equipped to discharge the highest duty of citizenship than were young people in the past. The main reason is that more young people attend secondary schools and universities today than was the case previously. I am sure that persons between the ages of 18 years and 21 years can accept responsibility: some are already doing so, as I have said. Some persons mature at an earlier age than others do. Some are mature at 16 years.

Mr. Broomhill: Some never mature.

Mrs. BYRNE: That is so. Some are, at 21 years, 25 years, or perhaps older, children emotionally. However, that is no

reason for retaining the present provision of 21 years as the adult age. Maturity depends on the individual. For the reasons I have given, I am confident that young people today can accept this responsibility. The acceptance of it will make them more responsible, not irresponsible. Therefore, I support the Bill.

Mr. GILES (Gumeracha): I consider this Bill to be one of the most important introduced in this Parliament for many years, and we must consider clearly all aspects carefully. I do not think any member disagrees that the 18-year-olds of today have more knowledge and are more advanced in world matters than were the 18-year-olds of 20 years ago. I do not know whether marriage statistics prove this point: getting married may or may not prove that one is more mature. However, in the *South Australian Year Book* for 1967, at page 229, appear the following figures:

MARRIAGE OF MINORS, SOUTH AUSTRALIA
Age in years

Year	14	15	16	17	18
	or less				
<i>Bridegrooms:</i>					
1903	—	—	—	—	8
1966	—	—	1	19	221
<i>Brides:</i>					
1903	—	5	12	45	93
1966	3	5	188	425	834

If those marriage figures are referable to maturity, I think we can accept that 18-year-olds are more mature now than were the 18-year-olds of 20, 30 or 50 years ago. Our mediums of communication are far better today. By television and wireless the young are able to learn about the worries of the world and see the advanced programmes not taught in schools. If we do not agree that the children are more mature today, we are reflecting on ourselves and our homes.

Responsibility and privilege should be earned, not given without some consideration. However, some young people today demand responsibilities and privileges without earning them, simply because they live in a community in which they want this, that, or something else. I did not get a privilege unless I proved to my father that I was worthy of having it. I was not allowed to drive a motor car until I proved to my father that I could handle it well.

Mr. Ryan: Is it a privilege to be sent to Vietnam under 21 years of age?

Mr. GILES: I do not think the majority of people between 18 years and 21 years wish to vote. We hear little from the majority, although we hear much from the few radicals

who make a noise, get headlines in the press, and appear on television.

Mr. Clark: Many people over 21 do not want to vote.

Mr. GILES: That could be so.

Mr. Venning: Many of them wouldn't know what electoral district they were in.

Mr. Clark: That is because many of them never see their member.

Mr. GILES: Recently I spoke to an 18-year-old school teacher. She said that she would like to spend the rest of her life being 18 years old, and that when she reached the age of 21 years she thought that she had grown up although she did not want to be grown up. She thought that the age of 21 was soon enough for her to vote because, as she hoped to live until she was 70 years old, she would have 50 years of voting and thought that this was long enough. I do not know whether the member for Whyalla supports the Bill or not, but in the debate he said:

I am always concerned at the conformist attitude (a reactionary attitude, in fact) of some adults, who seem to imagine that everyone who wears clothes that may be a little "way out", or everyone who has a beard or perhaps long hair, is some form of delinquent. Later, he said:

We find that when the people concerned get a little older they realize that there is not much point in being the object of attention all the time, and when they have reached the age of, say, 24 they usually behave much the same as most others behave and dress much the same as most others dress. Indeed, at that stage, they are hardly distinguishable from anyone else in the community.

Perhaps the honourable member was advocating that the voting age should be raised to 24 years instead of being reduced to 18 years. The highest accident rate occurs in respect of people between the ages of 18 and 23 years. I believe that this is the period in which there is a growing up and that it is during this period that young people obtain experience. By the time they are 23, 24 or 25 years of age they have obtained a little of life's experience: they are more sensible, have a saner outlook, and are more stable. The Royal Commission on the Licensing Act recommended that the permissible drinking age should not be reduced below 21 years, and I solemnly agree with that decision. When young people take to drink it often leads to their taking drugs and it is an extremely serious state of affairs when our young people take drugs. As illustrated by conditions in other countries and even in

other States of Australia, we find that many young people take drugs.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: What do you mean by the phrase "take to drink"?

Mr. GILES: The member for Whyalla seems to be able to find many replies to questions and I am sure he would be able to reply to that question from his wide experience.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: You used the phrase and I wanted to know your definition.

Mr. GILES: I was pleased with the Premier's reply when, in reply to a question I asked him about drugs being made up to look like confectionery, he said:

The penalty is \$2,000 or imprisonment for two years or both for anyone found carrying or taking drugs.

This is a serious offence, and I was pleased to hear that reply. Members on this side have received a communication that graphically illustrates the seriousness of young people's drinking and provides a most disturbing set of figures. In one Melbourne secondary school 65 per cent of the students have classified themselves as drinkers; 10 per cent showed no responsibility for drinking; and 2 per cent have an alcohol problem. This is a terrible state of affairs. The same document stated that this year 14-year-old children were committed for offences that were committed while they were affected by alcohol.

Mr. McAnaney: Do you think their parents should be locked up, too?

Mr. GILES: I believe that parents are a problem. The document further states that 40 per cent of accidents in Australia have liquor as a contributing factor. If the age of consent is reduced to 18 years (and we have problems with young people now), how much easier will it be for 16-year-old and 14-year-old children to obtain liquor, thereby causing a State problem? This situation has to be watched extremely closely. The President of the United States of America said that America would never be beaten by an outside foe but that it could be beaten from within. The U.S.A. has 54 per cent of the world's wealth but only 6 per cent of the world's population. We should not allow South Australia and Australia to be beset by the problems that exist in America today.

Last Saturday evening an evangelist and his wife described these problems to a group of men and women at a conference held in Adelaide. He is a minister on the campuses of universities in America, and I consider that, as a competent authority, he knows what he

is talking about. One only has to read the newspapers to realize what problems exist throughout America and, indeed, throughout the world in relation to young people. I do not think that most young people cause trouble, but a few of them seem to hit the headlines because they make news. In the *Advertiser* of September 21, under the heading "Protests Flare in Sabah", is the following report:

More than 10,000 people watched today while a group of youths burnt an effigy of President Marcos of the Philippines hanging from a makeshift gallows. Some of the youths, members of the ruling United Sabah National Organization, punched the effigy and spat on it before setting it ablaze and parading it through the streets of the Sabah capital.

In the *Sunday Mail* of September 21, under the heading "Olympics City Torn by Student Rioters", appears the following report:

Riot policemen battled with 3,000 Mexican students today in a new outburst of the violence harassing this city as it prepares for the Olympic Games opening on October 11. Some students hurled rocks and firebombs amid some gunfire as the 1,000 police used tear gas to control the crowd. A police truck was set on fire, and several people were reported injured.

The *Advertiser* of September 21 contains a report and gives figures of the large increase of the number of violent crimes in the United States. In the *Advertiser* of September 23 there appears the heading "Riot Troops Bar Olympic Competitors", and the article under that heading relates to the rioting of young people. The following heading appears in the *Advertiser* of September 21: "'No Repression' at U.S. University", and the article states in part:

There would be "no repression whatever" at Columbia University, the university's acting President (Mr. A. Cordier) told a student rally yesterday. He was addressing a rally of 300 students called by the moderate Students for a Restructured University to protest against the denial of facilities to the more radical Students for a Democratic Society.

Such articles as the ones I have just quoted reveal that there is a number of irresponsible young people in the community who represent a real problem. One of the main reasons for the irresponsible behaviour of such people is their lack of parental control. I believe that in our modern world, particularly in the higher societies, parents often cannot find time (or do not find time) to look after their children properly.

Mr. Corcoran: What is your definition of higher societies?

Mr. GILES: In America, for example, pressures are such that both parents often have to work, perhaps so that they can keep two Cadillacs in the garage and own a speedboat, etc.

Mr. Corcoran: Do you reckon that is higher society?

Mr. GILES: I regard that as higher society, because it relates to a higher standard of living. The parents who are trying to earn more money do not have sufficient time to spend with their children. I believe that basically there are no delinquent children: the parents are mainly the delinquents. As a result of parents' lack of control, many children receive too much freedom, and this leads to trouble. Concerning these children, nothing seems to satisfy their tastes for entertainment, etc., and this leads to drinking, drug-taking and engaging in orgies. Reverting to something told me last Saturday by the evangelist's wife, I point out that one of the most disturbing things we hear today is that religious instruction has been stopped in all universities and schools in the United States. Although students are not permitted to study the Bible, they are allowed to study the Koran, Fascism, Marxism, Buddhism, and Hinduism.

Mr. Venning: What about scientology?

Mr. GILES: Although I have not examined that position, I believe that the study of scientology is allowed and that, whereas the study of the Bible is illegal in America, the study of scientology, etc., is legal. It is an extremely bad situation when religious instruction is removed from teaching in schools, and I hope we never reach that situation in South Australia. However, lowering the age of majority to 18 is a step in that direction. The main factor behind stopping religious instruction and the study of the Bible in American teaching institutions is Communism: Communists believe that they can take over a sufficiently confused society. Australia is a marvellous country, and South Australia is a marvellous State; ours is regarded as the church State, and I do not think this description is derogatory in any way. Indeed, I think we should be proud of the title. Further, I think we can claim to have the best behaved community in the world, and I think we should try to retain this situation with every fibre of our being. We should not be responsible for making any laws that will reduce our standing in the eyes of those living elsewhere. Do not let us be the instigators of legislation that will reduce our standing and lead us to a point of no return.

Statesman is the name of an apple; as well as the term applied to certain politicians.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Now we may be getting to the core of things!

Mr. GILES: When statesman apples are in cold storage they have a nasty habit of "nesting": when one apple starts to rot it immediately affects the surrounding apples. I believe that our Australian universities have a small percentage of bad people and, as I say, although the number of such irresponsible people may be extremely small, let us not make it easy for such people to influence others. Only recently a few people influenced others to the extent that 2,000 people threw rocks through the windows of the American Embassy in Melbourne. Let us not give these few bad people sufficient freedom to incite others to act similarly.

Mr. Clark: What has the vote of an 18-year-old person got to do with this?

Mr. GILES: The Bill gives 18-year-old people adult franchise and is a step in the wrong direction. It seeks to give young people more freedom and a chance, among other things, to drink freely.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: Of course, you do not say that all 18-year-old people are irresponsible.

Mr. GILES: I am most certainly not basing my argument on the premise that all young people are bad. Had the Premier been listening earlier, he would have heard me say that I believed that it was an extremely small percentage of bad people in our community. I admit that we have this type of person in the older group, but I consider that relaxing our laws to allow these younger people more freedom will enable them to affect a larger group of younger people. Recently, Barry Jones interviewed the secretary of the students' organization at the Monash University. In the course of the interview the students stated that the association's aim was to be free. He was asked, "What do you mean by being free?" He said, "To be free to do what we like; to let our inclinations run riot." I consider that not one member here believes that this is a valid aim.

Mr. Venning: It sounds like Scientology.

Mr. GILES: I do not know whether it is Scientology. This should not be allowed to happen. We have laws not to restrict or tie people down but to make South Australia a good place for a law-abiding person to live in and do as he wishes, provided he does not affect the lives of others. It has been sug-

gested in the press that on some university campuses students should be allowed to have slot machines dispensing drugs and contraceptives. It is a terrible state of affairs when young people suggest this. It is degrading. If we give our young people more freedom, this is what they will be looking for next. This is what they do in the United States of America.

Summing up, I consider that South Australia's youth is second to none and that only a small percentage of young people is undesirable. There are some bad apples. I consider that most people between 18 and 21 years of age do not wish to vote. We should not be responsible for making it easy for the few bad people in the State to influence the good people adversely.

Mr. Clark: Just by giving them the right to vote at 18?

Mr. GILES: The member for Gawler has apparently not read the Bill. There is far more in it than giving them the right to vote at 18: it gives them full adult franchise, with which I disagree. We should be responsible for keeping South Australia at the highest possible standard of morality and making it a place in which we are proud to live and be happy as a community. I agree with certain of the Bill's provisions, but I disagree with giving full adult franchise to 18-year-olds.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): I shall not leave the House in suspense for one minute: I support the Bill. I listened with great interest to the member for Gumeracha who, at length, pointed out the evils of young people and went to no end of trouble to say that the cause of the evils in young people today was their elders. He concluded his argument by saying that the good young people were in a majority. I was also interested in the attempts by the member for Eyre and the member for Gumeracha to quote authorities. The member for Gumeracha referred to a number of authorities and quoted a number of people, but he did not name one of them. I wonder why? I wonder if these authorities are authorities of his imagination. He did not quote the name or qualifications of any of them. He referred to a young lady schoolteacher and commented on her claims and ideals. Fortunately, I know this young lady, because a group of young people from a church with which I am associated visited her often when she was in a mental institution. This is the type of authority quoted by the member for Gumeracha. The member for Eyre gave an example of what young people might be like, but

he went to the extreme. He referred to the worst type of young person one could find, and he said something about Andrew Jones. That is the type of person he used in his argument against what is a sound proposition.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: He put your mate out of Parliament.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: There is a long story attached to that, and when speaking to another Bill I shall have something to say about it, too. I submit that the change of attitude and making the majority 18 are long overdue. The young people of this decade are more ready, qualified and able to satisfy the highest demands of citizenship than any generation in the past has been. The young people of today want a say in the country's affairs. The very comments made by the member for Gumeracha about young people rioting and demonstrating show that they want to have some say in the affairs of the country and take a hand in them. They are frustrated because, although we can point to some of the actions of the young people, some of them are fighting for reform. All the great reformers of the world were looked on as villains at some time or other. Christ, the greatest reformer of all time, was taken out and crucified by the people of His day. The Government says that the time is not right and that we should not pass the Bill before any other State gives 18-year-olds the right to vote, but this has always been the argument of the conservative element.

When you and I, Mr. Speaker, and many members of the House were at school we thought we had done very well if we got through to the Qualifying Certificate standard. It was an accepted standard of education, but today a young person who is to make progress must have the Leaving Certificate. Most young people today have the Leaving Certificate or have reached an advanced standard of education. Ready, willing and anxious, they have been trained and encouraged to take an interest and indulge in discussion to solve problems.

The member for Gumeracha said that he was not allowed to do things until his father permitted him, nor was he allowed to drink until his father gave his permission. That was an amazing statement. People today have a wide experience, and I believe that the young people of today are kicking over the traces because they are frustrated, knowing that they have the ability to make decisions for themselves. They are disgusted with the things people of the older generation have done and

with the way they have left the world, which is in a most unsatisfactory state. It is the older generation who have made the mistakes and thrown us all into two world wars. The people who made these mistakes were not 18-year-olds: they were 40, 50 and 60-year-olds. Young people are frustrated because they are not able to do things. They are more able to discharge the higher duties of citizenship than have been people of any generation in the past. They have been prepared to take their part and they want to do it. Young people today drive motor cars, carry out scientific work in laboratories and so on. We had to wait until our fathers said we could do things.

Mr. Clark: Some are still waiting.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes, and I suppose some should still be waiting. I now wish to refer the House to an article which appeared in the *Sunday Mail* of July 27 and which reported the opinions of experts on the maturity of youth. I shall read the following part of the report which deals with the opinion of Dr. C. Keith Conners, Director of the Child Development Laboratory at Massachusetts General Hospital:

At 18, according to Conners, emotional and intellectual growth have been largely completed. Says Conners: "There is no surge of ability beyond the age of early adolescence as far as the basic ability to handle abstractions is concerned." By the age of 12, he reports, the average child has already begun to learn the rudiments of abstract thinking, the ability to form hypotheses and make deductions. Six years later the techniques of thought have been mastered. "I would be inclined to say", concludes Conners, "that there is little reason to assume the average 18-year-old is not prepared with the basic rudiments for abstract thinking." According to Conners, intellectual growth after this point consists largely of gaining information and experience. Furthermore, by 18 most people have survived the tribulations of adolescence, according to Conners, and have achieved the basic stability of personality that they will carry throughout life.

Learned men have come to that conclusion. If we are honest, we would all say the same type of thing about our own children and grandchildren; in fact, we would be offended if someone suggested that such was not the case. Young people today have advanced to a high degree of education and experience. We did not have the opportunity to be able to accept the responsibilities which adolescents today can accept. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I desire to rise to make a brief contribution to the debate.

Mr. Hudson: You desire to rise?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I have risen to make a brief contribution, and I am pleased the member for Glenelg is listening to me. As I listened to some of my colleagues express their views on the reduction of the age of maturity, I thought it was not I who was the most conservative member of the Liberal and Country League Government represented here but that perhaps some of my other friends were equally as conservative as, if not more conservative than, I am. It occurred to me, as I listened, that the true meaning of "conservative" could be taken from the following little verse by Oliver Goldsmith:

That man's the true Conservative
Who lops the moulder'd branch away.

In other words, the rule of the true conservative is to conserve the whole by cutting out the bad. Perhaps the member for Gumeracha might say that a true conservative cuts out the rotten apples. I am in sympathy with what is contained in the Bill.

Mr. Hudson: But the time isn't right!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I think the time is right, and I am pleased that I can agree with the member for Glenelg.

Mr. Hudson: Are you going to support the Bill?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: No.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I believe that, in all conscience, I could support the measures contained in the Bill if they were contained in separate Bills, because I find that generally I very much agree with most of the ideas expressed here. I refer the House to what the Leader said when he introduced the Bill on August 7. He obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to confer on persons of the age of 18 years the rights, privileges, responsibilities and obligations of persons of full age; to amend the Constitution Act, 1934-65, the Electoral Act, 1929-65, the Licensing Act, 1967, the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-67, and for other purposes.

First, I wish to refer to the lowering of the age of drinking. Some time after the legislation came into force in South Australia extending the drinking hours in hotels, I took the opportunity to visit one of the hotels in the northern suburbs to see how the extension of hours was being accepted. From memory, I think I did this on a Friday evening. The hotel I went to was an excellent type of hotel. I walked into the lounge area at about 7.30 p.m. and saw about 40 or 50 people there. I doubt whether more than four or five of them would have been aged 21 years or over.

Mr. McKee: They are enjoying the privilege now.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, although they are not legally entitled to have the privilege. These people were conducting themselves in a seemly and proper fashion. I have no doubt that the age for drinking in hotels could be reduced to at least 18 years: I do not think it would do much harm if the age were brought down to 16, because most of us are familiar with alcoholic beverages from childhood: we accept them as the normal pattern of life. I do not believe normal patterns of social behaviour can be altered by legislation of this type.

Mr. Casey: That is a very small percentage to which you now refer.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Of whom?

Mr. Casey: People being brought up—

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not a conversation.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The point I was making was that the people in this lounge room were overwhelmingly young people and that by their conduct there it was clearly evident that they were able to consume liquor in a proper and seemly fashion. I now wish to deal with one reference made by the Attorney-General in the debate. He commented on the fact that there had been ample opportunity during the life of the previous Government to make certain amendments to certain legislation. He referred, in particular, to the amendments to the Law of Property Act introduced by the previous Government, by which the age of 21 years was reduced to 18 years for certain purposes. He said that both Parties supported this move happily, and continued:

This matter was discussed at the Hobart conference in January, 1966, and the general feeling there was, as the Premier has put it, that if there were to be any significant change at all, the change should be Australia-wide. That was generally agreed, but what did our then Attorney-General say about this? He said, "We have a Bill before the House now which reduces the age for making a valid will to 18." He did not say that it was my Bill. One would have thought that it was his, but that does not matter. He was pleased to take some credit for it in another State. He went on to say, "We do propose to reduce the age for making valid transactions under the Real Property Act to 18." In fact, he subsequently introduced an amendment to the Real Property Act. He continued, "We are considering reducing the age of voting under the State Electoral Act to 18." That was in January, 1966, but it took him until July or August, 1968, to do anything about it.

At this point, I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

WATER RESOURCES

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Nankivell:

That, in the opinion of this House, a Royal Commission should be appointed to inquire into and report upon the water resources of South Australia, the effect of drainage thereon and the possibilities of conservation, and to make recommendations for the effective utilization of such water,

which Mr. Corcoran had moved to amend by striking out "a Royal Commission" and inserting "consultants".

(Continued from August 28. Page 904.)

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support the motion, with pleasure. The member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) has had much experience in this matter and has ably dealt with the case regarding drainage in the South-East. The problem of how to get sufficient water to maintain an increased population is perhaps our biggest problem. If we compare this with such matters as the establishment of the Totalizer Agency Board (although those matters may be necessary adjuncts in a modern world) we see that, if South Australia is to progress, we must make long-range plans to conserve water and also study the effect of the salting up of supplies.

Doubtless, the Engineering and Water Supply Department has plans to meet immediate needs, but I consider that a committee comprising people drawn from a wider field should examine the position. Most departmental officers are busy with the normal maintenance and development of immediate projects and have difficulty in examining a matter as a whole. We need a committee that can call expert evidence and try to develop a long-range plan. When I was in Kingston, during the Millicent by-election campaign, many paddocks surrounding that town were covered with water, and the water could not be drained to sea quickly enough.

It would be a small job to divert such surplus water into the Coorong, where at present water at the southern end goes pink in summer; because of the build-up of salt. As a result, fishing has been impaired and fish have been killed there in the past few months. Such a diversion would provide water for irrigation and, in times of drought in the eastern highlands of New South Wales, when not much water is coming down, and when it is wet in the South-East, this water could be taken into the lake systems, for use in Adelaide. This is one matter that should be examined.

Since becoming a member of this House, I have been amazed that these matters are not considered from a business angle, from the point of view of the return from the capital cost. I know that this principle cannot extend to all Parliamentary activities, such as education and the social services that have to be provided. In those cases, bookkeeping is only a matter of recording transfers from one section to another. However, projects such as water supply have to be conducted as a business. The South-Eastern drainage scheme has been of much advantage to the State, but we should make more use of the water, having regard to the large amount of money spent.

Increased production results in more revenue to the State from taxes. All producers create the wealth that provides the revenue for a State to continue. We need financial reform as well as social reform. Financial reforms provide the assets and the funds from which to make available the services that the people need, as part of modern life. Drainage in the South-East and the underground water basin there and in other areas are important matters. We know the difficulty being experienced at Virginia at present. There used to be a bore on the other side of Dry Creek, and millions of gallons of water flowed down the channel every day. At Virginia one could get water by fitting a ball cock on the top and reducing the flow, but the position is different now.

The Langhorne Creek Basin is being examined at present, and I understand that, if every pump in Langhorne Creek was working at the same time, 3,000,000 gallons of water an hour would be taken out. That is a colossal quantity of water. The basin level drops but within a short period of rain falling or a slowing down of pumping it returns to its normal level. Perhaps it is guesswork whence the water comes, but are we depleting the built-up reserves or is the water being replenished by rains that have fallen during the previous winter. At the Waite Institute last year experiments were carried out on a machine by which the age of water could be assessed quickly by determining the nature of certain chemicals in the water. There should be research into these matters in order to find out what volume of underground water is available. I was told by the Minister of Mines that it would be difficult to obtain 4,000 or 5,000 gallons from a bore at Langhorne Creek. However, many bores in that area provide more water than that, and local experts have told me that the department put the casing down

further than is normal and cut off the water supply. This is the sort of evidence that could be received if every situation was analysed.

I have seen freshwater and saltwater drains running alongside each other adjacent to the Murray River, a situation that should not be allowed to develop. Whilst the Hume Dam is half full at present, a terrific volume of water is flowing out to sea at Goolwa, and we should be studying the methods of using and conserving this surplus water. It is always difficult to look into the future, and people cannot be blamed for making mistakes, but from what was said in the debate last week it seems that the Morgan-Whyalla main is not being used to the extent that was expected, and the Murray Bridge to Onkaparinga main is now to be constructed with a full-year capacity of 140,000 acre feet, double the capacity of the Mannum-Adelaide main of 70,000 acre feet. The total of 210,000 acre feet is about the half the water available from the Murray River for a dry-year quota. These quotas must be improved. Also, we should know how much water will be available for the lakes area and how it can be used. An important decision must be made, but how can we use the water from the lakes that runs to waste in a good or medium year, whereas during a dry year none may be used? This question must be determined by the type of development to be allowed in the lakes area. Water considered to be salty when used for irrigation at Renmark for overhead spraying of citrus trees would be considered of the highest quality if used for irrigating lucerne and potatoes at Langhorne Creek, with water that is five times as salty for potatoes and 10 times as salty for lucerne. All circumstances have to be considered and appropriate planning done so that proper development can be achieved. I have tried to demonstrate the urgent need for long-term planning to use the water that is available. In the last financial year to supply and deliver South Australia's water cost \$6,000,000, and perhaps the time has come when people should pay for the quantity of water they use so that they will be a little more careful.

Last year, when the public was asked to be careful, it was shown how much water could be saved, and as this precious item must be conserved in this State there should be a plan for the development of future conservation schemes. I commend the member for Albert for moving this motion. One of his constituents wrote to me and informed me that he was a mighty man, with which opinion I

agree. I said that if we had 30 men of the calibre of the member for Albert the State would go ahead and would not get into the doldrums that we have been in during the last three unfortunate years. If the State is to have a progressive future we must determine the best possible use of our water resources, conserve them, and use them to the best advantage of everyone.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I support the amendment moved by the member for Millicent. Everyone would agree that we need a detailed report on the water resources of this State, the effect of drainage thereon, and the possibilities of conservation. We need information to enable proper recommendations to be made for the effective use of our water resources. No member would quarrel with the purpose of this motion, but we must ask what is the best way of achieving that purpose. I suggest that a Royal Commission is a suitable method of inquiry for certain purposes where one has to reach an agreement that balances the interests of various parties in conflict; where one is investigating, say, charges of corruption; and where one is dealing with particular problems that can be investigated in a semi-legal fashion. Then, I believe a Royal Commission is an appropriate form of inquiry. But where one is concerned to get information about a technical matter, and where the detailed recommendations that have to be made are also largely technical, the legal forms of a Royal Commission are not appropriate. A Royal Commission has to proceed largely by calling witnesses, and anyone who wants to give evidence, whether he is qualified or not, may appear before the Commission, take up its time, and have his evidence subjected to cross-examination. This fact in itself means that an investigation through a Royal Commission will inevitably be slow and tedious and an inefficient way of producing necessary recommendations based on the best technical information available.

