

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, October 1, 1968.

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

QUESTIONS

ADELAIDE OVAL

Mr. LAWN: For some years I and others have been advocating the building of more stands at the Adelaide Oval. The South Australian Cricket Association Incorporated, in building stands, has concentrated on only one side of the oval, whereas we think that stands should be built on both sides. During the Budget debate I asked the Government to use its good offices to settle the dispute between the South Australian National Football League Incorporated and the S.A.C.A., and said that the football league was prepared to spend \$1,000,000 on building stands.

Mr. Corcoran: You forecast correctly the results of the football, too.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, of the last two matches. Now I am surprised to learn from the press that the Adelaide City Council, without any thought for football patrons, will, apparently, refuse to allow stands to be built on the eastern side of the oval as that would spoil the view of the hills. As a result, stands will be concentrated on one side only. Apparently, the S.A.C.A. is imbued with the idea of building single-storey stands rather than multiple-storey stands similar to those built in other States. Will the Premier consider this matter and inform me whether the Adelaide City Council has the sole right to determine this matter, or whether any decision of the council is subject to review by the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation? If neither is the case, will the Premier say what action Parliament can take to ensure that the determination of the Adelaide City Council to build stands on one side only of the Adelaide Oval can be vetoed?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will obtain the detailed information sought by the honourable member about who can affect the situation at the Adelaide Oval and of what powers Parliament has in this regard. However, I understand that the views in dispute are far more complicated and have more facets than that raised by the honourable member, who has spoken on this matter before. Because of my (and the Government's) concern and the fact that the Government has been approached in the past by representatives of

the football league to consider an alternative site to the Adelaide Oval, I intend to use my good offices, if I can, to see the two parties separately, and to assess the points of dispute and try to bring the parties together. I will initiate moves this week, and I will keep the honourable member informed, whenever possible, of any progress.

CAMBRAI-SEDAN WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about a reticulated water supply from the nearly completed Swan Reach to Stockwell main for the Cambrai and Sedan districts in the Murray Plains?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Although the laying of the pipes of the Swan Reach to Stockwell main is approaching completion, it is expected that the construction of the three pumping stations and the installation of the permanent pumps will not be completed until about mid-1970. It would not be practicable to lay any branch mains from the main until this stage is reached, and it is tentatively planned to allocate Loan funds for a supply to the Sedan-Cambrai area in the 1969-70 and 1970-71 financial years, provided that the majority of the landholders want a supply and a satisfactory revenue return can be assured. To enable these points to be investigated, it is proposed to approach the Sedan and Cambrai district councils during 1969.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. VIRGO: Last week I asked a question about the acquisition of a property under the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan, and I am pleased that the Minister of Roads and Transport subsequently instructed the Highways Department to commence negotiations for its purchase. I have now been approached by another constituent who, in a letter to me, says:

In our case my wife and I are both in the 70's and might for health reasons have to sell our house at any time to purchase a home unit. Our house is between Winifred Avenue and Clarke Avenue and is in the direct path of the freeway.

The constituent then asks whether the Government would agree to purchase his house immediately to enable him to move, and continues:

This assurance would soften the blow that has shattered the sense of security so essential in old age.

Will the Premier say whether he regards this as a *bona fide* reason for sale and whether it

would be Government policy to purchase this house to enable the elderly people concerned to move?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I would obviously need further details from the honourable member or his constituent before I could give the opinion sought. I recall telling the honourable member within five minutes of the last time he spoke that he was wrong in his assumption that the Government was not sympathetic in these cases. He knows now, as he has already said in effect, that the Government acted in the previous case. I shall be happy to take up this matter with the Minister of Roads and Transport, and I would welcome further details from the honourable member.

INTAKES AND STORAGES

Mr. GILES: Can the Minister of Works supply figures relating to intakes and storages in the metropolitan reservoirs as a result of the recent heavy rains?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The figures I have are the latest available (as at 8.30 this morning) and indicate that most of the metropolitan reservoirs are full and that others are almost full. Mount Bold reservoir is full and running over the spillway at a level of 1ft. 4in. Happy Valley and Clarendon reservoirs are full; the Myponga reservoir, which has a capacity of 5,905,000,000 gallons, now holds 5,415,500,000 gallons. Millbrook reservoir is full and Hope Valley reservoir, with a capacity of 765,000,000 gallons, holds 644,000,000 gallons, while Thornodon Park reservoir, with a capacity of 142,000,000 gallons, at present holds 130,000,000 gallons. The Barossa reservoir (capacity 993,000,000 gallons) holds 803,600,000 gallons, and South Para (capacity 11,300,000,000 gallons) holds 10,106,000,000 gallons. The Warren reservoir is full and is running over the spillway at a level of 1ft. 1in. At present, the total storage is 34,153,100,000 gallons, the total storage capacity being 36,099,000,000 gallons. The increase in the last 24 hours has been 229,700,000 gallons, and the intake to the whole system has been 276,300,000 gallons. Consumption and evaporation in that time has been only 46,600,000 gallons.

MEAT DEPOT

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about the meat depot in Gilles Street, Adelaide?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: My colleague states that during the past six months there has been a substantial reduction in the quantity of meat brought in for inspection at the city inspection depot because of the largest of three operators then submitting meat slaughtered outside the board's area for inspection having ceased to slaughter at its own works. Discussions have been held between representatives of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board and other interested parties relating to a proposal to discontinue the inspection of meat from country slaughterhouses at the city inspection depot, and this matter (which involves an amendment to the legislation) is still under consideration.

ROLLING STOCK

Mr. VENNING: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked some time ago about the rolling stock to be used to handle the forthcoming grain harvest?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague states that the Railways Department has exactly the same rolling stock capacity for handling bulk grain on the Peterborough Division for the forthcoming harvest as it had during 1964.

WALLAROO INDUSTRY

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about a letter to the American industry that was considering establishing at Wallaroo?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I wrote to the syndicate in Mississippi on May 14, 1968, and asked whether it could give me, if necessary in confidence, any information concerning its future plans for the use of the land held at Wallaroo. As no reply has been received to that correspondence, I have again written and informed the syndicate of the further progress in connection with the natural gas transmission line and asked for a reply to my earlier communication.

LUCINDALE ROAD

Mr. RODDA: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about Main Road No. 295?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: In his advice to me, my colleague has presumed that the honourable member's question refers to the Lucindale-Furner Main Road No. 298, commencing at its junction with Main Road No. 295 at Conmurra and ending at Furner

in the Beachport council area. The construction and sealing of the Robe-Lucindale Main Road No. 295 is completed, with the exception of a final section being undertaken by Robe council in its area. The Lucindale-Furner road is of low general priority, and commencement of construction is not expected before the 1970-71 financial year. Until reconstruction commences, the responsibility for maintenance rests with the district councils of Lucindale and Beachport. Main road grants are made available to both councils to assist in this work.

PORT MACDONNELL JETTY

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my recent question about repairs to the areas adjacent to the Port MacDonnell jetty?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The local council has agreed to effect repairs to the car parking area at Port MacDonnell at an estimated cost of \$200, and I have authorized this expenditure. The work will be undertaken when the council has a suitable gang in the area and the ground has dried out after the winter rains.

DERAILMENTS

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my recent question about derailments in the District of Murray?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The derailment that occurred near Tailem Bend on September 7, 1968, involved a loaded bogie van and not a four-wheel vehicle, although a number of the latter subsequently left the track after it had been damaged by the initial derailment. The circumstances surrounding this incident have several factors which have been common to other derailments over recent years and which are now the subject of scientific testing in association with the Weapons Research Establishment. In all cases it has been the same type of bogie van; the speed has approximated 45 miles an hour and the track conditions have been comparable. It would appear that a resonance has been set up between the spring frequency and the track condition. The waggon springs have been changed, and now consideration is being given to the fitting of a dampening device. The derailments have not been associated with empty four-wheel vehicles, neither has speed been a factor. The Railways Department is continuing to pursue the problem as a matter of urgency.

WHYALLA TECHNICAL SCHOOL

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about additions to the Eyre Technical High School, Whyalla?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Yesterday, Cabinet approved of funds being made available for the erection of solid construction additions at the Eyre Technical High School, consisting of eight classrooms, two art/craft rooms, and a needlework room. The preparation of detailed tender documents will now proceed, and it is expected that these buildings could be constructed and ready for occupation in August-September, 1969. In view of the increased enrolments at the school, additional temporary accommodation will have to be provided by February next. A scheme for the provision of three fully transportable classroom units to meet this need is being prepared at the present time.

ALDGATE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the Aldgate Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The Aldgate Primary School is on a restricted site, a considerable part of which is not suitable for use as playground because of its steeply sloping nature. The enrolment has increased from 201 in 1960 to 209 in 1968. Several alternative sites have been considered for either the establishment of additional playground facilities or the resiting of the school. Recently two sites were suggested by the chairman of the school committee and inspected by departmental officers. One of these is considered to offer distinct possibilities as a site for a new school. The present position is that the Director, Public Buildings Department, has been asked to examine and report on it. When this report is received, further consideration will be given to the possibility of its purchase with a view to the eventual establishment of a new school at Aldgate.

TOURISM

Mr. BURDON: Has the Minister of Immigration and Tourism a reply to my question about the allocation of tourist moneys, particularly in respect of the Lower South-East?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: In the year 1967-68, \$64,220 was paid in subsidies to local government authorities for development of tourist resorts and \$32,951 was paid in swimming pool subsidies. Subsidies paid in the

Lower South-East amounted to \$6,096 for tourist subsidies and \$6,000 for swimming pools. In considering whether allocations to one district are fair, it is advisable to take into account the allocations made over a period of years, because the amounts of individual subsidies vary considerably.

GOOLWA BARRAGES

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of September 25 regarding the outflow of water from the Goolwa barrages?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: On September 27, the level at the barrages, with a slight easterly wind, was 3in. above pool. The amount of water released through the barrages since they were first opened on July 8 was about 1,400,000 acre feet.

GOVERNMENT DIRECTORY

Mr. RYAN: This morning, I was approached by a constituent on a matter that I told him should be placed before the Prices Commissioner. He asked me where the Prices Commissioner's office was. I did not know, so I referred to the telephone directory, which shows "Prices Department, 158 Rundle Street, Adelaide", but this did not mean a thing to me because of the recent changes of Government offices. On ringing the Prices Commissioner's office at the number shown in the telephone directory I was told that the number had not been connected and that I should ring another number, which I did. Ultimately, I found that the Prices Commissioner's office is now in the new Savings Bank building on the corner of Rundle and Pulteney Streets. As many Government departments have moved in the last few months, so that even members of this House do not know where some are located, will the Premier have issued a list showing where Government departments are now located?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will see whether this can be done. As the honourable member knows, the Government is upgrading accommodation in the Public Service and has moved departments into buildings that are more suitable for their type of work and more in keeping with the status of public servants in the community. This problem will arise further as more departments move into the new building in Victoria Square.

UPPER MURRAY TELEVISION

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Premier a reply to my question of September 3 regarding tele-

vision receiving licences for people living outside the recognized range of a television transmitting station?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Postmaster-General reports:

I refer again to your letter of September 5 concerning the suggestion made in the House of Assembly that persons residing in remote areas, where television reception is poor, be granted licences at reduced rates. I should explain that the Broadcasting and Television Act stipulates that a licence must be held in respect of each address at which a receiving appliance capable of being used for the reception of television programmes is ordinarily kept and that it contains no provision for exemption from payment of licence fees or for the issue of reduced-rate licences because of poor reception, the fact that reception of a particular station is not possible or for any other reason.

The question of introducing a zoning system for the purpose of assessing licence fees for television receivers, along similar lines to that in force for the broadcasting service, has been carefully examined on a number of occasions. However, as you may be aware, unlike broadcasting where, as a general rule, the grade of reception is directly governed by the distance of the receiver from the broadcasting station, television reception is influenced by a variety of factors including, for example, the nature of the intervening terrain and the type, location and height of the receiving aerial employed. For this reason it has been found impracticable to clearly define areas of poor reception or to prescribe reception standards that may be applied consistently throughout Australia for the purpose of granting licence fee concessions for television receivers.

It is a fact that there are areas within relatively short distances of transmitting stations where difficulties encountered in obtaining reasonable television reception are probably as great as in the fringe areas. In many cases, however, it is possible for reception difficulties to be overcome to some extent by the use of special aerials, but the problem is one which may be resolved only by individual users of receivers. Similarly, it is a matter for persons in such areas to decide whether, in view of the standard of reception available, they should acquire a receiver and incur the obligation of holding a licence. In view of the foregoing I am sure you will appreciate that the way is not clear to vary the existing licensing provisions as outlined in paragraph 2 above. However, as you are no doubt aware, every endeavour is being made to provide satisfactory television services, as far as is economically possible, to all populated areas of the Commonwealth. In this regard you will be interested to learn that present plans provide for stations to be established in the Renmark area in the second half of 1970.

STRATHMONT HOSPITAL

Mr. HUDSON: I understand that tenders for the erection of the first stage of the Strathmont hospital closed on July 25 but that, as

yet, no decision has been made by the Government as to the successful tenderer. Can the Minister of Works say when a decision will be made in this matter, and whether the building of the hospital has been delayed? If it has been delayed, what are the reasons for the delay?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I assure the honourable member that the Government has not promoted any delay, but he is correct when he says that tenders were received. They have been processed, but some difficulties about conditions have to be considered with the tenderers. These have been examined by me, by my department, and by the Auditor-General, and it is hoped that a decision can be made without delay.

Mr. HUDSON: Can the Minister say whether it is true that three builders intend to act as a consortium, should one of the builders get the contract for the Strathmont Hospital, Stage I, but have each, in fact, submitted separate tenders? Is it a fact also that none of these tenders is the lowest tender that has been received? Finally, should any tender but the lowest be accepted for this project will the Minister provide a detailed report for Parliament?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The honourable member is not entirely correct in his assertion, although one tender was received from a consortium of builders. In the latter part of his question, the honourable member requested that a report should be made to Parliament, but I point out that, by regulations under the Audit Act, all tenders must go to the Auditor-General for scrutiny, and this is always done in the normal way. Of course, the matters the honourable member has referred to are being presently investigated. As I told him in reply to his earlier question, I will certainly see whether this matter can be expedited and, as soon as this has been done, I will inform the honourable member.

ROAD PASSENGER SERVICES

Mr. FREEBAIRN: On September 17 I asked the Attorney-General to ascertain from the Minister of Roads and Transport what provisions would be made for pensioners and periodic ticket privileges when applications for licences to operate a road passenger service between Adelaide and Robertstown were accepted, and what time table this road service would maintain. Has the Attorney-General a reply?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague states that intending applicants for a licensed road passenger service between Robertstown, Eudunda, Kapunda, Freeling and Adelaide have been informed that the Transport Control Board, when considering the applications lodged, will take into account fares to be charged (including concessions offered pensioners and students), vehicles to be used, and services to be provided. The board does not stipulate a time table but advises applicants that services should be provided that will cater for most people who use public transport. Although pensioner concessions are granted by operators of some country services, this procedure is not uniform and the licensees concerned do not receive any reimbursement. Licence conditions provide that weekly tickets may be issued, the charge usually being not less than six times the adult single fare. The weekly fare for full-time schoolchildren is based on seven-tenths of the adult weekly fare. The board will communicate with councils in the area before reaching a decision on the services to be provided.

MODBURY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works details of a sewerage project at Modbury about which I asked recently?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The sewer extension to the Hope Valley Primary School was approved as a separate scheme, although several extensions to the subdivided areas adjacent to this trunk sewer have been approved as part of the main Hope Valley and High-bury scheme. No sewers to the east of the school have been approved, although the trunk sewer can be extended when warranted by development. The area including Amber Road and Sapphire and Zircon Avenues is not included in any sewerage scheme at the present time. The area is only sparsely developed, and long approach sewers through land, which is, at present, unsubdivided, would be necessary. The streets, however, are included in the area which can be ultimately drained into the trunk sewer at the Hope Valley school, as was indicated on the plan supplied in 1966.

MEAT BOARD

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Lands received a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to the question I asked on September 17 about the Government setting up a meat board to receive and market meat on behalf of producers?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture reports that the Government is always willing to consider any practical proposals designed to assist primary industries in this State. However, any marketing scheme would need to demonstrate convincingly that the setting up of such a board was acceptable to producers and would achieve the objects mentioned by the honourable member, at the same time ensuring that the interests of the consumer were protected. I would expect that, before action was taken to establish a board of this nature, details of the proposal would be submitted to a poll of producers, who would be asked to give a clear indication that, if implemented, it would have their full support and co-operation.

WORLD BANK

Mr. HURST: In this morning's newspaper, under the heading "World Bank plans vast aid effort", it was reported that Mr. R. McNamara, former United States Secretary of Defence, in his first public announcement as President of the bank announced a plan for the World Bank to lend \$US11,400,000,000 to developing nations in the next five years, and that Indonesia was included in the list of developing nations. Can the Premier ascertain what forms of development are likely to be associated with this loan, and can he say whether the South Australian Government has a representative in Indonesia who could advertise the wide range of manufactures, machinery, and goods available from South Australian industry?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will find out what details I can for the honourable member but it seems from the initial announcement that it may be some time before details are worked out. I consider that the spending of such a large sum would be spread over several years.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Five years.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: So it will not be possible, at present, to get full details of the purposes for which it will be used. Concerning a South Australian representative in Indonesia, I remind the honourable member that oversea trade is promoted mainly by the Commonwealth Government and that there is an efficient trade commissioner service with, I believe, the finest Australian representatives possible. I am sure that this service operates in Indonesia. The South Australian Government maintains only one office overseas: it is in London and is controlled by the Agent-General, who is also the Trade Commissioner. However, he considers that this title has become obsolete, because trade is being

handled most efficiently by the Commonwealth trade commissioner service in concert with private firms. However, I will obtain an up-to-date report for the honourable member.

MOSQUITOES

Mr. BROOMHILL: Can the Premier say what steps are being taken by the Government to provide aerial spraying in respect of the mosquito nuisance in the West Torrens District?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: For some years past, the Corporation of the City of West Torrens has arranged each summer for the aerial spraying of the Torrens River, the upper reaches of the Port River, and the Adelaide Airport, against mosquitoes. I am informed that this corporation plans to spray again during this coming summer.

PORT PIRIE HOSPITAL

Mr. McKEE: Can the Minister of Works say whether plans for the new children's ward and other improvements at the Port Pirie Hospital have yet been submitted to the Public Works Committee for consideration?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: They have not yet been submitted to the committee, but I will certainly look into this matter and ascertain the schedule for the honourable member as quickly as I can.

PORT PIRIE RAILWAY PLATFORM

Mr. RICHES: One of the longest platforms in Australia has been constructed at Port Pirie, and the refreshment rooms are situated in the centre of that platform. However, as trains travelling from Port Augusta pull up at the end of the platform, passengers have to embark on a marathon walk in order to obtain a newspaper or a cup of tea. On the last three trips I have made on this train, it has been impossible for anyone to get into the refreshment rooms in the time allowed. This morning people from Marree, who had boarded the train at 12.45 a.m., had no opportunity to eat anything until they reached Bowmans. Will the Attorney-General therefore ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to see whether a better arrangement cannot be made? If the Commonwealth Budd car and the State railcar could pull up opposite the refreshment rooms it might afford a service to northern passengers, at any rate.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I can well imagine the inconvenience which this situation the honourable member has described must cause. While some members might like

to have a bit of a walk, I realize that most would prefer to be taken to their destination (in this case the refreshment rooms).