That is why the Opposition has moved to amend this motion: we require not the appointment of a Royal Commission to investigate this whole matter but the employment of consultants. I would interpret fairly broadly the amendment that has been moved: there are matters in relation to our water resources in which the technical knowledge already available to the Engineering and Water Supply Department is sufficient not to require further investigations to take place. There are other areas, particularly in relation to problems of salinity along the Murray River; in relation to the use

of underground water; and in relation to the pet subject of the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell), namely, the excessive use of drainage in the South-East, where the knowledge of the E. & W.S. Department is limited. I suggest to the member for Albert (the mover of the original motion) that, if a Royal Commission were established and its members went to the South-East to consider the use of underground waters in that area and to consider whether further drainage should proceed and whether any existing drains should be diverted, it would obtain a tremendous volume of evidence from local people who had a basic interest themselves in what was to be done. This would be a good way of allowing the local people to let off steam but not a good way of assessing the extent of the resources and the technical possibilities of exploiting those resources; it would not be a good way of even assessing the possible long-term harm that is being done to the underground waters of the South-East by the current drainage diversion works which channel excess water away to the sea.

I think a similar problem exists in relation to the salinity problems along the Murray River: these problems are not fully understood by the E. & W.S. Department, because, within its own resources, the department has not been able over the years to undertake sufficient investigations and, of course, the whole problem of salinity is becoming more and more important as the years progress. It is not a matter of which we in South Australia have a vast knowledge based on past experience. I believe that any consultants employed on an investigation have to work closely with the E. & W.S. Department and that the work of those consultants should be integrated with the work of the department, the consultants being under the direction of the Director and Engineer-in-Chief, with the approval of the Minister. I do not believe that an inquiry by consultants on this particular matter will achieve any good purpose if it is directed by people who, to begin with, are not technically competent in the field. What happens when consultants are employed to advise, where the persons receiving the advice are not technically competent, is that the consultants' report has to be accepted willy-nilly. In relation to such complicated matters that are involved in a full investigation of our water resources, any recommendations and any detailed report made need to be assessed critically by people who are competent to make such an assessment, before any recommendations are implemented.

It is because I believe this is a technical matter that I support the amendment moved by the member for Millicent. I hope that the member for Albert and his colleagues opposite will find ways and means of rewording this motion so that we may decide a recommendation to the Government on this matter that is acceptable to all members of the House and acceptable to the Government, and so that the necessary work in carrying out a full and detailed investigation may proceed with all necessary haste. The matters that are the subject of this particular investigation are of great urgency to South Australia. We know that at the present time there are serious doubts whether the Chowilla dam will be proceeded with. We know at the present time (and it is becoming painfully more obvious each day) that certain people in Canberra are prejudiced against the Chowilla dam and are openly showing that prejudice.

This was demonstrated, I think, particularly by the Chairman of the River Murray Commission (the Commonwealth Minister for National Development). I am almost reaching the stage where I believe it may soon be necessary to take on the Minister for National Development and to challenge him in public in relation to the showing of prejudice. I am wondering whether or not we are reaching the stage where we have to create a serious conflict with that particular gentleman. This is, of course, going a little against part of the terms of the motion on the Notice Paper that stands in my name, but it is clear to all of us that if we do not get the Chowilla dam the industrial development of this State will be seriously retarded in the years to come and that the process of retardation will set in almost immediately. Without Chowilla many industrial development projects being considered over the next few years will be rejected because there will not be the assurance of the necessary water supplies for metropolitan Adelaide and Spencer Gulf.

Further irrigation development along the Murray River will also be completely restricted without Chowilla. We all know that even with the Chowilla dam the future development of South Australia beyond the year 2,000 is open to question and that further drastic changes in our method of using or supplying water will have to be made by that time. The supply of water in South Australia is therefore a critical matter; the whole of the State depends on it. Indeed, I believe this matter is of such critical importance that it should be subjected to the most searching inquiry.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE (Minister of Works): I thank the member for Albert for his motion, into which much constructive thought and research have gone. Obviously, it is a subject dear to his heart. I was interested in some of the historical comments he made. In his speech he canvassed the whole State but dealt more particularly with his own bailiwick, the South-East, which he and some other members would have us believe is the prime part of South Australia, and I am not denying that. The motion is, in principle, similar to the motion moved by the member for Flinders last year and seconded by me: namely, that an expert committee be set up to investigate the water resources of South Australia. That is the brief title of that motion. The idea behind that motion was to look into all aspects of water resources in South Australia, both our present and future requirements. I welcome the motion of the member for Albert and the remarks he has made.

I also thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for his support of the motion's principle. The only difference between the Deputy Leader's scheme and the mover's scheme is the method of implementation. The member for Millicent displayed a very keen knowledge of and interest in his subject and also local knowledge, and I thank him for his constructive ideas. I also thank the member for Stirling and the member for Glenelg for the ideas they have put forward. Both Parties are in agreement on the subject, which is dear to my heart. I appreciate the remarks that have been made. There is a little irony here: while this year we are all in agreement, last year, when substantially the same motion was put forward by the member for Flinders and me to achieve much the same thing, the then Minister of Works opposed the motion and his members voted in a division solidly to defeat the motion. As Minister of Works, I take a different view and attitude. I welcome the points of view that have been put forward: they are basically the same but are different in method. I do not regard any of the sentiments expressed in the debate as a criticism of the officers of my department: but I believe that the arguments have been put forward constructively as a means of improving the resources of the State.

It is a trite statement but none the less true that we must have water in order to live, especially in South Australia. Water is something that only too often we take for granted.

The fact that 90 per cent of the people of South Australia can turn on a tap and get water deludes them into thinking that there is an ample supply of water in this State. This is not the case, as we experienced last year when we had the coincidence of a drought and a low level on the Murray River. Our resources were getting depleted and at the same time, by coincidence, the Murray River was low. This should bring home to the thinking person that in South Australia we are at the whim of the vagaries of the natural elements of this country. Because we assume that we can get water out of a tap, many people take it for granted that they can always get water—and water of good quality. Unfortunately, we cannot get good-quality water at all times. Some parts of the State suffer from salinity and at other times rather turbid water.

My wife complains bitterly about what she calls muddy water. In some parts of the State people are lucky to get even muddy water, but it is always the department's aim to give the best water at all times. People take for granted too often that good quality and quantity water is always available. To use a hackneyed phrase, Australia is the driest continent of the world and South Australia is the driest State in that continent. Where can we get further supplies of water? There are several ways of going about it, and one of the most practical ways is to implement the purpose of the motion. We must either get more storages, pump more water from our existing reserves, or find more reserves we do not know about today and use them, or we must artificially create pure water from brackish or saline water by means of desalination. As the member for Whyalla knows, desalination was tried out at Coober Pedy with the installation about a year ago of the first solar still. This has now been augmented by the installation of a desalination plant. One of these plants was on display at the department's stand at the last Royal Show. It was effectively done. One could see very muddy water going in at one end and crystal-clear water coming out at the other end, and cups were provided for people to drink the water. It is necessary to have this new plant installed at Coober Pedy because, apart from the itinerant population of the town, it is a place that attracts more and more tourists every year. The tourists suddenly descending on the town put a burden on the town's water resources. We are doing something in this field, but I hope that more can be done.

The department and its engineers are looking into this subject very thoroughly so that we will not be caught when the time comes in the years ahead when we must go in for this work on a larger scale. We shall be abreast of our reading and research, and ready to swing into action. On other occasions I have said that South Australia is dependent on water, particularly on Murray River water. Any large industrial undertaking coming to this State (and I have spoken to a number of them over the years) wants to be assured that South Australia has an adequate supply of safe and reliable water, not only for the processes it will use in its factory but also for the domestic requirements of the employees who will be engaged in the factory.

It is imperative that we take steps now to safeguard our future water requirements, not only for industrial expansion but for domestic expansion as well. This is the best type of expansion that can occur, as our population and domestic requirements will grow year by year. We know what the natural increase in population will do and what the increased migration will do. Water is the very basis of our future industrial and domestic expansion in South Australia. We are undertaking certain works now. We know that the Kangaroo Creek reservoir is being constructed now and that a few problems were encountered in trying to construct a dam of that type with the Millbrook reservoir overflowing. Certain steps had to be taken to prevent any damage.

When this dam is completed in about 18 months or so it will hold about 6,000,000,000 gallons, and it is hoped that in the winter months next year we will be able to impound some water at least. This dam will provide a further 6,000,000,000 gallons, but what do we do after that? This is the last of our major dam sites and will be the last major reservoir we can erect in South Australia. Certainly, planning is going ahead on a second holding reservoir on the Onkaparinga River adjacent to Mount Bold and Clarendon, and it may be possible in years to come to use the Para River. However, I emphasize that the Kangaroo Creek reservoir is the last major reservoir. Therefore, in the future we will have to look elsewhere.

Mr. Nankivell: What about the Mount Bold site?

The Hon. J. W. H. COURCE: I have said that we are investigating that. When we consider the remarkable expansion of the last

few years and the expansion we hope to undertake in the next few years with mains pumping, this emphasizes the point of need. We already know about the duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla main, which is largely in use today, only a small portion near Hanson still requiring to be finished. The amalgamation of the Mannum-Adelaide main is to proceed and, as I announced the other day, the Murray Bridge to Hahndorf main is planned (in fact tenders have now been let for the supply of pipes for the first section of this large scheme, and camp sites are being set up to undertake the work). This will take out of the river about 110,000 acre feet a year. In addition, the Swan Reach to Stockwell main is nearing completion. Also, I announced about a month or two ago the construction of the Poldia Basin to Kimba main. All these mains are absolutely essential to well being not only in the metropolitan area but also in other parts of South Australia, some in very arid areas. Again, this emphasizes the fact that we have to get water from other basins or the Murray River and that at the rate we are going we will use up more water than we have supplies. Therefore, the meaning behind the motion and the amendment is that we must get more and more water.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Do you think we are conserving every little drop in the same way as the Snowy Mountains Authority is conserving it, and would its methods be practicable?

The Hon. J. W. H. COURCE: I think this matter should be investigated and it is one of the points to which the motion refers. In a State like this it is sometimes difficult to conserve water. The Snowy River has an abundance of water and a greater proportion of it can be conserved. However, what the honourable member has just raised is a vital point. It is no good having a large storage and not conserving what water there is: we must try to use the water to the best advantage. The motion deals with the conservation of our resources and this is an important topic. It is interesting to see how the average use of water has increased, especially in the metropolitan area. Over the last 10 years, the average rate of increase in consumption has been 1,000,000,000 gallons a year. In the next 10 years it is considered that the annual increase will be at least 1,500,000,000 gallons. In 1967-68, water consumed was 29,250,000,000 gallons and by 1972-73 it is expected to be 36,250,000,000 gallons. Of course, to that

figure must be added about 3,000,000,000 gallons a year for evaporation. Therefore, I submit that it would seem that, with the increase in consumption per capita and with the increase in population, the consumption of water has trebled in the last 20 years. If it were not for the use of the Murray River and other basins that we are making today, many of our inland towns would not be able to exist. I emphasize again the absolute necessity for us to get on with the job of looking for and using more resources.

Mr. Riches: You might have to re-use water.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Yes. This touches on the matter of re-utilization of commercial water, perhaps domestic water, and also the use of effluent water such as at Bolivar. I think this is referred to in the motion and, as far as I am concerned, it would certainly be one of the terms of reference. In fact, in the motion on this matter last year the use of effluent water was specifically referred to. The re-use of water industrially is an important aspect. Some industrial processes could lend themselves to the re-use of water. There is no doubt that this can be done. However, by this I do not mean that the water should be treated and put to other uses: it can be used within the same factory. In fact, I have seen one process recently where just this method is used. This was done not only to save water but also to save the cost, because this particular process happened to be one in which a terrific quantity of water was required for washing and the water could be used over and over again. This point should be investigated even more fully.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Have people considered that they could help themselves a bit more by the greater use of rain-water tanks?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: That is another suggestion, for which I thank the honourable member. Another aspect of the re-use of water concerns large industrial air-conditioning plants where much water goes to waste. I believe the encouragement of the re-use of this type of water would be of great assistance to the State as well as to the consumer, who would pay less in water rates.

At the time of the last election, the Government stated it would investigate water resources in South Australia, and consequently a number of decisions have already been made in this connection and some commenced. I will touch on these in a moment. General agreement on the principle in this motion has been indicated. The mem-

ber for Albert suggested a Royal Commission to examine water resources. On the other hand, the member for Millicent suggested that the inquiry should be done by consultants. Let us examine the method of implementing this inquiry. I agree that a Royal Commission would be far too cumbersome: frankly, I do not think it would be efficient or practicable. Therefore, I must ask the House to discard that idea. The amendment substitutes "consultants" for "Royal Commission"; however, I would prefer a committee, which was what was proposed in the motion last year. I intend to move a further amendment to this effect. I have spoken to the member for Albert, who moved the motion, and he agrees with my contention.

I believe several logical reasons exist why the motion should be further amended to contain the words "expert committee". To have consultants might cause a few problems. After I have spoken, I hope the member for Millicent will agree with my contention and either withdraw his amendment or allow it to lapse, because, after all, we are virtually all after the same thing in this matter. Action has already been taken along the lines indicated by the mover of the motion. On August 21 (as reported at page 743 of *Hansard*) I replied to a question asked by the member for Millicent regarding water resources, as follows:

The honourable member asked this question yesterday and, to assist him, I have obtained an interim report. This position has been reviewed, particularly in the light of several departmental reports that have been recently received by the Government from both the Engineering and Water Supply and the Mines Departments. These cover the North Adelaide plains (this report is currently being assessed by an independent consultant), the Bolivar effluent water scheme, and the underground water resources of the South-Eastern part of the State. This latter report is currently being studied with a view to considering what further work Government departments can undertake in research and development and to considering in what role any consultants might be most advantageously engaged. At the same time, some investigatory work is being carried out into the practicability of the desalination and future use of brackish and saline waters. It will be necessary to carefully draw up a specific brief on further exploratory and consulting work to be undertaken, but the Government, in line with its previous announcement, is determined that this type of work must be undertaken promptly.

That reply, given a month ago, indicated the thinking and intention of the Government and the department at that time about getting on with this type of work. Further, Cabinet has agreed to my recommendation that officers of

both the Mines Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department carry out further survey and exploratory work, mainly in the South-East. That decision followed receipt by me, as Minister of Works, of an interim report on exploratory work that had been done two or three months ago. This report laid down certain guide lines that the Government and I considered extremely promising.

Therefore, Cabinet has now agreed to this follow-up work being undertaken, and I consider that it will disclose the extent to which Government departments and their expert officers and engineers can undertake the type of work envisaged in this motion, the areas in which consultants can be advantageously engaged and the work they can undertake, the likely cost of the work, and the time involved in these investigations. In other words, I want to know what work the Mines Department and the E. & W.S. Department can handle within their own resources and by making use of their own expert officers and engineers, and in what areas consultants can advantageously be engaged when the departments do not have available the resources or manpower to undertake the work. I want to see the work correlated and to have information on time and costs. I hope that this report will be available in about a month. This is how we are thinking at present.

Honourable members know that, when consultants are engaged, the departments concerned do much service work for the consultants: it is fallacious to believe that the consultants themselves do all the work. The member for Millicent referred to a scheme which the previous Government had started and which involved engaging consultants to work in an extremely wide field. The brief was not detailed, but was extremely wide and loose, in my opinion. I have had experience over many years with many capable consultants in various fields of endeavour, and in my opinion it is absolutely essential that the brief given by the client (in this case the Government) to the consultants must be absolutely concise and detailed, carefully drawn and most specific. I intend that, when we engage consultants to do work in conjunction with our officers, the brief must be so drawn.

Regardless of how good or how qualified consultants may be, if the brief is loosely and widely drawn the consultants may not provide what the client wants. They may wander into other fields and consume much time or (and

this is more important) incur heavy expenditure. I believe that our Government is fortunate in having many expert officers in several departments. We have outstanding engineers and mining officers. Much work has already been carried out and much data, information and material is already available in the Mines Department and the E. & W.S. Department. Any consultancy service engaged will have available the services of these departments.

Mr. Corcoran: Do you intend to increase staff at this stage in any department in order to do this?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I intend to await the report that I have said will be available in a month, and I will then assess whether additional staff will be necessary. Therefore, I prefer not to commit myself at this stage. I consider that consultants will have to be used for this work and I intend that they shall be used, in conjunction with Government officers, because some officers will be committed on other work, although we have the staff to undertake much of it. The Government intends that consultants will be used in some areas, and this is the effect of the amendment moved by the member for Millicent. I want to go further: I want both the consultants and our officers to be engaged on the work, and I want assessments to be made of the findings of the consultants (and this is important). I have seen consultants' reports that, frankly, I would not accept. Some have been excellent, but some are no good. It is important that the findings and recommendations be assessed and that the best use be made of the money that the Government spends.

Mr. Riches: Would the department be able to specialize in desalination? This matter is of great urgency.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: Provision for the investigation of desalination is included in this motion. I have not said what is being done and what we hope to do, but I will certainly see that investigation of desalination is one of the terms of reference.

Mr. Riches: Of all the places in the world, we should be in the front.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I could not agree more. We have many outstanding engineers who could be members of such a committee as I intend to move to set up. In private practice and in the Government service and in various walks of life we have outstanding men who are willing and able to serve the State and give the benefit of their expert advice.

I want to use their talents, and I indicate that the Government intends to use consultants on parts of the project. Therefore, I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who moved the amendment, whether, in view of my undertaking, he will withdraw his amendment or allow it to lapse at the appropriate time, and support my further amendment. We want to get on with the job: both sides agree about it, and it is just a matter of how to get the best results. I support the intention of the motion and commend the member for Albert for moving it. I move:

To strike out "a Royal Commission" and insert "an expert committee".

The SPEAKER: Is the amendment seconded?

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HURST secured the adjournment of the debate.

CHOWILLA DAM

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Hudson:

(For wording of motion, see page 633.)

(Continued from August 28. Page 912.)

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): It is a month since this motion was last debated and one or two things have happened since then. Since I last spoke on this motion the Commonwealth Minister for National Development (Mr. Fairbairn) has visited South Australia and, with his staff, has discussed the Chowilla dam project with the Minister of Works and with me, and a statement has been issued setting out the historical facts surrounding the promotion and negotiations about Chowilla since it was first mooted in South Australia and in other States.

I thought that this statement, which was a statement of fact with which we all agreed, would have been the last significant word until the technical data, which is being examined by the River Murray Commission concerning the site at Chowilla and that at Dartmouth on the Mitta Mitta River, became available and that no further significant statement would be made by the Commonwealth Minister. I am sorry that again I am at loggerheads with or have a divergent view from the Commonwealth Minister who, after being greeted amicably in South Australia, has now been reported as pre-judging the situation. This is the sort of thing that I deplore, because honourable members know that before his visit I publicly criticized his action in appearing to pre-judge the decision of the commission. When he was here we

discussed a statement for public release, and it was released after being agreed to by both sides, because it was a historical portrayal of the position. I am sorry that the Minister seems to show a preference for the Mitta Mitta River site, and I have written to him asking him why he has done this and re-stating that the South Australian Government stands firmly behind the building of Chowilla dam. We should all consider the overall intention of the member for Glenelg in moving this wordy motion, and it is evident from his speech that he has attempted to shift the burden of guilt, which no doubt he and his Party feel in first agreeing to the study of an alternative site, from his and the A.L.P.'s shoulders to the L.C.L. Government's shoulders. This is the recurring theme of his speech but his approach is not in accordance with the minutes of the River Murray Commission. If he disputes the accuracy of those minutes he may be able to argue his case, but I am sure that he does not dispute their accuracy. I consider that he intended to smear the Liberal Government for an action taken by the Labor Government. When referring to the actions of me and the Liberal Government of South Australia, he said:

By allowing the investigation of an alternative site he has given away our case for arbitration.

Later, he said:

Despite what he then said of the Premier of the current Government he voted for the investigation of alternative works.

Later, he said:

All this Government has done is to vote for the investigation of the Dartmouth site.

His inference was that it was a bad thing that an alternative site was being investigated.

Mr. Riches: I think he meant that it was a bad thing that you withdrew the previous Government's instructions to the Commissioner.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The member for Stuart has been a member for a long time and knows how to drag in red herrings. I am dealing with whose responsibility the study of the alternative site is.

Mr. Burdon: If you go back 12 months you will see who was right and who was wrong.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I do not know what the honourable member is trying to say, but he will be able to speak in the debate. Does he agree that it was a bad thing for an alternative site to be investigated and, if he does, when was the alteration made? In the debate on August 28 I quoted from the minutes of the River Murray Commission, and surely the

member for Mount Gambier does not doubt the truth and the chronological order of those minutes. What did the minutes report when the alternative site was first discussed? Clearly set out in the minutes of the commission of October 10, 1967, is important information on this aspect. I ask members opposite: who was governing South Australia then? I ask the member for Mount Gambier, for example, who was governing South Australia on October 10, 1967?

Mr. Corcoran: We had a decent Government.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The member for Millicent says, "We had a decent Government", but the following is what his Government's representative agreed to at a meeting of the River Murray Commission:

The technical committee had submitted a plan for further studies aimed at producing a long-range plan for additional regulation of the waters of the river including the determination of the optimum size of storages in the Upper Murray and Chowilla. This plan consisted of two parts, the first designed to determine the improvement in deliveries to the States by the modification or amendment of the existing conditions governing the distribution of water between the States without the construction of new works. It was considered this could be achieved by 24 studies—and the minutes then list the studies.

Mr. Riches: Isn't that the very thing South Australia has to face up to?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Is the member for Stuart now admitting that his Government supported what was done?

Mr. Riches: I didn't mention any Government or Party.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member must surely realize that his Party, when in Government, had a member on the River Murray Commission, as had the Victorian, New South Wales and Commonwealth Governments. Does he realize that his colleague who has just been so critical of the Government implied throughout his speech that we were guilty of something by approving alternative studies? The minutes of the commission show that on October 10 the Australian Labor Party's representative from South Australia agreed to what was decided. Let us get this matter in its proper perspective.

Mr. Corcoran: There was no other course.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The member for Millicent, by saying that no other course was open, is admitting that his Government agreed to the decision.

Mr. Corcoran: What you have been saying is just rubbish.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr. Corcoran: Rubbish.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to refrain from interjecting. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Many other references in the commission's minutes clearly show that what the commission decided was sanctioned by the Labor Party when in office. The minutes of March 15 last state:

The commissioners had received but had not had adequate time to study in detail reports submitted by (1) the technical committee on the possible future developments of the water resources of the Murray River including proposals for additional storage at Chowilla and above the Hume reservoir; (2) The Snowy Mountains authority entitled "Notes on Proposed Dartmouth dam on the Mitta Mitta River, Victoria.

It is evident that the speech made by the member for Glenelg represents a colossal smear. However, the peculiar thing is that he is really trying to smear his own Party when it was in office.

Mr. Broomhill: You are reading only what suits you.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The member for West Torrens is well known for his efforts to distract members who speak in a debate, but it will not work with me. We are aware of the length of the speeches made by the member for Glenelg: I think his trouble is that by the time he has spoken for an hour or so he has convinced himself about what he is saying, and that is a great danger for him. The real essence of this is: do members opposite believe that the minutes of the River Murray Commission are set out correctly?

This can be the only dispute in this argument. The honourable member says that certain things are wrong, but the minutes say clearly what was done, so the honourable member condemns himself. I reject entirely the repetitive theme in his speech that we were wrong in doing what he did himself. He has said himself (the member for Stuart mentioned this) that we have withdrawn instructions given to the commissioner. What does the commissioner say about this? He himself says that the instruction has not been withdrawn. Is he a liar? Who is right? The commissioner makes the report and signs it. The commission has not been presented with any motion to change the policy initiated in August, 1967; it is continuing its investigation into the whole study of benefits to be derived from new storages on the Murray

River, both in relation to quantity of supply and the quality. It goes immediately back to August, 1967, when the last decision was made to study the alternative sites on the Murray River system.

If honourable members are not willing to take this into consideration, they are just being blindly political. I suggest to them that they study the copy of the minutes which I believe the Minister has made available to the mover of this motion. I hope that if he studies these minutes he will see the impossibility of his argument in this regard. I oppose the motion.

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): I support the motion, which is straightforward. It reaffirms the resolution passed unanimously in 1967 as follows:

That the State of South Australia has a fundamental and legal right to the construction of the Chowilla dam without further delay, and that assurances must be given by the Governments, the parties to the River Murray Waters Agreement, that pending construction of the dam South Australia will be supplied in dry years with the volume of flow of water which the dam was designed to ensure.

The *Hansard* record shows that even the present Premier was party to supporting that final resolution in this Chamber. Chowilla has been the subject of very wide interest in South Australia; there are people in the Murray River districts who are dependent for their livelihood on a proper and adequate supply and flow of water; the people in the metropolitan area are dependent on the water from the Murray River; and people in the more remote areas of the State are also dependent on Murray water. I refer in this regard to people in Whyalla, which is one of the largest industrial cities in this State. Unfortunately, during the dry situation in South Australia we must now depend on this major source to ensure supplies adequate for the proper development of this State.

This matter goes back to 1960 when members opposite were members of the Government that started the negotiations for this dam, and no doubt they received the support of the people of this State.

Mr. Broomhill: I think the people would be disgusted with the efforts of the present Premier.

Mr. HURST: Yes, and also those of some of his colleagues. Members opposite are trying to defend the actions of the present Government in this regard, but I am sure that Sir Thomas Playford would hang his head in shame at its efforts.

Mr. Broomhill: Some of the river members have been strangely quiet in this debate.

Mr. HURST: The Premier tried to make rubbish of what the member for Glenelg said, and in doing so he attempted to mislead this House in the same way as he misled the people in the river districts during the last election campaign. He was supported by his political colleague, the Prime Minister of Australia, in the Adelaide Town Hall, when they got up as great buddies, giving the impression that if the Liberal Party was returned in South Australia this State would get the utmost co-operation from the Commonwealth Government. All of this was just political propaganda designed to trick and confuse the people of this State. Now the Premier comes along flashing a file and taking a quotation completely out of its context to try to divert attention from his own words and his lack of action in this matter.