Mr. RICHES: Not even the Minister could walk that distance in the time.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not know whether that is a challenge. I will certainly take up the matter with my colleague.

STATE GOVERNOR

Mr. LAWN: Has the Premier further information about the appointment of a Governor?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am sorry. I have nothing yet to tell the honourable member although, of course, I am keeping nothing from him in this regard.

KALANGADOO SCHOOL

Mr. RODDA: I have been contacted by the Secretary of the Kalangadoo school committee expressing concern at the slow progress being made in completing work on the oval at the school. This is a new school, having been first occupied early last year, and I believe that tenders have again been called for the work in question. Will the Minister of Education examine this matter with her officers and bring down a report for the House?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I shall be pleased to do that.

SNAKE GULLY RESERVOIR

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on September 19 about the possibility of constructing a new reservoir on the Little Para River, in the Snake Gully area?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: A preliminary geological appraisal has been made of the area of the Little Para under consideration, and the Mines Department is currently carrying out an extensive survey of the underground water resources of the northern part of the Adelaide Plains. To assist in this regard and to evaluate the catchment, potential gauging weirs have been constructed on the Little Para River both upstream and downstream of the fault line. Possible duties of any dam which may be built include the storage of catchment waters, the provision of balancing storage for the Elizabeth and Salisbury areas, and flood mitigation. The proposal must be examined closely and a careful extensive evaluation made before a recommendation can be made, and the investigations may well take several years.

BAROSSA PASSENGER SERVICE

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to the question I asked on September 17 about the introduction next December of a passenger bus service to and from the Barossa Valley?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: As I am afraid I cannot see that reply, I will inquire about it.

CRYSTAL BROOK SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: Earlier this year I had the opportunity to open the Crystal Brook Primary School continental. Prior to doing so, I inquired about the building of two rooms at the school that were supposed to have been constructed this year. Before that, on contacting the department about the programme for the building of these two rooms, I was informed that they were expected to be constructed by July of this year. Can the Minister of Education say when these two rooms at the Crystal Brook school are expected to be constructed?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will call for a report on the matter and let the honourable member have it.

WHYALLA HOUSING

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to my recent question about the programme for additional houses at Whyalla?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am pleased to be able to inform the honourable member that the Housing Trust last week let a contract for the construction of a further 14 rental-sale houses at Whyalla. The trust will endeavour to increase the building rate wherever possible and intends to call additional tenders in the immediate future.

RETAIL DISCOUNTS

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Treasurer a reply to my recent question about retail discounts?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Prices Commissioner has informed me that, since 1964, his department has received only four complaints from traders where the circumstances are similar to those quoted by the honourable member and, although outside the scope of the Act, satisfactory arrangements for supplies to be obtained at recognized wholesale discounts were negotiated in two of these cases.

TRAIN PASSES

Mr. VIRGO: When on annual leave, daily-paid employees of the South Australian railways are entitled to an all-lines pass for themselves, their wives and families. However, daily-paid employees receive a second-class pass whereas salaried officers receive a first-class pass. After five years' service, the daily-paid employee is entitled to a first-class pass for travel within South Australia, but the first-class pass is not extended to interstate travel. A case was recently referred to me which emphasizes the point of my question. A daily-paid employee, with 35 years' faithful service, had to travel second-class interstate, whereas a young girl, who had had little more than 12 months' service, was able to travel first-class. As I understand the basis for this travel is by way of a reciprocal agreement among the Railways Commissioners in all States, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to take up this matter with a view to obtaining a reciprocal arrangement whereby employees with more than five years' service may be afforded the privilege of a first-class pass for travel interstate as well as intrastate?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: As the circumstances outlined by the honourable member certainly sound anomalous, I shall be happy to take up the matter.

MOUNT BOLD ROAD

Mr. EVANS: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the Mount Bold Road?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Highways Department is aware of the condition of the Mount Bold Main Road 438, and realizes that, although it generally carries traffic satisfactorily at present, increased tourist use in the future will dictate its reconstruction and sealing. There are, however, many demands on the available funds for main road construction, and at present it is felt that other roads have higher priority. Although the matter will be kept under review, and is included in the forward construction programme of the department, no firm date can be given at this time as to when funds will be available for sealing.

WHEAT

Mr. CASEY: At the weekend I noticed in the country edition of the *Sunday Mail* headlines referring to a press release by the Minister of Agriculture to the effect that a wheat boom would take place in South Australia. The article is as follows:

South Australia could become Australia's largest wheat producer in the next few years, Agriculture Minister (Mr. Story) said today. He said he expected an increase of 10 per cent to 15 per cent in the next five years. Then annual increases should lift South Australia from the third largest wheat producer to the largest.

I should like the attention of the Minister of Agriculture drawn to the fact that over the last five years the acreage sown to wheat in South Australia has fallen steadily from 17 per cent to only 13 per cent of the Commonwealth acreage. The average wheat production in South Australia over the last five years has been a little over 45,000,000 bushels, whereas in New South Wales the average has been above 120,000,000 bushels. As the percentage of acreage sown to wheat in South Australia (on a Commonwealth basis) has dropped and as South Australia has the second lowest wheat yield of any State in the Commonwealth, will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture for a detailed report substantiating the claims made in the press statement?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will forward the honourable member's argument to my colleague.

DENTAL CLINICS

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Premier obtained from the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question about a dental clinic in the Murray Bridge township?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Plans are in hand for the establishment of a school dental clinic at Murray Bridge by the end of June, 1969.

MOUNT GAMBIER TROTTERING CLUB

Mr. BURDON: Has the Premier a reply to my question of September 18 about the allocation of Totalizator Agency Board profits, particularly as such allocation affects the Mount Gambier Trotting Club?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Chief Secretary reports that the proportion of T.A.B. moneys going to trotting was raised by a deputation from the South Australian Trotting League and the South Australian Trotting Club. On July 31 last, the Chairman of the South Australian Trotting League was informed in writing as follows:

The present distribution formula was based upon an agreed submission from the off-course committee in which trotting interests were represented. It would seem to be unwise for the Government to amend that formula without reference back to these combined interests since any advantage which may be given to trotting can only be at the expense of racing.

I suggest that the South Australian Trotting League should, therefore, confer with the South Australian Jockey Club in an endeavour to reach agreement on an amended distribution formula.

On the question of the distribution to clubs, both racing and trotting, the decision was made by T.A.B. On December 12, 1967, the Chairman submitted to the then Chief Secretary the financial scheme adopted by the board defining the method of distribution of the profits derived by the board during the financial year ending June 30, 1968, and for subsequent years, and on December 20, 1967, the Chief Secretary replied:

I suggest that, as at present I can find no substantial objection, the scheme has my provisional approval, and, therefore, the details of the scheme may be advised to the clubs and the public generally. If after, say, two months from the date of advice to the clubs the board re-affirms to me its support of the scheme and I can still find no substantial objection thereto, I would be prepared to give my formal approval.

Evidently no objections were raised to the board and in a letter dated March 1, 1968, the board informed the Chief Secretary that at its meeting on February 26, 1968, it unanimously re-affirmed its unqualified support for the scheme. In a letter dated March 6, 1968, the Chief Secretary gave his formal approval. Any club not satisfied with its distribution should, therefore, approach T.A.B.

SISAL

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Treasurer a reply to the question I asked last week about the pricing of baling twine, in which I pointed out that the international price for sisal had dropped rather dramatically in the last few years?

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

The Australian manufacturers have quoted a price to user of \$12.50 a bag for sisal and \$13.10 a bag for polypropylene baling twine for the 1968-69 season. These prices represent a decrease of 40 cents a bag for this season (equal to \$16 a ton) and follow a reduction of 25 cents a bag in the 1967-68 season. Reduced prices reflect the lower prices quoted for sisal on the London commodity market. Since June, 1968, however, market prices have steadily risen but will not affect selling prices of twine for this season.

HOUSING TRUST HOUSES

Mr. HURST: Will the Minister of Housing find out how many Housing Trust houses built in the last three years for purchase have been equipped with water tanks and how many have

been equipped with water softeners, and will the Minister also obtain similar information in relation to rental houses built by the trust in this period?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will try to get the information for the honourable member.

WINNING BETS TAX

Mr. BROOMHILL: In his Budget speech the Treasurer, referring on page 4 to legislation regarding the winning bets tax and the proclamation of a date for the abandonment of that tax, stated:

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

Will the Treasurer indicate the levels of these taxes applying in the Eastern States?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Lest I make an error of memory, I will give the precise information to the honourable member, probably tomorrow.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. VENNING: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about payment of compensation to property owners affected by standardization of the railway line from Broken Hill to Port Pirie?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Minister of Roads and Transport has obtained this report from the Railways Commissioner:

An assessment of the amount of compensation due to landholders affected by the rail standardization works in South Australia is arrived at, in most instances, following upon negotiations between the departmental Property Officer and the landholder concerned. Under the conditions whereby the State is reimbursed by the Commonwealth for amounts so paid, it is necessary for the valuations to be certified in each instance by a Commonwealth valuer. A considerable amount of negotiation at a State level was undertaken before a valuer was appointed by the Commonwealth. This gave rise to delays in respect of a number of settlements. Further, in some instances the amount of compensation payable has depended upon surveys undertaken following definition of new boundaries upon completion of fencing. Work is well advanced in this connection.

HOLDEN HILL INTERSECTION

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to the question I asked on September 18 about the design of a traffic island at the corner of Main North-East Road and Grand Junction Road, Holden Hill?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague tells me that there is no necessity to modify the design of the roundabout, as the roadways around the roundabout are of sufficient width to make available two lanes for traffic use, permitting unrestricted left turns at the same time as through and right turn movements. The design of the intersection is workable and safe.

COACH BOOKINGS

Mr. EVANS: Has the Premier a reply to my question about the operation of, and commission paid for, buses booked through the Government Tourist Bureau?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Chief Secretary's Department's circular covering booking of omnibuses through the Government Tourist Bureau was first issued on June 9, 1949. This circular was issued following the re-opening of the bureau after the Second World War. Before the war the practice of booking through the bureau had been followed in accordance with a bureau request dated April 4, 1933. The Education Department instruction was first issued in 1949. The operator of the tourist bus pays a commission of 5 per cent to the Tourist Bureau. There is no extra charge to the school.

GERANIUM SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of September 4 about possible contamination of the water supply at Geranium consequent upon the provision of a drainage bore at the Geranium Primary School?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The drainage bore which it is intended to use to dispose of the effluent is cased to an appropriate depth to avoid contamination of the town water supply. This was done originally by the Mines Department to Engineering and Water Supply Department requirements. The Mines Department was consulted regarding this point during investigations into the recent proposal, and confirmation was obtained that there was no objection to the bore being used for this purpose.

NORTHERN ROADS

Mr. CASEY: I understand that the Attorney-General has a reply to a question I asked about 7 weeks ago about transport of ore by rail from Hawker to Quorn, and I am pleased that I jogged his memory last week. Will the Attorney give that reply?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am pleased that the honourable member is pleased, but I do not know that he will be pleased with the reply. The Minister of Roads and Transport states that the railway from Quorn to Hawker is owned and operated by the Commonwealth Railways and that the honourable member's request has been submitted to the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner for consideration.

LIQUOR FACILITIES

Mr. ALLEN: In Adelaide a few weeks ago a walkathon was held to raise funds for the Freedom From Hunger Campaign. The course was over 22 miles and I understand that, although several members of this House participated, only one of them finished the course. That proves, of course, that the other members were not physically fit. Last Sunday, in response to an invitation from the Burra Rural Youth Club, I attended, opened, and took part in a walkathon from Burra to Hallett, a distance of 20 miles. I completed the distance non-stop in five hours and five minutes. I attribute my fitness to the climbing of stairs in the House. On arrival at Hallett, I discovered that I was not a *bona fide* traveller within the meaning of section 158 of the Licensing Act, which states that to qualify as a *bona fide* traveller one must have travelled 60 miles in a direct route during the previous 12 hours. Under these circumstances it would appear that anyone walking that distance could never qualify as a *bona fide* traveller, because he could not walk the required 60 miles in 12 hours. Does the Attorney-General think the Act should be amended, or does he think that an insufficient number of people walk these days to warrant an amendment?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This section was re-enacted in an Act of Parliament passed during the life of the previous Government when, no doubt, its members were not as fit as are members of the present Government. To be perfectly fair to our predecessors, this section has been in the Act for a long time. No doubt 100 years ago when the section was first enacted members did not have to keep as fit to discharge their duties as efficiently as they do now. I thank the honourable member for his words of commendation for my effort and I congratulate him on his emulation of members of the Cabinet. I am sure it will help him in the discharge of his duties, especially those appertaining to the dishing of members of the

Opposition. I will certainly look at the section, which is more appropriate to those who ride than to those who jog. It may well be that it needs some amendment.

SEWERAGE FINANCE

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question concerning the speed with which his department makes connections?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The answer I shall give has been prepared to enable the honourable member to get his connections for his constituents in the appropriate manner. The department makes advances under this system to finance the cost of connecting premises that were in existence prior to the laying of sewer mains. The advances are made subject to the availability of finance and take into account the need for such assistance. The advances made are repayable over a period of six years in equal quarterly instalments, together with interest on the reducing balance of the advance. The department normally requires applicants to obtain three quotations from registered master plumbers. The work is carried out under the supervision of departmental officers, and a small charge is added for this service. Three quotations are required, both in the interest of applicants and the Government. Experience has shown that there is frequently a wide range of prices submitted for the same job, and the system ensures that plumbers are aware of the competitive element. The Government's interests are also protected by ensuring that advances made are reasonable and that money is not spent unnecessarily.

All applicants are advised to contact the plumbing and drainage inspector for their district before seeking quotations. The inspector provides a brief list of the work that is required, and this ensures that each plumber makes his quotation on the same basis. The main reason that householders in the Marino Rocks area have not been able to obtain three quotations is because of the amount of rock that may be encountered in the trenches. As a result, plumbers have not been prepared to provide a firm quotation for this work. It has now been decided that where difficulties are encountered in obtaining quotations because of indeterminate quantities of rock in the excavation, three quotations may be obtained, if approved by the district inspector, which will incorporate a clause for rock excavation on a basis of the quantity of rock encountered. It has now been decided (and I believe the honourable

member would agree) that this should solve the problem to which he has referred.

HORMONE SPRAY

Mr. WARDLE: For several weeks it has been obvious among growers of glasshouse tomatoes and cucumbers in the Murray Bridge area that something other than the normal diseases and problems associated with the industry has been causing extensive damage to crops. It is now suspected by local growers that the problems could have arisen from spraying of nearby crops with a hormone spray. Will the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, obtain a report on this matter?

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

BOWLING CLUB LICENCE

Mr. NANKIVELL: Last Saturday, I was approached by the manager of the bowling club at Bordertown regarding an application for renewal of the club's licence. Even though there are no changed circumstances in respect of the application, I understand that the manager must appear before the Licensing Court to apply for a new licence. Will the Attorney-General say whether it is correct that the manager must re-appear before the court each year? If it is correct, will the Attorney consider amending the Licensing Act to make it possible for applications for renewal under similar circumstances to be dealt with without such an appearance?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The circumstances the honourable member has given the House are rather scanty, but I believe it is necessary for the manager or the applicant to apply in person to the court. Speaking personally, I think that in the overwhelming number of cases this is desirable. However, if the honourable member will discuss the matter with me and give me details, I will examine it to see whether an amendment is justified.

STORM DAMAGE

Mr. HUDSON: The Minister of Housing will be aware of the damage to a number of houses yesterday as a result of the very severe storm in Adelaide. One or two people have raised with me the frequency of the kind of storm damage that raises the roof on a house, and it has been stated that this occurs in relation to the more modern house rather than the older type of design. It was put to me

this morning that it could well be the case that the requirements of the Building Act (that is, that the roof must withstand a 75 miles an hour gust) are not severe enough and should be made more severe. Will the Minister see whether the Building Act needs amending and also whether some of these accidents have been caused by shoddy building? In one case I know of (in Wangary Terrace, Seaview Downs) much of the damage to a number of houses was caused by the roof lifting off a house that had not been occupied for some years. The roof of this house lifted and sliced into a series of other houses in the street, causing extensive damage. What happened in a number of streets in my district and elsewhere indicates that it only requires something to be wrong with the construction of one house for a whole series of accidents to occur farther along the street. The consequences of this damage, even where the house is insured, are so serious that the matter should be urgently investigated. Will the Minister of Housing consider doing this?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Building Act Advisory Committee would be the proper authority to consider the first part of the question concerning specifications or requirements under the Building Act. I am not sure what specifications the Act requires in respect of these matters, but I can find out. I turn now to the general question of damage occurring in certain areas and the effect of the roof of one house lifting and causing damage to other houses. Inevitably, if roofs fly around in mid-air, they must land somewhere and will do damage to other property. I take it that this is what the honourable member has in mind. As I understand his question, he does not assume that the fact that one roof blows off prejudices the situation of adjoining roofs.

Mr. Hudson: In a couple of cases yesterday one roof blew off and sliced into another, and this started the lifting of that roof.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have referred to those inevitable consequences. I think that area damage occurs because of the nature of the velocity and turbulence in that area. In some areas turbulence builds up to a point where it is almost impossible for a roof to withstand it. I agree with the honourable member that it is not necessarily the workmanship that causes the trouble; roofs of a modern design are more likely to be damaged than is the older type of roof.

Mr. Hudson: A flat roof makes it worse.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I agree, and a flat roof with a large overhang presents a face to the wind that exercises strain on the roof. Although not an expert I have certain ideas, but I shall have the matter examined and ask the Building Act Advisory Committee for its advice concerning the first part of the question.

ROLLING STOCK

Mr. VENNING: Has the Premier received a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my recent question concerning contracts to build rolling stock which were originally allocated to the South Australian Railways but which were later taken away and given to private enterprise?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: With one or two minor exceptions, tenders have been called for the supply of all standard gauge locomotives and rolling stock. Except for main line locomotives, the South Australian Railways has submitted tenders, and whenever its tender has been the lowest the work has been undertaken at the Islington workshops. Recently, tenders were invited for standard gauge bulk-grain hopper waggons, with construction alternatively in aluminium or steel. Following the receipt of tenders, a recommendation was made to the Commonwealth authorities that the order be given to the South Australian Railways for manufacture in steel, its price being the most favourable received for construction using this material. However, the Minister of Shipping and Transport directed that tenders be recalled specifying steel construction only. Tenders have closed, but a decision has not yet been made regarding to whom the order will be given. It is incorrect to say that the South Australian Railways had been granted the contract originally but that it was subsequently awarded to another firm. The South Australian Railways has in the past been successful in gaining a great number of rolling stock contracts in open competition, and in every case the work has been carried out for less than the tender price.

MONEY BOXES

Mr. HURST: I read a recent press report that a leading bank had decided to change its money boxes from the pig type to a wombat type. Can the Premier say whether that change resulted from the publicity given to wombats in this House by the member for Eyre, and will he ask banks operating in the Eyre District whether they will convert their money boxes to the wombat type, thereby

depicting the native fauna within that district and also its representation in this House?

The SPEAKER: Does the Premier desire to reply?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I sense that the honourable member's question is facetious. I will obtain a report on why money boxes are now in the form of wombats instead of pigs

NARACOORTE COURTHOUSE

Mr. RODDA: The inadequacy of facilities at the Naracoorte police station and courthouse has been raised before. As I understand that a property owned by Ormerod Services and adjoining the police station is available for sale, will the Attorney-General ascertain whether arrangements can be made to purchase it, because additional space will be required ultimately for the courthouse?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This matter has been considered several times in the last few years, as approaches have been made by the company with a view to sale. Since taking office I have been approached, but the correct authority is the Minister of Works. The matter has been considered, and the company has been informed that the Government cannot enter into negotiations at present.