It is not good enough. The people of South Australia know very well the promises that he made unequivocally during the election campaign, when he said he was going to get the Chowilla dam moving within six months. That time has elapsed, and what has happened? We have members in this Chamber now who were elected to represent people from the Murray district as a result of that promise that Chowilla would be started. How do the Premier's colleagues really feel about this? Can they with any sincerity go back and truly face the people they allegedly represent? I feel sorry for those poor unfortunate people, for some of them are rather new to the political arena. I sincerely hope that they take a lesson from the rash promises and misrepresentations made to their constituents. Those members belong to a Party that has thrust on the people of South Australia minority decisions that it never even had a mandate to implement, anyway.

Mr. Broomhill: One would think that their consciences would not allow them to sleep at night.

Mr. HURST: That is quite right. Only this afternoon the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon) reported to this Chamber that he had attended a public meeting at Waikerie last Thursday evening and that amongst seven resolutions passed at that meeting was the following:

That this public meeting of citrus growers held at Waikerie strongly supports the early approval and completion of Chowilla for the future development and welfare of South Australia.

Mr. Freebairn: Was that the transport meeting at Mount Gambier?

Mr. HURST: The honourable member has been busy looking under his bed for Socialists, but I suggest that he have a look at the promises made to the people of South Australia that completely misled them. If he was sincere and honest he would want to look for a few ideas and constructive ways to improve and develop this State. He should be interested in seeing that the people he purports to represent receive one of the things that they are looking for, which is an adequate supply of water so that people on the land may be properly protected and may have available to them necessary resources to enable the State to be developed in the way in which members on this side want to see it developed. That is the type of job the member for Light should perform. I suggest he should come up with some constructive ideas and suggestions rather than continue to have his head under the bed. Perhaps he would then help his Party.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the honourable member get back to the motion.

Mr. HURST: I am speaking to the motion, which is important and which concerns the people of South Australia. Members have been interjecting, as I make a decent, constructive speech, and I reserve the right to reply to those interjections. The whole purpose of the motion is to provide benefits for the people of South Australia by ensuring that the Government does something constructive and that it carries out the promises it made at the election at which it received a minority vote and yet was able to occupy the Treasury benches. It is unbelievable that such a Party should now try to blame the Labor Government for what was done. To put the record straight for the Premier, I will again quote what Sir Thomas Playford is reported to have said. This report appears in the *Advertiser*, so it must be true. It states:

If investigations prove—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member is reading from a rather voluminous *Advertiser*.

Mr. HURST: I am quoting from it. The *Advertiser* gives the Government an exaggerated coverage, which enhances its position. The L.C.L. and the *Advertiser* have had an understanding for many years. Sometimes I wish I had the ability of the Editor and some reporters of the *Advertiser* and could construct a story in the way they can. Somehow they

are able to build up the qualities of members opposite, and therefore I consider they do a wonderful job, because they do not have good material to work on.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I suggest that the honourable member get back to the motion.

Mr. Freebairn: Get back to the transport meeting.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HURST: I am speaking to the motion moved by the member for Glenelg but members opposite are interjecting. I believe I have the right to reply.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order and the honourable member can ignore them.

Mr. HURST: I am looking for your protection, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because I believe you appreciate the points I am making and want to hear me.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair is waiting to hear what the honourable member has to say about this motion.

Mr. HURST: I support the motion. I will not take out of context parts of the report of the River Murray Commission as the Premier did. In fact, the Premier voted for the resolution passed in this House in 1967. On that occasion he expressed some dissatisfaction because the resolution did not go far enough. However, after much debate the resolution was supported unanimously by all members in the House, including the Premier. He is now trying to save face by blaming the Labor Government and accusing it of not doing the job. He also accused the former Premier of not following the proper course. However, on August 15, 1967, the former Premier said:

That is in the hands of the commissioners, and when there is a dispute it goes to arbitration. Precisely how the arbitrator decides is in the lap of the gods because there is nothing in the agreement on this matter. We have certain legal rights and we can cite certain clauses of the agreement. However, this is not something that is legally open and shut in the short term; I believe that in the long term we can insist on the construction of the dam.

I support those remarks. Which Government was responsible initially for drawing up this particular agreement? I refer to the report which the Premier read and in which we find that the River Murray Waters Agreement was amended on October 8, 1963. The agreement then provided for the inclusion in clause 20 of the Chowilla project. To my knowledge the Labor Government was not in office at that time; therefore, if anything is wrong with the agreement, members opposite must bear full responsibility. When the former Premier

moved a motion last year to strengthen the hand of this State's representative on the River Murray Commission, the House decided unanimously that this was the sound and proper way of going about the matter. Honourable members opposite will remember (and it was advocated by the previous Leader of the L.C.L. in this House) that we had a legal right to do this. I can recall Sir Thomas Playford standing up in the House and taking a considerable time advocating emphatically that, if we were going to do our job, we should take the matter to court; but what happened? It was the same as in the case of many other documents and Bills drawn up by the previous Liberal Government: there were so many loopholes that the necessary procedures could not be followed.

I believe the Premier of the Labor Government handled this matter properly. We note the absence of any provision in the Estimates or in the Loan works programme for the Chowilla project. A considerable amount of money has been spent on the project so far and we have heard it repeatedly publicized in the press how the Liberal Government was going to get things going and how it was going to start this project within six months of taking office. I ask honourable members whether we can believe anything uttered by the present Premier of South Australia.

Mr. Burdon: Wasn't he going up north with some shovels.

Mr. HURST: This was another stunt indulged in just before the last elections in order to prepare himself for the publicity we saw in the *Advertiser* and other newspapers—photographs of the Premier and Sir Thomas Playford, armed with steel helmets and picks, in a jeep going to dig up opals. If the Premier was sincere in his desire to get Chowilla going, what has he done with those shovels! He should have been up there and at least have done a little work himself. He would have got some publicity and it might have satisfied some of his own cronies.

Mr. Burdon: He would have a few willing helpers up there and it would have demonstrated his sincerity.

Mr. HURST: He might have satisfied some of his own cronies. This would have been as good an excuse as he could make. I think that even members of his own Party representing Murray River districts will agree with me that he can no longer be trusted. He led them up the garden path. I see the member for Chaffey looking at me. I express my concern for his feelings about this. I should like

to see the look on his face when he returns to his district to try to explain his Government's action in this matter. There are one or two other matters that should be mentioned in reply to the Premier when he tries to accuse our Party of giving away the project. It was stated in *Hansard* on August 15, 1967, in a speech by Mr. Pearson:

However, I believe that the project started to lose momentum in 1965 and that it has continued to lose momentum in the last two or three years.

There were problems with the Chowilla scheme from the word "go"—problems relating to the foundations, the walls, preventing saline underground water getting into the dam water, and so on. Here was a frank admission by the then Opposition that the thing was losing momentum, and now members opposite are trying to accuse us of selling out the project.

Mr. Broomhill: Not trying—they are doing it.

Mr. HURST: All the motion does is to reiterate what was said before about protecting South Australia's interests. Even the Premier himself has told us how he conferred with his Commonwealth cronies on this matter. They came to an agreement, as a result of which we have this document about further storage on the River Murray, produced as a statement of fact. He referred to this in the few remarks he made before I rose to speak. Then he informed us that he had had to write to the Minister for National Development about a press statement he had made that was not altogether in accordance with the agreement that had been drawn up. Just what is going on in that Party, which is supposed to be representing and looking after the interests of the man on the land? It is difficult on this side of the House to really believe what is being told us. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADELAIDE TO GAWLER RAILWAY (ALTERATION OF DRY CREEK TERMINUS) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

HOMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**ADVANCES FOR HOMES ACT
AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**ADVANCES TO SETTLERS ACT
AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

[*Sitting suspended from 6.1 to 7.30 p.m.*]

THE BUDGET

The Estimates—Grand total, \$295,284,000.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 24. Page 1357.)

THE LEGISLATURE

Legislative Council, \$41,494.

Mr. HUGHES (Walleroo): Before asking for leave to continue my remarks, I was referring to the shock Budget that the Treasurer had presented to this House on September 5 and I also said that never before in the history of responsible Government in South Australia had so many imposts been placed upon people in the lower income brackets. The underlying cause of these imposts, of course, is the present Government's very bad handling of the State's financial affairs. It seems rather a coincidence that on the very day the Treasurer presented his Budget to this House the prices of a number of goods were decontrolled. Decontrolling these prices will be very worrying to the people I have already referred to, those in the lower income brackets. Despite what Government members may say, decontrolling prices immediately leaves an opening whereby people in the lower income brackets can be charged higher prices than those they were being charged for the particular goods that I shall mention directly. It is well known that as long ago as the Second World War unscrupulous business men took advantage of the people.

Mr. Jennings: It started a long time before that.

Mr. HUGHES: Exactly. I have vividly in my mind a case that occurred at Wallaroo. When an inspector arrived in the town, he needed only to call at one place and it would not be very long before certain business men in the Wallaroo district knew that an inspector was in the vicinity, and they took good care, if asked by the inspector for a pound of tomatoes, to charge the correct price. Similarly, the recent decontrolling of some prices will leave an opening to certain

business men. I am not saying that this applies to all business men, because there are many honest business men in South Australia. Nevertheless, there are people who seem to take delight in adding a few cents here and there to get rich quickly. So, it was unfortunate that the announcement about decontrolling prices was made on the day the Budget was introduced.

Mr. Jennings: It could be an invitation to increase prices.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, the lifting of controls does leave an opening for this type of person. The prices of tomato sauce, kitchen and cooking utensils, and water tanks have been decontrolled. Glass was also decontrolled, the various categories being set out as bent, bevelled and blasted or engraved, bottles, flasks, jars, vials and tubes, louvres, plate, sheet, figures, rolled, cathedral, milled, rough cast or wired cast, and sheet glass, plain or fancy. Many people use louvres when providing additions to their houses and even from the details of glass alone we see that advantage will be taken in regard to the use by many people of these items in their houses.

I was staggered by the number of goods being decontrolled, yet I suppose that not one member opposite, with the exception of those in the Ministry, would know how many items were involved. During a debate on price control legislation the Attorney-General, who was then a member of the Opposition, said that very few goods were controlled. Apparently, he was either under a misapprehension or did not know, and was setting out to, perhaps, have us believe that, because so few goods were controlled, it was not worth while continuing with price control.

In addition to the items I have mentioned, other items decontrolled include building bricks and blocks (including refractories), builder's hardware of any material (including hinges, locks, fasteners and casement catches, and builders' small hardware), and building boards (including caneite and masonite). Every honourable member knows that most people use caneite or masonite at some time for linings or ceilings in their houses. Also decontrolled were cast-iron porcelain enamelware (and substitutes therefor made from metal or plastic), earthenware and stoneware other than ornamental or decorative, and fibrous plaster sheets.

Again, many of those items are used in house construction or in providing additions.

Mr. McKee: Fibrous plaster sheets are used in Port Pirie to build fowl houses.

Mr. HUGHES: Not only are they used in Port Pirie; they are used in great quantities in the Wallaroo District and throughout the State. A grave disservice has been done to the people by decontrolling this item. The list continues as follows:

Fibrous plaster, mouldings, cornices and cover battens; fittings and equipment of a type used in the installation of water, drainage or sewerage systems in buildings.

These things are used in house building and I cannot see that any harm would have been done to people if these goods had continued to be controlled. At least, people building houses would have been safeguarded to a large extent. The list also contains joinery, joinery stock and roofing sheets. For older houses particularly those in country areas, many roofing sheets are used, because most country towns are old and the houses have galvanized iron roofs.

Mr. Ryan: It would affect the farmers.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. The farmer uses much galvanized iron not only to re-roof his house but also to build sheds. Today, the progressive farmer does not erect a few mallee rails with a straw roof to house implements. He builds beautiful, big implement sheds, which are necessary because of the expensive equipment used on farms today. Good sheds are required to house this equipment satisfactorily so that when it is required it is in good order. Not only has an injustice been done to people living in the country but also particularly to those who live on farms and use so much of this material. The list contains "sleepers", which are used mainly by the Railways Department. Apparently, the Treasurer is not concerned about losses of that department and so has recommended that sleepers be de-controlled. The list continues:

Tiles of all kinds, including roofing tiles, wall tiles and floor tiles.

Hundreds of houses are being built in the metropolitan area and hundreds are being built in the wonderful city of Whyalla and, no doubt, on most of these houses tiles are used as roofing material, because this is the modern method and the tiles last longer. I believe that these goods, particularly goods used in house building, should have been kept under price control. The list continues:

Galvanized iron and zinc anneal sheet—plain or corrugated; galvanized steel pipes and fittings; malleable pipe fittings; poisons, drenches and sprays, namely—(b) arsenate of lead; patent dryers and putty; resins, includ-

ing synthetic resin; shellac, sandarac, mastic, and other dry gums, other than yacca gum; thinners; mineral turpentine and turpentine substitutes; whitelead; all raw materials used in the manufacture of paints, colours, varnishes, enamels and lacquers (Item 303A).

I pause there to say that this item (No. 303A) is one that can be abused because of the number of ingredients used in the production of these goods. Then, of course, the finished article has to be retailed out to the consumer. I maintain that if control had been retained on items such as I have just mentioned it would have been to the advantage of the consumer, because it is very easy with articles such as these to whip up the price a few cents.

Of course, we all realize that any matters can be referred back to the Prices Commissioner for investigation at any time, but many people lose heavily over a period of time because they do not know of the functions of the Prices Branch. Therefore, these are the type of things that should have been retained under price control. The list goes on:

Any process in respect of timber including kiln drying, sawing, planing, milling and machining of all kinds and descriptions.

This bears out what I have been saying previously. All the things I have mentioned, apart from perhaps the first one or two which refer to cooking ingredients, have a bearing on the cost of building. If all the items I have previously mentioned had been kept under the control of the Prices Commissioner, there would have been no worry, in my opinion, to those people who are having buildings erected. The list continues:

The manufacture of bricks or blocks of cement or cement concrete. Public utilities—communications. Supply and fix fibrous plaster. Non-intoxicating drinks of the following kinds:

- (a) aerated waters;
- (b) mineral waters;
- (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.

This is where it hits the children. Perhaps we can be excused for not making more of a fuss over the de-control of a number of the items that previously had been under price control. However, when it comes to taking the last cent off a little child, which is what the de-control of this latter item will do, then I say we are failing in our duty as a Parliament in not seeing that items such as these are kept under price control.

Under list B there are many items which are controlled but for which prices have not been fixed. This list was also brought into

operation on September 5, the very day on which the Treasurer presented the Budget. Since these lists have been in my possession during the past four hours, five members have asked me whether they could see whether or not certain items had been released from price control. One member was most concerned because the price of an item in which he was interested was not controlled. Rather than weary members by reading list B, I ask that it be incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

ITEMS CONTROLLED BUT PRICES NOT FIXED
Item No.

- 101(b) Parts for the manufacture of footwear—soles, heels, boot and shoe uppers and all component parts, materials and aids to manufacture, partial manufacture or repair for use in the manufacture, partial manufacture or repair of footwear of all descriptions.
- 222 Leather.
- 224 Rubber pads, soles and heels.
- 225 Slipper forms, and piecegoods for use in the manufacture of boots, shoes or slippers.
- 226 Tyres and Tubes.
- 227A Articles manufactured wholly or partly from rubber other than rubber gloves, and rubber floor coverings.
- 304A All types and grades of bags, sacks (other than new bags and sacks) but including bags and sacks filled for the first time.
- 355 Bricklaying and laying of cement and concrete masonry units and blocks.
- 357 Building repairs, alterations and renovations.
- 358 Carpentering.
- 361 Commissions on declared goods and services.
- 364 Electrical work and repairs.
- 364A Footwear manufacture—sole sewing, stuff cutting, upper sewing, shanking and all other services supplied in the manufacture or partial manufacture or repairs of footwear of all descriptions.
- 373 Painting, paper hanging and glazing.
- 374 Plastering.
- 375 Plumbing and repairs, including installations of hot water services.
- 383 Tiling and floor laying.
- 384 Termite (white ant) treatment services.
- 387 Ice cream including ice cream whether coated or otherwise, served in containers or packages of all kinds and descriptions.

Mr. HUGHES: There is another list, list C, which contains a number of items which are controlled and for which prices are fixed.

I believe these items would be of great interest to honourable members.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: How big is the list?

Mr. HUGHES: It runs into two foolscap pages.

Mr. Ryan: At least the public can see it when they read *Hansard*.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, not only will it be of benefit to members but also persons interested can read it in *Hansard*. I also ask leave to have this list incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

ITEMS CONTROLLED AND PRICES FIXED

- Item No.
- 9 Bran and pollard and sharps, and stock foods containing bran, pollard or sharps.
 - 10 Bread and bread rolls.
 - 10A Breakfast foods.
 - 27 Flour, wheaten, wheat meal and self raising.
 - 34 Wheat.
 - 37 Infants' and invalids' foods.
 - 47 Milk.
 - 50A Prepared stock and poultry foods.
 - 56 Soap, toilet or laundry.
 - 63 Wheat meal (for stock foods).
 - 69 Firewood.
 - 70 Mallee roots.
 - 99 Clothing, garments and apparel of all descriptions other than:
 - (a) Handkerchiefs;
 - (b) Bathing costumes, trunks and caps;
 - (c) Furs and articles of apparel made from furred skins;
 - (d) Garters, arm bands, braces, suspenders and belts;
 - (e) Hair nets;
 - (f) Millinery;
 - (g) Clothing, garments and apparel made, or principally made, from alpaca, mohair, astrakhan, sealette, fabric imitating fur, imitation camel hair cloth, velvet, velveteen plush, lame, tinsel, fabric including lame or tinsel, pure silk, chenille, linen, lace effect fabric, hand painted fabric, applique designed fabric, and nylon;
 - (h) Women's clothing, garments and apparel of all kinds and descriptions;
 - (i) Men's clothing, garments and apparel of all kinds and descriptions, other than working attire;
 - (j) Maids' gowns, dresses and frocks where designed for use as evening, dance or wedding wear, being ankle length or longer.

Item No.

- (k) Safari jackets, other than for college wear, jodhpurs and leather jackets;
 - (l) Surgical garments;
 - (m) Foundation garments, other than maids' or girls' brasieres;
 - (n) Scarves;
 - (o) Ties, other than school and college ties;
 - (p) Men's shirts, other than working shirts;
 - (q) Men's, youths' and boys' felt hats;
 - (r) Maids' and girls' socks, stockings, and sockettes made from nylon, pure silk or wool.
- 100 Diapers.
- 101(a) Footwear (children's, youths' and maids' footwear and working boots only).
- 105 Nursery squares.
- 108 Infants' and babies' shawls.
- 223 Leather, imitation leather, and fibre kitbags, attache cases, satchels and the like.
- 228 School requisites, namely:
- (b) coloured chalks
 - (c) coloured pencils
 - (d) compasses and dividers
 - (e) drawing paper and pins
 - (f) erasers
 - (g) maps
 - (h) notebooks
 - (i) pasting books
 - (j) pens, nibs, pencils, including drawing sets
 - (k) protractors (celluloid)
 - (l) rulers
 - (m) set squares
 - (n) "T" squares
 - (o) drawing and sketching materials.
- 248 School exercise books and the like.
- 252 Textbooks, primary and secondary schools.
- 257 Acid, sulphuric.
- 271 Manure and fertilizers, organic and inorganic including:
- (a) blood and bone fertilizers
 - (b) sulphate of ammonia
 - (c) superphosphate.
- 285 Kerosene.
- 289 Oils—mechanical and lubricating.
- 293 Petroleum and shale products, other than aviation gasoline.
- 335 Sand and gravel.
- 339 Stone.
- 354 Boot and shoe repairs.
- 359 Cartage, haulage and delivery rates excluding crane hire and fork lift truck charges.
- 367 Funeral, cemetery and crematorium services.
- 368 Men's and boys' haircutting.
- 372 Meat pies and pasties.
- 376 Public utilities—gas.

Mr. HUGHES: Last evening, what I was trying to say appeared to annoy members

opposite and they made many interjections that were not invited by me. They tried to drown me out.

Mr. Clark: They didn't have much chance.

Mr. HUGHES: No, but nevertheless, by way of continued interjections, they attempted, perhaps, to make it awkward for *Hansard* reporters to hear what I wanted to say. I spent so much time last night dealing with the mistakes made in the speeches of members opposite that I had little time left to talk on the Budget. Our economy is one in which Government spending in development has come to occupy a very crucial part. The idea that, if Government capital expenditure is increased it may imply a reduction in private capital expenditure, is hardly valid. Rather, the contrary seems to be true. Heavy public spending on capital projects today provides one of the main incitements to capital expansion in the private sector.

After reading through the Treasurer's Budget speech, one could not charge him with budgeting boldly or with any element of risk. One can only view with some reservation, even concern, the lack of Government spending at a time when inflationary forces are moving into the ascendent.

Mr. McKee: It indicates the incompetence of the present Government in administering the State's finances.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. I am concerned that at June 30 last Loan funds to the extent of \$5,658,000 were unspent and, to make it worse, the Government intends to hold this money in reserve when there are urgent financial requirements arising from large-scale developmental works already under way, public clamour for more spending to remedy the serious community deficiencies in roads and education, and the unavoidable increases in expenditure on social services. It is clear from the text of the Treasurer's budgeting speech that there was a need for a very large increase in Government spending again this financial year. However, despite this the Treasurer not only curbed spending but he outlined in his speech that he wanted to save money. In his Financial Statement, made on September 5, 1968, he said this:

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 fact that the net shortage on Revenue and Loan Accounts combined was \$2,707,000 at June 30, 1968, was not in itself a matter of such serious concern.

The Treasurer himself admitted that he was not concerned about the \$2,707,000. He continued:

The serious concern arises primarily from the withdrawal of between \$17,000,000 and \$18,000,000 of borrowed moneys away from their normal function of providing for works and developmental expenditures to meet current needs and also from the debt service commitments of nearly \$1,000,000 a year which will persist in the future as a consequence.

The Treasurer said he was concerned about the \$17,000,000 or \$18,000,000 which had allegedly been misspent, but the Treasurer, after making such a scathing attack on the Labor Government for having this money transferred, proceeded to do the very same thing himself. He continued:

It is acknowledged that in other States a considerable volume of expenditure of the nature latterly transferred in this State against Loan Account has been customarily charged to Loan.

He admitted that it was the right and proper thing to do, and that his colleagues in other States had been following this method of financing their State's financial affairs, yet, when the Labor Government wanted to do it, it was all wrong. Nevertheless, he proceeded to do the same thing himself. He continued:

However, the procedure of covering the shortfall of revenue in relation to expanding current requirements for social and public services by making transfers against Loan Account is one that is not capable of repetition.

I stress those last words "not capable of repetition". Yet he was doing the same thing when he presented the Loan Estimates to this House only a short time before. He continued:

Moreover, the diversion of current Loan funds to cover any further current revenue deficit is indefensible, whether the diversion is for formal funding of a revenue deficit or merely to hold surplus funds on one account as a general offset to a deficit on the other. I have already made it clear in the Government Loan works proposals that such a diversion will not be entertained under present circumstances.

I find it difficult to understand how the Treasurer could talk in these terms. He continued:

Whilst it is not practicable for the Government in its first year both to discontinue the charging of certain grants for capital purposes to Loan and to secure a balanced Revenue Budget, the Government regards a balanced Revenue Budget as its minimum immediate objective.

I referred to this point a little earlier. In presenting his Budget the Treasurer left the impression that he was going to attack viciously the people in this State by introducing taxes, and he then referred to "a balanced Revenue Budget

as its minimum immediate objective". I have no alternative but to presume from those last few words that he intended not only to balance the Budget but also to save money, at the very time when it was necessary to channel money into the building of houses and other capital works in this State which, in turn, would have created greater employment. Money that we spend on capital works will work as wheels within wheels, creating services, reducing unemployment, and enabling more people to enjoy prosperity. However, the Treasurer is holding about \$5,000,000 in reserve, instead of putting it to good use. Further, he has introduced vicious taxes that hit the little man to the extent that the Treasurer has said, "I will save money from them."

It can be seen that the Government is endeavouring to apply the brakes on spending at a time when the economy is already operating at low pressure, because of the drought conditions of last season. Unemployment figures are too high, and prices and costs are on the move. Because of this, business confidence has become acutely sensitive to measures of economic restraint since the over-strong application of the brakes in 1960, which was savagely resented by all States. The hostile reaction to the Budget increases evoked many outbursts from business representatives and others. Among the foremost of those who hit the headlines following the presentation of the Budget were the President of the Chamber of Automotive Industries, the President of the Chamber of Commerce, the Chairman of the South Australian Division of the Australian Finance Corporation, the Secretary of the Taxpayers Association, the President of the South Australian Branch of the Australian Medical Association, and the President of the Royal Automobile Association. Let us consider some of the comments made by these men. In the *Advertiser* of September 6, the day after the presentation of the Budget, appeared the following report:

Motorists see tax increase as red rag: Any increase in taxation on motorists to boost general State revenue was like a red rag to a bull as far as the Royal Automobile Association was concerned, the president of the R.A.A. (Mr. R. N. Irwin) said yesterday.

Mr. Edwards: Didn't you know that a bull was colour blind?

Mr. HUGHES: The member for Eyre said a short time ago that mistakes were made, and I said that the greatest mistake ever made was in the making of the honourable member. When he refers to my knowing that a bull is colour blind while I am quoting

the remarks of a person who has had a serious look at the Budget and is so concerned about it, all I can say is that the honourable member belongs to the red ragers, not to the L.C.L. as he claimed a few weeks ago.

Mr. Edwards: You know all about red ragers.

Mr. HUGHES: If the honourable member speaks up as he does when calling wombats out of holes, perhaps I will hear him and be able to reply. I find it difficult to hear the honourable member. Several Government members take a great delight, when Opposition members are speaking, in talking in inaudible tones so that we cannot reply. I challenge the honourable member, through you, Sir, that if he likes to speak up so that I can hear him I will give him replies that he may not relish. Mr. Irwin, commenting on the Budget, said:

This is a discriminatory tax which will in no way benefit the motoring community and strikes at the root of the established principle that taxation on motorists should be earmarked for road construction and maintenance. Motorists are already contributing heavily towards State general revenue through stamp duty on car purchases and transfers. This impost on compulsory third-party payments comes at a time when Australian motorist organizations through the Australian Automobile Association, are considering launching a full-scale survey into the third-party insurance structure with the hope of finding some new way to reduce these premiums, which already impose too heavy a burden on motorists. This tax will only serve to boost them higher. It cannot help but have a retarding influence on the motor industry, the very industry which is becoming the lifeblood of South Australia.

The President of the Chamber of Automotive Industries (Mr. J. W. Taylor), also commenting on the Budget, said:

We will hope the increases in stamp duty will not effect the industry, but it is inevitable that sales will be affected. This adverse move comes at a time when the industry has been looking for some relief. Because of the increasing taxation placed on the automotive industry, this new increase is most unfair. To be fair, taxation should be spread evenly over the community, but this has not happened.

There are two leading personalities in this State.

Mr. Jennings: Hughes and Jennings!

Mr. HUGHES: I am aware of that, but I am speaking about the two leading personalities whose comments I have quoted. I am modest and do not wish to be referred to as I have been referred to by the member for

Enfield. These two men are playing a prominent part in the prosperity of this State and, on behalf of the organizations they represent, they have said they are disgusted at the manner in which this taxation has been placed on third-party insurance.

Mr. McKee: They are not isolated, either.

Mr. HUGHES: They certainly are not. The President of the Chamber of Commerce (Mr. K. D. Williams) said:

The Budget as announced is a tough one for South Australia, even though we recognize the need for State Governments to balance their Budgets. It is a pity that at this time, when South Australia needs encouragement, the Government has seen fit to implement the receipts tax of 1c in \$10 related to turnover.

Here is a man who supports the Liberal Administration to the utmost coming out and saying that he, too, is disappointed in the Budget.

Mr. Clark: He is probably like many of us: he is cynical.

Mr. HUGHES: True. The president of the South Australian branch of the Australian Medical Association (Dr. R. T. Steele) said:

It will be a heavy burden for the sick to bear.

Mr. Jennings: Of course, he has a burden to bear with that name, too.

Mr. HUGHES: The chairman of the South Australian division of the Australian Finance Conference (Mr. P. C. Speakman) is reported to have said:

We cannot comment specifically on the effects of the new duties until we have an opportunity to examine the new legislation.

This man was being very fair. He continued:

However, this represents a further extension of the imposts affecting the finance industry and its customers which have been progressively increased by the other Australian States in recent years. The selective nature of this type of taxation underlines the difficulty facing the States because of the narrow tax fields open to them under the present unsatisfactory Commonwealth-State reimbursement formula.

This man hit the nail squarely on the head. He realized that the Commonwealth Government was not playing its part in adequately assisting this State, and he was not afraid to say so. This shows that what the present Opposition was saying when it was in Government was perfectly true, for it is now being echoed by this man. The newspaper article stated:

The Secretary of the Taxpayers Association of South Australia (Mr. L. H. Duncan) said last night that, while it had been felt there

would be an increase in State taxation, it had been hoped that it would not have been so severe.

Mr. Duncan then went on to refer to the stamp duty on receipts of 1c in \$10 and to point out how it would affect commerce and industry, which he said had already been hard hit by the 2½ per cent increase in Commonwealth income tax on companies. Mr. Duncan realizes that every Government, no matter what its political persuasion, is in charge of the financial affairs of the State and has to find money to run the State. However, there are ways and means other than those announced by the present Government whereby money can be raised. I think the point that Mr. Duncan was trying to make was this: before the election, the Dunstan Government told the people that it would be necessary to increase certain types of taxation, but members of the then Opposition did not say that they intended to increase taxation as they have done in the Budget. It is no good the Treasurer or any other member opposite trying to say that, until they could look at the Treasury records, they could not say what was necessary for the finances of the State. That is far from the truth. They knew about the finances of the State and, if they had had any commonsense, they would not have misled the people by saying that they would spend more money, balance the Budget and make no taxation increases. They should have been honest and told the people what they were going to do.

Mr. McAnaney: Was your Party honest?

Mr. HUGHES: It did not take members opposite long, after they assumed office, to tell people what they intended to do. Of course, then they had won the election, not on their own but with the assistance of an Independent and on a minority vote. At least the people can say that the Labor Government was honest; they cannot say that about the Party opposite.

Mr. McAnaney: At least I am honest.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member has set himself up as the financial wizard of the Government. If he is so honest, why did he not tell the people before the election that, if his Party was elected, it would increase taxation? In the last couple of weeks he has said taxation increases are necessary. In fact, he went further and said that the Government should implement the type of taxation envisaged by the Labor Party.

Mr. McAnaney: Now you are getting off the track.

Mr. HUGHES: No, I am not; the honourable member should look at his speech in this debate. No-one was more dumfounded than I when the honourable member said that succession duties should be increased. He cannot deny that he said that.

Mr. McAnaney: But you are dumb.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member is not dumb, because he makes his own speech and then wants to make everybody else's.

Mr. Broomhill: He was responsible for all the propaganda.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HUGHES: Thank you once again, Mr. Chairman. The people of South Australia knew perfectly well where the Labor Government stood. They knew that, if we were returned to office, we intended to try to increase certain taxes. However, neither the member for Stirling nor any of his colleagues endeavoured at all to tell the people that taxation increases would be necessary.

Mr. Jennings: They kept their traps shut.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, on that subject. What they said was the opposite of what they are saying now.

Mr. McAnaney: Oh, Oh!

Mr. HUGHES: I have here what the honourable member for Stirling said when speaking on September 17. He now says "Oh, oh!"—he does not want to hear it. He said, "This form of taxation is not good." Those words are in *Hansard*. He does not mind fleecing the little man.

Mr. McAnaney: Oh!

Mr. HUGHES: He can run a farm that is giving him a bountiful return.

Mr. McAnaney: You are a liar. It is not.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There are too many interjections. If the honourable member continues to interject, I shall have to take other action.

Mr. HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I regret that I incited the member for Stirling by the reference I made, but I just read what he said, as reported in *Hansard*. He cannot deny he said it. Perhaps he does not look at or correct his own speeches.

Mr. Venning: It is your interpretation.

Mr. HUGHES: By that interjection the honourable member is reflecting on the *Hansard* staff.

Mr. Jennings: And everyone else, too.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. If the member for Rocky River says it is only my interpretation

he is reflecting on the members of the *Hansard* staff, who are held in high esteem by members of this House. Even though the member for Stirling has called me a liar, I am not objecting to it, because I know that it is not true and that every honourable member, with the exception of the member for Stirling, knows it is not true—but he would not have enough brains to know whether or not it was true. I will leave him alone now because I think I have exposed him enough in this Chamber tonight for the way in which he and his Party misled the people of this State prior to the last elections. It is a pity that some honourable members do not realize when we are talking about finance or when we are talking about wombats. Perhaps the member for Eyre (Mr. Edwards) is more competent to talk about wombats than about finance, so I suggest he continues reading the Auditor-General's report and does not try to interject in something of which he knows nothing. I have just quoted some influential men in this State who are concerned about our economy because of the vicious taxes imposed by this Government in this Budget. One of the main statements I am concerned about is that made by the President of the South Australian Division of the Australian Institute of Hospital Administrators (Mr. Gibbs), who said:

The number of road accident victims being treated has been placing increasing financial burdens on public hospitals throughout the State in recent years.

I know that Mr. Gibbs would be very much concerned about the increased charges that will be levied against people who have to be hospitalized, and I, too, regret it very much. This is the wrong time to levy a tax against people who, through no fault of their own, have to be hospitalized—a time when this Government is holding up its sleeve more than \$5,000,000. I said earlier that not only is the Government holding this sum up its sleeve but the Treasurer, in presenting his Budget, said:

The Government regards a balanced Revenue Budget as its minimum immediate objective.

In other words, he intends to save money at the expense of the sick. The Treasurer's decision to raise money in accordance with the schedule of taxes outlined in the Budget will severely hit the little man, the man who is struggling to raise a family, the man who is endeavouring to set up a home, because everything he purchases will be affected. The little man is justly entitled to own a motor car. I

do not think it is a luxury for a man to be able to take his family in his motor car to visit his mother-in-law. I do not consider that a luxury! Yet he will be required to find an additional \$2 when he pays his compulsory third party insurance premium. Two days after the Budget was presented the little man was told in the press that, if, after he had worked hard all day, he wanted to have a schooner or butcher of beer, he would have to pay an additional cent, or 2c for a pint.

Mr. Riches: How does my mob get on?

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member's mob has been hit even harder, as I said earlier. A little hilarity is all right sometimes, but I point out for the benefit of the member for Rocky River (Mr. Venning) that, in the event of sickness, the man I have been speaking of will have to pay higher hospital charges for himself and his family.

Mr. Clark: This is serious.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. In addition, less money will be available to him from the State Bank, and he will pay more for goods bought on hire-purchase, as has been shown by the remarks of the hire-purchase representative to whom I have referred. Yet, if this man were not able to borrow on hire-purchase to build and furnish a home in which to raise a family, he would not be able to buy the items at all. He may have to pay a little more when he uses hire-purchase, but that is beside the point. Eventually the article becomes his property, yet the vicious taxes levied against him will prevent him from owning a car to take his family out.

Mr. McAnaney: That's not right.

Mr. HUGHES: Of course it is right. All that I have said about the effect of taxes on the little man is true, and he will pay dearly.

Mr. McAnaney: You put it up two years ago.

Mr. HUGHES: I am talking about the present Budget. I thought I had got through the skull of the member for Stirling that the Labor Government told the people of any taxation moves that it intended to make. The L.C.L. members do not like being reminded that they said they intended to spend more money and to balance the Budget without increasing taxation. Not one word was spoken about these increases by the Premier and his colleagues prior to the last election. In fact, the Premier led the people of this State to believe that, if they were elected as a Government, the very reverse would apply. The people were misled into thinking that this Government would increase spending, balance

the Budget, and not increase taxation, and not one Member of the Government can deny it.

The L.C.L. made capital out of a pamphlet called the *Voice of South Australia*. It used fictitious personalities to mislead the people into thinking that the Walsh-Dunstan Government had increased taxation out of all proportion. I was surprised that certain people who subscribe to the Christian faith sent those pamphlets out with their compliments. I should like to think that they were innocent and were unaware of the pack of lies that the pamphlet contained. I challenge any Government member to prove the statements in the pamphlet attributed to anonymous persons. It was the rottenest bit of electioneering any party could ask its candidates to subscribe to. I quote from one of these pamphlets placed in my letter box at Wallaroo. I quote from No. 3 of the series, as apparently the L.C.L. selected certain districts in which to place these pamphlets in an attempt to mislead people. It states:

This is the third of a series of pamphlets setting out what many of the people in South Australia are saying about the State Labor Government. This is in their words, taken from the actual answers to a professional public opinion poll carried out recently in homes throughout the State. South Australians are saying this about Labor's policy of higher taxation.

I will say something later about the percentages that were levied by the Labor Government and of the vicious imposts that are now being imposed on the people of this State in the first year of L.C.L. Administration. The pamphlet continues:

State Taxation is Too High: a 38-year-old teacher: Labor put up rates and prices which hit the little man they are supposed to protect.

Never in the history of the State has such a vicious impost been placed on the little man as is being placed on him by this Budget.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You raised water rates, you raised hospital charges twice, and in the first two years you raised the level of taxation by \$14,000,000 a year.

Mr. HUGHES: I will inform the Treasurer of the percentage a head increase that occurred during the Labor Party's Administration and will also inform him of the Liberal percentages which, apparently he does not know.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Yes I do.

Mr. HUGHES: Then why not be honest about it?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I am being honest.

Mr. HUGHES: The Minister is not being honest. The pamphlet continues:

A 33-Year-old Record Librarian: The Labor Government has increased taxation, including stamp duties and land tax.

These people were not told about the formula that was introduced by the Playford Government concerning land tax. The pamphlet continues:

A 58-Year-old Engineer: They're all out to raise money at the expense of the public.

A 29-Year-old Housewife: I don't like the Labor Government because it didn't mention before the election the putting up of land taxes, and then blaming the other Party for its mistakes.

Obviously, these supposedly anonymous contributors did not know anything about the land tax and that this Government was blaming it on the other Party for its mistakes. When this pamphlet was written care was taken that nothing was said about the formula, which had been introduced and which was considered every five years. They forgot to tell the people that when they wrote this little pamphlet. A 67-year-old retired fruitgrower said:

The State Labor Government has upset the basic principles of fair taxation.

It is not necessary for me to go on further. On the subject of what is fair taxation I think I have quoted enough of the remarks of the very prominent and influential men in this State as reported in the *Advertiser* of September 6 this year.

All this rubbish, plus the Budget before the Chair, came from the Party opposite which said that the Labor Government should keep State taxes low in order to maintain a competitive cost structure. Despite what the *Voice of South Australia* printed from its anonymous contributors, during the life of the Labor Government we increased taxes by less than 4 per cent a head compared with an increase of 20 per cent a head in the first year of the present Government.

Mr. Broomhill: And there will be more.

Mr. HUGHES: The Treasurer is not very happy about the percentages I have quoted because he knows they are true.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The honourable member does not realize that this 20 per cent—

Mr. HUGHES: The Treasurer can make a second speech later in an effort to prove that the Opposition is wrong. All I can say is that he did not do a very good job when he explained the Budget in this Chamber on September 5.

I turn now to education. I have become more and more concerned about the alarming situation that has been allowed to develop recently regarding student teacher allowances. The excellent speech made last week by the former Minister of Education (Hon. R. R. Loveday) in support of the retention of these allowances completely demoralized not only the Minister of Education but also the whole of the front bench. The honourable member exposed the system proposed by this Government, and he was so sure he had the support of the people of this State in what he was saying that he told this Chamber that unless the Government was prepared to withdraw its proposals he would move a vote of no confidence in the Government.

Apparently the honourable member struck such a knock-out blow that the *Advertiser* the following day announced to the people what the former Minister of Education thought of this retrograde step and also what he intended to do about it. I wish to quote from the *Advertiser* of the day following the speech of the member for Whyalla and the reply of the Minister. The *Advertiser* thought that the former Minister had made such a fine speech and had been so sure of his facts that it saw fit to place the following report on the front page, under the heading "Labor Threat on Teachers":

Unless proposals to alter the system of student teacher allowances were withdrawn, the Opposition would move for a vote of no confidence in the Government, Mr. Loveday (A.L.P.) said in the Assembly last night. Replying, the Minister of Education (Mrs. Steele) said Mr. Loveday knew that the question of student teachers' allowances had been under review since 1964.

The Hon. Joyce Steele: So he did.

Mr. HUGHES: The article continues:

He also knew that certain recommendations were made to him when Minister because there was criticism of the scheme by the Treasury, by the Auditor-General, by the internal auditors of the department and by the principals and lecturers of the teachers colleges. Mr. Loveday, a former Minister of Education, said that the Opposition would move for a decrease in the Education Department's Budget estimates as a vote of no confidence in the Government. He criticized the proposals on the grounds that:

Insupportable hardship would be imposed on students and parents by being required, in many cases, to pay extra for books and travel between the colleges and homes.

There would be a reduction in numbers of students wishing to become teachers at a time when increased enrolments were vital for the expansion of education facilities in South Australia.

The State Government would make a saving of \$64,688 a year under the new proposals, solely at the expense of the students.

Many students would be forced to leave their homes some distance from the colleges and seek accommodation closer so as to save on travelling expenses. This accommodation might be less suitable.

Rental in homes and flats close to the colleges would be forced up as the demand increased.

College and university libraries would be placed under extreme pressure to provide the compulsory text books for students unable to afford them.

Mr. Loveday said that when the Labor Party had come into office in 1965, one of the first things it had done was to improve student allowances for teacher trainees.

The Minister was interjecting. I wonder if she wishes to interject now and say that what I have quoted is untrue.

The CHAIRMAN: Interjections are out of order.

Mr. HUGHES: The article continues:

Now the Government without warning and without consulting the students was, in effect, reducing allowances from an average of \$101 a year to \$85. "Statements by Mrs. Steele have been most unsatisfactory and in many respects have not presented a fair picture of the results of the regulations," he said. While the new proposals would provide an allowance of \$85 to the students for both travel and book expenses some students' costs were as high as \$460 a year.

The saving of \$64,000 to the Government under the new system would be in addition to the saving in administration costs which had not been disclosed. It would be interesting to see how many officers of the department would not be employed if this system were introduced.

The Minister herself stated in this Chamber last week that one reason why this regulation had been introduced and why the Under Treasurer and the Auditor-General had drawn attention to the matter was that the old system was being abused.

The Hon. Joyce Steele: The students admitted that in their delegations to me.

Mr. HUGHES: The Minister also stated:

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. . . . 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.

The charge of the Minister of Education that the old system was being abused is serious.

Her reply to the member for Whyalla yesterday afternoon clearly indicated that the Minister has no foundation for blackening the character of every student teacher in the State by stating that the system was being abused. About 3,500 student teachers are affected by this charge. Their characters have been damned by the Minister's statement. Let us look at the post-mortem carried out by the Minister in her attempt to back up her baseless statement. This is what she said in reply to a question from the member for Whyalla yesterday:

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.

How the Minister can base her insulting remarks about student teachers on informing the House of a few cases out of 3,500 students is beyond my comprehension. The Minister will be not only held up to ridicule by the students but also despised by their parents, and she will be the means of lowering the dignity of her Cabinet colleagues and of Parliament as a whole. The Minister reflected on those students who travelled by car; apparently she had not troubled to read the conditions set down on the back of the claim form for refunds of travelling expenses. The conditions are as follows:

Payment is made in respect of travel from home to a teachers college, university, institute of technology or other place where instruction is given—

and this is the point I want to bring before the Chamber—

It is recognized that students may not travel by public transport but, whatever conveyance is used, they may claim the cost of travel by

public transport from home to college and return in excess of 20c per day.

From this it is quite plain that the Minister had not taken the trouble to do her homework properly. This shows that the Minister was very hard put to find any argument to support her action in reducing student teacher allowances. She had to fossick at the bottom of the barrel to find something to support her action. An article in today's *Advertiser* shows what the students think of the Minister. We know that yesterday's Cabinet decision was brought about through pressure by the member for Whyalla (Hon. R. R. Loveday) and other Opposition members, but I particularly commend the member for Whyalla for the manner in which he handled this delicate situation. Because of the pressure brought to bear in this House on the Minister, plus the support received from the students themselves—

Mr. Nankivell: They were pressured.

Mr. HUGHES: There is no need for me to defend any action taken by the member for Whyalla, because he is well able to defend himself. As a result of his action Cabinet in its wisdom could see that if it did not do something about the allowances it would have real trouble on its hands. Consequently, a hurried decision was made and, as the Minister said yesterday, she and her colleagues relented to some degree, though not to my satisfaction and not to the satisfaction of the 3,500 students. The allowances were increased by \$20. The article in the *Advertiser*, which shows what the students thought of the Minister's reply, is headed "Students to Stop Work for a Day". Perhaps that may not be quite correct: I do not know, but I do not say the *Advertiser* is wrong, because the Minister told us what student teachers were paid in the various States.

The Hon. Joyce Steele: That was verified yesterday morning—

Mr. HUGHES: The Minister has had her say, and it was not very convincing to the 3,500 students. Perhaps I could be wrong if I were a lone wolf. However, what I am saying is supported by the 3,500 students.

The Hon. Joyce Steele: And I suppose they're absolutely right.

Mr. HUGHES: Government members have said many times that students should not be incited to demonstrations, and so on. However, on this occasion the members of the Government could be charged with inciting the students in South Australia to take drastic action.

Mr. McAnaney: That is what you are doing.

Mr. HUGHES: The whole fault lies with the Government. The following report appeared in this morning's *Advertiser*:

Students to stop work for a day: An open-air meeting of about 2,500 students from all five S.A. teachers colleges yesterday carried a vote of no confidence in the Minister of Education (Mrs. Steele) and decided to hold a one-day strike. Students hissed and booed during the meeting. In an announcement in the Assembly earlier, Mrs. Steele said the Government's answer to the submissions made by a deputation representing the students was that allowances to student teachers would be increased by \$105 a year instead of \$85. In answer to Mr. Loveday (A.L.P.) Mrs. Steele said that at mid-day yesterday she received the presidents of the five student representative councils, who were accompanied by the President of the S.A. Institute of Teachers.

This followed a deputation on September 11, which was asked to make submissions in writing. "We had a long and amicable discussion," she said. "I advised the students that I had done what I had said I would do, to consider their submissions thoroughly and to discuss them with the Director-General of Education (Mr. J. S. Walker) and to have full discussions with Cabinet on this matter." Mrs. Steele said she then told the deputation that the Government's answer to their submission was to increase the annual allowance by a further \$20. Mrs. Steele said outside Parliament that the original \$85 allowance was arrived at by dividing the amount provided for textbooks and travelling allowances by Parliament last year among the number of students eligible.

"In actual fact we exceeded that amount," she said. "This new allowance of \$105 is based on the actual amount spent. We arrived at a figure of \$101, but we decided to make it a round figure of \$105. "It will come into effect from January 1, 1969." She said she had told the deputation that the Government could not find any extra money to meet this additional allowance, which would have to be contained within the Education Department vote. Mrs. Steele said that if a student living at home could prove extreme hardship, he or she would become eligible for the \$250 boarding allowance. The one-day strike proposed could only hurt students, particularly when examinations were close. Asked if students would have their allowance "docked" for the day off, Mrs. Steele said teachers colleges were autonomous and matters of discipline were in the hands of the principals.

I wish to be fair and quote what the Minister said, because I would be the last to misquote her.

Mr. McAnaney: Famous last words.

Mr. HUGHES: One could quote from an article and take the words out of context, and this could be damaging in the eyes of the people of South Australia, but I do not intend to do that, because I want to be fair to the Minister.

The article continues:

The meeting called by student leaders to hear the outcome of the deputation to Mrs. Steele was held in the courtyard and surrounds of the Adelaide Teachers College. Rain fell during the meeting. After hearing a report from the deputation, the meeting of students decided to:

Take a full-page advertisement in the *Advertiser* within a few days to tell potential teachers and their parents "to think" before deciding to begin training at South Australian teachers colleges.

Support an organized boycott of teaching practice in schools near the end of this year if the Government continued with existing plans for student allowances.

Make known to secondary school-children the financial conditions of student teachers at teachers colleges and suggest they investigate other ways of entering the teaching profession, such as through scholarships to universities.

Invite Mrs. Steele to attend a general student meeting and answer questions.

The meeting voted against a motion urging an immediate "sit-in" at the administrative sections of each of the five teachers colleges, and that subsequently night and day at least 100 students should occupy the offices and by answering all incoming mail, effectively separate the teachers colleges from all contact with the Flinders Street administration (Education Department), thus creating five autonomous teachers colleges.

Student leaders announced at the start of the meeting that Mr. Walker had told them he would consider any submission the students wanted to make, but nothing more could be done this year. Their account of remarks made by Mrs. Steele and Mr. Walker was greeted with howls of derision. There was sustained booing and hissing when the President of the State Council of Student Teachers (Mr. P. Mitchell) reported that Mr. Walker had told the deputation that the students should accept the allowance increase gracefully, and there was one cry of "String him up."

Mr. McAnaney: Do you support that?

Mr. HUGHES: I am not supporting anything, but people read this and no doubt it is worrying the Minister and her financial adviser sitting behind her. The article continues:

The students carried placards—

The Hon. Joyce Steele: This was arranged beforehand.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not know whether that is so; the first I knew of this was when I read the newspaper this morning. Apparently, the Minister could have stopped this if she had taken the appropriate action, because apparently she knew about it, and it is worse than ever if she did know what was to take place but did not try to stop it. The article continues:

The students' next move will be to attempt to influence Parliament to revoke the recent Government regulation which deals with the new rules governing student allowances and

conditions. Mr. Mitchell said last night that he and the President of the Adelaide Teachers College SRC (Mr. D. J. Smith) would go to Parliament House at 10 a.m. today. They would submit evidence to the Parliamentary Committee for Subordinate Legislation to see whether the regulation could be disallowed. Mr. Mitchell said it seemed that the students would get no further in negotiations with the Minister. The students had asked for the retention of the present travel reimbursement system and adequate individual book grants. "We have got an extra \$20, but we didn't get what we asked for," he said.

All they were requesting was the retention of the *status quo*. Members opposite would like the public to think the students were asking for something additional, but that is not true. The article continues:

The president of the South Australian Institute of Teachers (Mr. W. A. White), who attended the deputation to Mrs. Steele, told the meeting that the Government had been "badly advised from the start" in deciding to change the regulations governing student book and travel allowances. Changes in the regulations had been proposed during the life of the previous (Labor) Government, but the then Minister had decided not to go on with them. It was not a member of the Opposition who told the students this or was responsible for this report being in the newspaper: it was the President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers. Members opposite are silent now. He pointed out that the previous Minister had had these suggestions put to him but he was not prepared to give effect to them because he did not believe in them.

Mr. McAnaney: That does not necessarily make his decision right.

Mr. HUGHES: True, but in this case, according to 3,500 student teachers in South Australia, the former Minister of Education was right and the present Minister is wrong. The member for Stirling is not helping the Minister of Education one iota, and if I were in her position I would lean over and quietly tell him to be quiet, because he is only adding fuel to the fire.

I will not reply to the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell), who seems to be trying to interject, because every time I do so he becomes annoyed, and as we have been on good terms over the years I should not like that situation to alter. I, like the student teachers of South Australia, register my disapproval at the action of the Minister in reviewing, to the detriment of a very large number of trainee teachers, both existing and prospective, the conditions relating to travelling expenses and the provision of textbooks. Obviously, this ill considered action on travelling expenses is inspired because

of the necessity to reduce expenditure in the administrative field of education. Mean figures have been determined for application to all trainees to eliminate book work and the cost associated with dealing with the many and varied individual claims. Although some stand to gain and others are not greatly affected, the majority, especially those who have to travel some distance, would appear to suffer financially from such measures. If a mean figure of, say, only \$50 instead of \$60 had been applied, with provision to pay all expenses to those trainees whose fares exceeded the mean figure, there would have been some merit and fairness in the scheme. As it is, however, the individual has received no consideration whatever.

In any case, one wonders what factors were considered in the fixation of travelling expenses at \$60 and what guide lines the Minister used in arriving at this figure. I know of one student whose fares have been about \$28 a term, or about \$80 a year, notwithstanding that she resides at West Croydon, which is only two miles from the Western Teachers College. What about students living at Gawler, Salisbury or Largs Bay? The situation is worsened, of course, by the hopelessly divided or annexed nature of students' accommodation. A student at Western Teachers College can be required to attend at Thebarton, Currie Street, Norwood Technical School (for craft work), the Institute of Technology or the university. Practice teaching and educational excursions, involving other locations at certain times, are in addition to this.