HOLDEN HILL HOUSES

Mrs. BYRNE: I refer to the cracking of houses built by the Housing Trust in the Holden Hill area, a subject on which I have asked many questions of and written many letters to the Minister of Housing. Can he say what type of footings were used in these houses and whether a soil test was taken in this area? Also, can he say whether suitable footings for the soil type were used in constructing these houses, and can he state the name of the builder or builders?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will endeavour to get that information for the honourable member.

MARGARINE

Mr. McANANEY: In the previous annual report of the Dairy Produce Board reference was made to the new practice in South Australia of selling cooking margarine, labelled as a "spread" or "super-spread", in a way that would mislead the purchaser into believing that it was table margarine. Being of the opinion that this contravened specific provisions of the Food and Drugs legislation and

that, adopted universally, this form of merchandising would multiply the table margarine quota system and be severely detrimental to the butter industry, this board sought legal action by the appropriate authority. So far no prosecution has resulted. On the other hand, according to reliable consumer surveys, sales of cooking "spread" margarines have shown the predicted growth explosion. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture why no prosecution has resulted if this Act is being contravened?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will ask the Minister of Agriculture for this information.

LICENSING ACT

Mr. GILES: An anomaly seems to exist in the Licensing Act in respect of football clubs. The committee running the social activities of a football club is appointed by the annual general meeting of that club, which meeting may comprise all members of the club. However, this general meeting may comprise a majority of the club members who are not interested in the club's sporting activities, that is, members interested merely in the privileges they receive from the club's social activities. Will the Attorney-General examine this situation with the view of making it possible for those interested in the sporting activities of a club to nominate the majority of members on the social committee, so that a football club does not become a drinkers' club instead of a sporting club?

The SPEAKER: Order! As the question seeks a legal opinion from the Attorney-General, I do not think I can allow it.

RAILWAY IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. VIRGO: A report in the *Advertiser* of July 31 last stated that the Minister of Roads and Transport had called for a comprehensive report from the railways on improvements and planning. The Minister was reported as saying that some of the matters to be dealt with included locating the interstate booking office on the North Terrace frontage to make it compare with airline offices opposite, modernizing the suburban ticket offices, and upgrading country rail services with air-conditioned cars and a finer service. As these improvements have been indicated as being desirable and urgent, and as nearly two months has now elapsed since the press report appeared, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport what progress has been made on these improvements?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

TRANSPORT OPERATORS

Mr. NANKIVELL: A transport operator telephoned me this morning and expressed concern that radio and press announcements were being made that certain truck drivers from South Australia had been involved in accidents and that many women knew that their husbands, who were driving transports, could be in the vicinity of accidents that had been reported. Consequently, considerable emotional tension was experienced by wives until they knew whether or not their husbands had been involved in an accident. Will the Premier therefore see whether it is possible in some way to have information concerning accidents withheld until a definite statement has been made and the persons concerned have been contacted?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As I understand that accident reports from other States are a frequent source of distress to relatives of drivers, I will try to obtain information on this matter from the Chief Secretary.

SUPERPHOSPHATE

Mr. RODDA: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last week about superphosphate bagging facilities at Penola?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Mr. Waterhouse, Chief Engineer of Adelaide and Wallaroo Fertilizers Limited, reports that provision will be made at Penola for the filling, by means of a hopper and chute, of open-mouth bags, which will be unsewn. The sale will be by bulk weight: it is not intended to weigh the bags. The farmer will be able to fill the bags himself and load them on to his own vehicle, or arrangements will probably be able to be made for the company to undertake the filling of the bags.

SMALL BOATS

Mr. McKEE: Earlier this year I wrote to the Minister of Marine about a Port Pirie fisherman who was experiencing difficulty regarding mooring accommodation. Although, fortunately, that matter was rectified, I am sure the Minister is aware that accommodation at Port Pirie for small craft is inadequate, and the position is becoming worse. Will the Minister ascertain whether the present unsatisfactory situation can be rectified as soon as possible?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Being aware of this matter, I will certainly take up the honourable member's request.

MURRAY RIVER

Mr. ARNOLD: On Friday last and yesterday I inspected the Berri evaporation basin at Winkie and Eckert Creek, and it seems that insufficient fresh water is able to flow from the river into the mouth of Eckert Creek to flush out the saline water after it is released from the evaporation basin. Yesterday, three weeks after the release of water from the basin, the salinity reading in front of Mr. Migga's property was still 1,720 parts a million. Will the Minister of Works examine this matter with a view to having an additional flow control pipe put in the bank at the mouth of Eckert Creek for the purpose of flushing out this system quickly after water from the evaporation basin has been released?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will examine the interesting suggestion made by the honourable member to see whether it is feasible, and I will notify him accordingly.

LONDON-SYDNEY RALLY

Mr. CASEY: Over the weekend I received several telephone calls from station owners in the North-East of the State complaining that cars were coming through their properties at all hours of the night, causing much disruption to their lamb-marking, which was proceeding at the time. The landowners concerned were not notified that their properties would be traversed by the drivers of these cars who, I understand, represent the vanguard or reconnaissance party of a rally from London to Sydney that is to take place soon. According to information I have received, Australian Consolidated Press apparently has something to do with this rally in conjunction with the London *Daily Express*, and correspondence between these two organizations apparently states specifically that all landowners along the route have been contacted. However, the people who telephoned me have heard nothing about the matter, no-one having contacted them previously. On the other hand, the Victorian Premier has apparently been contacted, because the route of the rally will include Victoria as well as South Australia and, eventually, New South Wales. The people taking part in this rally apparently intend to traverse pastoral property, using roads outside the jurisdiction of the Highways Department (station roads maintained by the station owners themselves). As the station owners concerned have not been asked whether their roads may be used, will the Premier see what can be done to protect the interests of these people

who will be subjected to some fairly torrid experiences if these rally cars traverse properties without the owners being notified?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Having no recollection of receiving any correspondence concerning such a trial, I shall be happy to take up the matter with the relevant authority, and I should appreciate the honourable member's giving me any relevant information. I will try to obtain a reply, and to assist him in the problem he has raised.

DRIVERS' LICENCES

Mr. McANANEY: I understand that in New South Wales drivers' licences may be obtained for a period of three years. As this system may be beneficial to motorists if implemented in South Australia, will the Attorney-General obtain a report from the Minister of Roads and Transport concerning the feasibility of such a scheme in South Australia?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Roads and Transport is in the process of examining the whole question of drivers' licences and the conditions under which they are issued. I should think that this matter has occurred to him, but, if it has not, I shall certainly take it up.

WATER LICENCES

Mr. NANKIVELL: I understand that the Minister of Works is presently inquiring into the matter of additional water licences. My question relates specifically to the situation in the Meningie area. This morning I received a letter from a constituent stating that, although he was unable to get a water licence and therefore could not sell his property as a property with a water licence, it was possible for him to sell it to an adjoining landholder (namely, Dehy Fodders (Australia) Proprietary Limited), because he claimed that the Dehy organization had an unlimited water right to the lake and could therefore exercise this right over his land as well as over any other land it already held. Can the Minister say whether these statements are correct? If they are, I point out it is an unfair situation, as many other people would also like to have the use of water from the lake for their own purposes.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I do not think the situation is quite as the honourable member outlined it. I know the previous Government extended to the Dehy company a licence for a large acreage (from memory,

I believe about 8,000 acres was involved). I know that the matter referred to by the honourable member is causing concern to many residents in that area. As it is also concerning the Government and me, I will obtain a considered reply to the question.

FLUORIDATION

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (on notice):

1. What is the estimated cost to the Government of supplying fluoride tablets to children of an age where such tablets will be effective in preventing tooth decay?
2. What is the estimated cost of installations necessary for fluoridation of the South Australian water supply?
3. What is the estimated cost a year of operating such installations?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The replies are as follows:

1. Total cost a year: all children 0-14 years (328,465) \$192,000 to \$240,000, depending on probable discounts. This is the bare cost of tablets. Distribution costs and wastage would probably at least equal basic costs.
2. Capital cost, \$160,000.
3. Total annual cost, \$46,000 (fixed plus operating costs).

METROPOLITAN ABATTOIRS

Mr. JENNINGS (on notice):

1. How many clerical or administrative staff of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board have been dismissed since the reception of the "McCall Report"?
2. What were the classifications of any such former employees?
3. What further dismissals are expected?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Adult males, 3; junior males, 4; adult females, 2; total 9.
2. Offal weight clerk, by-products, 1; compensation clerk, time office, 1; store clerk, 1; junior clerks, 4; ledger machiniste, 1; and typiste, 1.
3. A further six retrenchments are likely during the present week, but until the effect of changed procedures is known it is difficult to forecast details of future reductions in employees.

THE BUDGET

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

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 26. Page 1488.)

THE LEGISLATURE

Legislative Council, \$41,494.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): Last Thursday, I was dealing with a paragraph from a booklet on fluoridation issued by the Tasmanian Department of Health Services. This paragraph stated that dental disease and tooth loss caused industrial inefficiency. I find this hard to believe. I am sure that people wishing to hire employees do not ask them about the condition of their teeth; usually such people are trying to find the men best suited for the jobs. I believe that, although many people believe that fluoridation will benefit the community, there is still certain doubt amongst the people generally. I would like to be more certain about the advantages and disadvantages because, unlike social legislation, this matter affects everyone in the State.

Many members of the medical profession are perturbed about the matter. They believe that people with certain illnesses can be affected. Perhaps some way can be found whereby water that will not worsen their condition can be supplied to such people. However, doubts exist on this matter. It has also been said that pipes can be corroded. Many States in America have discontinued the addition of fluoride to their water supplies. In some cases, this has been as a result of referenda. Apparently only 1 per cent or 2 per cent of water used is consumed by people, the rest being used for watering gardens, etc. In view of all these facts and in view of letters that I have received about the matter, I should like to be sure that fluoridation will benefit all of us.

I hope that some of the revenue raised from the increased taxes in the Budget will be spent in my district. One thing that has surprised me recently is that the locality of the fire station in Unley has been changed. This station has served the people of the city of Unley and other areas for many years, even in the days of the horse-drawn vehicles. With the modern units and improved methods nowadays, fire-fighting is able to be conducted in a much better way than was the case in the old days; fires can now be put out much more quickly. Sometimes it is desirable to change the location of an instrumentality, but the removal of the fire station

from the heart of the Unley District, amongst factories and dwellings (some of which are extremely old) to Glenside should be reconsidered.

Mr. Rodda: How many fires do you have at Unley?

Mr. LANGLEY: I do not know, but since the fire station has been located at Glenside most of the fires have been in the Unley District. During summer the position could be precarious. The Minister of Agriculture has spoken of the growth of grass in the different areas, and in the Unley District we have not the best gardens, although we have the best footballers: they proved that they were the best team by far.

Mr. Clark: It's a pity—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order!

Mr. LANGLEY: I am sure all South Australians are pleased about the victory of the Sturt Football Club on Saturday and are hoping that the team will win again next week.

Mr. McKee: The Government has the ball at his feet, but it can't kick it.

Mr. LANGLEY: We heard this afternoon of the fitness of individual members, but we did not hear about the team. The Opposition will never be beaten in the team game.

Mr. Clark: Do you suggest members opposite have been roving to beaten rucks?

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes, for some time, but soon the winning rucks will be back again. The financial contribution to fire services is on the basis of five-ninths by insurance companies and two-ninths by local government and the State Government, and surely we should have more fire stations in developing parts of the State, especially in the metropolitan area. The people of the Unley District do not approve of the removal to Glenside, and the Chief Secretary should further consider this matter. The station at Norwood has been staffed by one officer and one man and I do not understand why the same practice should not be adopted at Unley. A fire station at Unley would be closer to the new St. Marys station and would support the Glenside station.

Mr. McAnaney: But it wouldn't give a 24-hour service, would it?

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes. Every station does that.

Mr. McAnaney: How could that be done at Unley?

Mr. LANGLEY: By working shifts, two men work for 24 hours and then take two days off. As the population increases, we should progress regarding such facilities as fire stations.

Mr. Rodda: You said there would be two men.

Mr. LANGLEY: There would be more than two on a shift work basis. The fire officers do not work around the clock in the way Parliament sits. They would be inefficient if they did. However, our fire officers are efficient men. Local government should ensure that our cities are fully equipped to meet an emergency. Any insurance company that handled only fire insurance would make a handsome profit, and I hope that something will be done about the matter to which I have referred. In summer time we need a fast and efficient fire service, and it is important to remember that the Unley fire station previously served a large area of the District of Mitcham.

Last year I, with several other honourable members, attended a function regarding motor vehicle safety. I am sure that the introduction of the *alpha numero* system of number plates has been successful, but I hope that the Government will consider the introduction of reflectorized number plates. At the function to which I have referred we were told that the cost of these plates, if bought in large quantities, would not be much greater than the cost of other number plates. Many accidents are caused by one vehicle running into the back of another, and reflectorized number plates would enable the motorist to see the car ahead much sooner than is the case now.

These plates are being used successfully in America, England, Italy, France, Spain, Canada, and in the Australian Capital Territory. They are favoured by the automobile associations and the Police Forces in Australia and I hope that motorists will become aware of the desirability of using these plates and that they will be available on the market. During the last session I asked a question about the use of reflector tape. Many accidents are caused by motor vehicles running into stobie poles, which are dark in colour and difficult to see from a distance. In my district, one stobie pole juts out on a corner at which the road has been widened. The corner is dangerous but, since reflector tape has been put on the pole, the number of accidents at the corner has decreased considerably. It was nothing unusual for a car to be in one of the houses on the corner once a month.

When I asked my question, I was told that the people concerned did not know anything about this. Any member of the Highways Department, however, could go along Mitchell Street and just before reaching the orphanage see the reflector tape on the stobie pole and see how noticeable it is. I hope that this matter will be considered. I know that all these things cost money and that the Government is not able to do everything it would like to do. We have never been told about the money that came from Radium Hill, but I am still hoping to hear what happened to it.

Mr. McAnaney: That's the surplus the previous Government used.

Mr. LANGLEY: I am not a financial wizard.

Mr. Hughes: Are you suggesting that the member for Stirling is a financial wizard?

Mr. LANGLEY: No. I would like to see the members for Glenelg and Stirling have a debate under an unbiased umpire, and I am sure the member for Glenelg would have a better than 50 per cent chance of winning.

Mr. Clark: At anything from marbles up.

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes. The Unley area contains the greatest number of used car dealers of any district in the State. Many of them are along Goodwood Road and Unley Road. About 95 per cent of these dealers are honest people who are well respected in the trade.

Mr. McKee: The motor industry is restricted under the present Government's imposts.

Mr. LANGLEY: I am more concerned with the people who have less money in their pockets than they would like to have—and soon they will have even less. Two or three people have complained to me that they have had driving tests in used cars they have bought and the first thing that happened was that the car became unroadworthy. The cars were reasonably priced. A certificate of roadworthiness should be essential before a used car can be sold, as some people have been defrauded by being sold unroadworthy used cars. A used car purchaser expects some guarantee on the car, and is entitled to expect that when it is put on the road it shall be roadworthy. Unroadworthy cars have cost people extra money for repairs. I hope the Attorney-General will ensure that cars must be certified as being roadworthy before they can be sold. This would benefit many people and would assist the motor vehicle industry, which is an important part of this State's economy.

I spoke earlier of the Totalizator Agency Board and the winning bets tax. Recently, one of my constituents placed a bet on a daily double, and there was a dead heat in the first leg. It was immediately announced that, as there had been a dead heat, two horses had to be named in the second leg, but when the second leg came up only one horse was named. The man concerned did not know what horse he had and was not told this. When the substitute for the second leg was named he thought he would receive his money, the same as with the first leg, but he was told that he had another runner. This is the type of thing I do not like to see in racing. The man tried by all means to obtain the money I think he was entitled to receive for the race, but there was no possible way for him to get it. I conclude by repeating that the people of the State were astounded when this Budget was introduced, and I hope such a state of affairs does not occur again.

Mr. BROOMHILL (West Torrens): I join other Opposition members in expressing extreme disappointment at the Budget's effects. As a result of the Commonwealth Government's financial actions many people in the State are still unemployed and business is still in a parlous condition.

Mr. McAnaney: But the employment figures have improved considerably in the last month.

Mr. BROOMHILL: That is not true. The honourable member should consider the figures that have been quoted in the last few weeks and he will see that what he said is not true. The position is still not good.

Mr. McKee: Would the honourable member understand those figures?

Mr. BROOMHILL: He is not an expert on any figures. By his interjections the honourable member seeks to encourage members into thinking that he is a wit, and I think that he is half right in this assumption. The employment position and the business stagnation facing the State will not be helped by a Budget similar to the one we are considering. Obviously, the reverse effect will occur once the impact of this Budget has been felt by the community. It is regrettable that the impact of these taxation measures will be felt mostly by those who have the least ability to pay the increased costs that are to be dragged from them.

The Government, through the Treasurer, has, when making several public statements on the effects of the Budget, proudly announced that the effects of the proposals will be the

same on all members of the community. It is regrettable that the Treasurer should make this sort of statement as though it was something of which to be proud. He suggested that each member of the community would pay the same but, when we established that there would be more than \$8,000,000 a year obtained from these taxation measures and that the population was just over 1,000,000, it seemed that, on the Treasurer's assumption, each member of the community would pay about \$8 a year extra.

Mr. Rodda: You know that's not correct.

Mr. BROOMHILL: It is obvious to me that, when we consider this factor, a reasonably well-off married couple will pay about \$16 a year extra, and a married wage-earner with three children will pay about \$40 extra a year, yet he is in the worst position to pay these extra costs because, in addition to these measures, many items have been released from price control. As these items have been listed and referred to by the members for Gawler and Wallaroo I will not repeat them, but members will recall that the list is lengthy. When we consider that the family man is required to buy more clothing and food for his family, and that additional costs will be applied to him by the business community taking the opportunity to relieve itself of the problem that will be created by these taxation increases, obviously, these extra costs will flow back to the family man as a result of this Budget.

Mr. McKee: He is the only man who pays, because everyone else passes them on.

Mr. BROOMHILL: True, yet the Treasurer, as spokesman for the Government, boasts about the fairness of the taxation measures. I should have thought that if taxation increases were necessary they should have been applied on the same basis as the Commonwealth Government applies its taxation measures, that is, to apply taxation so that the people in the community who are best able to pay do, in fact, pay more than anyone else. For instance, the business manager pays more Commonwealth taxation than the factory worker does; the single man pays more than the married man; and the man with children pays less than any of them.

Mr. Jennings: They only do that in respect of income tax.

Mr. BROOMHILL: It is the fairest type of taxation and not in accordance with the thinking that is evident by members of the

present Government. Some of the Treasurer's proposals are not clear. We appreciate that he is not able to give details of all these things but, nevertheless, there are some threats of additional taxation about which I believe the Treasurer should have provided further information. He referred to taxation on bookmakers' turnover and to stamp duties that are to be considered by the Government. Today I asked him whether he would provide me with the figures applying in the Eastern States so that we can have an idea what the Government intends to do. These things should have been included in the Budget so that we could have directed our attention to them.