The fixation of \$25 a year for books is ridiculous, and again one is mystified as to how such a figure was determined. It is realistically assessed that the annual cost for books for an ordinary primary training course would be \$97, whilst art students would incur expenses of at least four times this sum. If this base or mean figure of \$25 has been assessed as an average of sums spent over recent years, it is doubtless because little money has been expended by the Education Department on books over the period concerned. The replacement of books or, in other words, the mere maintenance of a library or reservoir of books, established over many years, would be largely involved. However, this is a completely false basis to apply to students required to purchase all of their text books, whether new or secondhand.

This move by the Government is inexplicable. On the one hand it claims to be

spending more on education, whilst on the other hand it cuts the grass from under the feet of the already scantily paid trainee teachers, the future leaders in the profession who are the whole backbone of the educational system. The Minister of Education has said, "The Government will save no money under this scheme". If this is so (and, of course, we know it is not), why was it introduced? Doubtless, many students who will be financially embarrassed will be forced to quit the profession. Other prospective teachers and those with a natural aptitude for this occupation will just not be able to pursue it because of their parents' inability to support them.

I know of a young lady residing 18 miles from the Adelaide railway station who is in the category I have just mentioned. She is a bright intelligent girl doing her Leaving at a technical high school, where she is a prefect. For many years she has displayed intense interest in handicapped or retarded children and is bent on teaching in this specialized field. She will be most disappointed if her aim cannot be achieved. The recent action of the Minister through Executive Council, however, places her in practically an impossible situation. Traveling expenses at the cheapest railway rates would be \$2.68 a week from her home to Adelaide, without the fares involved in traveling from the Adelaide railway station to the teachers college. Conservatively, her estimated travelling expenses would be \$140 a year. How does the Minister's \$60 a year measure up in these circumstances?—and her home is only 18 miles from Adelaide. Honourable members can see that the cost of travel plus textbooks would place this girl "in the red" at the outset to the extent of about \$200 depending on the subjects she would be required to undertake. Art subjects could increase this to a considerably larger sum, which is a completely untenable situation. This case is but one of many. I know of another girl in a somewhat similar situation and she resides much nearer, in the Woodville district.

Surely there is nothing more imperative in modern society than the highest possible educational standard. A prerequisite to this is the attraction to the teaching profession of the best talent available, as the success of the whole system rides squarely on the shoulders of its instructional capacity and ability. The Government's action, in these circumstances, must be stamped as the most damaging in the history of this State, ill-considered, unwisely implemented, and completely unjustified.

I turn now to the line dealing with the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and will deal with fluoridation. I address my remarks in particular to members of Cabinet, which recently announced that our water supplies would be fluoridated without even a Parliamentary discussion, let alone a referendum, in which I believe. A few days ago at a luncheon the Premier said that he desired the people to have an opportunity to submit ideas for their own welfare.

Mr. Rodda: Were you present?

Mr. HUGHES: No, but I read two daily papers that reported what the Premier said. If the Premier was sincere in his statement, why did he not ask South Australians whether they wished their water supply to be fluoridated? Surely the present Government cannot in all honesty believe it has a mandate to make a decision of such magnitude without even a debate in this House. During the election campaign members of the present Government did not even mention fluoridation, so it is now duty bound in the interests of democracy to allow the people themselves to decide whether the water supply should be fluoridated.

I am not the only member of Parliament who believes that the Government has overstepped its authority in this regard: a member in another place, who belongs to the same political faith as that of members opposite, believes the Government's action is highly censurable and has taken a step, by way of a motion, to force the Government to retrace its drastic step and to allow Parliament to decide what action, if any, should be taken.

Mr. Broomhill: The Government is getting the opinions of people on every other subject.

Mr. HUGHES: I did refer to that matter a short time ago. At a luncheon the Premier called upon the people to help him run the State.

Mr. Lawn: The Premier will get plenty of ideas if he reads the letters published in the newspapers.

Mr. HUGHES: This motion is being put forward to force the Government to retrace its drastic step.

Mr. McAnaney: You can move a motion any time you like.

Mr. HUGHES: Maybe I will.

Mr. Broomhill: It may be necessary.

Mr. HUGHES: Exactly. In view of the Premier's call for people's opinions on how the State should be run, it is clear that the Government has run out of ideas. He should have sought the people's help some months ago.

Mr. Jennings: Why don't you suggest that he resign?

Mr. HUGHES: That would be the best thing. The present Leader of the Opposition is known far and wide for his great ability in running the State: he could readily accept the responsibilities if the Premier resigned. I have a copy of a letter (and I believe copies were forwarded to all members of Cabinet) that explains very well why the Government should not fluoridate our water supply without first consulting the people. Undoubtedly other members, too, received this letter:

Re fluoridation of public water supplies: Those who campaign against the fluoridation of public water supplies are not campaigning against the use of fluoride in attacking dental caries. We campaign for the right to choose our medication, or our doctors and dentists to prescribe it for us as individuals. No person against the fluoridation of public water denies the right of any child (irrespective of financial status) to be able to obtain fluoride if that child's parents, guardian and doctors consider it desirable. Personally, I dislike the idea of fluoride for myself or any child, in spite of wanting to cling to my own teeth to the last minute, and having spent a great deal of money to do so. I would like satisfactory answers to the following questions:

1. Why is it necessary to fluoridate public water supplies in order that those who want or need fluoride should obtain it? As it seems agreed it can only be of benefit up to the ages of about 12-15 years, surely a reasonable plan of free distribution of tablets (or improved method) and free regular examination of teeth till that age would achieve this purpose? If fluoride does achieve 60 per cent reduction of caries, then there would very soon be little work to be done as a result of these examinations and the free tablets recommended to them. Any deleterious effects could also be treated immediately.

2. Why, when it is obvious that a considerable body of people (both lay and scientific) have grave misgivings, fears over mass medication of this chemical through water supplies, does the Government ignore and disregard these fears? Surely it is not the thoughtless or apathetic who have taken the trouble to study the matter in detail and in the long term. Many of us are too old to have great fears for ourselves, but are extremely concerned for children and grandchildren.

3. Why is it that in the case of fluoride doctors are willing to prescribe a medication (or not oppose it) for thousands of unseen individuals without even knowing how much of said medication any individual might ingest? Normally a doctor is loath to prescribe for one person over the telephone, even when knowing that individual. My personal interpretation of medical ethics and practice would rule this haphazard method of prescription completely out.

4. Why is it that tooth decay (which in the past has been considered not only on a

diet basis but a geographical one as well) is now prescribed for in blanket fashion irrespective of climate, soil or any other ecological context? For instance, it is obvious that South Australians will ingest more than Tasmanians as our public water supplies are used in everything we eat for the greater part of the year. Cool climates of high rainfall would probably mean that people would only take fluoride in the water they drink. In South Australia in the past it has usually been felt that hills-born persons have less chance of good teeth than those on the plains. Surely any scientific approach must be through local research and then recommendations made in districts or areas.

5. Why do the authorities put fluoridation of water in the same category as X-rays, chlorination, immunization, etc.? Chlorination attacks microbes in the water and is not a human medication. Fluoride actually alters the growth of the body, as a medication not a part of diet. Where fluoride occurs naturally, it is accompanied with certain balancing minerals and is part of the district's ecology. T.B. is a killer disease and communicable—the damage X-rays may do to tissue is carefully weighed against the risks of infection and the X-rays carefully spaced. Parents willingly have their children immunized against the more serious of the communicable diseases. The practice now has a long history of success and confidence. Any mistake or deleterious effect on the individual child can be immediately detected and traced. Once a medication is placed in the community's supply how can effects on individuals be traced?

There are several further questions that I do not intend to read, but the last one clarifies my point that the Government has no right to fluoridate the State's water supply, because "once a medication is placed in the community's water supply how can effects on individuals be traced?" I have received letters from eminent men who would support the statement that we could not trace effects on the individual, and the health of some people in South Australia would be drastically affected by taking fluoride into their bodies. The person who wrote this letter lives at Highgate but, apparently, Cabinet in its wisdom completely ignored the letter, as it did the advice of other eminent people. I am no authority on fluoridation—

Mr. McAnaney: Who said you were an authority?

Mr. HUGHES: As I have strong views on this subject I hoped that all members would treat it seriously, because we are dealing with something on which eminent professors and medical men disagree. I am concerned at the way fluoridation is to be introduced, and I have been guided to some extent in my actions by the letters I have received from these people. I have never set myself up as an

authority, but I object to having a mass medication that has been referred to by some people as a poison. The Labor Party was charged by a former member of the L.C.L. with putting poison in the hands of children.

Mr. Nankivell: Stop waffling and get on with it.

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member can wander outside if he likes. I can remember that, when members of the Liberal Party were sitting over here, they took hours and hours over speeches, and I never objected at any time.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: I think the honourable member is trying to encourage you.

Mr. HUGHES: I am very grateful for that, and I am sorry if I misunderstood him. As I said, I do not set myself up as an expert on this matter, but I object strongly to having mass medication thrust on the people against their wishes, and to the disgusting way in which the Government is attempting to do it. I am not the only person objecting: certain members of the Liberal Party in another place are taking strong exception to the way this is being introduced. Those members are concerned not so much with whether it is a good or a bad thing but with the arrogant way the Government is taking action in this matter.

I understand that Cabinet members were supplied with an extract from the *Medical Journal of Australia*. However, the Government seems to have ignored this extract, otherwise it would never have gone on and announced its intention in this matter. The extract is signed by Arthur Amies (Professor of Dental Medicine and Surgery) and Philip R. N. Sutton (Senior Lecturer in Dental Science), and I do not think any one of us in this place should ignore what such eminent men had to say, particularly when their comments were considered important enough to be inserted in that journal. The extract is as follows:

Recently some members of the medical and dental professions have chosen to advocate an increased intake of fluorides by the whole population through the fluoridation of their water supplies. 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 re-assessed.

During the past ten years, much new information has become available, which has led to a growing awareness amongst scientists of potential adverse aspects of fluoridation. An indication of the caution demonstrated concerning this measure is a resolution published last year (April, 1967) by the International Society for Research on Nutrition and Vital Substances. This has a membership drawn from 76 countries, and includes 65 per cent medical scientists. The first Honorary President was the late Albert Schweitzer, who was succeeded by Linus Pauling. The Scientific Council of the Society comprises 393 members, including five winners of the Nobel Prize and 262 university professors. Three of the 15 paragraphs of their resolution on fluoridation, as stated in the English language version, were:

The Scientific Council of the International Society for Research on Nutrition and Vital Substances (Society for Combating the Civilization Diseases) recommends all Governments, State Parliaments and city councils, who concern themselves with the problem of fluoridation of drinking water and the protection against dental caries, to refrain from the fluoridation of drinking water, which is in reality a medication, as long as the scientific aspects of this problem will not be satisfactorily clarified. The fluoridation of drinking water releases a fluorine circuit which includes vegetables, fruit and other horticultural products as well as milk, and has an uncontrolled effect on the human organism. The fluoridation of drinking water should not be valued according to briefly occurring successes, which are judged very differently, but rather according to the later hazards which are then incurable.

These eminent men are warning us (and this was dated March 2, 1968) that we should be careful about introducing fluoride into our water supplies because of the hazards which can occur and which they claim are incurable. I do not think that these matters would appear in the *Medical Journal of Australia* if there were not some weight behind them. I can only be guided by such eminent members of the medical profession, and therefore I oppose strongly mass medication of our water supplies and the method by which the Government intends to implement its proposal. It remains to be seen how members of another place react to the motion that has been moved there. Another eminent man, Dr. Rae, who is Associate Professor of Chemistry at the Toronto University, addressed the Chemical Institute of Canada on this matter. If members read that address they will see that this man also gave a warning. Therefore, we should be more careful and undertake more

research before we proceed. Dr. Rae also believes that a grave danger exists in drinking fluoridated water, the effects of which can be incurable.

Certain churches are also bitterly opposed to fluoridation, as it cuts across some of their beliefs. Although I have not received a letter from my own church, I have received one from the Christian Science Committee on Publication for South Australia (which is the Christian Science Church), as well as letters from people in my district (who represent various churches), asking me to take steps to prevent the implementation of this proposal. The letter from the Christian Science Committee is worth bringing to the attention of members. Dated July 29, 1968, it states:

Because of the rising pressure from some quarters to fluoridate the public water supplies throughout the State, we feel it could be helpful to you to know the considered and collective thought of our people on this matter. A brief statement on behalf of the Christian Scientists in this State to clarify our church's position on the question of fluoridating the public water supplies follows.

We wish to make it clear at the outset that it is certainly not our desire or intention to oppose legitimate public health and sanitation programmes or to deny any of the various medicinal health measures to those who desire them. But, when it comes to compulsory fluoridation or any other programme that would undermine the basic freedom of the individual in matters of personal health and religion, then we feel it is our duty to register our convictions and strongest protest. We wish to emphasize that our church supports the establishment of an orderly, just, and lawful society, and that as individuals, we obey the laws, including public health laws, whenever they apply to us. At the same time, however, we are definitely opposed to any measure which involves unnecessary compulsion, especially on something as personal as individual health. We believe that the question of fluoridation cannot be separated from those larger issues of individual freedom and compulsory regimentations, including mass medical treatment, which today loom large in our society.

We also believe that fluoridation of the public water supply violates the sanctity of the individual rights of citizens; that the Government should not have the power to compel any citizen to submit to unnecessary treatment which violates the dictates of his conscience, his personal integrity, or his day-by-day control and responsibility for the care of his own body. We believe that the individual's right to choose his own diet and method of health treatment should be preserved because this is a fundamental human and civil right. It is, therefore, our deepest conviction that the public water supplies should not be used for the purpose of mass medication, nutritional additives or for any

substance except those necessary for purification of the water. It should be made very clear that we are not concerned here with the medical question of whether fluoridation is effective or ineffective. Our only concern is with the methods being proposed, which would deny the individual his freedom of choice. The fact is that other methods of making fluoridation available do exist—tablets, toothpaste, direct application, milk, and so forth—and these methods can be used in a large-scale community-wide programme without infringing unnecessarily on the rights of those who do not want to take part. These other methods have been endorsed by many medical and dental authorities, and can be made available to all those who desire their children to have such treatment.

This being the case, we earnestly question the justification or necessity for medicating all citizens involuntarily by means of the public water supply, especially since it is clear that without it no threat or danger to the public welfare is involved in any way. On the contrary, we wonder whether compulsory fluoridation would not be a dangerous precedent for a very serious erosion of individual freedom. We would like to call attention to the fact that compulsory fluoridation goes far beyond almost all public health measures now in existence, even those for serious contagious diseases. It would force "automatic" mass medication on every citizen using the public water supply, without regard to individual needs and conditions. It introduces a whole new order of compulsory public health measures which deprive the individual of his right to determine his own form of treatment on even so personal a matter as dentistry. We would, therefore, like to respectfully request that consideration be given to the effect that the enactment of compulsory fluoridation would have on the individual freedoms of all those who use the public water supplies of this State, and the ultimate cost in terms of fundamental individual human rights.

Yours faithfully,

A. P. H. OKE.

I think that alone clarifies what I stated earlier: that there are some people in this State unable to judge whether the fluoridation of water will benefit or harm the community. That is my opinion. I am not an expert, so I cannot say whether it would be harmful. The present Government has no mandate to fluoridate our water supply, because this matter was not mentioned by members of the present Government prior to the election, and I am very doubtful whether they then had any policy at all on the matter. Consequently, the people should decide whether the water supply should be fluoridated. I realize that the member for Albert is anxious to follow me in this debate, and I realize the respect he has shown for me in allowing me to bring these matters before the Committee without his raising any objection. I expect he will harshly

criticize some of the matters I have raised tonight.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): The member for Wallaroo is quite correct. I have been a captive member of the audience. As he has spoken for a total of about three hours, I suggest that, if he expects his constituents to follow his points, he provide them with a *precis* of his speech. I should like to comment on some of the matters he has raised. First, I will deal with the Budget and the new taxes. There are some very interesting comments if one chooses to read them, but apparently some members do not choose to do so, in both the Auditor-General's Report and the Treasurer's Financial Statement. The Auditor-General says that we finished last year with a deficit of \$8,365,137, against which was carried forward an amount on Loan Account of \$5,658,152. This amount carried forward is an unspent amount, and it follows the practice of the previous Government in carrying forward a Loan surplus to offset a revenue deficit from the preceding year. If we look at it a little more closely, we find that the deficit was actually greater than \$8,000,000. Also, notwithstanding what the honourable member said, the previous Government substantially increased taxation during its term of office. Also, as pointed out by the Auditor-General, it took advantage of the surplus in Loan Account and trust accounts to assist it to meet current deficits as they occurred. Although some of the money transferred from Revenue Account to Loan Account was spent on capital works of a similar nature to Government capital works that had no recovery provision, it reduced the amount that would have been spent, in accordance with the previous form of budgeting, on Loan works by about \$17,000,000 or \$18,000,000. Money that would have been spent on non-governmental capital expenditure (such as on universities) from grant money was spent from Loan money. This transfer meant, in effect, that our total Loan expenditure was reduced by this amount.

Mr. Jennings: When?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Over the three years the Labor Government was in office.

Mr. Jennings: The same proportion, or worse, is provided this time.

Mr. NANKIVELL: A worse proportion is not being provided for. I will outline, for the benefit of the honourable member, what happened during the three years the Labor Government was in office. The member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) said that the budget-

ing for an extra \$8,000,000 in taxation was somewhat iniquitous. However, in 1966-67 his Government caused increases in taxation, as a result of its own action, of \$9,725,000. Now I will tell the honourable member precisely how these figures were arrived at. In 1965-66, as a result of increased land tax, increased stamp duty on cheques, harbour charge increases, increased water charges (mainly in the price of water), and increased hospital fees, \$4,320,000 additional taxation was raised. In 1966-67 increased land tax amounted to \$2,100,000, and this arose as a result of the quinquennial assessment. Another additional increase (both increases are additional, the \$2,100,000 being additional to the \$850,000) was \$1,350,000 in stamp duties, in addition to the previous \$900,000. Stamp duties increases came from conveyances, hire-purchase, and money-lenders' charges. In that year there was an increase in liquor taxes of \$750,000. The increase on rail freights and fares (mainly increased charges on the cartage of grain, manures, general merchandise and fares) was \$1,550,000. Tram and bus fares brought in an additional \$375,000. These taxes affect the little people. Water rates increased by \$500,000, again mostly as a result of the quinquennial assessment. There was also another increase in hospital fees, this time of \$600,000. Then there was increased revenue from lotteries of \$1,700,000. A calculation shows that lotteries have meant a contributory charge by those who hope to get some reward of about \$8 a head of the work force of this State.

Mr. Jennings: That's their business.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Precisely, but this time we have the little people taxing themselves. The total annual effect of increased charges levied by the previous Government is \$14,045,000, and these charges are recurrent. For the Labor Party to say that it did not increase taxation is ridiculous.

Mr. Corcoran: Who said that?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am replying to the member for Wallaroo.

Mr. Corcoran: Of course we increased taxation.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: I don't remember the member for Wallaroo saying that: he spoke about what we had done.

Mr. Corcoran: You said that we said we had not increased taxation, but we have never said that.

Mr. Jennings: Has the member for Stirling checked the figures?

Mr. NANKIVELL: These figures bear the stamp of the Treasury, so I can vouch for their authority.

Mr. Clark: The stamp of what?

Mr. NANKIVELL: These figures were provided by the Treasurer and given to him by the Under Treasurer, so they would be accurate.

Mr. Riches: And you are increasing them another 20 per cent.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes, because the Labor Party ran the State into a deficit of \$8,000,000 and someone had either to increase taxation to balance that or reduce the general services. We can't have it both ways.

Mr. Corcoran: Go to your big brothers in Canberra.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I will deal with the Commonwealth later. I think the member for Wallaroo was under a misapprehension about the new taxation provisions, particularly concerning the fourth one, about which the Treasurer said:

An extension of the present hire-purchase duty of 1½ per cent to cover other forms of time payment, leasing and like transactions.

We have it on hire-purchase, but when one buys a motor car today the fellow handling finance will suggest that the buyer does not buy it under hire-purchase because of the higher insurance charges, but that he takes out a chattel mortgage on which there are no charges. That is a legitimate evasion of the tax, and our provision is designed to close that loophole.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Didn't we hear something from Labor members about closing loopholes?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Of course we did. Regarding other forms of taxation, we have to accept the facts for what they are worth.

Mr. Corcoran: We don't have to accept them.

Mr. NANKIVELL: We make no excuses for imposing them; we are running behind in current expenditure to the extent of \$8,000,000. If we maintained current expenditure without reducing services, the people who demand them will have to contribute towards the expense.

Mr. Corcoran: What was the deficit last financial year? Was it \$8,000,000 or \$2,000,000, or are you talking about the cumulative deficit? You are trying to raise \$8,000,000 in one year.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The trading deficit or the actual running deficit was \$8,000,000.

The Labor Party carried forward \$5,000,000 unspent Loan money which we are carrying forward, as the Labor Government did, and we are thus reducing the total deficit to about \$2,200,000. The revenue expenditure of the Labor Government was actually running \$8,000,000 excess.

Mr. Jennings: What happened to the \$9,000,000 from Radium Hill?

Mr. McAnaney: That is in your imagination. It may have been about \$2,000,000.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The Treasurer drew attention to the fact that he had made representation (as had previous Treasurers) to the Commonwealth for a readjustment of the formula under which taxation reimbursements were returned to the States, and that additional representations have been made for special accommodation and special assistance to meet particular circumstances that this State has suffered. I know the previous Government suffered from the effect of drought, resulting in revenue from certain sources being less than was expected.

Mr. Corcoran: We had two bad years.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am not making any excuses. Although I have great respect for the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) and his figures, I do not believe that the drought and the rejection of the succession duties legislation accounted entirely for the deficit that the Labor Government accumulated. We have had bad years previously. I am giving the Labor Government the benefit of the doubt in saying that there was a reasonable case for an approach to the Commonwealth Government for additional assistance.

The Constitution of the Commonwealth Government was framed in 1901 and the Commonwealth was then given taxation powers. In 1942 legislation was introduced for uniform taxation, and the reason given was that the circumstances were such that instead of the Commonwealth Government being a partner with the States in collecting income tax it should, because of war emergencies, have the sole right to collect tax on the understanding that it would return to the States a certain fraction of this money, to be arrived at by an agreed formula, in return for the States' surrendering these rights.

This was challenged in the High Court by all States, and the High Court ruled that where there were inconsistencies in legislation the Commonwealth legislation took precedence of State legislation. The case was lost to the States, and the Commonwealth Government's

pre-eminence in taxation collection was established. It was again challenged in 1957 by Victoria and New South Wales, and again the case was lost. Notwithstanding that, we have been told that if we wish to resume these rights and the States agree the Commonwealth Government might consider surrendering some of this taxation power.

If one looks at the Commonwealth Budget one sees where its revenue comes from. From the paper put out by the Commonwealth Treasurer we find that some \$5,414,000,000 is collected in income tax and that \$711,000,000 is made available to the States for works and housing. One also sees in the Commonwealth's Estimates that \$646,000,000, which contributes to its budgetary deficit, is put down to expenses for State works, net advances to States, works purposes, Housing Agreement, and other things.

In other words, out of its revenue Budget the Commonwealth is providing the major part of the moneys allocated under Loan to the States for capital works. Even though the Commonwealth Government has tremendous taxation and revenue powers, its actual capital debt is only a fraction of that of the States. Sir Henry Bolte said that the Commonwealth debt at June 30, 1968, was only \$2,095,000,000 against a total State debt of \$9,821,000,000. Looking at other avenues of capital expenditure under the Commonwealth, the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electricity Commission scheme was paid for out of revenue and is being repaid to the Commonwealth as a debt. Similarly, money is lent to the Postmaster-General's Department, which is a revenue-earning department looked upon as being almost comparable to private enterprise in its function, and is repayable.

In other words, moneys collected by the Commonwealth under the taxation powers given to it under the Constitution and confirmed by contests in the High Court enable it to finance its capital works out of revenue and to lend to the State moneys on which it demands that the States pay a nominal rate of interest depending on the purpose for which the money has been allocated. Much of the money provided for the States on Loan Account is recoverable. Moneys loaned to the Electricity Trust are not only paid back in full but the trust is able to make sufficient profit out of its operation to enable it to finance a considerable part of its expansion programme out of its own resources. Similarly, the Housing Trust is able to recover most of the moneys provided to it. On the other hand, there is a net loss on moneys

loaned to the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The rates for its services do not return sufficient money to meet in full the interest and sinking fund repayments on the moneys loaned to it. Departments such as this (and there are many of them) are subsidized out of Revenue Account.

However, I wish to draw attention to the fact that, if one looks at what it costs the State to provide services of a non-recoverable kind, one finds that it is costing the State about \$10,500,000 a year interest on these moneys, moneys loaned to us to build schools and hospitals. The Commonwealth Government provides moneys in the form of grants to the State for education at a tertiary level. However, when it comes to building secondary and primary schools, the moneys come by way of loan. Moneys for building hospitals again come to the State by way of loan, but none of these services (and they are vital) are able to recover the loan, either the principal or the capital and sinking fund repayments, and therefore they become a dead weight on the capital of the State, thus increasing the overall State debt. One way in which considerable relief would be granted to the States would be if the Commonwealth Government were to provide moneys for these purposes on the same basis as it provides money for universities: that is, by way of grant instead of loan. Such a policy would assist the State considerably.

I agree with the member for Glenelg (who I am pleased to see has come into the Chamber) that the money that has been spent on libraries and science blocks could result ultimately in certain components of our schools being completely out of keeping with the general standard of the school the State Government is able to provide, because, when this money is put up, it is usually put up with strings attached to it, although I am pleased to see (and the Minister of Education can correct me if I am wrong) that the money this year is being provided in a gross amount, allowing the Education Department some discretionary powers. However, when the Commonwealth Government determined how this money should be spent, there was a possibility of certain provisions for some schools, the science section and the library section being provided on a far more elaborate basis than the State could afford to match.

There are also other problems regarding the Commonwealth-State relationship in finance for education. These are matters about which I have gained a little more knowledge in the

last two or three months as a result of appointments that I have been proud to accept, on the Council of the Institute of Technology and the Council of Flinders University. The member for Whyalla will well remember the debates that took place last year in this Chamber on matching grants. I did not have much sympathy with him then, because I was in Opposition and, like other members in Opposition, I took up the case that the Government should be able to put up more money to match these grants. However, there is only one way to do it—by increasing taxes to enable the Government to do so. Otherwise it would not be able to match the increasing grants.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: That's what I told you.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am rather belatedly agreeing in these matters, out of knowledge and experience. In this place only recently I referred to the problem facing the Institute of Technology in respect of recurrent grants and to the fact that it was said categorically by the Director that the institute could not take in any new students in 1969 unless an additional \$300,000 or thereabouts was added to the institute's allocation to enable it to operate, as it was calculated that an additional \$50,000 would be needed to honour commitments to existing students, as well as a further \$250,000 if the institute were to operate with quotas approximating those that applied last year.

Some of this problem arises from the changing structure of the institute. It is staggering to see the proliferation of subjects. In 1967 the institute was teaching 740 subjects; in 1968 it is teaching 940 subjects; and in 1969 it will be teaching 1,200 subjects. Much of this arises from the fact that it still has its degree courses in technology operating parallel with its new courses for diplomas and certificates; but, notwithstanding this, a considerable strain already exists on the recurring budget of the institute. This has not all been brought about by its commitments at The Levels, but the commitments on the new site of The Levels will be considerable. From memory (I stand to be corrected on this) it is estimated that 60 additional persons will be needed to maintain the property and premises when the institute moves to The Levels.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: It will be a nice place.

Mr. NANKIVELL: It will be magnificent. Its design is excellent. Some of the planning is being done by the architects at the insti-

tute. Much, if not most, of the supervision comes under Mr. Scrymgour. It is an exercise in design and planning that must be of inestimable value to students in practical experience and oversight of their own drafting and their own design. What concerns me is that this is growing like a mushroom. The Whyalla branch will grow. The Port Pirie branch has been closed, but this was only one of three branches. Government money is also being provided for teachers colleges.

The Hon. Joyce Steele: In the last instance.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes. In the case of the Institute of Technology, the new teachers college and the work done at the Roseworthy Agricultural College, the money has been largely provided by direct grants from the Commonwealth Government, for which we are grateful. We must, however, face up to providing the money necessary to maintain, service and staff these projects and to provide equipment and teaching aids. Education, though nominally free, is not free in this sense: someone must pay for it, even though the students themselves may not be able to do so.

I understand that a proposal for commencing a new teaching hospital in conjunction with Flinders University was submitted to the Australian Universities Commission during the present triennium. I am grateful to the Hon. A. J. Shard for providing me with a copy of the report of the Committee on Facilities for Training Medical Practitioners in South Australia. Early in the report, in connection with the first term of reference, the committee concluded:

1. Medical services in South Australia are relying too heavily on doctors from overseas.
2. There is a shortage of doctors in South Australia, particularly in general practice in country areas.
3. There is a continuing trend towards a higher proportion of full-time salaried positions.
4. The present unsatisfactory situation will deteriorate faster if the rate of immigration of doctors from overseas is reduced.

The following recommendation was made:

In addition to the predicted 95 graduates per year from the University of Adelaide, a minimum of 45 additional South Australian graduates should qualify annually from December, 1975.

Regarding its second term of reference, the committee concluded:

The Medical School of the University of Adelaide is fully committed and cannot be expanded without a deterioration of undergraduate teaching standards.

The committee recommended:

A second medical school should be established with a minimum of delay at Flinders University. It should be the intention that the first increment of medical students will qualify in December, 1975.

This report was prepared by a group of well-known people. The Chairman was Dr. Nicholson (Medical Superintendent of the Royal Adelaide Hospital), and the members were Professor L. W. Cox, Professor R. P. Jepson, Dr. H. R. Oaten and Mr. K. W. G. Treagus (Administrator of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital). They recommended that the solution to the problem was a new teaching hospital in association with the Flinders University. This submission was made to the Australian Universities' Commission for this triennium and I consider that this matter should be considered on the basis of a training hospital. We are also training first-year and second-year medical students, and there is a need for additional trained doctors in this State.

Unfortunately (although the member for Barossa will not agree with me) I say advisedly that we have committed ourselves to another hospital that is not being built in association with a university. I am not saying that this hospital is not necessary, but my point is that it cannot be used in co-operation with a university, and developed as a medical school in that sense. It may be developed along similar lines to the hospitals associated with Monash University and the University of New South Wales. They are satellite hospitals, each with an associate professor. If the Chief Secretary does not believe that this is a serious and retrograde step, I ask him to inquire into the situation that arises from teaching medicine in those circumstances in Victoria and New South Wales. It is not satisfactory to train doctors by farming them out, so to speak, in satellite hospitals in association with a university.

Mr. Clark: Of course, Modbury will have some association with a university.

Mr. NANKIVELL: It will have some association with Adelaide University, but it will be of no consequence to Flinders University. The report says that Adelaide University is at saturation point now. I understand from members of the medical faculty at Adelaide University that the Chairman of the Australian Universities Commission has asked the faculty whether it can take another 30 students at that university. If these students were taken, that would be the worst thing possible for the future of medical training in this State.

It would be a retrograde step. These doctors would be able to get their practical experience only by being farmed out at a satellite hospital, and I have pointed out that such an arrangement is unsatisfactory in other States.

Mr. Clark: But there's some difference of opinion about this.

Mr. NANKIVELL: There is not much difference of opinion when one hears the medical people involved in training. I have pointed out that, in addition to staff and equipment, an associate professor is needed at each hospital.

Mr. Clark: I am not disagreeing with you: I am saying that not everyone agrees.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Never is everyone in complete agreement, but I hope I speak for the majority, because that is how I see the position. I am concerned that we may be getting our priorities mixed. Although we need additional hospitals, including one in the south-western suburbs, the new hospital in that area must be operated in association with Flinders University if it is to be an effective training unit. There is no doubt that we need such an effective training unit in order to provide the medical practitioners in this State required by our normal growth. Already we encounter difficulty if doctors do not come to South Australia from other States or overseas. Notwithstanding this intake of doctors, we still have shortages in the country.

The only way to solve this problem is to train our doctors, and we can train them only by providing the facilities. We do not meet this situation by training an additional 30 doctors in pressure circumstances at Adelaide University. The position can be met adequately only by having a new training hospital in association with a new School of Medicine at Flinders University.

I should also like to speak of the problem of staffing country hospitals. My experience has been that, even with the best facilities, it is not always possible to obtain the type of trained staff needed, particularly unmarried persons, but it is possible and feasible to obtain married trained personnel. When these people are brought to a country area to provide skilled and trained staff at the hospital, usually no accommodation is available for them, because only accommodation for unmarried persons is provided. We must critically consider this problem, as I think it will continue to grow, and some provision must be made to provide accommodation in country towns to

house these people. They are no more permanent than any other person employed in a job. Naturally, a married person may not wish to continue working in a town or working at all and living in the area, but while they are working and providing a service to the hospital it is important that accommodation be found for them, because if such accommodation is not available the services of this staff, which is being obtained by the Bordertown District Hospital from London, cannot be availed of. I suggest to the Government that this problem will develop, and we may have to provide a pool of housing to accommodate this type of person, particularly in country areas where the accommodation problem is more acute.

Mr. Riches: Have you approached the Housing Trust?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes, and it is sympathetic.

Mr. Riches: But the trust is getting less money than ever this year.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I will not debate that; I am merely indicating the need for this type of accommodation. This problem must ultimately be dealt with. The member for Wallaroo suggested that we have an affluent farming community. I refer him to an excellent article in the Institute of Public Affairs *Review*. The source of the figures in the article is the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Mr. Broomhill: Is it a reliable source?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics is an authentic source, and the article, after showing that since 1948-49 until 1967-68 the farm income as a proportion of the net national product, after depreciation, had fallen from 21.7 per cent to 4.5 per cent, continues:

The present condition of agriculture in Australia seems to be a typical state of profitless prosperity.

I am sure that the member for Frome would agree that that statement completely sums up present conditions. When it comes to capital taxes, we are told that those who own property are affluent. We are looked upon by members opposite as being wealthy farmers and, although perhaps in capital we are, in income we certainly are not. The article then points out that by 1956-57 the index of rural production was 31 per cent above the pre-war figure and that by 1958-59 it was 49 per cent above it. Then production soared to a new record of 174 (using a pre-war basis of 100) in 1963-64.

Notwithstanding that obviously there has been no inefficiency (because production has

increased), the ratio of prices received to prices paid in that time has fallen. Using 100 as the basis, it has fallen from 126 in 1950 to 69 in 1967-68, while at the same time farm costs, on the same basis of estimate, have risen from 121 to 268. In other words, prices have more than doubled and income has fallen by almost two-thirds.

The net result is that the farming community is not a very substantial contributor to income tax. The average net incomes at present are as follows: a primary producer, \$2,400; a self-employed person not on a farm, \$2,700; and a male wage or salary earner, \$2,100. The member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) would do well to have a look at this, because he would find that the survey showed that the net annual income of 36 per cent of wool-growers in the high rainfall areas and 19 per cent of farmers in the wheat-sheep areas was less than \$2,000.

Mr. Virgo: For the Taxation Department's benefit.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Taxation assessments are made on a basis common to all. The member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes), who represents a farming community, should know better than to say that the farming community is affluent. The situation is becoming critical.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: How much of this is due to people paying an uneconomic price for land?

Mr. NANKIVELL: We are dealing with the situation that exists. If we are going to make land economic, we are going to write down the asset of the person who owns his land without any encumbrance. We are also going to reduce the equity of a man who is borrowing, and therefore the situation will become even more acute. I am not getting away from the fact that land is at an inflated value today, and only one thing will change this situation. The member for Frome (Mr. Casey) drew attention to this matter, and I can say that action is already being taken in some cases to ask people to meet their commitments. If this does not happen, possession will be taken of the property. With possession come forced sales and with forced sales values come back to a level that can be financed. In the meantime somebody loses much equity and assets.

Mr. Corcoran: But forced sales would not constitute the majority of land transactions.

Mr. NANKIVELL: No, but once prices are put on a new basis, this establishes a common denominator.

Mr. Corcoran: You can get high prices for a special reason in a certain district, but it

does not necessarily follow that that will flow through. Can you give any other reason why the price of land is inflated?

Mr. NANKIVELL: The basic reason for inflation is twofold, as the honourable member would know. First, there is the value that was placed on the land, before it was developed, by people who were developing the land for capital gains. That puts the bedrock price up, as the honourable members knows. Secondly, we do not deny that between 1950 and 1955 there was a period of affluence in the rural community during which there was a desire to acquire additional land. The most economic land for a man to acquire, if this was possible, was the adjoining property. A "squeeze" system operated whereby two or three neighbours bought the intermediate property. They spread their capital over the whole of the property, and they did not have to service what they bought by borrowed money. They just took the new property into their other holding and serviced it with the same plant, equipment and manpower as they had before; actually, their farms probably became better economic units. The man squeezed out went somewhere else with a large sum of money in his pocket. I saw this happen. People walked into districts where land prices were conservative, decided to buy a certain farm, nominated a price and so set the price for property in that area. This happened all around.

North and south of Adelaide people paid substantial sums, as the member for Millicent has said, for small areas of land that had some special value—in this case subdivision. Again, people who had no other means of livelihood than farming chose to shift their activities from where they had been displaced to some other area. Some of them, who had been operating in a modest way, suddenly found themselves almost millionaires. If they wanted something they bought it. I could name many instances where this sort of situation prevailed. This was not wise expenditure of money but, for these people, money did not mean anything at the time because they had it and they wanted property.

Mr. Clark: You don't have to go far from Gawler to find this.

Mr. NANKIVELL: These things have been responsible, in some measure, for this situation. When it reaches a certain level, nothing can be done about it except, as I say, when land values depreciate and assets dwindle in one case and equity dwindles in another. The problem is that these properties with high capital values are, under the present trend of

costs (and we need only one or two dry years to put the squeeze on returns), not economic in the true sense of the word. Even the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry, who I imagine was a small farm man (he is a Country Party member), found himself in the embarrassing position of having to suggest that some assistance would be required to enable aggregation of property into economic units to take place. A move has already been made in this connection in dairying, and I think this move will possibly have to be extended further as time goes by. I cannot see many people on settlement schemes ever getting out of the trouble they are in: they will only get in deeper if they cannot make more money. I know from what I have been told that the productivity on soldier settlers' blocks has increased considerably and that their incomes have fallen. The member for Millicent will know that these settlers found it hard to meet commitments out of the incomes they were previously receiving; if costs increase, their problem will become acute. This can happen under the Australian Mutual Provident Society scheme to anybody on a property that is supposedly a living area (goodness knows how one defines that).

Mr. Corcoran: Is there any reason why disintegration instead of aggregation has come about?

Mr. NANKIVELL: We have had a policy of subdivision under our Crown Lands Act since about 1870.

Mr. Corcoran: But that is on freehold land.

Mr. NANKIVELL: True, but not much freehold farm land has been subdivided privately in this country, although it has been subdivided and aggregated elsewhere.

Mr. Corcoran: What has happened in Renmark?

Mr. NANKIVELL: That is something about which the honourable member, as a former Minister of Lands, would know more than I. I am speaking of something I understand—the situation as regards cereals, and more particularly the situation as regards grazing.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the honourable member address the Chair?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I shall be delighted to do so. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for reminding me I was wandering off into a discussion with the honourable member opposite. I have exceeded my time. I thank the Committee for the courteous way in which it has listened to me. I support the first line.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): The honourable member who has just resumed his seat was talking about people on the land going broke. I heard loud sobs coming from my right and saw the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) weeping tears of blood. I do not know about people on the land going broke, but this Budget will send many people not on the land broke. It is hard to believe that we can have so much talk in this Chamber about such a stingy Budget, because there is little in it to talk about. The member for Wallaroo has dealt with it most extensively, and I cannot find much to say. I can only say it is a discouraging Budget and has introduced a gloomy and dismal atmosphere to the State.

Mr. McAnaney: What about the employment figures?

Mr. McKEE: I hope members opposite do not expect the people of this State to believe that this Budget will fulfil the promises they made before the election.

Mr. Riches: They were only election promises to catch votes.

Mr. McKEE: Of course. I was amused to notice some humour that appeared in the daily press recently in an article headed "Guess who?" I know that honourable members will guess who it is before I finish it, and that will probably spoil the joke, but never mind. The article stated:

Guess who? Labor is financially irresponsible. We will get the State moving. South Australians pay too much tax. I will build Chowilla dam.

Who do you think that is? Then there appears "Steele Hall, M.P., 43 per cent Premier of South Australia".

Mr. Virgo: He has got the State moving backwards.

Mr. McKEE: That is right.

Mr. Clark: The worst is to come.

Mr. McKEE: It is. The Budget has produced a gloomy and dismal atmosphere in the State. The people are wondering what is coming next and are fearful. We can hear them in the streets, people who one would not think would take any notice of the Budget, but they are all alerted to this one because it is so bad that it has really caused concern. I notice that Government members who have spoken in this debate found it difficult to say anything nice about this Budget.

Mr. Riches: Every one of them has apologized for it.

Mr. McKEE: Yes, they apologized. The honourable member who has just resumed his seat said that, since he had had a period in Opposition, he realized the situation.

Mr. Lawn: He will have another period in Opposition soon.

Mr. McKEE: Of course he will. If we had an opportunity to go to the people now we know what would happen. Government members are finding it extremely difficult, because they know this is the worst Budget ever introduced in this place. The member for Gumeracha (Mr. Giles) referred to it as a Budget similar to one introduced in the early 1930's. I do not like agreeing with members opposite at any time, particularly in connection with politics, but I am afraid on this occasion I am in complete agreement with the honourable member.

Mr. Lawn: Are Government members worried about cleaning school windows?

Mr. McKEE: The member for Adelaide is concerned about school windows, but I will leave that topic to the Minister of Education. Cleaning windows is the least of her worries. I cannot say anything favourable about this Budget. Undoubtedly, it is the worst Budget introduced during my time in Parliament.

Mr. Broomhill: Don't forget Sir Thomas Playford's Budgets.

Mr. McKEE: There were some fairly dismal Budgets during Sir Thomas Playford's régime, but one could usually look into them and find something that would benefit one's district. He would butter one up with some little thing, but I have searched this Budget high and low without finding anything for my district. What I did find were some vicious taxation measures that have caused concern throughout the State.

Mr. Lawn: There is also the promise of more to come.

Mr. McKEE: I should not be surprised about that. These vicious taxation measures will place an added burden upon the people who can least afford to pay them. They will be forced to pay extra amounts in connection with third party motor car insurance premiums and in connection with hire-purchase. Some repossession agents will be very busy. There will not be room in Adelaide to hold all the repossessed motor cars. Not only taxes but also prices will rise. Business will pass the increased taxes on to the consumers, as always happens. I think the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) would agree with that.

Mr. Lawn: The hotelkeepers have already done it.

Mr. McKEE: Yes, they beat the gun.

Mr. Jennings: The member for Stirling is a slow thinker, so give him a fortnight.

Mr. McKEE: He is thinking about it now. He has not denied what I said. I think he agrees, because the increases have always been passed on, and I do not think that business will have a change of heart this time.

Mr. Clark: They have been given the opportunity by being released from price control.

Mr. McKEE: Yes, the Government agrees with and supports them.

Mr. Lawn: The shoe repairers have already passed on the increase.

Mr. McKEE: I have not heard objection from big business to these increased taxes, but imagine the outcry from the Chamber of Commerce if our Government had imposed them! Do you know why we have not heard any objection from them? A deal was made with them. I understand that the State Government approached big business and the Chamber of Commerce saying, "Look, we have to impose these taxes. Otherwise you will have the Socialist Government again. You will not have any worries at all, because we are lifting price control, and we will give you a free go."

Mr. Lawn: Did they say, "But we want a contribution to our Party funds?"

Mr. McKEE: That is always in their minds. I know what happened, because I got information about it. They said, "We do not agree with price control, anyway, so you can have a free go. You can pass your share of the increases on to the consumers. As far as we are concerned, you can put on a little bit on the side, add a little extra."

Mr. Lawn: Did they say, ". . . for our Party funds"?

Mr. McKEE: Yes, they said, "You can add a little extra and make a nice profit on the side as well." So, out of increased taxation, business came out on top, while the workers have been going broke. The rich get richer and the poor get poorer!

Mr. Lawn: They haven't paid the Democratic Labor Party's election costs yet, so they have to get their share out of this.

Mr. McKEE: During the election campaign the Liberal and Country League said that the Labor Government had been overtaxing. This appeared in pamphlets distributed in various districts, and the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) has referred to one instance. A 29-year-old housewife said that she did not like the Labor Government, because they increased land taxes. I understand that she was a waitress at the Adelaide Club! They

said to the people, "If you vote for us, we will reduce taxation. Not only that: we will get South Australia going again." The Premier volunteered to build Chowilla dam. He did not say whether he would use a long-handle shovel or a short-handle one, but I think the member for Semaphore (Mr. Hurst) said that he had bought the picks.

I thought the Premier was going to build the dam on his own, or perhaps might have intended to organize a busy bee. The L.C.L. said, "We will restore confidence by showing the Government's ability to get back to prosperity." Some prosperity! If it were not so serious it would be laughable. To add sugar to its propaganda, the L.C.L. decided to bring the big chief across from Canberra on a meet-the-people campaign. Of course, the L.C.L. public relations department, the *Advertiser*, came out with a big announcement that the Prime Minister would be visiting South Australia to tell the people about all the goodies that he would give them if they voted for the L.C.L. This Government has said how difficult it is to raise funds to do what it wants to do, but I understand it is spending a considerable sum to maintain a publicity department for the Premier and his Cabinet, yet they have a big publicity department in the *Advertiser*, so that the money being spent is wasted and the work is being duplicated.

Mr. Rodda: A responsible newspaper.

Mr. McKEE: What a thing to say. The Prime Minister visited South Australia, but I doubt whether he met many people, and his visit did not turn out to be a meet-the-people campaign. He spoke to a few Liberals in the town hall.

Mr. Clark: No, there were others there: it was a noisy meeting. Some of those terrible university students were there!

Mr. McKEE: Of course, the town hall is a branch of the Adelaide Club so that they were all at home. The next morning the *Advertiser*, publicity department of the L.C.L., spread the good news throughout the State that the Prime Minister had promised to bring prosperity to South Australia, provided that the people voted for the Liberals. If they did not vote for the Liberal Party they would get poverty. The Prime Minister told the people that if they voted for the L.C.L. they would get a better deal from the Commonwealth Government, and this is what Government members believed. I am sure its public relations department, the *Advertiser*, did not let them down, because its report stated that

the Prime Minister had said that if the people voted for the L.C.L. they would get a better deal. The Premier and the Treasurer, who believed the Prime Minister's statement, must have received a shock when they arrived at Canberra for the Loan Council meeting, because things were not so rosy.

Mr. Virgo: How could you believe a Liberal Prime Minister?

Mr. McKEE: The Prime Minister was flying a political kite when he came here, and the Premier found that out in Canberra.

Mr. Virgo: Their F111 is a good political kite.

Mr. McKEE: Perhaps, but it will not stay up. The Treasurer went to some length to blame the Commonwealth Government for the impositions in the Budget, but when we were in Government and explained to Parliament that we were not receiving sufficient from the Commonwealth Government in order to do what we wanted to do and had to raise taxation, as this Government has done, in order to carry on, Liberal members, then in Opposition, refused to accept the fact that we had a problem with the Commonwealth Government. When we accused the Commonwealth Government of not meeting its commitments, members opposite just would not believe us. It is amazing how their outlook is so different now. It seems to me that they thought they had such a good alley with the Prime Minister that he was really going to do what he promised. I think the Prime Minister "took them in".

The Treasurer put in most of his time criticizing the Commonwealth Government for not meeting its responsibilities to the State. Of course, South Australia is not the only State that is complaining: every Premier in Australia is complaining bitterly about the deal he is getting from the Commonwealth. Each year the situation is getting worse, and I am afraid I cannot see it getting any better while we have such an irresponsible Government in Canberra. It is hard to believe that a country as rich as Australia is in such a financial position. If we went anywhere else in the world and explained this to people they would not believe it, because they would say they had heard so much about this very rich country. The tales we tell to migrants must make them think that this is a land of milk and honey, but they find out differently when they get here and before long half of them are on the dole.

Mr. Virgo: Oversea interests are milking us dry.

Mr. McKEE: While we have a Commonwealth Government that has sold us out to oversea investors the situation can only get worse.

Mr. Casey: Now they are trying to get out of it by taking action before the next election.

Mr. McKEE: They are putting up a front about one of the insurance companies, but they should look at the mineral deposits and other things in this country that we have lost to oversea investors. While we have such an irresponsible Government in Canberra things can only get worse. In criticizing the Budget I have been as brief as I can. I could say much more about it, but I think the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) has done a pretty good job in covering the main points. On the question of fluoridation, I support the member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) and my friend from Wallaroo. I understand that fluoridation will cost about \$200,000.

Mr. Lawn: To start with.

Mr. McKEE: Yes, and that is in the metropolitan area only.

Mr. Lawn: Every year more has to be put in the water.

Mr. McKEE: That is so. I am not arguing whether fluoride is right or wrong, but I register my objection to the way the Government is going about this matter. I think most people are not very happy about having a minority Government forcing fluoridation on them without the matter being first debated in Parliament.

Mr. FERGUSON (Yorke Peninsula): Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) on his constructive and thought-provoking speech in this debate. However, I am afraid I cannot congratulate the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee), whose speech reminded me of the words of the old song we used to sing:

I'm forever blowing bubbles, pretty bubbles in the air,

They fly so high, nearly reach the sky,
Then like my dreams they fade and die.

When people keep repeating that others are not speaking the truth, one begins to wonder whether the people making the accusations are telling the truth. There has been a barrage of words from Opposition members in this debate to the effect that the Government and its supporters are dishonest. Because members opposite are continually saying this, the public is beginning to doubt their sincerity. I realize Parliament is regarded as a place of free speech and that members can say almost

anything during this debate. However, I cannot understand why any member should want to speak for three hours. Surely a member should be able to condense what he wants to say and take less time than that.

I wish to refer to the important matter of noxious weeds, to which some other members have already referred. It has already been said that the sum allocated to councils for the eradication of weeds on Crown lands has been reduced. Any member who has had anything to do with local government will know what a difficult task councils have in getting ratepayers to appreciate what the councils are trying to do towards eradicating noxious weeds. Ratepayers of many councils have had to be educated in the matter, and much tact has had to be used by councils in approaching them. However, the stage has been reached where most ratepayers have been educated about this matter. It is a great pity that at this time the grants made to councils to eradicate noxious weeds on Crown lands have been somewhat reduced, because most councils are overcoming this problem.

During the last few years councils have joined together in threes or fours and appointed a weeds officer to control and look after appropriate areas. Those weeds officers are doing good work and getting results without provoking the ratepayers. The eradication of noxious weeds is important for the State. Nobody can realize what would happen if the rural lands of South Australia were overrun by noxious weeds or can visualize the reduction in production that would occur if we did not pay some attention to this matter, so I hope the Agriculture Department will seriously consider this problem. I know that, when a Minister of a department presents his estimates to the Treasurer and the Treasurer says he must reduce them, the Minister then has to see where he can reduce his estimates. I believe that this year the Minister of Agriculture has had to reduce the grants made to councils because he did not want to interfere with some of the other extension branches within his department.

I turn now to the certification of seeds and the provision of new types of seed to primary producers. I refer to the production of a variety of barley that the department has named "clipper". The history of this type of barley goes back for some years. I think it was 10 years ago or more when the barley-growers of this State appealed to the Agriculture Department for a type of barley that would retain the grain in its head under

extreme storm conditions, and the department in conjunction with other authorities set about to produce an improved barley that would not only retain the same malting qualities but would also resist wind and storm. Last year the department released this barley, and about 10 growers were supplied with seed. They are growing it this year, and the seed from the crops will be available to barley producers for seeding in 1969. The Agriculture Department has requested barley-growers who desire this seed to apply for it early to ensure an even distribution. In perhaps one or two years this variety is expected to replace the popular "prior" variety. The "clipper" variety is expected to give a greater yield, which is very important to barley producers nowadays. All primary producers are conscious of the rising costs that have reduced their margin of profit. They face a doubtful future, and it is only because of their increased production up to the present that they have been able to break even. We see evidence of the problem I have referred to in the present prices for lambs, wool and beef. Furthermore, we have been told that we will receive less for the barley produced in the coming season.