It is clear that the proposals outlined will mean that every item purchased will be more expensive; that credit purchase sales that are not sales under hire-purchase agreements will cost more; that liquor will be more expensive; that every car owner will pay more; that anyone needing hospital treatment will pay more; and that anyone seeking assistance from the State Bank will find that there is substantially less money for industry and for housing loans. We have no need to impress on the Government the feelings of the public of this State, the wage-earners, concerning the effects of this Budget, but let us consider what business interests in this State think about it. In the *Advertiser* of last Friday, under the heading "Government Levies Cancel Management Gains", a report states:

The management's success in reducing expenses under its control in 1967-68 was nullified by the growth in Government imposts, the chairman of Clarkson Limited (Mr. L. S. Clarkson) indicated yesterday in his annual address to shareholders. He emphasized that "the largest single problem facing management is cost," and expressed concern at the "growing field of expenditure over which management has no control." The recent South Australian Budget gave further evidence of the trend of thinking of all Australian Governments. Commerce and industry appeared to be "fair game in the endeavour to extricate Governments from their financial difficulties," he said. The new South Australian turnover tax represented a further serious charge against profits. It would add to the problems of management and do nothing to stimulate the State's flagging economy, he continued.

Mr. McAnaney: You were saying that wage-earners were paying for it but now you are saying that business is paying it.

Mr. BROOMHILL: In view of the honourable member's earlier interjection, in which he said that things were improving in this State, he should take note of the business leaders—

Mr. McAnaney: You are contradicting yourself.

Mr. BROOMHILL: —who are able to assess the position much better than is the member for Stirling, who does nothing but sit on the Government benches acting as a seat warmer. The report continues:

The continued rise in Government imposts reduced the ability of commerce and industry to make reasonable profits and maintain the level of employment so vital in the community.

Mr. McAnaney: The member for Glenelg wants double taxation.

Mr. BROOMHILL: I can understand why the member for Stirling requires advice, and the advice I give him is that he should press his maxilla further against his mandible and stay in that position. The report continues:

Mr. Clarkson urged Government to "bear in mind that unless private enterprise prospers, it cannot expand and make its proper contribution to the development of this country."

It may be suggested that that is only an isolated comment from a business manager in this State, but in the *Advertiser* of September 13, under the heading "S.A. Budget disturbing", appears a report of comments by the President of the Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. McAnaney: You say the *Advertiser* is biased!

Mr. BROOMHILL: I am not saying that here; I am saying that this Budget is a completely unsatisfactory document in the light of the economic position of the State. The article in the *Advertiser* stated:

The South Australian Budget was attacked as "further evidence of a very disturbing trend" by the President of the Adelaide Chamber of Commerce (Mr. K. D. Williams) at the chamber's annual meeting yesterday.

Mr. McKee: Are you sure you're quoting from the *Advertiser*?

Mr. BROOMHILL: Yes, and the *Advertiser*, which is not normally prone to attack the present Government, has seen fit on this occasion to recognize the exact degree to which this Budget will affect the State. Indeed, many people will be placed in the position that they will not be able to pay for the *Advertiser*, in view of this extra taxation (maybe that is why the *Advertiser* is prepared to make this type of statement). The article continues:

In his presidential address, Mr. Williams said all Australian Governments seemed to be adopting a policy of imposing additional taxes on trade and industry to the extent that reasonable profits were becoming more difficult to

achieve. "Without reasonable profits, incentive is blunted as well as the desire for further expansion and development of private-enterprise activities," Mr. Williams said.

In view of the fact that the public will find little with which to be pleased in this Budget, and in view of the fact that management in this State has expressed considerable concern at these taxation measures, one wonders exactly what was in the Government's mind, considering the current economic position, when it introduced a Budget that will have such an adverse effect on the State's growth. In view also of what Government members said when in Opposition just prior to the last election, it is surprising that the Government chose to adopt this particular attitude. The Government has quite properly drawn to the people's attention constantly the fact that it is important concerning South Australia's future growth that our taxation levels are below those of other States, so that industry may be attracted to this State.

It is disappointing that the Government has made such a vicious attack in one year; indeed, an increase of 20 per cent on State taxation is regrettable. The fact that the Treasurer was so outspoken, when a member of the Opposition during the term of the last Labor Government, must have caused him to have some pangs of conscience when introducing this Budget. I could quote at length some of the speeches made by the Treasurer while he was a member of the Opposition.

Mr. Jennings: You couldn't regarding the last Budget, because he didn't bother to speak.

Mr. BROOMHILL: That may be so, but he certainly extended himself in 1965. The Treasurer said on September 21, 1965, at page 1642 of *Hansard*:

We are reaching a point where the householder's budget, attacked as it is from every side, is becoming such that only people on the higher salaries can live reasonably, whereas those in the lower income brackets are having real difficulty in meeting all the charges.

It is surprising that the Treasurer has seen fit to reverse his attitude completely in such a short space of time. At page 1643, he told members one of his little stories. He occasionally relates interesting little stories in the Chamber, but I think members will find this one somewhat amusing. Referring to the Labor Budget, the Treasurer said:

One man, who is not a political supporter of mine, has said to me, "What does this programme outlined in the Budget add up to?" I said, "You can draw your own conclusions about that," and he replied, "This

is the beginning of stagnation in South Australia." I said, "They are strong words, you know," to which he replied, "Admittedly, the portents are not very clear at present, but the moment you begin to hit hard, those people with sufficient spirit and independence to make a niche for themselves in life will be hit. This means that we are getting a slowing-down process, and the beginnings of the effect of a Socialist policy in South Australia that will lead, if it goes on long enough, to disenchantment, disillusionment and despair on the part of people who are saddled with this heavy and still heavier taxation." That was the comment of an observer, who, I think, will be a follower of mine from now on.

I should like the Treasurer to explain, if he can, any observations this person may have made since the current Budget was introduced. Indeed, I should be surprised if the person concerned were still a supporter of the Treasurer, because the sentiments expressed concerning the 1965 Budget describe the present Budget accurately. It is difficult to follow matters when a person is not named, and one may imagine that this sort of story is a little exaggerated.

The Premier, while Leader of the Opposition, in seeking the public's support prior to the last election, carefully avoided mentioning taxation increases. Having looked through his policy speech carefully one is struck by the absence of any reference at all to the likelihood of increased taxation. In fact, I believe the Premier deliberately sought, by using some strange phrases, to mislead the people into thinking that, if they voted for the Liberal and Country League and returned that Party to Government, there would not be any increased taxation.

Mr. Burdon: They didn't vote.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Insufficient numbers voted for the Government to be able to say that it had a mandate to implement its policy. Nevertheless, the present Government is in office, and it is reasonable to assume that those who supported it expect the Government to relate its actions to what was outlined in the Premier's policy speech. In his policy speech, the Premier said:

We are concerned not only about the State's finances but equally about lost job opportunities, reduced personal incomes and loss of overtime payments, all of which add up to a difficult budget problem for the household . . . We believe that private initiative, a proper regard for the economic and social welfare of every individual, efficient management of the State's resources, and a constructive exploitation of its potential will put South Australia back once more in the front rank of national progress.

Nothing was said about imposing severe taxation increases. The Premier said, under the heading "Stability":

Finance: When we are elected to Government our first tasks will be to restore stability in the State's accounts.

The Premier did not go on to say that he would do this by introducing the forms of taxation that we are now considering under this Budget. He used the following terms to explain how this was to be done:

We will do this by arranging a careful priority of spending, by making sure that we get value for our money in our spending, and by securing more money as a result of increased activity in industry and commerce. Take no notice of the sceptics who say we can't do this. Instead look at our past record in government. Year in and year out we gave South Australia financial stability. Indeed we set a record in this field that was the envy of all the States. In addition, we will work with the Governments of every other State and the Commonwealth to hammer out a better Commonwealth-State financial agreement.

It was clear to anyone who heard the policy speech by the then Leader of the Opposition that his Party had other ideas than about how it would handle the State's financial problems. Nothing was said then about increasing taxes to the level to which they have been increased in the Budget; rather, reference was made to Government priorities in spending, and so on. Either the then Leader was completely unable to perform his job and incompetent to work out what would be required to manage the State, or else he was deliberately misleading the people. I regret that political parties adopt the type of policy that was adopted by the L.C.L. during the last election campaign, because no-one will ever again believe what the L.C.L. has to say before an election. No matter what sort of promises it puts forward, the people will remember what it said it would do in 1965—that it would straighten out the State by careful priorities of spending, and so on. The people will also remember that when the L.C.L. became the Government it imposed severe taxation measures. They will have cause to remember this because, as I said, the economic development of the State will suffer greatly as a result of these imposts. I suggest that the actions of the L.C.L. during the last election campaign will have the effect that in future the people will not trust the L.C.L. whatever it says during election campaigns, and that is regrettable.

Although the Leader and the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) have expressed already in this debate and other debates views

which correspond with mine on the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report, as many of my constituents are particularly disturbed about its effect, I believe it is my duty to refer briefly to it. I join with other members on this side of the Chamber in criticizing the Government's action in releasing the M.A.T.S. Report to the public without first considering and indicating to the public whether or not it was able to finance and approve it. If the Government had taken the course we have suggested, people would have known exactly where they are going. As it has happened, the Government has released the report and, whenever we question the Premier about it, he says that the Government does not support or oppose it but is asking the people to determine what should be done about it and to lodge any protests they may have. This is not the way to handle such an important project affecting the future development of the State's transport system. I make it clear from the outset that I do not oppose forward planning in this direction. As I understand that the number of motor cars on the road will double each seven years, I recognize that we must have some form of planning to cope with this growth. However, I do not believe we should thrust upon the public a proposal which the Government has not said is proper and can be financed. People living along these proposed freeways should not be affected, as they have been, without the Government's properly approving such a plan.

Since I have been a member, I have already seen the problems that can face people when reports not likely to be proceeded with are released. In 1962, a report about the metropolitan area of Adelaide was released by the Town Planning Committee, which recommended that a freeway would be required from the southern districts, crossing into my district at the Morphett Road intersection opposite the Morphettville Racecourse, and proceeding through Camden, Henley Beach and Grange to Port Adelaide. As a result of this recommendation, the Highways Department immediately proceeded to buy vacant land along the route of the proposed freeway. People along the route were prevented from adding garages or rooms to their houses. Many people were unable to sell their houses, as no-one would buy them because of the likelihood that the land on which they stood would be required for a freeway. As a result of what happened, I was approached by hundreds of people who expressed concern about the

matter. Some said they were selling their houses at a value less than that which they would have received in other circumstances. Many who were getting on in years did not like the prospect of retiring from work, finding their house would be required for the freeway, and having to move elsewhere. In fact, to avoid this problem one person sold his house at a price that he did not consider fair and shifted to another area, and I understand that the land on which his present house is built will be required under the new proposal.

I believe it is improper for the Government to have released the M.A.T.S. Report to the public without first firmly approving of it and indicating to Parliament how it can be financed. It is not too late for the Government to recognize it has made an error in this respect and to withdraw the M.A.T.S. Report from the public until such time as the Government can follow the procedure I have outlined. To conclude, I wish to refer to one of the final paragraphs of the Treasurer's explanation in which he said:

It has sought a balanced impact throughout the community and at the same time has attempted to avoid any measure that may act prejudicially to the economic and industrial development of the State. No taxation measures are ever welcomed and none is ever painless but the broad coverage of the 1968-69 new revenue proposals is such that it is hoped their impact, though unwelcomed, will be fair, reasonable and effective.

I believe the Treasurer is either incompetent in making such a statement or else he has made it simply to try to mislead the public into believing that the taxation measures in the Budget are fair and reasonable. In fact, in my view the Budget creates an imbalance throughout the community and a situation prejudicial to the industrial and economic development of the State. I regret that I will probably be proven correct in this opinion when the effects of the Budget are thrust on the State in the next few years.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): I am usually kind when speaking on the Budget but I shall not be so on this occasion, because I do not support this Budget. I doubt that the public supports it: in fact, I have reason to believe otherwise. That belief is strengthened by some of the remarks that have been made by Government members, including the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) and the member for "Twilight". The latter honourable member, in his tirade, said that, possibly, he would vote against certain Budget proposals. I now challenge him to carry out his

dare and join the vast majority of citizens in this State and members on this side of the Committee, who irrevocably oppose these measures and the Government's action in introducing such a Budget when South Australia's most urgent need is bold and imaginative leadership, which is not forthcoming from the present Government.

One story we hear in the country is that the present Premier never gives an answer. Further, a recent newspaper report stated that a certain gentleman in the city would be taking over from him. The public are saying that he has already been taken over. The Government has completely repudiated what its members said when they were in Opposition. No longer do the people of South Australia accept the creditability of the Government. The creditability of the Government is suspect in all the utterances of its members. This Budget is a repudiation of what Government members said to the people before the last election regarding taxation and costs. When this Government was in Opposition, its members told the people that the Labor Government was not spending enough and that State taxation was too high. However, the taxation measures in this Budget will affect adversely every wage and salary earner and every small business man, but this Government intends to perpetuate the protection that the wealthier sections have enjoyed down through the years.

Last year members of the Liberal and Country League said that South Australians were paying too much in State taxation on a population basis, although we were paying less than the people of any other State except Tasmania and although the increases in State taxation under the Labor Government had been less than the increases imposed by a Liberal Government in the same period. Not only did Government members say repeatedly that we were paying too much in State taxation: during the last election campaign they mentioned only one tax that they would deal with specifically. We have heard during this debate, particularly when the member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill) spoke this afternoon, that the Government did not tell the people before the last State election, what its taxation proposals were. The only tax of which the Government spoke before the election was the winning bets tax, and the Treasurer has said that the Government intends to remove that tax at the end of the financial year.

All that Government members said specifically was that this taxation would be

reduced. They did not say that, in its place, they would impose additional taxes on racing by way of increased tax on bookmakers' turnover and stamp duty on betting tickets and that they would bring these taxes to the levels generally operating in the Eastern States. However, the Treasurer has told us that in this Budget. South Australia has been raising from taxes on racing, including the winning bets tax, only \$1.60 a head of population, against the Australian average of \$2.50 a head, but we are to pay \$2.50 a head when the winning bets tax is removed. The result to the racegoer will be similar to the result to the student teachers, who have been given a little bonus but have had many advantages taken away.

The remaining Government financial proposals show clearly that it refused to be honest with the people before the last election. That this is so has been adequately emphasized by other Opposition members, particularly the member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill). The Government has announced seven new taxes already, apart from the new racing tax, and all these imposts will inhibit business or strike at people who can least afford to pay. Despite that when Labor was in office all State Governments protested about the Commonwealth's handling of State finances, the L.C.L. Opposition in South Australia said that there was nothing wrong with the way the Commonwealth was handling such finances and that the financial situation was all the fault of the Labor Government. We were told that we should not blame the Commonwealth.

However, we have a complete about face now that that Opposition has become the Government, because the present Treasurer has been violent in criticizing the Commonwealth Treasurer. I understand that the State Treasurers intend to meet next Friday to find out whether they can have the Commonwealth contributions increased. As I have said, L.C.L. members said two or three years ago that the Commonwealth was completely right, that there was nothing wrong with the Commonwealth-State financial relationship, that the Commonwealth Government was helping the South Australian Treasury in a fair and just manner, and that it was because of the actions of the State Government that the State finances were in such a position.

Mr. Hurst: Don't you think we are paying for that here?

Mr. BURDON: We are paying for the attitude adopted by the State Government not only on this aspect but also in other fields in which the Government intends to raise revenue.

Mr. Hurst: They demonstrated that they didn't know anything about finance.

Mr. BURDON: I think the honourable member is close to the mark. This Government is not showing a deep appreciation of the financial position of the State. The member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) is itching to get going again on his financial prognostications. However, I do not think he would be very influential with members on this side, or on the Government side, either. When we were in Government, the Opposition at that time told the people of South Australia that it was vital to keep State taxes low to maintain our competitive cost position with other States. However, under the proposals in this Budget taxation will increase from \$41 a head a year to \$49 a head a year, the biggest increase in any one year in living memory that this State has had. I am sure it is agreed that this is a terrific imposition on the people.

Mr. McAnaney: What about 1966 and 1967?

Mr. BURDON: If the honourable member relates the figures on a population basis to the total increase, he will find that, as the population is about 1,000,000, the Government intends to raise another \$8 a head in a full year. The whole thing was adequately explained. If members read the speech made by the member for West Torrens this afternoon, they will find that he dealt with it.

When members of the present Government were in opposition, they used to condemn us for charging buildings to Loan funds, although every other Government in Australia had been doing precisely this for years. Not only does this Government roundly condemn us for having done it: it has extended the field into which the Labor Government entered. Also, the present Government is holding \$6,000,000 in Loan moneys, which will simply be held to offset spending from the cash accounts of the State that are sufficiently buoyant to meet all calls on them without the need to hold these funds. The combined effect of the Budget and the Loan Estimates is to withdraw from the community and Government spending moneys that should be spent to call unused manpower and reserves into employment. At a time when we have in the building industry a considerable slump, investment funds for building through the Housing Trust and the State Bank have been significantly reduced. The whole effect of this programme cannot but be to dampen down business recovery in South Australia, to hit the building industry, and adversely to affect costs to

every business man in the community, particularly the smaller business man.

Mr. Hurst: And they were going to get things going!

Mr. BURDON: They are getting things going—backwards. There is no doubt about that. Another point of interest, which was dealt with by the member for West Torrens, relates to the Chamber of Commerce. We all know how assiduously the present Government, when in Opposition, endeavoured to woo the Chamber of Commerce in South Australia. Now that this Government has introduced its Budget, the Chamber of Commerce, both in the city and in the country, has taken a dim view of the recent imposts.

That is, briefly, my opinion of the Government's Budget. Its taxation measures are repressive. It would have been well advised to introduce a system of progressive legislation in respect of succession duties, which was advocated by the Labor Government on two occasions. The Bills introduced by the Labor Government were rejected by another place which, by so doing, once again protected a certain small minority in the State from making its just contributions to the State revenue. The propaganda put out by the Liberal Party prior to the last State election was completely misleading. Some members opposite have done a disservice to their constituents in the country, their so-called "country supporters", their farming friends, in the matter of succession duties. The farming people today are paying higher State taxes because of this Government and the protection that the other place afforded a small section of the community. While peddling misinformation to the country people, members opposite have deliberately and unjustly increased their taxation. If the measures proposed by the Labor Government had been put into effect, we should have had about \$2,000,000 or \$3,000,000 extra from the protected section of a community.

When speaking in this Chamber last week, the member for Glenelg laid down the lines on which the payment of gift duties, succession duties, etc., in this State is being avoided to the detriment of the farmers and the people in the country. Nobody can deny this, because certain sections of the community are protected under our existing legislation. We shall be interested to see just what effect this gift duty legislation will have, whether it will plug some of the loopholes. Many farmers are not able to take advantage of the loopholes in the existing legislation, and I give full marks to

the member for Glenelg for his warning to the Government that this is a field in which it can get extra revenue and of which the farming community, in the main, cannot take advantage.

Mr. Venning: Would you exempt farmers from succession duties?

Mr. BURDON: The honourable member got an answer to that question from the Premier a week or two ago in reply to a question by a member of the Opposition. The Government has to face up to this. There would have been no need for increased taxation today if the Legislative Council had accepted the Bills submitted by the Labor Party, the passing of which would have been of benefit to the people on the land and many other people.

Mr. Venning: You have no sympathy for the man on the land.

Mr. BURDON: I was brought up on the land; I have every sympathy for the man on the land—probably more than some members opposite have, because they are protecting a section of the community that is able to make just contributions to the State's revenue. After all, these people still build their mansions in Toorak in Melbourne and on the North Shore in Sydney. We must find the right answer to the problem of succession duties because these people I have just mentioned are not making their just contributions to the revenue of the State, and the Liberal Party is responsible for this. It has misled people in the country and the farmers whom it claims to represent and has imposed unjust taxation through the people it is trying to protect.

Mr. Clark: You are talking about South Australia generally?

Mr. BURDON: I was talking about South Australia, and the man on the land. If our legislation had been passed, he would have been protected but, as a result of this Government's legislation, he will be slugged.

Mr. Edwards: You are slugging many of your own people, too.

Mr. BURDON: We would have given some benefit to all the people. We can look with pride and pleasure upon the legislation that we introduced while in Government, which legislation has now been adopted by the present Liberal Government, although it opposed it when in Opposition.

Mr. Broomhill: About 53 per cent of the people were happy with our legislation.

Mr. BURDON: Yes; 53 per cent voted for us at the last election, yet we have a minority Government today in this State. The member for Eyre (Mr. Edwards), who is mumbling in his beard at the moment, may read a contribution to his local newspaper which states:

I voted for the Liberal Party but I believe and know that we have to thank the Australian Labor Party for its wheat policy in relation to the wheat farmer.

The Labor Government introduced that plan. If the honourable member looks at his newspaper, he will realize that what I say is correct. The legislation introduced by the Labor Government has been of benefit to the Australian wheatgrower, dairy farmer and other members of the community.

Mr. Edwards: It was introduced by an Independent long before your Party came into Government.

Mr. BURDON: Yes, and my Party will be in Government again before very long. I have heard some of these so-called experts on the other side of the House. The Government should cast its mind back a few years to the Budget introduced by the Liberal Government in 1964-65, in which there were surpluses in the Revenue Account, the Loan Account and the Uranium Account of \$8,600,000. The Liberal Government budgeted to overspend to absorb this sum and to run into deficit to the extent of \$1,760,000. In other words, it proposed in one year to spend over \$9,750,000 more than it received. This is history.

The Liberal Government did nothing to raise revenue. If the Government is going to spend money it must first of all have the revenue, but that Government did not. What did it do this for? I doubt whether the then Treasurer entertained bright hopes of coming back to the Treasury benches in 1965-66. Not only did the previous Liberal Government do this but it created a level of spending that it failed to match in revenue, and it denied to the people of the State a measure designed to assist about 75 per cent to 80 per cent of the people. It fought tooth and nail to protect the remainder of the State's population. That was the position with regard to succession duties. The Labor Government did something in its term of office, but we have yet to see anything introduced by this Government.

During the Labor Government's term of office it improved workmen's compensation from the worst to the best in Australia. The Labor Government made a promise to the Public Service that it would amend superannua-

tion benefits to bring the service up to the level of its counterparts in other States. This promise was carried out, and it has been graciously acknowledged by the Public Service Association. The Labor Government made welfare and public relief its objectives, and carried these out. It greatly improved provisions for widows, deserted wives and children. It also introduced a policy of free school books, which had been part of its platform for many years.

The Labor Government also provided for many other reforms by means of legislation, regulation or administrative decision. It provided for increased salaries to all members of the teaching profession at a cost of \$650,000 in a financial year. It greatly increased payments to trainee teachers during training for the first time in 10 years and it granted the same concessional fares to children travelling to and from school on privately-owned buses as were enjoyed by those travelling by public transport. It also made provision for continuity of service for women teachers who married and returned to the profession.

These are some of the measures that were given to the people under a Labor Administration. Not only did the Labor Government promise and introduce service payments to Government employees, but this provision was also contained in the present Government's policy, although not to the same extent as the Labor Government provided. The Government said that the Labor Government gave this service pay, but the present Government also proposed the same thing. I do not support the Budget introduced by the Hall Government.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I add my modest contribution on the apology we have before us that masquerades as a financial statement.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Why be so modest?

Mr. JENNINGS: I shall be as modest as I generally am, but if I am provoked into saying things that may be immodest and immoderate it will be the fault of members on the other side. As so many of my colleagues who have already spoken have said, I find the Budget most offensive. The most offensive features of the Budget are its hypocrisy and its charlatanism. Beyond doubt, the effect of the Budget on the economy is calculated to be inflationary, followed by the inevitable consequences of deflation, whereas what the State urgently needs is a period of stability to enable it to overcome the drought and its effects on our markets in other States.

As bad as that has been, it is infinitesimal compared with what the State's reputation has suffered through broken pledges and a policy of votes at any price. That was exactly the policy pursued by the present Government during its period of Opposition and in that wild and irresponsible attempt to win the last State election. Things that were then called extravagant, irresponsible, immoderate and, indeed, almost immoral are now accepted as normal procedure and quite justified because of the existing situation. The situation, of course, that caused the former Government to do things it did not like doing was caused by the things I have just mentioned, the drought and its consequences, and the need to raise social service benefits to a reasonably satisfactory standard for this day and age, and from which we had declined during three decades of inefficiency and reactionary government.

Mr. Clark: We were one of the worst places in the world in this respect.

Mr. JENNINGS: We were one of the worst in the British Commonwealth and one of the worst in what we consider to be—

Mr. McKee: The free world.

Mr. JENNINGS: I am receiving too much help. At this early stage I am not going to worry too much about what I thought I perceived then—guttural rumblings of a rutting wombat.

Mr. Clark: Would you say he was gutless?

Mr. JENNINGS: I think he is not gutless: I think he is guttural in his interjections.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you think he is a bit of a wit?

Mr. JENNINGS: I noticed earlier that the member for West Torrens referred to another member, now occupying very temporarily an exalted position in this Chamber and said that he was a half-wit but the honourable member did not object.

Mr. Clark: Do you know why?

Mr. JENNINGS: I said to my friend, the member for West Torrens, that perhaps he thought that being described as a half-wit was giving him a 25 per cent tolerance, anyway. We heard many things during the last three years, particularly during the election campaign, which inclined us to believe that the present Government was determined by whatever means it had at its disposal to get back into power, irrespective of the methods adopted. Let us consider things when they

are not the same. In the Budget debate last year the present Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, said:

It ill behoves the Treasurer to use the Commonwealth Government as a cause for the State Government's own inability to increase its housing programme, to properly site the new houses, and to properly stimulate the economy.

As I suggested earlier this afternoon, the present Treasurer did not bother to speak in last year's Budget debate, and that is significant. In fact, I wonder whether that is the reason why he is now the Treasurer. It could be that the Premier spoke and did not see fit to take over himself the position of Treasurer, which is the time-honoured tradition in South Australia, or it could be that because the present Treasurer did not speak the present Premier decided that he would be the safest person to make Treasurer. This is what the Treasurer said this year:

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. The South Australian Premier at that time, and subsequently, submitted that from a variety of causes the South Australian reasonable requirements had latterly been less adequately dealt with than had those of other States. He indicated he was prepared, if necessary, to have the Commonwealth Grants Commission arbitrate on the matter pending the 1970 reassessments. We now understand that the Commonwealth does not feel able to make an immediate increase in the financial assistance to this State or to any other State upon either general or particular grounds, but that it has not closed the door upon reconsideration of South Australia's position should developments during the course of the two years to June 30, 1970, make such reconsideration appropriate. The Government considers that the stand of the Commonwealth towards the States generally and towards South Australia in particular has been most unreasonable and inconsiderate. A mass of information and submissions has been placed before the Commonwealth indicating the relative gross inadequacy of the sources of State finances both in volume and in growth potential to meet the ever expanding State responsibilities. This inadequacy is highlighted even more by the extent, flexibility, and growth potential of the Commonwealth's own resources, which are such that the Commonwealth is able to finance its works and functions at standards which are much higher, and increasing at a much more rapid rate, than is possible with State standards.

The special problems of the State of South Australia and the retrogression in financial assistance relative to provisions for other States

were impressed upon the Commonwealth. The retrogression in Commonwealth assistance to South Australia, particularly in relation to assistance to Western Australia and Queensland, in both general purpose and special purpose financial arrangements, has been very great indeed. We do not for one moment suggest that such assistance should not have been given to those States, but simple equity and real need demand comparable treatment for this State. The Government has no intention of relinquishing or even abating its efforts to secure a more reasonable financial arrangement with the Commonwealth for current purposes, for future purposes, and for some contribution toward those recent deficits which in part can be attributed to inadequate earlier arrangements made by the Commonwealth.

I agree with every word the Treasurer said, but I hark back to what was said last year by his Leader, the present Premier, when he was Leader of the Opposition:—

It ill behoves the Treasurer—

referring, of course, to the Treasurer of the Labor Government—

to use the Commonwealth Government as a cause for the State Government's own inability to increase its housing programme, to properly site the new houses and to properly stimulate the economy.

When were members on the other side correct? Was it last year or this year? Were they correct last year? I think not. I think they were simply having a shot at the then Labor Government. I think the present Treasurer was correct this year when he made the statement I have just quoted about the Commonwealth Government's attitude to the States, particularly to South Australia. Members opposite cannot have it both ways. When my Party was in Government (for far too brief a time) one of the most voluble antagonists was the member for Mitcham (Hon. Robin Millhouse). I am sorry the honourable member, who is now the Attorney-General, is not at present in the Chamber. He is probably out somewhere—

Mr. Ryan: Gathering funds.

Mr. JENNINGS: No; I think he has taken very badly his defeat in a pre-selection ballot by the present member for Boothby in the Commonwealth Parliament (Mr. McLeay). He has probably arranged for a couple of stooges to stand against Mr. McLeay in the pre-selection ballot and he is out canvassing.

Mr. Ryan: How are they going to select their candidates?

Mr. JENNINGS: This is one of those mysteries to which we do not know the answer. I think perhaps the candidates they want will win: I think we can be sure of that,

but we do not know how they will go about it and we certainly will not be able to find out from the press, because newspaper reporters are not admitted to conferences or meetings of the Liberal and Country League. It may be interesting for some of the gentlemen on the other side, who accuse us of all sorts of peculiar things, to know that members of the press are always freely admitted to our conferences and council meetings.

Mr. Ryan: Is it true that Andrew Jones will lead the Scientology march?

Mr. JENNINGS: I think he might lead it, but it would be from a distance.

Mr. Ryan: That is where he will be next time when the votes are counted.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, he will be well behind then. Regarding wombats, I am a member of the Central Council of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and, as such, I am concerned not only about wombats but also about members like the member for Eyre (Mr. Edwards).

I have just read the speech of the present Attorney-General on the 1967 Budget. I must concede that I did not listen to him at that time because all his speeches have both an emetic and a cathartic effect on me, and this is a very bad combination, because it means that it affects both ends at the same time. There was very little in his remarks about the Budget, but there was much violently offensive sarcasm, which was not even leavened by humour, to which the honourable member was then very prone and which even now, in his exalted position, he often cannot resist. I have looked at a couple of points he made that are relevant to this Budget. He said:

Motor vehicle registrations has been one of the matters to which the Treasurer has referred. He has often said that one of the ways in which the Commonwealth Government could help the economy of South Australia would be to reduce sales tax on motor vehicles. He shed some crocodile tears when that particular form of taxation was not reduced in the Commonwealth Budget. Why does he not live up to what he says?

This is the member for Mitcham (now the Attorney-General) talking about the former Treasurer. He continued:

May I remind members of the Committee that in South Australia there is a stamp duty upon registration and transfer of motor vehicles . . .

There is such a tax at the moment; it has now been vastly increased. The Attorney-General went on to say:

The present Government has had deputations on this matter asking that this form of taxation be taken away because it is having an

adverse effect on motor vehicle registrations in this State. The Royal Automobile Association of South Australia Incorporated was represented on a deputation about this matter, and in its official publication, dated January, 1967, it states:

The failure of the R.A.A. organized deputation this year to secure the repeal or a significant reduction of the savage State stamp duty on motor vehicle transfers and new registrations

What has happened since? Just the opposite! The R.A.A. has circulated every member of this Chamber about it. What do we hear now from the honourable Attorney-General?

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: A deep and impressive silence.

Mr. JENNINGS: A thunderous silence—the sort that wombats make down in their holes!

Mr. Edwards: Perhaps you could come over and teach me a little about them.

Mr. JENNINGS: I could teach the honourable member much, but I am not going over there to do it; I would rather spend my time in trying to persuade the honourable Mr. Bockelberg to recontest the plebiscite of Eyre, which I am sure at the age of 85, or whatever it may be, he would overwhelmingly win from the present member for Eyre.

Mr. Ryan: Do you reckon he was a statesman?

Mr. JENNINGS: Everything in this world is comparable, and scarcely a person in South Australia, if he were compared with the member for Eyre, would not be a statesman. However, I cannot waste all of my valuable time answering the member for Eyre, even if I could understand him. In regard to stamp duty on cars, or things likely to affect cars, the Treasurer referred to a "stamp duty of \$2 upon certificates of compulsory third party motor vehicle insurance" and said it was "designed to assist in public hospital operation, as fees payable in public hospitals for road accident patients cover only a portion of total costs. It is expected that this will raise \$840,000 in a full year and \$500,000 this financial year".

This, of course, is sugar-coated to lead us to believe that the money raised will go into a particular hospitals fund, or something of this nature. Of course, nothing is further from the truth: it will merely go into revenue, and it will be used for any purpose the Treasurer wishes. I do not object to that at all: I think a Treasurer is entitled to have a certain

amount of flexibility. However, I certainly disagree with making these excuses and with making subterfuges of this nature in providing for extra imposts in the Budget. The Treasurer referred to another measure, as follows:

An extension of the present hire-purchase duty of 1½ per cent to cover other forms of time payment, leasing and like transactions. This is expected to bring in \$600,000 in a full year and \$350,000 in this financial year.

I think all of us here will acknowledge that this again affects people who buy motor cars. This type of taxation is designed to help our motor industry in reverse, as is the case with most of the present Government's legislation, not that it has passed much yet. I think such measures are designed deliberately and with malice aforethought to win votes by every filthy means known to the depraved minds of those who think that they have a divine right to govern, irrespective of how people vote. In fact, in their hearts I do not think Government members believe that the ordinary person is entitled to a vote at all, but they have to concede a vote, and so they make it as ineffective as they can by gerrymanders and by Upper Houses, and by using every conceivable kind of subterfuge. What else could explain these poisonous slanders that went out prior to the last election, under the title, the *Voice of South Australia*? It could have been the *Vice of South Australia*! The pamphlet concerned was distributed at a time when, I am told, the present Attorney-General was President of the Liberal and Country League Publicity Committee, or whatever it may be called. Some of my colleagues have kept pamphlets such as this one, in which a 38-year-old teacher is quoted as saying:

Labor put up rates and prices which hit the little man they are supposed to protect.

A 33-year-old record librarian (I do not know what the record was) is quoted as saying:

The Labor Government has increased taxation, including stamp duties and land tax.

A 58-year-old engineer is quoted as saying, "They're all out to raise money at the expense of the public." Comparing a later pamphlet with this pamphlet, it appears that a 27-year-old housewife is the same person as the 38-year-old teacher, so this person had cut 11 years off her life and got married in the meantime. She is quoted as saying, "They haven't kept the promises they made. They have not improved housing for young people and there is not enough work for married women." A 36-year-old stenographer who on a previous

pamphlet, appears as a 29-year-old housewife (so this is a bit different from the previous case), is quoted as saying, "Once they got in they forgot about their promises." Then there is a 93-year-old mother of three teenage girls who is quoted as saying, "My endowment means nothing now they are in." That is the *Voice of South Australia*.

Speaking again of the Attorney-General, that honourable, learned and gallant gentleman and major, who has never been to war and never will go if he can help it—

Mr. Rodda: That is not true—it is most unkind.

Mr. JENNINGS: Is it? I do not think so. The Attorney-General used to rise in this place, frequently complaining—

Mr. Clark: It was monotonous.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, he is always monotonous. He used to rise in choler and high dudgeon about an increase in hospital charges. However, at this time, as a member of the Cabinet, with corporate responsibility or something of that nature, he has been silent about what his Government thought it had to do in imposing an increase of \$1 a day in the charges at public hospitals in public wards and also in imposing considerable increases in charges for intermediate and private wards (about which we have not seen anything in the press).

I will not deal with what was said by other members opposite, because I do not think it is necessary. We heard from the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell), an experienced member, who did not even know what happened to that \$9,000,000 from the Uranium Fund which the Playford Government spent when Radium Hill was closed down. Strangely enough, no-one on the other side seems to know anything about that: it is one of the best kept secrets in South Australia. In fact, when we mentioned it the new members opposite had not even heard of it before. As I have said to my friends it is astonishing that these gentlemen know nothing at all about these matters. The member for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson) advocated the tourist attractions of his district.

Mr. Rodda: Very well, too.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, he made a much more effective speech than the honourable member.

Mr. Clark: That still does not make it good, though.

Mr. JENNINGS: No. As I said earlier, everything is relative. I must admit that I have never noticed the tourist attractions of Yorke

Peninsula because, every time I have been there, I have been engaged on electoral business and I could never see the prospects very favourably; this may have given me a rather jaundiced view.

Mr. Evans: You were blind on one occasion.

Mr. JENNINGS: I was all over Yorke Peninsula, right to Pandalowie Bay, and the only people I found who were going to vote for my Party were the intelligent people, and, as they were not in a majority, I was not very affected at all. One thing that has been said about the Budget is that it coincides with considerable decontrol of prices. Once again, here we can see the finger of the Attorney-General, who we know has been opposed to price control ever since he has been in this place. I still consider him to be the *de facto* Premier of this State.

Mr. Ryan: He has great ambitions.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, and if the Premier had not come back from overseas as quickly as he did, I think there would have been a bloodless coup. However, he got back in time to resuscitate himself.

Mr. Clark: They are building up for another try.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, and this is not going to be a bloodless coup: it will be a well-publicized one. We heard great praise of the Budget and the financial system adopted by the Government from the member for Rocky River (Mr. Venning). Once again, this is slightly astonishing because, ever since he has been here, the present member for Rocky River has been loud and almost nauseating in his praise of Sir Thomas Playford.

Mr. Venning: He was the best Labor Premier you ever had.

Mr. JENNINGS: If he was, the honourable member, as an arch Conservative, would not be praising him. If decontrol is justified and laudable, how can the honourable member relate this to the attitude of Sir Thomas Playford, who retained price control for many years, despite the harrying tactics of the present Attorney-General? He cannot have it both ways. The member for Rocky River also said that he was opposed to arbitration and that we got the economy into a mess because of arbitration. Does the honourable member suggest that we resort to the law of the jungle? My Party believes in conciliation and arbitration.

Mr. Ryan: That attitude defeated the Commonwealth Government that had talked about the abolition of arbitration.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, and the Prime Minister at that time (Mr. Bruce) lost his seat. He got on all right, though: he managed to go to London and become Lord Bruce. However, I do not think the member for Rocky River is ever likely to become Lord Venning. The former member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) was a great friend of mine and of all other members on this side.

Mr. Ryan: Why?

Mr. JENNINGS: We do not know why. Nevertheless, he was our friend and, if he did not become a belted Earl, I do not think the present member for Rocky River has much chance. The member for Eyre (Mr. Edwards), this curse of crows and the whipper of wombats—

Mr. Rodda: You must admit he is effective.

Mr. JENNINGS: He is effective, all right! He is affected.

Mr. Clark: I understand that that honourable member is to follow you in the debate.

Mr. JENNINGS: I will not listen. I will go outside because, whilst I have a certain amount of moral courage, I do not think I should put up with that.