The member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) paved the way in this debate for a discussion on tourism by making some very good suggestions. Yorke Peninsula lends itself particularly to the type of tourism associated with seaside resorts, which are extremely popular during the summer months. Tourism has particular application to Yorke Peninsula at present, and the *Advertiser* of July 11 last contained the following report:

Wardang Island may be resort: The State Government is understood to have transferred the lease of Wardang Island, in Spencer Gulf, to an Adelaide businessman who is interested in developing it as a tourist resort.

Mr. Jennings: Is that the one they took from the Aborigines?

Mr. FERGUSON: I will refer to that later. The report continues:

Wardang Island is seven miles from Port Victoria and two miles from the nearest point of the mainland. For years it has supplied a particular type of sand for the Broken Hill Associated Smelters at Port Pirie, but now B.H.A.S. can get the sand more readily from deposits at Coffin Bay, which is linked by rail to Port Lincoln, 30 miles away. B.H.A.S. has withdrawn its staff from Wardang, which is Crown land. The street is abandoned. The school has no pupils and the timber homes used by B.H.A.S. employees are empty. A caretaker lives on the island. The lease is understood to have been transferred to Mr.

H. G. Pryce, of Adelaide. Mr. Pryce said yesterday that he had applied for the lease but could not make any comment until he received official word from the Government on the result of his application.

On the next day Mr. Max Fatchen, who I know has an interest in Wardang Island and has a good knowledge of the island because he has spent many holidays there, described the island in a report in the *Advertiser*, as follows:

Wardang Island, its white sand dunes and long, low coast rising across the seven miles of blue water from Port Victoria on Yorke Peninsula, may be destined for a new and perhaps unique tourist role. It is understood that a businessman, Mr. H. G. Pryce, has been granted a lease of the island which, it is believed, he intends to develop as a tourist area with some unusual features. Wardang, in a sense, is an unusual sort of island, rich in sea lore, with its shores studded with wrecks. About 10 wrecks have occurred along its coastline.

I question that statement because a Mr. Edwards, who lived for a time at Port Victoria, has given an interesting lecture on the wrecks off Wardang Island, and I have heard him say that about 20 wrecks stud the shores. Mr. Max Fatchen continued:

It has a sweeping, windy sort of landscape with a curious sense of isolation although the mainland is near. The island, about six miles long and more than two miles wide, is topped by a slender lighthouse. Its vegetation is natural grasses and low bush. It has been the scene of sheep farming endeavours by aborigines and even of an early experiment in infecting rabbits with a virus. The sheep-raising venture was partly defeated by the island's lack of water, although catchment roofs were built a few feet above the ground and the water run off into tanks. The early aborigines had their own legends about Wardang. One of their gods, a giant warrior angry with the misdeeds of his people, struck the ground a great blow causing a depression into which the sea rushed forming the bay on which Port Victoria stands. Bits of land flew from the island into the sea forming the small Wauraltee group of islands of which Wardang is the largest.

As for the virus venture against Wardang's hardy rabbits, a number of rabbits were corralled and infected with the virus through the eyes. But it was found the rabbits of various warrens didn't mingle and so the experiment was only a limited success. Wardang still has numerous and thriving rabbits. But for many years Wardang was the source of a special kind of sand for the Broken Hill Associated Smelters at Port Pirie, a fortnightly tug towing a barge filled with about 1,100 tons of sand from the island to Port Pirie. The barge brought firewood and water to the island. Now this special sand comes from Coffin Bay near Port Lincoln and the families who lived and worked on the island have left.

But the neat six-roomed houses and other amenities that remain could form the nucleus for any tourist settlement. There are about eight houses and bachelor quarters, a stone garage, a small community hall and a landing strip for light aircraft. The island itself provides the sort of setting that appeals to bush-walkers, fishermen, bird watchers (the shores of the island teem with sea-birds) and those people who want something different and removed from a more conventional holiday area. The eastern side of the island is shallow and sandy but the southern end and west side have interesting reefs, sandy bays, comparatively deep water and the kind of area that skin divers like to explore.

The bones of ships lie around its shores, for nautically it stands by a historic anchorage where the squareriggers loaded wheat from the stacks of nearby Port Victoria. The ketches lightening the wheat from the jetty to the ships anchored in the bay. The exposed anchorage sometimes meant their doom and Wardang was dreaded by some captains—and certainly by marine underwriters. While Wardang's plentiful supply of rabbits and its wild dogs would need to be controlled first, it would make a good area to stock with native fauna, and certainly a free-and-easy wandering ground for the walker. It needs trees, for the northerlies and south-westerlies drive unchecked across it. An island tourist project would help nearby Port Victoria, which already has a considerable summer tourist season. The great stretch of water between it and Wardang has some of the most intense blue of any seen around the South Australian coast, and its reflections on a calm day and its sunsets can be memorable. Islands always have some kind of enchantment and the low, windy island of Wardang has its own slow spell of the sea and sea things. It could become an important tourist playground.

Mr. Hughes: It could become one of the best.

Mr. FERGUSON: On the following day, under the heading "Betrayal Alleged on Island Lease", a report in the *Advertiser* stated:

The State Government had betrayed the South Australian Aboriginal Lands Trust in leasing Wardang Island, in Spencer Gulf, as a tourist resort, a trust member said yesterday. I am surprised that Mrs. Natasha McNamara rushed into print on this occasion.

Mr. Jennings: She is a very responsible lady.

Mr. FERGUSON: I have no doubt of that, but I cannot understand why she rushed into print on this occasion. I thought that the Chairman of the Aboriginal Lands Trust would have been the spokesman for the trust.

Mr. Corcoran: He was a long way away.

Mr. FERGUSON: I am aware that Timothy Hughes (Chairman of the Aboriginal Lands Trust) was a long way away, but I have no doubt that he could have been contacted and asked for a statement about Wardang Island.

I am sure that Tim Hughes would have been able to make a real assessment of the value of Wardang Island to the Point Pearce Reserve. Tim Hughes, who lived for all his boyhood days on the Point Pearce Reserve, is a friend of mine; his late father was a friend of mine; and his mother (Mrs. Elphick) is a friend of mine.

Mr. Corcoran: He was a good digger.

Mr. FERGUSON: Yes, and I speak in his defence. Tim Hughes knows well what value Wardang Island would be to the Point Pearce Reserve, and I am surprised that on this occasion he was not the spokesman on its behalf. On July 24, questions were asked in this House about Wardang Island, and later that day the Leader of the Opposition said that the Point Pearce Reserve or the Aboriginal Lands Trust was not able to take over Wardang Island. The Leader said:

The development of tourist activity by a reserve area could be of great benefit in providing employment opportunities for Aborigines.

I presume he was referring to Point Pearce Reserve and to the people who live on that reserve. He continued:

And, therefore, Wardang Island is very important to the Aboriginal people of this State.

The member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) interjected and said, "They would welcome the opportunity to turn it into a tourist resort." I doubt whether the honourable member meant that, because he knows the situation just about as well as I do, and I think he knows that, rather than being an asset, Wardang Island could become a liability to the people of the Point Pearce Reserve. In my opinion, Wardang Island would be some of the most barren land attached to the lands of Yorke Peninsula.

Mr. Jennings: How is it attached to the lands of Yorke Peninsula?

Mr. FERGUSON: It is a part of Yorke Peninsula. I do not think it would be a very great acquisition for the Point Pearce Reserve. I am all for giving the Aboriginal people more land, provided they can prove that they are capable of developing the land and producing to the full what it will produce. I would be the first to advocate giving the Aborigines more land if they could prove they were capable of working it and developing it. However, I know that Point Pearce already has sufficient of the type of land that exists on Wardang Island, and I do not agree with the Leader of the Opposition when he says that the island should have been handed over to the people of the Point Pearce Reserve so that

they could set up a tourist resort on the island. I think it is about time we spoke the truth about what the peoples of these reserves are capable of doing and what they are not capable of doing.

Mr. Hughes: They have shown how capable they are in developing Point Pearce.

Mr. FERGUSON: Yes, I admit that they are developing Point Pearce to a very great degree. I think that when one has lived alongside the Point Pearce Reserve and has had an association with the peoples of that reserve for at least 40 years, one should be able to make some assessment of what ought to be done and of what can be done. I believe that the handing back of Wardang Island to the people of Point Pearce Reserve would have been an encumbrance to them rather than an asset. I am all for giving the Aborigines on reserves all the responsibility that we can give them, and I have mentioned this matter to the Minister. I think we ought to give these people more responsibility under the officers who are already in charge on reserves.

I think the Aboriginal people can do almost anything that other people can do, and in fact those on Point Pearce have proved themselves to be efficient farmers and efficient tradesmen.

Mr. Jennings: Why qualify by saying "almost"?

Mr. FERGUSON: One cannot share profits with all one's friends and relations and still plan and provide for the next year's work.

Mr. Jennings: Don't you think that is a stage of development they have been going through?

Mr. FERGUSON: They have been going through this stage of development for years. This is the point where we have not yet succeeded. When we can teach Aborigines how to handle financial matters, we will be well on the way to getting them on their feet. I support the first line.

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): This Budget is one about which I can say little good. It is one of the most depressing documents members have had to deal with in this Chamber for some time. I believe its effect will be to restrict and retard progress in the State. After one of the worst droughts on record, there was a minor deficit of about \$8,000,000. Instead of bringing down a Budget to try to stimulate spending, the Treasurer introduced a measure which will have the opposite effect, and which will ultimately have disastrous repercussions on the State. Instead of stimulating spending, the Budget is designed to take from people opportunities they may have had in

many respects. House purchases will not be stimulated to assist the building industry, which is in dire need of stimulus. All the items of increased taxation in the Budget will fall heavily on the pockets of working people in the State. If we have a depressed work force, we will not get the maximum possible from it.

The first item of increased taxation is a receipts duty of 1c in each \$10, which is patterned on the measure recently introduced in Victoria, although it does not extend to wages and salaries. This will add to the costs of everyone. In fact, as a result of the Government's action in decontrolling prices (details of which I do not desire to repeat as they were competently presented last evening by the member for Gawler), purchasers will pay all the imposts made by the Budget. The second item of increased taxation is a stamp duty of \$2 on certificates of compulsory third party motor vehicle insurance. Surely people in the motor car industry are being hit heavily enough already. This, again, will affect the family man. Justifiably, it is an unpopular measure. The third item is gift duty. Here, we find that people who are in a position to make substantial gifts to others, possibly within the family, are a group that can afford to pay this duty, so I have no adverse comment.

The fourth item is the 1½ per cent impost on hire-purchase contracts. Who are the people forced to have hire-purchase contracts? Again, it is the small man. This will hit him heavily because these charges will, in effect, be passed on to the producer. We have already seen what has happened as regards the increase in the fee for a liquor licence. The member for Eyre himself has complained recently in this Chamber about what he considered to be an excessive charge for a bottle of beer at the Royal Adelaide Show. I can visualize that within 12 months the member for Eyre will completely change his political outlook. It is just that he has not had the political experience and has not met up with the facts. Basically, he may nurse some Socialist ideals within his heart. I hope he will be man enough to express them and support the policies that we on this side of the Chamber support.

He has already indicated his feelings about exploitation. I appreciate the great burden he carries and the big decision he has to make to overcome his political convictions, but no doubt as a result of the education he is receiving in this Chamber he is realizing minute by minute, hour by hour, day by day, week by week, how

during the years of his farming career he has been completely misled by his political philosophy. I hope he will see it for himself. I am confident that, if he is really honest with himself, he will finish up by being a Socialist.

Mr. Clark: Are you offering him the benefit of your personal tuition?

Mr. HURST: I will help him because I think he will appreciate and value my assistance. From his utterances, the interest he displays in his district and in wild life and the number of questions he is asking on behalf of his constituents, I am sure he is a man who has his people at heart, and anyone who has people sincerely at heart and who believes in the ideals that we on this side of the Chamber believe in must be respected.

There will be a charge of 45 per cent on the profits of the State Bank. I go along with this but I wonder how members opposite will feel when they have to take some revenue from a Socialist undertaking to try to balance their Budget. Where is their conscience? I know that the member for Eyre will realize the significance of this. He is being led by his colleagues, so possibly at this point of time he may support this but, with the passing of time, I am sure he will see the light and come to the party.

[Midnight]

I turn now to increased hospital charges. No working person today can afford to be sick. There are limited fields in which revenue can be raised that will not put people in the invidious position in which this Budget puts them. It is not financially possible for the average citizen today to pay these charges, particularly in view of the other additional imposts being made on him and in view of the one-sided system in connection with wage increases. He is prevented from receiving his share of the wealth of this country, while so many bodies are imposing extra charges.

In carrying out one of his rash election promises, the Premier has suggested that by June 30, 1969, the winning bets tax will be removed. Undoubtedly he impressed a few punters by this promise and obtained a few votes in his effort to win the election.

Mr. Virgo: He will compensate for any loss of revenue by extra taxes on bookmakers' turnover, which will be passed on to the punter.

Mr. HURST: This is typical of the whole Budget. The Government proposes to secure authority to bring the levels of tax on bookmakers' turnover and the stamp duty on betting

tickets to the levels in other States. Who does he think he is kidding? Who will pay for this? It is a waste of money to print the documents, because in the final analysis the punter will have to pay for it. In the past it was the person who won his bet who paid. Undoubtedly bookmakers will have to adjust their prices to meet these charges, so here we have another attempt by the Government to hoodwink the people of South Australia. In introducing the Budget the Treasurer said:

Members will be aware that in June last the Premiers of all States put to the Prime Minister submissions and proposals for a revision of Commonwealth-State financial relations to divert to the States a greater and more equitable share of the Australian resources for public finance. These submissions were not successful, as the Commonwealth took the stand that a revision must await the conclusion of the present grants arrangements in June, 1970.

This statement is completely inconsistent with the attitude of the Government Party, and it shows that members opposite will defraud the people. I challenge any member opposite to deny that the Prime Minister misled the people and was responsible for telling an untruth when, in the Adelaide Town Hall, he told the people how they would get a better deal. The Government is in office because of false and misleading statements made to the public. The public will speak in no uncertain manner, but a Labor Government will find it difficult to straighten out the damage that will have been done by the present Government. We realize that additional revenue was needed to meet growing demands and the lack of facilities, and to achieve modern standards. Members opposite and their colleagues in another place played an important role in denying the Labor Government the opportunity to raise revenue from people who can well afford it. The community would not have been affected adversely, and the state would have been stimulated to prosperous growth and progress.

Government members were silent when the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) explained what had happened regarding succession duties. The present Government was responsible for our inability to raise revenue, and for the creation of the deficit. The establishment of a State Government Insurance Office was desired by the people and the benefit that could be derived (including the assistance to revenue without taxation imposts) was pointed out to members of the present Government and their colleagues in another place. However, the passage of that measure was denied.

The people had the opportunity to decide whether they wanted State lotteries.

Mr. Virgo: And 70 per cent wanted it.

Mr. HURST: Yes, but members of the then Opposition said that it was like putting poison in the hands of small children. This Government has no confidence in the people, and the people have no confidence in the Government. Because of the gerrymander this Government, with the support of one of the most vicious capitalistic newspapers in Australia, has been able to gain office wrongfully and impose pernicious charges on the people. The Government has said that expenditure on education has increased six-fold since 1953-54. Sufficient has been shown about the handling of the affairs of the Education Department to make us realize that the present Government is trying to break down the *status quo* and make the student teachers pay the piper. Nothing is provided in the Budget for cleaning school windows. I thought the Minister would have suggested that as a corollary to reducing allowances to student teachers she would give them a job at half pay cleaning windows during their vacation, but she is not prepared to do anything.

Expenses have increased in the Hospitals Department, but they would have been much higher had not the Labor Government introduced the State lotteries, as \$1,700,000 has been paid into the Hospitals Fund from this source without direct taxation being imposed on the people, who are free to purchase a lottery ticket if they wish. Large sums of money were sent out of this State before the lottery was introduced, but now the benefits accrue to the people of South Australia. The parochial attitude of an L.C.L. Government caused the people of this State to send money to lotteries in other States, thus helping to finance institutions there.

The cost of maintaining law, order and safety has increased from \$4 to \$9 a head. We should be looking to the Government for a guide on morals and many other things, but it has been completely dishonest in many ways. How can we expect the ordinary person to be honest when he has the example shown by the present Government? Provisions for many items have been reduced and as a result of the increased taxation measures price increases will occur.

The Minister of Works recently announced that the Government intended to fluoridate the metropolitan water supply. I do not dispute that fluoride could in some cases assist dental health, but I question seriously the

wisdom of this Government's decision to put this State to what I consider unwarranted and unnecessary expense in treating only a small minority of the people.

Indeed, we have never been told how many people will be assisted by the introduction of fluoridation. I know from my own experience and from what other people have told me that many people are allergic to fluoride, yet we have never heard a single word about how those people are to be assisted. This money could be spent on things that would be far more beneficial to the health of the vast majority of people in this State.

In the Royal Park area and at Semaphore South there are still many groups of houses that have not been connected to sewers because those areas are not sufficiently densely populated. This is a serious matter. It is known that there has been a great amount of sickness in those areas. People are entitled to form their own opinions about these things, and it is believed that much of this sickness has occurred because sewerage effluent cannot be disposed of properly. As I said before, I consider that there are areas in the health field in which this money could be expended far more beneficially for the people of South Australia.

I do not intend to speak at length because I would only be repeating things my colleagues have said in condemnation of this Budget. However, I think I should deal with one or two aspects. I am glad that the Minister in charge of tourism is now present. Much has been said by previous speakers about the need to do something to attract tourists to and boost the tourist industry in South Australia. I agree with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Corcoran) that more should be done in this regard. I believe that, where people in certain areas and localities have shown they are prepared to do something to attract tourists, the Government has a responsibility to assist those areas and localities to a greater extent than it has in the past.

At one time the Tourist Bureau subsidized municipalities on a \$1 for \$1 basis. The Port Adelaide City Council, which is in the district I represent, appreciates the assistance it has received from the bureau by way of grants for the development of the foreshore in that area. I point out to the Minister that I believe this has been a sound investment. However, the State as a whole has a greater responsibility in this direction than it has shown in the past. The foreshores and other

facilities in the district I represent are used by people all over South Australia and yet the greater part of funds for their upkeep is contributed by ratepayers in the district. In addition, these facilities are also used by tourists from other States. In this connection I refer to the Zinc Corporation's picnic grounds at Largs Bay. Keen competition is coming from New South Wales and Victoria to attract people from Broken Hill to spend their holidays in those States. Mildura has ski-ing on its lakes and so on and the roads are all bitumen.

I want the Minister to realize that not only the people in the Largs Bay and Semaphore areas benefit from expenditure in this connection. I believe that the people who come from Broken Hill to spend their holidays inject into the economy of the State at least \$250,000 within about a month. All business houses in the city share in this: indeed businesses between Broken Hill and Adelaide receive their share. Greater assistance should be given where facilities are established because of the benefit derived by people outside the district concerned. There is room for a greater subsidy for these facilities.

I have heard other members refer to potential tourist areas in their districts. The member for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson) referred to tourist attractions in that area. However, most people who go to the Yorke Peninsula go from the metropolitan area to their weekend shacks. Therefore, the State does not receive any large injection of money from people from other States or overseas. The tourist industry is important and every encouragement should be given to its development. Larger grants should be provided to add facilities to those already existing, because this is a worthy undertaking. Largs Bay has many sailing and rowing clubs and other sporting bodies. I ask the Minister to consider this area. The Minister always gives me the utmost attention and courtesy. As he is a man of logic, I am confident he will provide as much as possible to help this area. I am speaking from a State point of view, not parochially as most members do. When I try to lift the standard of debate, I am met with a parochial outlook! This will benefit the State of South Australia. It will be in my district, one of the most important districts in the State, the gateway to South Australia.

It is proposed that in February, 1970, the Largs Bay Sailing Club shall hold the world championship sailing competitions at Largs Bay, when 40 nations will be competing. Here

is a district that has already shown initiative but it has spent to the maximum it can afford. I am confident I have convinced the Minister of Immigration and Tourism of the value to the State of this function, which would be a good drawcard, with the representatives of 40 nations assembling at Largs Bay. What better investment could there be for the State than to pour a few thousand more dollars into the area to try to build it up? Sir Thomas Playford would have been wise enough to do this. I want the Minister to confer with the Treasurer about this.

Mr. Rodda: Where is this scenic outpost?

Mr. HURST: One of these days I shall take the member for Victoria graciously under my wing and show him around the district, which is well represented and has good citizens. However, there is a limit to what they can do and I am sure the honourable member will support me in my appeal for financial assistance for this occasion. If the State can do something to impress those people from 40 countries, the member for West Torrens can come into my district and gain a few ideas. My district is taking the initiative and is asking for assistance. Also, I appeal to the Treasurer and the Minister of Works to try to do more about the passenger terminal at Outer Harbour, the gateway to South Australia.

Again, the Royal Yacht Squadron is contemplating holding a regatta in March, 1970. It would be good if the Duke of Edinburgh could present the Prince Philip Cup during that regatta. I am sure that a new passenger terminal, duly erected and painted, would impress him. This would be a start in promoting an important industry in this State, and we would gain world-wide publicity. The Duke of Edinburgh travels to all British Commonwealth countries, and I am sure the member for Rocky River (Mr. Venning) would forgo any grant he might received for the Ippinichie Creek in order to secure this attraction.

I sincerely hope that the Minister of Immigration and Tourism and the Treasurer will persuade their colleagues in Cabinet of the wisdom of promoting tourism in South Australia. In my district we are sowing the seeds of something that could flourish. People there are facing up to their responsibilities. If the Government wants to make a name for itself it should help financially to enable this State to receive the praise of which it is worthy.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): Like other members, I listened with much interest when the Treasurer explained his first Budget, and

I commend him and his department for it. I have since listened with much interest to the comments made by members on both sides about the Budget, some of which were constructive and some destructive. In particular, the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) gave an enlightening address. He also gave much detail to educate members opposite about the present financial position of the man on the land. An evening or two ago I listened to the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) speak on the Budget and, when he took the socialistic smirk from his face and got rid of the shackles of Socialism, we heard a reasonable speech from him. If he could get rid of those shackles completely, he would be an asset to the State. The honourable member said that, before the last election, my Party had misinformed people in the country about the effects of succession duties on them. I will not comment on the correctness or otherwise of that statement, but I hesitate to say what members opposite would do to the man on the land in the matter of succession duties if they were to occupy the Treasury benches again.

I commend the member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) for his speech, particularly on his remarks regarding tourism. From time to time my predecessor in this Chamber (Mr. Heaslip) spoke of tourism as it affected the District of Rocky River, and he tried to have the road to The Bluff opened as a tourist road, so that advantage could be taken of the excellent view over a vast area from the ranges. However, the Postmaster-General has not yet given the necessary approval, and I hope that he will reconsider the request made by Mr. Heaslip so that this avenue of tourism will be available. The district is known more specifically as The Bluff area.

Mr. Nankivell: It is the site of the television mast.

Mr. VENNING: Yes. Tourism is increasing annually, with the improved standard of living, and people are using caravans, a popular mode of travel, so that they can see more of the country. I think it is important that people see Australia before they travel abroad, so that they can be ambassadors capable of explaining the potential of Australia.

We have listened with interest to the comments made by members opposite on the Budget. Unfortunately, those members play the game of politics very well indeed. We have heard much about the Government's proposal to fluoridate the metropolitan water

supply. One wonders what Opposition members' comments would have been if they had introduced this measure. No doubt they would have had different arguments but we, as a result of the wisdom of our Leader and of the Party and at the request of many people, have introduced it because we believe it will benefit the people of the State generally.

No-one likes increasing taxation, but today the public is demanding services which are becoming more difficult to maintain and which were encouraged by the previous Government. When the leadership of this State changed hands we found the Treasury finances in jeopardy. The Labor Party, inexperienced in matters of finance and trying to honour extravagant election promises, soon wrecked the sound financial structure that, during its years of sound financial policy, the Playford Government had been successful in establishing. What a wonderful opportunity members opposite had when they took over the Treasury benches from Sir Thomas Playford and his Party. They inherited a healthy state of affairs without having to pay the iniquitous tax that we hear members opposite rave about, that is, succession duties. The hardship of our succession to office is now evident, but we have been entrusted with the responsibility of redeeming this State and, obviously, the sad situation has been arrested and we are now on the way back to stability, which almost automatically spells security for the people of this State.

The Treasurer has outlined the Government's measures to bring in \$3,820,000 this year and about \$8,300,000 in a full year of operation. Whilst I and many of my colleagues represent country districts, I am concerned with the continual rise in costs that are being forced on our primary industries at a time when returns from primary products are in a precarious position. It is not necessary for me to detail the present position. During this last week the announcement on beef prices has shocked producers. For the last few weeks we have been concerned about lamb prices, and much has appeared in the newspapers about the excess grain being produced in Australia (about 500,000,000 bushels this year).

Mr. Freebairn: Do you think we can sell it?

Mr. VENNING: The Australian Wheat Board realizes the situation confronting it and will answer the challenge as it has always done, and will be trying to do its best to sell this large quantity of grain. It seems that there will be a carry-over of about 6,000,000

to 7,000,000 bushels of grain from last year. However, the organization in South Australia intends to do everything possible to handle this record crop.

As you probably well know, Mr. Chairman, primary industries are continuing to provide 70 per cent to 80 per cent of export earnings on a basis of a return of 3 per cent on capital outlay. Recently, a taxation consultant, when advising primary producers on the various aspects of family arrangements, said:

The farmer who is leaving his son his farm should remember that the net return to his son would not be any better than an average paid job, and the son would not be in a position to pay out other members of the family.

Often we see the situation further aggravated when a young father dies and those who remain have to sell a large portion of the property to pay probate and succession duties, which are based on inflated land values far beyond productivity values.

Mr. Casey: Who caused the inflated farm values?