Mr. Edwards: You wouldn't be a squib, would you?

Mr. JENNINGS: Not normally, but on this occasion I may be. The other day, during Question Time, the member for Eyre pretended to ask a question about Mr. Hurford's programme on television. He said that he knew that this was not a statement. Apparently, despite all that we prophesied, the member for Eyre is capable of learning—at an extremely slow rate. He is learning now that this was not a statement. Nevertheless, he went on with the question, which was whether the Premier would do something to prevent (or something of this kind) Mr. Hurford from having programmes on television, because they were violently political.

Mr. Rodda: Was it Mr. "Hereford"?

Mr. JENNINGS: At one stage he got to Mr. "Hereford", and I wondered when he was going to get to Poll Angus, or something of that kind. He did not bother to mention that the present Commonwealth member for Adelaide (not the future member) already had three programmes on television. Apparently they are quite all right. This is the kind of mentality of people like the member for Eyre and other Government members. It is the same as their electoral proposition: it is quite all right for people whom they represent to have a vote worth three or four times the

value of the votes of the people that we represent. If something were different, it would not be the same. It is all right for Mr. Andrew Jones to have three television programmes but it is not all right for his opponent, Mr. Hurford, to have one.

Mr. Edwards: Nobody said anything about his not having a programme on television. You didn't listen to the question.

Mr. JENNINGS: This is what I understood the honourable member to be mumbling about.

Mr. Lawn: What does a wombat do?

Mr. JENNINGS: I think the member for Adelaide knows the habits and haunts of wombats. A rather peculiar theme has developed in this debate, namely, that the present Treasurer is a successful business man: therefore, he must be a good Treasurer! I cannot accept that theory. I think the Treasurer is a good and honourable member, but I also think he is a rotten Treasurer. However, people on the Government side have been saying that the Treasurer must be a good Treasurer, because he is a good business man. The implication is that members on this side are not capable of conducting a business, and I think this attitude is completely wrong. I cannot think of any member on this side who has not been extraordinarily successful at what he has taken on.

Mr. Clark: You aren't going to enumerate them, are you?

Mr. JENNINGS: No.

Mr. Clark: That would take too long.

Mr. JENNINGS: If a man starts in a fairly menial job and, without assistance and without his father being a managing director, or something like that, he becomes the secretary of a large union, I think that man has made a success of life. If he gets elected to Parliament without the help of the Adelaide Club, the establishment or the press, he has not done too badly. My Labor Party colleagues have all made great successes in their chosen spheres, but not necessarily in the sphere of making money. If we judge people on whether or not they make money we have to look only at the case of someone who, on the judgment and standards suggested by members opposite in the debate, was one of the greatest successes in Australia and who had been in this country only a short time. He was murdered (I suppose, unfortunately) in Kings Cross and left \$60,000 to the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. I am talking about Mr. Joseph Borg, who made

a considerable amount of money out of the bodies of the girls who worked for him. Is that the kind of thing members opposite think is successful in life?

Mr. Clark: He was undoubtedly a good business man.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, but so was Ned Kelly. Borg and Kelly came to an untimely end. I do not want to associate the Treasurer with those people I have just mentioned, as I do not think he comes in the same category. The reason I mentioned those things is that they have been introduced by members opposite. I now have a pleasant task to perform on behalf of the assembled multitude, and that is to present to the member for Eyre a small model of a wombat in return for the publicity he has given to one of our diminishing native fauna.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. McAnaney): Order! The honourable member will go back to his seat.

Mr. JENNINGS: Mr. Acting Chairman, do you suggest I am not entitled to do this?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The honourable member can speak only from his seat.

Mr. JENNINGS: I was not speaking, but walking over to the member for Eyre. I will ask one of my colleagues to present the wombat on my behalf and on behalf of the assembled multitude. The Budget shows that the Government is unfit to govern. The sooner the Government leaves the Treasury benches and they are fumigated and a Labor Government takes over, the better it will be for the people of South Australia.

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

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide): This is probably the most peculiar and most unusual Budget debate that I have heard since I have been a member.

Mr. Clark: It is a peculiar Budget.

Mr. RYAN: Of course it is, and that is why we have had such a peculiar debate. First, Government members praised the Government for its efforts, but they were speaking without any feeling or knowledge of the Budget's effects. Government members do not favour the Budget, but they speak in favour of it because they are members of the Government.

Mr. McAnaney: You should write a book with an imagination like that.

Mr. RYAN: It is not my imagination, but I will prove to the honourable member how much imagination the political writer of the *Advertiser* has by quoting his articles about

previous Budgets. Opposition members are strongly criticizing the Budget and, if it is to be treated on its merits, that is the only thing that can be done. Not only are Opposition members criticizing the Budget but also on the evening on which the Budget was delivered the *News* printed a front page headline "Shocker: 7 New Taxes" in probably the largest and blackest letters that I have seen used in a newspaper in this State. The lettering is called "poster type", and is usually used on posters to attract people to buy newspapers. It is also used by newspapers when tragedies occur and, no doubt, this Budget is a tragedy for the people of this State.

Mr. Ferguson: You got another shocker last Saturday.

Mr. RYAN: Of course I did. Whilst I am not the sulking type, I must admit that last Saturday I disagreed with the member for Unley and during the weekend we did not speak to each other for a few minutes. He has referred to the umpire but, when dealing with political umpires, one can at least be critical. This Budget is a shocker: it has inflicted unwarranted penalties on the public, and taxpayers believe that they are unwarranted.

The member for Stirling said something about imagination. The Treasurer in the New South Wales Parliament delivered his Budget speech on Thursday, September 26, and that Budget contained sharp rises in taxation similar to those inflicted on the people of South Australia by this Budget. The editorial of the *Sydney Morning Herald*, which certainly does not support the Australian Labor Party, says: The increases are regressive and hard on low-income earners.

I believe that, when the L.C.L. said, "We will get South Australia going", it left out one word, because, in fact, it has got South Australia going backwards. Ever since the L.C.L. Government came to office we have seen one long procession of firms leaving South Australia, firms closing down, and firms sacking employees—a long procession of contracts going to other States, of work disappearing from South Australia and of increased prices and taxes.

Mr. McAnaney: Why has there been an increase in unemployment?

Mr. RYAN: Because many large firms that had operated in this State for many years decided to leave it.

Mr. McAnaney: The employment figures have improved over the last two months.

Mr. RYAN: The unemployment position in this State is still the worst in the Commonwealth.

Mr. McAnaney: We will improve the employment position.

Mr. RYAN: When the Labor Government was in office the L.C.L. said that, if it was returned to office, it would make South Australia the best State in Australia in respect of employment, but it has not done so.

Mr. McAnaney: It took you only a year to run the State down.

Mr. RYAN: And it has taken the honourable member's Party six months to make it even worse.

Mr. Evans: The position is improving.

Mr. RYAN: Beckers (South Australia) Proprietary Limited, which operated in this State for 40 years, has left South Australia. Rosella Foods Proprietary Limited has left South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order! There are too many interjections. The honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr. RYAN: I appreciate every interjection, Mr. Chairman. A long established firm with premises close to my home that were opened by Mr. T. Playford is closing down and will sack 750 employees, yet the Liberal Party, of which you are a member, Mr. Chairman, is saying, "We'll get South Australia going." It made the big announcement that Davies Coop (South Australia) Proprietary Limited would be occupied by Australian Consolidated Industries Limited, the firm that operates next door. Not one additional person was employed. A.C.I. is merely taking over the Davies Coop premises; there is no additional production and there are no additional employees to the firm's payroll, yet this is supposed to be an additional industry. The present L.C.L. Government has made more promises in six months than the Labor Government made in the whole three years it was in office. We were criticized, because we carried out our promises.

Mr. Venning: Oh!

Mr. RYAN: Some new members, who did not even know there was a House of Assembly when there was a Labor Government, are now criticizing what the Labor Government did, but not one of them can say that our Government did not carry out the promises it made prior to the election. We were severely criticized for implementing our pledges. What

pledges did the L.C.L. make prior to the election? Not one hint was ever given that taxation would be increased or, as the *News* put it, that we would get the "seven shockers".

Mr. Broomhill: There is more to come.

Mr. RYAN: Yes. The present Premier was not game to become the Treasurer of the State. He knew there would be increased taxation and substituted someone else as Treasurer to take the rap. Is not the dispute within the Liberal Party connected with the argument that in the past, as the Premier was also Treasurer, it was necessary for the Premier to be a member of the House of Assembly but that, as the two positions are now divorced, the Premier should be in the Legislative Council and that it is no longer necessary for him to be in the House of Assembly? At least one portion of our policy still applies today: we are united as the Australian Labor Party, and I am sure members of the L.C.L. would love to be in that position now, and even more so regarding the Commonwealth sphere. The morning after the Budget was delivered, the *Tory Advertiser*, which makes no contribution to the A.L.P. (except critical) praised the Government for the Budget it had brought down and said it was necessary. However, the *Sydney Morning Herald* said just the opposite. The *Advertiser* praised the Government and said the Budget was a course of good political management.

Mr. Broomhill: Different from what the Chamber of Commerce said.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, the Chambers of Commerce and Manufactures, which are other subsidiaries of the L.C.L., criticized the Budget, saying that the forward movement promised by the L.C.L. would prove to be a backward step regarding production and commerce. One paragraph of this editorial in the *Advertiser* shows it up to be the greatest two-timing newspaper that has ever existed in the State: it is an absolute twister.

Mr. Evans: It supports both Parties.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, the L.C.L. and the Democratic Labor Party.

Mr. Allen: You told us we supported the D.L.P.

Mr. RYAN: It is rather amusing that, because the L.C.L. did not pay the D.L.P. Senate campaign expenses, the D.L.P. has threatened to withdraw from the L.C.L. combination if the L.C.L. has an election this year.

Mr. Evans: Speak up.

Mr. RYAN: As I am paid to speak up on behalf of the people I represent, I will earn the salary I get. The paragraph to which I was referring is the last paragraph in the editorial of the *Advertiser* of Friday, September 6, and states:

Prudence and efficiency in the conduct of State affairs, however, cannot achieve miracles. There remains incontrovertible proof that, with the greater tax resources at its disposal, Canberra's spending shows a faster growth rate than that of the States. It is a basic maladjustment and the Treasurer is entitled to condemn the Commonwealth attitude to the States as "unreasonable and inconsiderate."

That editorial supports the Treasurer's criticism of the Commonwealth Government's allocation of funds. However, when the Labor Government was in office, the *Advertiser* took the completely opposite view and strongly attacked both Hon. Frank Walsh and the present Leader when they were Treasurers for criticizing the reimbursement made by the Commonwealth to the States. According to the *Advertiser* it was wrong for Labor Treasurers to criticize the Commonwealth but correct for an L.C.L. Treasurer to do exactly the same thing.

Mr. Broomhill: Only in the eyes of the *Advertiser*.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, that is the point I was making.

Mr. Venning: Wouldn't you like it on your side?

Mr. RYAN: We would not have it as a gift. Apparently, but for contributions made by the *Advertiser* to the L.C.L., that Party, like the D.L.P., would not be able to pay its way at election time. If I had what people opposed to the Labor Party, such as the *Advertiser* and insurance companies, paid to the L.C.L. before the last election, I would retire!

Mr. Evans: The same as union contributions to your Party.

Mr. RYAN: I could not imagine a better Party to which to pay. They get value if they contribute to the A.L.P.

Mr. Evans: At least ours is voluntary.

Mr. RYAN: I think I read an agenda item for the annual meeting of the L.C.L. that enrolment on the House of Assembly roll should be voluntary and voting should be voluntary. I think that was compulsorily defeated, but we did not read about what happened. The Labor Party has nothing to hide: our rule book has been quoted many times in this Chamber. However, we never hear about the L.C.L. rule book, because that Party has not got one.

Mr. Evans: At least we've got one, but you've got nothing.

Mr. RYAN: Well, it must be top secret, because a copy cannot be obtained. Mr. Chairman, no representative of the press or television is allowed to attend the conferences of your Party.

Mr. Broomhill: Parliamentary members of their Party aren't allowed to be on their central executive.

Mr. RYAN: That is right. They are disfranchised.

Mr. Hughes: Tell us how the L.C.L. will select its candidates.

Mr. RYAN: No-one knows. In this morning's newspaper there was a report that the General Secretary of the L.C.L. said that it would be determined in the next couple of days, but he did not say by whom.

Mr. Broomhill: Why aren't Parliamentary members of the L.C.L. allowed on the executive?

Mr. RYAN: They say they believe in the freedom of the individual, but there is not much freedom for members of Parliament. On the other hand, the press are allowed to report the proceedings of our State and Commonwealth conferences. Before the last election there was no mention of the taxes which this Government is now inflicting and of which our Government never dreamed.

True, the public had some warning about these taxes when the Budget was introduced, but I am concerned about the other method of taxing the ordinary low-wage earner. Only two or three weeks ago I read in the *Advertiser* that the Government had decontrolled prices on certain articles. As soon as these items were decontrolled, their prices were increased. Until the ordinary person in the street buys a particular item he is not conversant with what the Government has done. Under price control, 26 oz. bottles of cool drink sold for 13c a bottle, but the day after price control was lifted the price was increased to 14c, or an increase of 12c a dozen.

Mr. Allen: What about building materials? Were their prices increased?

Mr. RYAN: I do not have the figures. I am not going to quote something I cannot prove, but I have no doubt that these prices will increase. While footwear prices were not altogether decontrolled, price control on this item was discontinued. Under price control the brand of shoes I wear cost \$14.45 a pair.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: You're lucky to be able to pay that much.

Mr. RYAN: The Minister is typical of the greedy, grasping Liberal who seeks to hoard his money and thus cause a depression in this State by not spending it. A week after the Government lifted price control the price of this brand of footwear was increased to \$14.95 a pair. This is the difference between price control and decontrolling prices. This is the difference between the Labor Government's policy and the present Government's policy. When the present L.C.L. Government releases articles from price control the ordinary person in the street does not realize the significance of the action until he has to pay the increased price for an article that has been decontrolled.

No-one can criticize the Prices Commissioner for the margin of profit he allows on articles he controls except the producer who may be a bit hungry, and he is always prepared to sell the articles at the price determined by the Prices Commissioner. When price control is lifted there is a great and sharp increase in the prices of the commodities that are decontrolled. Sir Thomas Playford, when leading the Liberal Party, was a great advocate of price control, much against the minority opinion of members of his Party, who now seem to have most control and who have forced their opinions on the people of this State. For the benefit of country members of the Government, I quote what Sir Thomas Playford said in 1964, because it may help to educate them. He said:

The policy of my Government has always been to watch the interests of the primary producer and to render assistance wherever possible. In this respect, and particularly under present circumstances, some of the benefits which primary producers are enjoying would not be possible without the extension of the Prices Act. In numerous instances current trading conditions have become so complex and so involved that many consumers including persons on fixed income find it difficult to make ends meet without some assistance and guidance. Further, comparable housing building costs in this State on a 12-square home of five rooms would be at least \$1,500 cheaper than in any other State. If prices are not controlled this most favourable differential could be considerably whittled down.

Although he referred to conditions applying to primary producers, it is enlightening to read again the last paragraph of what he said in the light of the present Government's actions in releasing practically all building requirements from price control. What will happen to the building industry? I think that what

Sir Thomas Playford forecast in 1964 will happen—that the differential of \$1,500 in respect of a five-room 12-square house under price control will be whittled down and the price will become equal to that in any other State. We will find that the building firms will move from this State to other States, to the disadvantage of South Australia. The primary producer, who has enjoyed much as a result of price control in this State, may be just as greatly affected by the removal of price control on many commodities as will the ordinary man in the street.

Mr. Hughes: They are not happy about this move.

Mr. RYAN: Whilst you, Mr. Chairman, would not be prepared to tell us that your Party is split wide open on the present Government's actions, there is no doubt that this has actually happened and that some members of the L.C.L. are fearful of the degree of control that is being exercised by the present Government. This Parliament has no say at all in regard to decontrolling prices: this can be done only by executive action. One of the criticisms levelled against the Labor Government was that it was using too much executive control and not giving Parliament enough say. The Premier has criticized members of his own Party in another place; he has said that they may wreck the executive control being exercised by members of this Chamber. How much longer the Premier will remain in his present position we do not know.

The question of fluoridating our water supply is being determined by the executive, not by the people's representatives. I hope that the criticism by members of the L.C.L. in another place will wreck the executive control exercised by the Premier and some members of his Cabinet. Since I have been a member of this House, it has often been said that the power of Parliament is being reduced and being vested in Executive Council and that, consequently, the people themselves have no say on many issues. The Labor Government was criticized on this score, but there should be far more criticism of the L.C.L. Government in this connection.

A further increase, the increase in hospital charges, has been announced since the Treasurer's introduction of the Budget. In the main, this is a direct imposition against a section of the community that cannot afford it. It is a sectional increase, because the ordinary low-income earner cannot afford to pay large contributions to a hospital benefits

fund. So, when he or his family needs hospitalization, there will be a direct charge against that individual and he will not be reimbursed by the State or by a hospital benefits fund. Therefore, this matter gravely concerns the ordinary people. Some of the people who will be most affected by the increases in the 1968-69 Budget are pensioners, and it is rather enlightening to see the way in which these people are being led up the garden path. First, we see increased taxation for people simply because they are taxpayers; then we see evidence of a Commonwealth member of the L.C.L. hoodwinking these people by saying that as a private member he will introduce a Bill to relieve pensioners from the payment of local council rates. I do not know how ridiculous people can get but, if the statement emanating from the Commonwealth member for Adelaide is true, then what we have heard about this person is correct: he does not know what he is talking about. He as a member of the Commonwealth Parliament would know that he has no power whatsoever to introduce a private member's Bill that will involve the Government of which he is a member in any financial expense.

Indeed, we in this Parliament know that a private member cannot introduce such a Bill. Unfortunately, however, many people believe things which are said publicly but which never eventuate, and these are the people who are being hit, as they are affected by some of the increases in this Budget. I have no hesitation in saying that I will oppose the infliction by this Government of such increases. We often heard it said, especially by members of another place, that, had we spelled out word for word what legislation we intended to introduce, another place would not have opposed such legislation. Some of the statements emanating from another place were absolutely ridiculous. New members may not be aware of the fact that, regarding the Bill we introduced to set up a State insurance office, the ridiculous statement emanating from another place was that, because we had referred to insurance, it did not cover assurance and this therefore was not included in the policy enunciated by our Government. But will another place throw out the legislation of the present Government, including this Budget, because the Government's intentions have not been spelled out word for word, dollar for dollar?

Mr. Broomhill: It would be justified in doing that.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, it would receive the backing of the people, who would believe that there was some justification for having another place.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: They used to tell us we had no mandate.

Mr. RYAN: Yes. Could another place amend legislation relating to increased taxation already initiated in this place because this was not spelled out word for word, dollar for dollar, prior to the election? The minority Government we have today would certainly not be in office (and the member for Chaffey would not be sitting in this Chamber today) had the policy of the Government prior to the election been enunciated as one of increased taxation.

Mr. Broomhill: The member for Chaffey is only seat-warming.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, for three years, although I do not think the Government will last three years, because even the so-called Liberal that is keeping the present Government in power cannot save the Government for the remaining two-and-a-half years of its term.

Mr. Edwards: Don't think too hard.

Mr. RYAN: At least I have something with which to think.

Mr. Edwards: That's doubtful.