Mr. VENNING: All Government departments today are prepared to take this inflated value. Would it not be better to consider land values on a productivity basis rather than on the price at which the farm is expected to sell?

I believe that for a long time our problems have been accentuated by our arbitration system. Governments of the day are being impeded and embarrassed. Arbitration has been responsible for inflation, and when an industry (particularly a primary industry) has not been able to hand on the resultant created cost, devastating results occur.

Recently an article headed "Optimistic Trend on Wheat Sales" appeared in the *Advertiser*. Part of that article, dealing with remarks of the Speaker of this House (Hon. T. C. Stott), is as follows:

Mr. Stott said the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia had also appointed a committee to consider ways to arrest costs and to examine the Arbitration Court system and how the inevitable wage rises affected the primary producer. "Primary producers' costs are increasing alarmingly and yet the prices we are receiving are falling," Mr. Stott said. "This state of affairs cannot continue too much longer. Because of the increasing high costs, we are pricing ourselves out of the export markets."

Metaphorically speaking, the chickens are now coming home to roost, and it will take wise and strong counsel from the appropriate authorities to reinstate confidence and stability in our rural industry and bring it to its former significance, with security to those involved.

I was very pleased that the member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) indicated that there was still a certain amount of humanitarianism on the other side of the House. He told the Treasurer he was aware of the situation in which Treasurers today found themselves, and said he sympathized with the Treasurer in his endeavour to carry out his responsibilities.

I read with concern in the Auditor-General's Report that he estimated that no more than 70 per cent of road maintenance charges were being sent in. This is most unfair to those who send in returns. This system of revenue raising has never been popular with at least primary producers and their organizations, and for some time these organizations have favoured a fuel tax instead of road maintenance tax contributions. A fuel tax would mean a wider range of contribution, and the cost of collecting it would be negligible compared with the present road tax system. Furthermore, there would be no evasions, and the book work that has been a curse to conscientious truck drivers would be eliminated. However, the State taxing authorities have been loath to surrender to the Commonwealth any further avenues of income earning, because of the problem of Commonwealth repayment.

It is obvious that a greater reimbursement to the States from the Commonwealth is long overdue. I trust that soon the Premier will be successful in convincing the Commonwealth authorities of the needs of this State and of the need for greater participation by the Commonwealth financially to restore the State to its former stability and to provide for its future development. I wish every success to the Speaker and the committee that was formed recently under the auspices of the United Farmers and Graziers Association to fight for the Chowilla dam. I trust that the combined effort of all concerned will eventually bring successful results in regard to Chowilla and to the future water needs of South Australia.

I was interested to hear the member for Glenelg speak at length about the State Bank. I was particularly interested in what he had to say for a personal reason, as I understand from my family record that my grandfather (the late William Jasper Venning) played an active part in organizing primary producers throughout the State towards the formation of a State Bank. I was pleased tonight to find in the library a reference in *Hansard* of 1886 to petitions being presented to Parliament for the formation of the State

Bank. A portrait of the late Hon. Sir John Bray, who was the Treasurer of the State when the State Bank was formed, hangs in the centre of the hall opposite. Conscious of the integrity of the Treasurer, I commend the Budget proposals and have much pleasure in supporting the first line.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I consider it an honour to follow the member for Rocky River. However, certain aspects of his speech need to be cleared up, and this I will do. I congratulate the Treasurer on introducing his first Budget, although unfortunately the people would not do so because they probably received the greatest shock of their lives when they heard its contents. On looking at the Budget and on considering the propaganda circulated before the election, I consider the Budget was undoubtedly arranged and conceived by a select band of top Liberal and Country League brass. No doubt the former member for Gumeracha played a leading part. All press statements prior to the election and all forms of propaganda circulated made some play of the fact that Sir Thomas Playford always balanced the Budget. That was natural, because he balanced it on many occasions, but on many occasions he did not. When one brings down a Budget of this nature, one can always claim that, being a balanced Budget, it is something that somebody else did not do. It rings a cheerful bell for the general public. During the Labor Government's term of office the L.C.L. at no time let up in saying that the Government was spending too little in this direction and too little in that direction, and at the same time was increasing taxation at an enormous rate. We were criticized from the time we took office until the last elections.

Those criticisms were not justified. I was intrigued to hear the member for Rocky River expound his theory on what transpired as regards succession duties during the last Government's term of office. I agree that succession duties are an iniquitous tax (I do not think anybody will disagree with that) but it is here and we have to live with it. All the Labor Government wanted to do was to bring some equity into the whole system compared with other States and plug a few loopholes that were never intended, in the first place, to be there, so that people here would not gain any advantage over people in other States. As I look back, I believe now as I believed then that politics was played right up to the hilt, because the Legislative Council threw out that legislation.

In most Parliaments in this country the Party controlling the Lower House also controls the Upper House, but that situation does not exist in South Australia, and it never will with the present restricted franchise for the Legislative Council. The Legislative Council defeated this measure, which would have balanced our Budget or, if it had not, would have gone a long way towards doing so. Whilst I agree with the member for Rocky River that succession duties are an iniquitous tax, I do not agree with his suppositions that what we were trying to do was something that did not occur in any other State. It does. However, the legislation initially introduced in this State had many loopholes in it, which were used, and still are being used, by people able to use them. By plugging those loopholes, we would have brought our system into line with that of the other States. This false propaganda mentioned by members on this side should be exposed in full, because I believe it was a trick used to influence the voters of South Australia in certain areas. Let us consider the case of a firm that sells a certain product and claims that it contains certain properties which, in fact, it does not contain. Let us assume that the firm knows that the product does not contain these properties. If members opposite purchased this product and found that it was not what it should be they would take the necessary steps to remedy the matter. It is likely that they would take the firm to court. To say that the L.C.L. was unscrupulous in its use of political propaganda would be putting it fairly mildly.

I believe, as do most citizens, that Governments should be elected on their election policies and, if any political Party, Labor or Liberal, sees fit to cheat the citizens during an election campaign, it is natural to assume that the guilty Party will pay the penalty at the next election. I believe that the L.C.L. Government has cheated the citizens of this State. The present Premier and his colleagues in the Cabinet, when in Opposition, were always clamouring for increased expenditure and at the same time were highly critical of any tax increase that the Labor Government implemented. The Premier did not refer during the election campaign to what he would do to raise additional revenue.

The L.C.L. conveyed to the people of this State a very distorted theory about what would happen if an L.C.L. Government were elected. It said that the L.C.L. was the only Party that should and could govern and, of course, that it would balance the Budget. It did not

consider how it would achieve this aim. No mention was made whether the economy needed a boost and no mention was made about the taxation increases with which we are confronted in this Budget. Members opposite are careful not to mention this unpalatable subject, because they realized that they would have to increase taxes. Sir Henry Bolte had got away with it in Victoria, so they could use the argument that this State could do what was done in Victoria. There was not a word about the section of the community on whom these taxes would be levied.

I can remember that the present Treasurer often supported Sir Thomas Playford when he was Premier, by saying that South Australia must maintain a cost structure advantageous to this State, when compared with that in other States. In this way industry would be attracted to South Australia. Industries in this State must compete not only on the Australian market but also on the world market, so we should try to conduct our affairs in such a way that we do not establish an atmosphere that automatically makes industrial relationships difficult for the firms that hope to come to South Australia. This horror Budget will do absolutely nothing to stimulate this State's economy. In fact, it will depress it because the average wage and salary earner will have to pay more for his goods in the first place as a result of the receipt duty of 1c in \$10, which will be passed on to the consuming public. Stamp duty on certificates of compulsory third party motor vehicle insurance will be \$2, and the price of beer will increase because of increased liquor licence fees. Public hospital charges will be increased, and the present hire-purchase duty charge of 1½ per cent will extend to other forms of time payment, leasing, and similar transactions. I do not know how much more the average wage and salary earner in this country can be taxed. I have said before that he is the one who circulates the money and so creates a buoyant economy. These people may be taxed even more heavily when the Supplementary Estimates are introduced. There is no reason to believe that the Government will not follow Sir Henry Bolte's example and go the whole hog, but that will destroy our cost advantage in comparison with other States.

I was pleased that the member for Rocky River (Mr. Venning) spoke of the wheat industry in Australia, but I draw the Committee's attention to the bad position of all primary production in Australia. Unfortunately, I

think we are at the end of our tether regarding the subsidizing of these industries. I am alarmed at what may happen. It is costing every man, woman and child in Australia \$5 a year to subsidize the 54,600 dairy farmers: every dairy farmer gets an average subsidy of about \$1,800 annually. We must seriously consider how far we can go. There are about 56,000 wheat farmers in Australia, and they are being subsidized by about \$800 each annually. Unfortunately, the present wheat position is such that next year the subsidy from the Commonwealth Government for that industry is estimated to be \$100,000,000. We do not know what the exact figure will be but the economists are thinking in terms of that amount of subsidy next year and, if that amount is paid, each wheat farmer will receive about \$2,000.

Mr. Venning: What would be the contribution of the Commonwealth Government to primary industry compared with wheat-growers' contributions?

Mr. CASEY: When the stabilization plan started several years ago it was as gentle as a lamb but, unfortunately, today it has turned out to be something of a Budget-eating monster. This year \$43,000,000 has been set aside by the Commonwealth Government for the wheat stabilization plan, and last year the Commonwealth paid \$15,500,000 into this plan. This year's harvest is an all-time record of about 550,000,000 bushels, and it will be interesting to see how we get rid of this wheat. The wheat industry is an extremely important part of our economy, because if anything drastic happens to it not only the wheatgrowers but also many thousands of employees deriving their income from handling this product are affected. Other ancillaries to the wheat industry, such as fertilizer and equipment, are also handled by these employees.

Wheat is overproduced in the world at present, and no country wants much of it. This has a periodical effect on the economy of countries but most of them seem to come through the crisis satisfactorily. I referred to subsidies, because we should compare what an age pensioner receives (a measly \$1 a week or \$52 a year) with what the wheatgrower receives in subsidies. I do not say that the wheatgrower should not receive this subsidy, because he has to have a stable industry and we must have export earnings, but it must be nauseating to the pensioner when he realizes the small pension he receives compared with the large subsidies paid to wheatgrowers.

Mr. Venning: Do you realize that in a normal year of the Commonwealth Government's contribution to stabilization it gets 35 per cent back in direct taxation?

Mr. CASEY: Many people other than wheatgrowers pay taxation, but that is another argument. We have to remember that our primary industries are our biggest export earners at the moment but, although the member for Rocky River claimed that they represented 60 per cent to 70 per cent of our export earnings, I think the figure is more likely to be 48 per cent. The price of wool, this country's major export earner, is at present showing signs of favouring growers, and not before time. However, for all other rural products (wheat, meat, sugar and butter) the outlook is grim. A bombshell exploded earlier this week when producers were informed that they would have to impose a restriction on their exports of beef to the United States of America, because the quota, decided under an agreement made between the U.S.A. and Australia several years ago, had been filled. On top of this, whereas we have been exporting to Kuwait about 130,000 sheep a year, mainly of the big wether class of sheep that were unsuitable for the trade in this State, we have now lost this contract, which I believe has gone to Western Australia. Earlier indications were that it may have gone to Argentina, but so far as I know the contract is still in Australia and has gone to Western Australia.

It seems that farmers will have difficulty this year in storing this surplus wheat. The South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited has done a magnificent job over the years in providing permanent silos for the wheat harvest, and this year it has gone further and provided temporary storages in certain areas. This will absorb some of the surplus by allowing farmers to store a considerable quantity of their wheat. On present estimates I think about 20 per cent of the grain harvested will have to be stored on the properties themselves.

It was announced a short time ago that Great Britain had the misfortune, due to unseasonable conditions just when the crop was ripening, to lose a considerable part of its crop. As we have been selling wheat to Great Britain for a number of years, it is possible that with the loss of that country's crop due to the inclement conditions at harvest time we can now come to the party and sell that country a considerable quantity of wheat.

I consider that the biggest problem confronting Australia and South Australia today in the export of rural products concerns wheat. I

can tell members what happens in our sister dominion of Canada, which is another big exporter of wheat and which is very much like Australia in many ways. In fact, Canada's exports are more or less identical to our own, with the exception that our main export is wool and Canada's main export is paper and wood pulp. Because the volume of wheat exports is so large, the Canadian Government's policy with regard to wheat has always been based on the assumption that it would be prohibitively expensive to pay either production or export subsidies to producers, and this is where Canada differs markedly from Australia.

The only continuing and direct subsidy the wheatgrower in Canada gets is under the temporary Wheat Reserve Act, which provides for a portion of the cost of storing wheat in commercial facilities. Except for this payment, the Canadian farmer receives for his wheat the world selling price less the cost of marketing. The Canadian wheat farmer is dependent on the world market not only for the price he receives but also as to how much he can sell. The quantity a farmer can market is controlled by marketing quotas that expand or contract as Canadian export sales expand and contract. The Canadian Wheat Board has been supplying the major portion of its export harvest to the Communist bloc, namely, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Communist China. The procedure the Canadian Wheat Board adopts is that it controls the movement of wheat from the farm to the export position. The board does not own any facilities, as the South Australian Bulk Handling Co-operative Limited does, but contracts with the owners of the marketing facilities for their use. For example, the primary collection in country elevators is done by co-operatives or private firms acting as agents of the board and on the basis of rates negotiated with the board. The wheat is then moved by rail to terminal positions at the board's request on the basis of rates established by Statute. Terminal elevators are owned by co-operatives and private companies, but these again operate on behalf of the board on the basis of established tariffs. The sale of grain is completed, on the basis of prices established by the board, by Canadian and international grain firms acting as agents of the Canadian Wheat Board. These firms, when making sales to non-Communist countries such as South Africa, Norway and Japan, sell to private companies in those countries on the basis of prices established

by the board and subject to the board's confirmation of grade, port, and shipping period.

In the case of sales to Communist China and the other Communist countries, the procedure is slightly different. The Canadian Wheat Board enters into and negotiates contracts directly with the Government agency responsible for wheat procurement in those countries. There are two types of contract involved, the first of which is a long-term agreement. This is where I believe the Wheat Board in Australia missed out in the early part of the negotiations. It would have been more in the interests of the wheat industry in Australia if long-term contracts had been entered into. Nevertheless, I suppose we all learn by our mistakes. The long-term agreement in Canada is a declaration of intent to buy on the part of the importing country and of intent to supply on the part of the exporting nation certain quantities of wheat over a period of time, usually three years.

It is interesting to note that the volume of wheat sold by Canada to China and the U.S.S.R. has been substantial indeed. In the case of China, Canada is now in the second year of the third long-term agreement. The first was signed in 1961 for a minimum of 112,000,000 bushels and a maximum of 187,000,000 bushels. The importing country, namely China, imported 145,000,000 bushels on that occasion. The next agreement was for the period from 1963 to 1966 for a minimum of 112,000,000 bushels and a maximum of 187,000,000 bushels, and on that occasion they bought the maximum. For the third agreement the minimum is 168,000,000 bushels and the maximum 280,000,000 bushels. So far the Chinese have been purchasing at a rate that indicates they are likely to take the maximum quantity.

It is interesting to note the attitude of the U.S.S.R. which, until 1963, was an exporting nation of wheat; but suddenly it decided to come into the world market for wheat and import all it possibly could. In that year Canada supplied 250,000,000 bushels. Owing to climatic conditions in the U.S.S.R., it bought relatively little wheat in 1964, but in 1965 it again became a major purchaser, purchasing about 220,000,000 bushels; and in 1966 it again signed an agreement with Canada for the purchase of 335,000,000 bushels over a three-year period. That agreement is now in its final year.

On no occasion has the Canadian Wheat Board found any fault with the payments from these countries. I remember that several

years ago, when it was moved that we should sell wheat to the Communist bloc, a long-term agreement was frowned upon because the powers that be were under the impression that the Chinese or the Russians would not adhere to their contracts and no money would be forthcoming; but the experience of the Canadian Wheat Board has been that it has had no problems regarding payment for its wheat. In fact, it has been rather surprised when on some occasions payment has been forthcoming before the stipulated time. I mentioned these points because I thought they would interest members.

One of the most important aspects of this trade with the Communist bloc is that wheat is probably the lowest priced food traded in volume on the world market, and China in particular is interested in purchasing wheat on the assumption that it can sell rice, which it produces in enormous quantities, at a profit. Then it can use wheat for home consumption. It is a natty way of applying economics to the position and, apparently, this is what it does; but we must remember that the Chinese population is increasing to the extent of about 20,000,000 people annually, which is almost double the population of Australia. So we can appreciate the enormous amount of grain it requires. It is for that reason that our hope of selling a large quantity of this year's harvest lies in Communist China.

The other aspect is that earlier this year during the Presidential campaign in the United States of America I read that one of the candidates for the Presidency, Hubert Humphrey, said that, if he was elected President, he would lift the restrictions applying in America relating to trade with the Communist bloc. Unfortunately, if this happens the high-yielding soft wheats of the U.S.A. will find their way into Communist China, because the Chinese prefer soft wheats to the hard wheats of Australia and Canada. Nevertheless, all these matters will undoubtedly be taken into consideration if they come into operation.

We have heard much from all members and from people outside about the need for rural industries throughout Australia to become more efficient. Some weeks ago the Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Anthony) spoke in Adelaide of the advantages of a system operating in the U.S.S.R., namely, collective farming. For a Country Party member of the the Commonwealth Parliament to say this is incredible. I wonder what members oppo-

site would have said if we had said that collective farming was more efficient than the type practised at present in Australia, yet we did not hear a hue and cry when the Minister for Primary Industry said these things. It is remarkable to hear this from a gentleman who will soon become the Leader of the Country Party in the Commonwealth sphere.

The emphasis today is undoubtedly on farming efficiency, and Australia is recognized as being very efficient in primary production. If they are to become more efficient, farms must be amalgamated. It has been suggested by economists and other people outside that some form of amalgamation can take place either by compulsory land acquisition or by voluntary amalgamation. I think it was Mr. Campbell Curtis who suggested that the voluntary amalgamation of small holdings could be considered. I believe that any aspect of our rural industries must be considered. It might be advisable to attempt to inhibit the flow of people into farming. We could perhaps stop encouraging young people to go into farming and encourage farming youths to enter other occupations. We could discourage certain individuals from starting to farm.

Mr. McAnaney: But for taxation, more people would go on the land.

Mr. CASEY: We are encouraging people to go on the land.

Mr. McAnaney: I don't think we are.

Mr. CASEY: I do not agree with the honourable member. We are increasing the activities of the Rural Youth Movement, a wonderful organization. The Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Anthony) has said that we have too many small dairy farms and that they should be amalgamated. The Commonwealth Government has provided \$25,000,000 for such a scheme. However, people who have been on small holdings for many years and want to stay there are often too old to learn a trade, and it would be difficult to place them in work. That is a problem facing primary industry, particularly dairying. How many people should we encourage to go on the land? We are providing more agricultural courses in our secondary schools.

Mr. Ferguson: Which schools have these courses?

Mr. CASEY: Most area schools and the special rural schools. The Orroroo Area School has an agricultural course. These courses can be taught by secondary school-teachers, but the training is on a more advanced

basis at places like Urrbrae Agricultural High School. Tremendous pressure has been put on Governments to establish more agricultural colleges. When I was Minister of Agriculture, people in the Murray River area wanted an agricultural and horticultural college to be established there. That would be an excellent central place for such a college, but how many people should we encourage to go on the land? Our citrus industry has over-production at present. I do not suggest the discouragement of interest in farming. There will always be a need for some people to take it up, but the total number entering the industry should be limited by discouraging those with the least chance of succeeding as farm owners or managers. Basically, the Rural Advances Act screens these people thoroughly before they go on the land. Perhaps people wishing to farm should have a minimum managerial ability. Today, the man on the land must be an accountant and an economist as well as a good farmer to make a go of farming. If these qualifications are required, the young person may have to sit for a theoretical and practical examination before being allotted land because, obviously, managerial ability is as necessary for a successful farmer as it is for a successful business executive.

The member for Stirling has often said that, and I agree with him. Perhaps scholarships should be established to enable young farm boys, who have graduated from high schools, to be awarded scholarships in non-farming vocations. If a bright lad does well in his schoolwork in the agricultural field but is then offered a scholarship for an academic career as a doctor, lawyer, or dentist, these lads may change their minds, and this may relieve the strain on those who wish to make a career of farming. We have to consider every aspect of rural conditions throughout the Commonwealth, because everyone cannot go on the land. Today, about 25,000,000 acres has been sown to wheat compared with 8,000,000 acres about 10 years ago, and we have to get rid of this food that is being produced. These problems have to be solved soon.

Mr. Ferguson: Is there a surplus of food in the world today?

Mr. CASEY: Yes, but people are starving because of the lack of good distribution of it. Strangely enough, the only measure of relief I can see in this Budget concerns the winning bets tax. Prior to the election, promises were made by the present Premier, who said that if

his Party was elected it would lift the winning bets tax. He organized the punters association to have deputations to him personally about what he said were the anomalies being created in the racing industry. He also said that the poor old punter was being taxed out of existence.

At the time, I frowned on this type of lobbying, because I did not think the punter was as badly off as he claimed to be. When we were in Government we did, after 13 months of operation of the Totalizator Agency Board, lift the tax on the stake. Those who bet on the totalizator are automatically relieved of, I think, 14 per cent, so that is an automatic tax on the bets a person makes through the totalizator. The same thing applies with the turnover tax when a person bets with a bookmaker. We find here that we are not going to lift this tax on the punter at all, at least not for a couple of years. This is a complete farce, because there is no guarantee that this tax will be lifted at the time it is said that it will be lifted. It seems that what the Government is going to do is pass legislation and put it into effect when it sees fit. I certainly will not vote for that legislation under those conditions.

Mr. McKee: I would support an inquiry into racing generally.

Mr. CASEY: If the Premier really wanted to do something to boost the revenues of T.A.B., he should ask the Commissioner of Police to put a few more police on the job to cut out S.P. bookmaking, particularly where the T.A.B. operates, because I know that S.P. bookmaking is rife in many of those areas.

Mr. McKee: What do you expect with this form of T.A.B.?

Mr. CASEY: I have always maintained that if there is a place to bet legally the people should use those facilities, and that if they are not prepared to use them they should pay the penalty for betting illegally.

Mr. McKee: The T.A.B. should pay out after a race; this would enable it to compete.

Mr. CASEY: I was greatly interested in the following remark made by the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney):

Succession duties have doubled. It has been suggested that we should raise finance by this method of taxation. Possibly there could be some increase in the tax on large estates.

This is almost a complete somersault for the member for Stirling, for it is vastly different from what he said a few years ago. It is a staggering reversal of thought on his part. One of the taxes imposed by this Budget is a gift duty. I have no hesitation in saying that had we imposed this type of tax when we were in Government the Legislative Council would have thrown it out. I am interested to see whether the Legislative Council will do that on this occasion, but I shall be surprised if it does. Perhaps the present Government put this in as a gimmick; it might have said, "The Legislative Council will throw this one out and that will make the Legislative Council appear fair and above board; at least it will appear consistent, and we don't really need that particular revenue anyway." These are tactics that are sometimes employed by Governments, and the Government could be employing those tactics on this occasion. Of course, it could be caught out on that one, too.

I am very much disappointed with the Budget because I think it will hit a lot harder the man who can least afford to pay. I believe in progressive taxation, but the Budget does not provide for that. It is amazing that each time taxes are increased they seem to hit the man who can least afford to pay.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I can assure honourable members that I will largely keep to the timetable that has been set for the conclusion of proceedings this evening. I have already taken my pen to my notes and crossed out a considerable amount. Much has been said this evening to the effect that my Party had little to say about what taxes there would be if it formed a Government. However, I have vivid recollections of being on the same platform as the Premier (or the Leader of the Opposition as he was then) during the election campaign and he made no promise whatever on this score. In fact, he distinctly said that, if his Party were elected as the Government, it could easily be that a tough Budget would be introduced. I think we all realize that this is a tough Budget, as the Treasurer in particular realizes. It appears to me, as a new member with his first glimpse of a State Budget, that there is reasonableness in the fact that those who have enjoyed certain privileges are surely under some obligation to pay as well. Although I am not prepared to debate my convictions on the matter now, I do not like the expression "working class". Many of us have shared over

the years benefits in the way of additional leave, equal pay, superannuation, and so on, and I believe that those who have benefited in this way, when there is a deficit must be prepared to share in meeting the costs of those benefits. I believe that in Budgets for several years to come there will have to be a greater sharing and sharing alike in these matters.

The member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell), in a most excellent speech, informed the Committee on many matters of considerable interest and talked about profitless prosperity. Those who are in touch with primary production know well what is meant by profitless prosperity. The members for Mount Gambier and Chaffey, the Speaker and I attended a meeting at Waikerie last Thursday evening where we were given some current figures on the citrus industry to the effect that 15 years ago a case of oranges was worth three times as much as it is today, but at that time the cost of producing a case was about one-third of the present-day cost. Therefore, it is obvious that, in primary industries such as fishing, dairying, wool, poultry and grain-growing, with the increased cost of production, we must expect that money will not be about to stimulate our economy. The member for Semaphore felt that the Budget would not stimulate our spending. It is a plain matter of economics when we have not the money to spend, and there is a large proportion of the community that does not and will not in several years to come have the money to spend, in order to stimulate our economy.

I appreciated what the member for Millicent had to say about moneys allotted for tourist development. I do not believe there is any better organization in this State for the development of tourism than local government, which knows what is desired in its particular area by tourists. Local government has the ability to move into the tourist field but it is limited by the funds at its disposal. Many parts of the State have been mentioned as areas where tourism could be expanded greatly. I add to them the Murray River throughout its entire length from the border to the sea, and particularly the area that I believe will become the aquatic playground of this State—the lower Murray reaches. It is disappointing to local government that a comparatively small sum has been allocated to it in the Budget for tourist development. There is an allocation of \$1,000 for the Murray Valley Development League. Although it is

gratifying to see that \$1,000 again in this Budget, those of us who have been closely associated with the league know of its worth and value in co-ordinating affairs between the States and the tourist industry, and it is disappointing that this sum could not be trebled.

I refer now to the increase in the allocation to the Royal Association of Justices in South Australia. All members know only too well the tremendous effort that association makes

in this State. We know how many thousand man hours are given voluntarily by justices of the peace to assist in court work in South Australia. I have pleasure in supporting the first line.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 2 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 26, at 2 p.m.