Mr. RYAN: There's nothing doubtful about it. The only doubt is in the minds of the people of Eyre, who have the greatest doubt about their representation in this Chamber and are extremely sorry about it. There is nothing in the Budget about wombats, which seems to be the most important thing for the honourable member. Increased taxation and maladministration by a Government are the important things concerning the public; they are not concerned about the way in which wombats go down or come out of a hole, yet that is what we have heard from the honourable member, who now criticizes what I am saying. At least Opposition members deal with specific matters and will advise on what should and should not be done. I believe the people are now completely aware of what happens when a minority Government is elected. If there is any doubt about this, let us have an election and see which Party the people really do want as the Government. Let the people say whether they want this type of Government or whether they like to see what was said before an election repudiated. It is all right for the Government to say the complete opposite of what it said before, but ultimately it has to face the people. We issue a challenge to the Government.

Mr. Burdon: Do you think it will accept the challenge?

Mr. RYAN: Down the Port they would say it has not got the guts to do so. I believe that 53 per cent of the people in this State honestly believe that this is a gutless Government.

Mr. Allen: We are game to face the issue.

Mr. RYAN: Face the electors, not the issue! The people do not want to be governed by one man; they had that for many years under Sir Thomas Playford, and they now have it under the Hall-Stott Government. The position today is that impositions made on the taxpayers of the State are being made on the vote of one person, namely, the member for Ridley.

Mr. Corcoran: Members opposite have the temerity to snigger: they reckon it is all right for one member to keep them there.

Mr. RYAN: This is not funny. People did not realize on March 2 what type of Government they were going to get. It would not be so bad if the L.C.L. had the majority of members in this place or if the majority of electors had voted for that Party. Members on this side would then have accepted the verdict of the umpire. Members of the Labor Party have always believed in freedom of choice and of expression. I believe that most people in the State believe in this and do not want to go back to the days of dictatorship rule in this State. The people would be happy if the Party elected by the majority of the people had the majority of members, but no-one wants to see any Government anywhere under the control of one person. However, that is the type of Government we have today where one person has to be consulted before any legislation whatever can be introduced. The proof of this has often been seen. We had the proof on April 16, when one person, not the L.C.L., destroyed a Government that had been elected by the majority of the people.

Mr. Virgo: He'll be a knight one day.

Mr. RYAN: He will be a knight in the day time! Through history more knights have been assassinated than have ordinary people, so one can look forward to the future, having regard to history.

Mr. Hudson: You wouldn't go as far as to say that, would you?

Mr. RYAN: I am referring to the past. There is no doubt about what the future political trend in South Australia will be. The Labor Party will be in Government at the first

available opportunity that electors have to vote. I wish that the present Hall-Stott Government would take the attitude of Mr. Gorton about testing popularity. Let the present Government test its popularity.

Mr. Virgo: What popularity?

Mr. RYAN: Yes, they have not got any popularity, with 43 per cent of the votes. Yet, this is what is called majority Government! Whilst people have said that it is essential that this Chamber and another place operate as a two-Chamber Parliament, I think the attitude of the present Government to having two Chambers will be amplified in the next few months when that place becomes a rubber stamp for what is done here. That is because, whilst there is in that Chamber a terrific majority against the A.L.P. on which we have not been able to make any dent over the years, what that Chamber does is determined, once again, by one honourable member.

Mr. Virgo: Do you think they will be in session for long enough to rubber-stamp any Bills?

Mr. RYAN: I understand that it meets on one day a week, which is a good effort! I believe that the other place is not meeting tomorrow, for some good reason.

Mr. Virgo: I think there is a function near Port Pirie.

Mr. RYAN: I understand so. Social functions take precedence of Parliamentary business.

Mr. McKee: They'll all be there tomorrow.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, for ulterior reasons. Social activity once again takes precedence of Parliamentary business. This is what we have seen for a long time. These matters will be settled when the people voice their opinion at the ballot box. This Government has never expressed the majority opinion of the people. Whilst they are prepared to at least pay for some of the amenities they receive, taxpayers do not like to have their incomes squeezed unnecessarily, but that has happened during the present Government's term of office. In the main, taxation in the Budget affects the low-wage earner: it does not affect the big man. In the Budget there is no vast increase in company taxation, nor is there a sliding scale of company taxation, which is something companies could afford. The member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) went to great lengths to explain where the terrific income of some of these companies is going. It is not going in taxation to relieve the burden on the ordinary wage-earner: it is going to outside people who have no interest whatsoever.

Mr. Virgo: Making the rich richer.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, and the poor poorer. Today, some honourable member criticized one of my relatives because he stole from the rich and gave to the poor. I refer to Ned Kelly. He had steel armour, because it was necessary to protect himself from the capitalists. In those days the capitalists were always gunning for the man who was prepared to take from the rich and give to the poor. Today, instead of steel armour we see Steele Hall, who is not adopting the same policy that Ned Kelly adopted of taking from the rich and giving to the poor; he is taking from the poor and giving to the rich.

Mr. Hudson: "Steele All".

Mr. RYAN: I oppose the Budget in its present form, because it is an infliction on people who cannot afford to pay.

Mr. EDWARDS (Eyre): I support the first line. In his Budget speech the Treasurer said that no taxation measures are ever welcome and none are ever painless. However, the broad coverage of the 1968-69 new revenue proposals are such that it is hoped that their impact, though unwelcome, will be fair, reasonable and effective. The Treasurer has not had an easy or enviable task in drawing up the Budget.

It is well to quote the effects surrounding the financial situation confronting the Treasurer. This, I believe, is fundamental, but everyone should heed the real state of the State's balance sheet, and it is against this background that the Treasurer has brought down his Budget. At June 30 this year the deficit in the Consolidated Revenue Account was \$8,365,000, which is a long way in the red. This has been built up over the last three years without a fully compensating increase in taxation and other revenue. Immediately prior to June, 1964, surpluses amounting to \$3,844,000 had built up in the Revenue Account. During 1964-65, the total deficit of \$2,621,000 left a credit balance of \$1,223,000 in hand. During 1965-66, there was a current deficit of \$6,834,000 and, after consideration of the previous year's credit, the Revenue Account was \$5,611,000 overdrawn at June 30, 1966.

Mr. Broomhill: This is full of inaccuracies.

Mr. EDWARDS: During 1966-67 a surplus of \$106,000 was recorded but only after debiting to Loan Account, that is, the State's development funds, the sum of \$6,902,000 of expenditures which it had been customary to charge

to Revenue Account. Furthermore, a deficit of \$2,860,000 was recorded in 1967-68, but again about \$5,015,000 of expenditure normally charged to revenue was charged against Loan Account in that year. It must be borne in mind that without these changes in accounting procedures of the last three years there would have been revenue deficits shown in the accounts of \$6,834,000 in 1965-66; \$6,796,000 in 1966-67; and \$7,857,000 in 1967-68, for an aggregate of \$21,505,000. Since this period which commenced with a credit of \$1,223,000, the net deficit today, on the basis of the former method of accounting, would be \$20,282,000 instead of \$8,365,000 as shown. The \$11,917,000 difference has been paid for out of Loan funds. To meet this situation, the Treasurer made it clear to Parliament that the diversion of current Loan moneys to cover further revenue deficits is indefensible, whether the diversion was for formal funding of a revenue deficit or merely to hold surplus funds on one account as a general offset to deficit on the other.

Mr. Broomhill: Did the Treasurer make that clear to you?

Mr. EDWARDS: Of course he did. The Government's revenue and expenditure proposals for the year ending June 30, 1969, have been prepared under conditions of considerable financial difficulties, and involve extensive revenue measures without which it would be impossible to provide for the proper maintenance of essential works and services and to restore the State's financial equilibrium.

Much has been said about tourism by the honourable member for Millicent, and I compliment him on the way he spoke about this subject. Tourism was also spoken about by the honourable member for Gumeracha, and by most other members who have spoken. This subject can well be spoken about at length, because tourism wants all the publicity it can get. We would like some help in this matter, because if we had better roads and were served by power, light, and water, Eyre Peninsula would be in a better position to attract tourists. We have some of the best coastline in the State for surfing, water skiing, and other sports, as good as anywhere on the Gold Coast. Eyre Peninsula has some of the best fishing and crayfishing that can be found in South Australian waters. These assets could be used as part of a drive towards tourism that could be of advantage to all in South Australia, and we should do something about this important industry.

I again ask the Electricity Trust to get on with the job of supplying power everywhere on Eyre Peninsula, because it is badly needed there. I hope that the people there will not be the forgotten race because they are so far away from the hub of things here in Adelaide.

Water is the life blood of this dry State, so let us conserve all the water we can in every possible way. I suggest that people who do not want fluoride in their drinking water could overcome the problem by erecting a 1,000-gallon or 2,000-gallon tank in their backyards. In this way 1,000 gallons of water annually might be saved for each such household in the metropolitan area. These people will then have no problem at all as a result of fluoridation. It is as simple as that. Last Friday's *News*, in an article headed "Dentist lashes fluoride critics", says:

Australian Dental Association (S.A. Branch) President, Mr. J. F. Irwin, today criticized members of Parliament over their handling of the fluoridation issue. One would have expected M.P.'s to take the opportunity of learning something about fluoridation before criticizing it, he said.

Mr. Irwin was commenting on a move in the State Parliament to delay the Government plan to fluoridate the S.A. water supply. He said the 59 members of Parliament had been invited to attend a dental education conference in Adelaide on October 7-8, at which Australian experts would speak on various facets of fluoridation.

Questions on all aspects of the subject would be answered at the conference. "Of all the people who have opposed the Government plan in Parliament only two have accepted the invitation to attend the conference," Mr. Irwin said. "One of these is Mrs. Byrne, M.P."

Mrs. Byrne: That statement was wrong, because I have not yet posted it.

Mr. EDWARDS: The article continues:

One of these is Mrs. Byrne, M.P., who has given notice she will move next week for a referendum on the question—even before she attends the conference at which the question will be discussed. The other is Mr. Whyte, M.L.C.

"Only 11 other members have accepted invitations to the conference. Twenty-four have declined, and the remaining 24 have not even had the courtesy to reply."

Mr. Burdon: Are you going to the conference?

Mr. EDWARDS: I have gladly accepted the invitation, because I should like to know more about fluoridation. The article continues:

"Some weeks ago we wrote to M.P.'s inviting them to submit any questions on fluoridation to an A.D.A.-nominated authority on the subject. I have not had one inquiry,

which indicates that some M.P.'s are prepared to talk about something without bothering to check to see if they are using facts.

"It is amazing that members who represent electorates where people with young children dominate, and who are least in a position to afford dental care, are the ones who are most vocal against fluoridation," he said.

"Fortunately, in both Parties, there are men of experience and wisdom who are prepared to study the question thoroughly, and we hope the views of these people will prevail. Fluoridation should not be a political football—it should be considered as the important public health measure it is," Mr. Irwin said.

Much has been said in this place about fluoride in water, but if honourable members opposite take the trouble to read the report of the medical conference held here in Australia this year, they will find a recommendation to the effect that fluoride could be used to advantage.

The people of Kimba will not forgive the Labor Government for deferring the laying of the Poldas to Kimba main during its three-year term of office. It has been pointed out to me that if the Labor Government had had that main laid we would have had Electricity Trust power as well through to Kimba by the end of 1968. Now it will probably be 1972 before it comes through. So we on Eyre Peninsula are not happy about this. Whilst at Sheringa last weekend I was shown what is known as the Round Lake. At most times of the year a person can boil a billy, and make first-class tea at this spot. I would estimate it covered 100 to 150 acres and would be up to 12ft. deep in the centre. It consists of quite good water and is fed by underground springs, and the level does not alter appreciably, even in a dry year. This is certainly a marvellous supply of water.

Honourable members opposite keep saying that we do not mind the taxation increases. We have no argument against that, but what I really think they mean is that if they were in Government their Budget would be far worse than the one introduced by the Treasurer. This Budget is something that is greatly to his credit, and we must give credit where it is due. When we have to increase taxation, the fairest way to do this is to spread it over as wide a field as possible, and this is what our Treasurer has done. The member for Whyalla (Hon. R. R. Loveday) has raved on about education and about book and travelling allowances, but when we went to school how many of us received these allowances? Anyway, these allowances are not meant to cover the whole cost. This has been pointed out by the Minister of Education. Furthermore, when we speak to different headmasters throughout the

country, we hear the claim that since the so-called free books have been introduced they have had more trouble over books than ever before.

Mr. HUDSON: Who is your authority for that statement?

Mr. EDWARDS: It came from a headmaster.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. EDWARDS: In fact, one headmaster told me it cost him more for books now than before this free book system was announced, mainly because only some of these books are free and consequently this makes whatever books which have to be bought dearer. When books are all bought from the one firm, they can be bought more cheaply. Members opposite are all critical of the Budget. However, after hearing most of them, I can say that this is no wonder at all, because most of them do not know any better. The price of beer does not worry me at all; I am only trying to help others in distress. I like to help all people, if at all possible, because I believe in a true democracy.

I do not know why honourable members opposite have the idea that farmers are well off. Half the farmers throughout the State would be lucky if they were earning the equivalent of the basic wage (or very little more) at this time. With the high cost of everything they have to buy, with high land costs, with the high cost of production, and with decreasing prices for everything they sell, the only reason why many farmers hang on to their farms is that they do not like working for a boss, preferring to manage their own affairs. If honourable members opposite do not believe this, let them try farming for themselves; then I am sure most of them would certainly change their minds. I have been given to understand that many members opposite are defunct cockies, anyway. Much has been said about what we promised before the election. During the by-election campaign at Millicent I went along to hear the Leader of the Opposition and I was amazed at the propaganda that he was trying to put over the people who follow his Party; it was much worse than the so-called half-truths we were said to have used during our campaign. As I see it, what one believes all depends on which side of the fence one sits, except that we, at least, do speak the truth.

Much has been said about housing. As far as I can ascertain, the Savings Bank of South Australia lends about \$16,677,134 each year

for the purpose of building or buying houses; \$1,569,153 towards the financing of church schools and other institutional buildings; and a further sum of \$2,441,646 for the purchase or development of farming properties. At June 30, 1968, there were 27,522 first-mortgage loans with balances outstanding totalling \$151,290,861, and this is in addition to the sum supplied by the State Bank of South Australia. The Commonwealth Savings Bank would lend almost as much as the Savings Bank of South Australia in the way of loans for houses, and the Commonwealth Development Bank lends a considerable sum for rural houses. I am also sure that most banks lend money for housing and other building projects throughout the State. Therefore, with all these fields from which to draw finance I fail to see why house building and other forms of building throughout this State cannot expand. I understand two new banks will be built in the city area and that two big motels will be built on North Terrace soon. I have been informed the motels are both to be eight-storey buildings with parking facilities underneath. I also know of two motels to be built in the country at this time.

The member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson), as usual, raved on (getting lost in his own importance) about all the untruths from members on this side of the Chamber. Of course, the honourable member is perfect: he would not use an untruth! He considers himself above that. Of course, that is the honourable member's own belief. Other people may think otherwise. Who is the honourable member, to talk about untruths? If he made more considered statements he might give us something more constructive and, for a change, we might learn something. However, I am pleased that the honourable member praised private enterprise, in the form of the Electricity Trust of South Australia. Why cannot we have more private enterprise in all of our business fields because the Labor Party, as a whole, does not believe in private enterprise?

It was easy to see that the beliefs he expressed were those of the honourable member himself, and he is the only one who takes much notice of them. I am sure that his own colleagues must get tired of hearing him expound at great length. Towards the end of his speech, he really got wound up about his own ideas on how to run a bank. I certainly would not like to be one of his clients! He told us how he would run a bank, what he would do if he were to meet the Commonwealth Government, and how he would deal

with the State Bank and the State Savings Bank if he had a chance. Of course, they were all the honourable member's own ideas. Government members were pleased when the member for Glenelg sat down. I listened to the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) and, but for the prompting from his colleagues that kept him going, he would not have been able to speak for long.

Mr. Lawn: Who writes that trash for you?

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr. EDWARDS: I cannot understand how anyone can talk for as long as the member for Wallaroo spoke, yet say so little. Regarding the decontrolling of the prices of certain items, if this decontrol is abused price control will have to be restored, and the Prices Commissioner has power to do this. The member for Wallaroo kept talking about the little man, but I did not know who the little man was. I wondered whether it was the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) or whether that honourable member and the member for Wallaroo were both little men.

Mr. Jennings: I imagine that, if he were referring to little men in the skull, he would have been referring to you.

Mr. EDWARDS: When the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) started to speak, it was hard to know whether he or his Party mates were making the speech. Regarding the member for Semaphore (Mr. Hurst), I suggest that, if that honourable member wants a tourist resort in his district, he start a colony of wombats in a reserve in the sandhills. That will attract many people to his district. I do not know why the member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill) has to agree with other members opposite. Has he not a mind of his own? Before he got down to business he kept referring to what other honourable members had said some time previously. Then he asked how a man on wages could pay \$40 a year in income tax. Under the new system I do not think any member on wages will be paying \$40 a year. Many Opposition members are only seat-warming, but some of the time they are even not in their seats to keep them warm. I object to the remarks made by the member for West Torrens about the Liberal and Country League at election time. Who do the Labor Party members opposite think they are?

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Jennings: You can't even read. Turn the page upside down and you will do better.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Enfield must cease interjecting.

Mr. Jennings: I was trying to help the honourable member.

Mr. EDWARDS: Members of the Opposition tell more untruths at election time than do L.C.L. members. Members opposite keep saying that Government members do not know anything about finance. The Opposition does not do a very good job itself. It did not do a very good job last year, otherwise we would not be in Government today. If it had not been for the Labor Government, the present Government would not have been in such a bad financial position when it came into office. South Australia is not going backward, but is starting to move forward and will continue to move forward in the future. Sir Thomas Playford was the greatest statesman this State has ever known. He got many industries going in the State and was responsible for bringing in many good migrants as citizens to maintain these industries. The only thing that put his Government out of office was the votes of the many migrants he brought to the State.

Mr. Jennings: He never won an election honestly.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. EDWARDS: The member for Port Adelaide likes to run down the L.C.L., but I would not like to be a member of his Party. The people of South Australia know what they would have got if a Labor Government had been voted into office at the last election. That is why the Labor Party was not elected, and that is why we are in Government today. I am sure that the crows and wombats in the district of Eyre have more intelligence than some of the Opposition members, especially the member for Enfield.

I speak of two other matters before concluding. The first is the cost relating to what was called Legislative Council enrolments in 1967-68 for people who were qualified to vote, amounting to \$76,900, making the total expenditure on this special line \$147,300 for two years. This work could have been done voluntarily and would have saved the Government unnecessary expense. Secondly, the Murrie Royal Commission could have been avoided, but the amounts debited to the cost of this commission totalled about \$20,000. This included payment for counsel fees and expenses for Mr. J. D. Murrie,

\$3,661; fees and expenses of counsel for Education Department officers, \$3,330; and a contribution to the expenses of the S.A. Institute of Teachers of \$5,000. These amounts do not include the salaries of the Royal Commissioner, Crown Law officers representing the Education Department, or of other departmental officers. In addition, Mr. Murrie was paid \$2,498 salary and district allowance while he was relieved of his duties. I am pleased to know that he is now back doing his job, and doing it well. I have much pleasure in supporting the Budget.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): I suppose of all members of the Chamber I am the most fortunate in that, following the honourable member who has just resumed his seat, I shall probably escape the criticism and thrashing that have been delivered to members on this side. I thought the honourable member's speech ran to a pattern that we have listened to from the new members, a somewhat different pattern from speeches we have heard before from new members. Almost to a man they criticized the previous Government for overspending, saying that the finances of the State were in a difficult situation because of the large expenditures and implied that they were unjustified, but they immediately outlined many proposals demanding more expenditure than ever.

The member for Eyre said that the people of Kimba would never forgive the Labor Party because the Kimba main was not built during the three years it was in office. I remind the honourable member that a demand for a water supply for Kimba has been current as long as I have been a member (that is, for 30 years, not three years) and that there has been a succession of Liberal Governments that have had ample opportunity to provide a water supply for Kimba. This was a live issue all the time the present Treasurer was Minister of Works, but plans did not progress to any marked degree. The Labor Government said the same as the Treasurer is saying today: that application would be made to the Commonwealth Government for assistance and as soon as the Commonwealth Government came to the party the work would be done.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I have never said that—not since I have been Treasurer, anyway.

Mr. RICHES: The Treasurer in his statement, at page 5, said, giving as one reason for the financial situation today—

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: That is another matter. The undertaking I gave in connection with the Budget was that the Kimba water supply project would start later this year. I made no qualification.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: That is correct.

Mr. RICHES: I accept that. I am not trying to put words into the Treasurer's mouth that he did not utter.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I didn't say we had to rely on Commonwealth help.

Mr. RICHES: With great respect, I say that the Government expected to get finance from the same source as that from which it was sought by the Labor Government. In his Budget speech the Treasurer said:

The retrogression in Commonwealth assistance to South Australia, particularly in relation to assistance to Western Australia and Queensland, in both general purpose and special purpose financial arrangements, has been very great indeed. We do not for one moment suggest that such assistance should not have been given to those States, but simple equity and real need demand comparable treatment for this State. The Government has no intention of relinquishing or even abating its efforts to secure a more reasonable financial arrangement with the Commonwealth for current purposes, for future purposes, and for some contribution toward those recent deficits which in part can be attributed to inadequate earlier arrangements made by the Commonwealth.

This indicates that the Treasurer expects to receive finance for these projects from the same source as that from which the previous Government sought assistance—the only source the finance can come from, the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The honourable member is completely misrepresenting my statement. He made a statement about the Kimba water supply, but I said, "The Kimba water supply does not depend on any assistance from the Commonwealth Government."

Mr. RICHES: I accept that the Treasurer said that the Kimba project would proceed irrespective of the Commonwealth Government's coming to the party. I have never implied otherwise, but I do say that the Treasurer expects to get the money for the Kimba water supply from the same source as that from which the previous Government sought it. I do say that he had all the years before 1965 to provide a water supply, if that was physically possible. The truth is that any Minister of Works, whatever his political colour, would bend over backwards to give the people of Kimba the water supply that they know to be

necessary for their very existence. Anyone would do that and every member, whether representing a country or a city district, would be behind any Government that could do it. It is a matter of practical arrangement, and we are glad that the stage has been reached where Kimba can expect a supply at a reasonable date.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The honourable member will agree that during my time we developed the Polda Basin, which made a water supply possible at Kimba.

Mr. RICHES: I agree with that, but I do not know what it has to do with the argument. I am not criticizing the actions that the present Treasurer took while Minister of Works. I am dealing with the unjustified criticism of the Labor Government. If this kind of criticism was levelled at any other Government it would be just as unfair.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The Kimba water supply was ready to go when your Government took office. This is quite correct, and the honourable member cannot deny it.

Mr. RICHES: I do not know that. It could have been, but I do not see the relevance of that argument. The plans could have been drawn, but plans have been drawn for the Port Augusta Gaol and a number of other projects. The practical difficulty is that of finance, and the present Government is looking to the same source of finance as that to which the previous Government looked. I have often said that the real solution to the problems of Kimba's water supply is an extension of the Morgan-Whyalla main. If this main had been required for a work like Woomera rather than rural Kimba, a water supply would have been provided long ago.

The Treasurer will recall that I referred to this matter previously. This was a live issue before he ever became Minister of Works in the last Liberal Government. There is no room for Party politics in this matter, and that is why I have referred to it. There has been a tendency to try to bring Party politics into everything associated with the development of this State, including the development of projects within the State. This does not help South Australia or the individual districts that members represent. We ought to be able to divorce the development of the State from Party political issues, considering them on their merits, and not seek to impute motives when there is no ground for such imputation.

We have continually heard Government members claim that the Labor Government entered into expenditure without providing for sufficient revenue to meet that expenditure, but that is only a half truth: when the Labor Government sought to provide revenue to meet the expenditure incurred, the necessary legislation to provide that revenue was blocked in another place. However, not one Government member has referred to this: not one Government member has considered it at all. In those circumstances, responsibility lies not in this Chamber but in another place. No member has suggested what expenditure he would not have incurred or what hospital or school he would not have had built. On the contrary, almost without exception, Government members have referred to the necessity for building more schools and for providing more water supplies. The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Evans) referred to a number of requirements in his district for which he said he would fight until they were met.

Mr. Evans: I also said that it was unnecessary for the Labor Government to bring in an extra week's pay.

Mr. RICHES: I thought the honourable member was completely answered on that point.

Mr. McAnaney: Who answered it?

Mr. RICHES: The member for Glenelg gave a complete answer to that question and, in any case, all members know that the effect on the Budget of that expenditure was small, if it had any real effect at all. I believe that this Budget is a bad Budget because it imposes burdens on a section of the people and not on all the people. It imposes burdens on those people who are least able to bear those burdens and to whom the burdens will represent a real hardship indeed. I did not attend the same school as the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) attended, and I cannot see from my experience in life that there is any satisfaction if, in the process of balancing the State Budget, the home budget is unbalanced.

There is a marked trend in this Budget similar to that which led up to the depression years, and we find things happening in Government financing with a similarity that is not comfortable. We find attention being given to the sum being paid out in interest on debts accumulated in the past. We find attention being given to increasing taxation on every little item, particularly if that increase can be imposed by way of indirect taxation, which is levied wherever it can be borne and on people

least able to protest. Schoolteachers were the first to have their salaries hit by Act of Parliament. The pattern is alarming, with the State in the position where essential works, such as schools, are not able to be carried out. A trend is setting in which has too much in common with the trend in the first Budget I saw as a member of this place, a trend that is uncomfortable to me. Hospital charges are increased. The very category of the people that was being attacked in those days is being attacked this year.

Mr. McAnaney: And over three years, twice.

Mr. RICHES: All of the difficulties this Government faces were faced up to by the previous Government. There is not a situation today that did not have to be faced by the Labor Government, yet it did not impose the level of taxation we have here. If the honourable member thinks that the Labor Government imposed taxation too severely, his attitude should be to ask for a reduction, and he should not support still further increases. How can he argue that the State was over-taxed in 1967 and then, in 1968, attempt to justify further increases in taxation? It does not add up—he cannot have it both ways. I believe that, in all the circumstances, if this Budget has proved anything at all it has proved to the people of South Australia how well the Labor Government held down prices and taxation.

Mr. McAnaney: You took \$5,000,000 extra in 1966-67.

Mr. RICHES: And the honourable member's Government is taking so much more on top of that.

Mr. McAnaney: We are taking \$4,000,000 this year—not as much as your \$5,000,000.

Mr. RICHES: In the face of the worst drought South Australia has ever known and in the face of the deal the Commonwealth Government gave the Labor Government, the Labor Government would have been justified in imposing the same level of taxation as has been imposed by this Government, but it did not.

Mr. McAnaney: If you get it from the Commonwealth Government, the people at home must pay for it: the Commonwealth Government does not have a magic pool out of which to get money.

Mr. RICHES: The honourable member should tell that to the Treasurer, because that is where this Government hopes to get the money.

Mr. McAnaney: Every Government has expenses to meet out of its own Budget.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. RICHES: In his statement, the Treasurer says he hopes to get money from the Commonwealth Government to meet every new increase that may occur, which the Government has to meet, in any wages. No provision is made for such increases in the Budget. If any increase in wages occurs (and I think I read about a slight increase in teachers' wages last week) and if we take what the Treasurer says in his explanation literally, either the Commonwealth will have to pay more money or we will be called together again so that a further dose of taxation can be ordered. This is what is spelt out in the statement. We do not know that we have had the last word on these vicious tax increases.

Concurrently, some price control has been removed; about this enough has been said already. On the Budget generally, I believe the Committee is indebted to the member for Glenelg for the excellent speech he made.

Mr. McAnaney: Our consumer price index went up more than that of any other State in the last three years.

Mr. RICHES: It is still there and it will go up further because of the removal of price control.

Mr. McAnaney: How does that prove the effectiveness of price control if other States haven't got control? Prices went up in your time, even with control.

Mr. RICHES: No-one said that price control could keep down all prices. We trade with other States. That was spelt out consistently by the Labor Government but was not accepted by the Liberal and Country League until that Party came to office. Now we have the same thing in the Treasurer's statement.

I wish to refer to one matter regarding development in my district. I shall leave other matters until the debate on the lines or as matters on which to ask questions, but I wish to refer to the building of the standard gauge railway right through from Adelaide to Perth, with the connection of the line to Whyalla. I refer to the matter not because enough has not been said about the project but because so many conflicting statements have been made that no-one knows what the true position is. I asked the Premier about South Australia's attitude to this project because,

having attended the linking of the line in Western Australia with the Commonwealth line at Kalgoorlie, I considered the project an urgent one in respect of which we could not wait for five years. When I expressed that opinion, the Premier replied that the Railways Commissioner had reported that I was incorrect in saying that present plans envisaged a delay of five years in the provision of a standard gauge railway between Adelaide and Port Pirie.

I want to deal with the interpretation of "delay". I am suggesting not that the Railways Department is not planning for the standard gauge but that, on the Premier's own statement, it will be five years before this work is put in hand. In reply to my first question the Premier said that South Australia was insisting on the Commonwealth Government's carrying out the whole of the undertaking entered into in the agreement (which was drawn up in the days of the late Mr. Eddie Ward) and that this would be a five-year programme, and that the line from Port Pirie to Adelaide would be considered in the latter part of that programme. Another statement was that, in considering the line from Port Pirie to Adelaide, consideration would have to be given to the rebuilding of the Adelaide railway station, as contemplated by the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report.

How many years do members think will pass before that line will be built and available for use? It is reasonable to assume a period of five years, but I urge everyone interested to ensure that Adelaide is not denied a connection with the standard gauge line for that time. A leading article in the *Advertiser*, dealing with priorities of rail construction, states:

The question is higher priority than what? Than the Whyalla link was given before? Than other unspecified Commonwealth projects? Or, in fact, higher priority than the Pirie-Adelaide line, which our Government has rightly stated to be South Australia's first priority.

The South Australian Government has not said anything of the kind. In the answers the Premier has given me he has said it will be at the latter end of a five-year programme involving all the other lines in the Northern Division of South Australia and that this is the lowest priority and not the highest. We are entitled to know, as a Parliament and a people, what the South Australian policy is on this matter and what priority has been given this line. I consider it is important that the line between Whyalla and Port Augusta should

be built independently of the other constructions, because that would give one part of South Australia at any rate immediate connections with Perth, Sydney and Brisbane, without a break of gauge. It would transfer heavy traffic from road to railway. It would be a paying proposition right from the time of opening and it would mean a tremendous benefit to South Australia. It should have no relation to the building of the line between Port Pirie and Adelaide or any other connection, because there is no let or hindrance, except the will to do it and the provision of the necessary finance, to provide the link between Port Augusta and Whyalla.

It has been said that the priority for that line is lower than the priority for the line from Port Pirie to Adelaide. One could examine the answers to questions in this place, but I defy anyone to be able to tell from them just what priority South Australia places on these important provisions. It has been said that the Commonwealth Government is anxious to build a line from Whyalla and is waiting for South Australia to approve it. It has also been said that the Commonwealth Government is anxious that the line from Port Pirie to Adelaide should be standardized, has offered to make \$30,000 available for the preliminary survey, and is waiting for South Australia to give a priority, and that South Australia has not claimed the \$30,000. That has been said by the member for Grey, who has the authority of the Commonwealth Minister to say it. That statement has been published and has not been answered by South Australia. I think this demands an answer, because this work cannot be delayed for five years. We should get on with the job right now. I wanted to draw attention to this unsatisfactory position of railway planning or announcements concerning railway planning, and I will be raising other matters during the debate on the lines.

The CHAIRMAN: If it is the wish of the Committee I will take the lines *seriatim*.

First line (Legislative Council, \$41,494)—passed.

House of Assembly, \$70,994; Parliamentary Library, \$25,199; Joint House Committee, \$35,584—passed.

Electoral Department, \$177,761.

Mr. HUDSON: It seems that unless we have a firm statement by the Government with respect to the enrolments of people entitled to be on the Legislative Council roll

or, alternatively, a firm statement about possible amendments that may be introduced, supporting, for example, the introduction of a common House of Assembly and Legislative Council roll, we are left with an unsatisfactory position. The previous Government, by much effort, conducted a campaign to enrol those people who were entitled to be on the Legislative Council roll. Before this action, the only enrolment cards sent out by the Electoral Department were those sent to people who had purchased property. The previous situation was grossly unsatisfactory, for it produced a bias in the enrolment procedures for the Legislative Council in favour of one particular Party. The limited enrolment and the way in which electoral boundaries were drawn already meant that there was a substantial bias in favour of the L.C.L. in the enrolment procedures.

We are entitled to a statement now from the Government regarding what it intends to do about Legislative Council enrolments. Will it revert to the practice of the Playford Government and send out enrolment cards to those who purchase property and ignore householders and people who are paying rent, holding the view, which was held by Sir Thomas Playford, that those who purchase property were more likely to vote L.C.L. than were householders? No indication has yet been given on this matter. We know there are different opinions between several L.C.L. members in this Chamber and those in another place, but we are entitled to know what procedures are to be adopted before amending legislation is introduced.

We are entitled to know whether the Government considers that the present situation of the Legislative Council is satisfactory. Does the Government believe in the system in the Legislative Council which, despite the large support for Labor, leads to the Labor Party having only four seats out of 20? Does the Government believe that this is just and proper? Does it believe that this division in the Legislative Council is in the interests of good Government, is in the interests of effective Opposition, and leads to the effective working of that Chamber, even if it is to carry the role of a House of Review and even if its function is considered in that way? Surely there can be no justification for the kind of procedure that has been accepted for so many years in relation to the Legislative Council. Can the Premier say whether the Electoral Department will continue to send

out cards to householders, and can he say what action the Government contemplates to alter the enrolment qualifications in connection with Legislative Council elections?

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): Each of the honourable member's queries depends on the other. Electoral reform in South Australia is in the melting pot. After legislation connected with the Budget has been dealt with, we must consider electoral reform in connection with the House of Assembly. Obviously, some alteration will also be promoted in connection with the Legislative Council's franchise and its electoral boundaries. The Labor Government spent \$147,000 in sending out forms to obtain electoral support for itself. In the light of the changes that the honourable member can surely see coming, the extent of which changes we cannot foresee, no good purpose will be served by embarking on a campaign to enrol electors for the Legislative Council.

Mr. HUDSON: Are we to assume that the Premier has a guarantee from his supporters in the Legislative Council that any measure he proposes to alter the Legislative Council franchise will carry sufficient support within the Legislative Council to ensure its passage? If the Premier introduced legislation for a common roll for the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly, there would be considerable savings within the Electoral Department. If we could have got legislation through the last Parliament for a common roll for Legislative Council elections we would have been delighted to do so. I would say that I do not think we on this side would even ask the Government necessarily to demand compulsory voting: I think members on this side would be only too pleased to see the adoption of a common roll.

We know that the Premier is the head of a Government that is short of money. In these circumstances, the introduction of a common roll would enable considerable savings to be made within the Electoral Department, because the present enrolment procedures require staff that would be unnecessary if a common roll was used. I should think that a significant percentage of this wages component for the Electoral Department (\$10,000 at least) could be saved were the State Electoral Department not required to carry out Legislative Council enrolments and were a common roll introduced. I suggest that that sort of saving to the Government in its present financial position is not

something to be sneezed at. Can the Attorney-General say what kind of saving could be made within the Electoral Department if a common roll were introduced and if the separate enrolment procedure for enrolling people on to the Legislative Council roll were abolished?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): The honourable member has used the term "common roll". By that I take it he means a roll that can be used for both Commonwealth elections and State elections (both for the Assembly and the Legislative Council). This matter has over the last few months been the subject of negotiation with the Commonwealth Government. As the honourable member should know, there is an arrangement with the Commonwealth Government for the payment by it of half the costs of keeping the roll for Commonwealth elections, that is, for the House of Representatives and the Senate, and for elections for the House of Assembly. That arrangement with the Commonwealth has not up to now extended to the Legislative Council roll, which has been a separate roll.

One of the things my predecessor did as the Minister in charge of the Electoral Department was to go ahead before the last election, in the latter part of 1967, with the preparation of a computer roll which was, in fact, a combined roll for the four Houses, showing the electors qualified to vote for the Legislative Council. He or the previous Government (I suppose we should make them all take the responsibility for it) went ahead with a combined roll without consulting the Commonwealth, without getting its assent to the preparation of that roll, and contrary to the provisions of the arrangement with the Commonwealth.

In December last the former Attorney-General wrote (and I have seen the letter) to the late Prime Minister asking for the Commonwealth to come in on that. No reply was received until March 20, after the work had been done and after we had had our elections, and the answer given by the present Prime Minister was that, while the Commonwealth's changing over to a computer roll was still under consideration, the Commonwealth preferred not to vary the arrangement, and that meant that South Australia had to bear the entire cost of the preparation of the computer roll authorized by the previous Government (and in fact used at the election) plus half the cost of the production by the Commonwealth (and this was produced in the early

months of 1968) of a roll by conventional methods, because that was our obligation under the arrangement. This was, in my view, a careless way to handle the funds of this State.

I am glad to say, however, that since we have been in office we have been negotiating with the Commonwealth, and it now looks as though we will be able to salvage a considerable sum of money from the mistake of the previous Government. The Commonwealth, because it is now seriously considering adopting the same processes as we have developed, is likely to be prepared to pay South Australia a development fee for the work we have done, and that will be about half the cost of production of the roll. I think the figure is just under \$40,000, which we hope we will get back from the Commonwealth. This will be a real saving if the deal is clinched. Therefore, in that way we will then have a roll which is common to the four Houses (Commonwealth and State) and which differentiates between Legislative Council and House of Assembly electors for our purposes. I hope that the honourable member will be satisfied with the work we have had to do, since we came into office, on this matter to save money.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): Naturally enough, I am moved to correct the complete misinformation which the Attorney-General has seen fit to give.

Mr. Corcoran: He is telling little fibs again.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is just the way he plays politics. Obviously enough, he does not bother to tell what he knows from the departmental records, and has sought to give information which completely misrepresents the situation. The history of the matter was that South Australia developed the keeping of a roll by computer system. This involves not only the printing of rolls but also the method of keeping rolls. The previous method of keeping the Legislative Council roll was hopelessly ineffective, as every member must know. At every election we had streams of complaints (numbers of them came from the Attorney himself) about the inaccuracies of the roll and the fact that voters had not been able to get a vote. We developed a system. The Attorney-General says we did not consult the Commonwealth Government about it, but the Commonwealth was fully informed of the development of this system from the very outset, before we even undertook any computer course of any kind. It sent its officers to South Australia to watch the trial runs of our computer system.

We negotiated with the Commonwealth from the outset to try to get an alteration in the arrangement so that we would be able to proceed with a much more efficient method both of keeping and printing the roll because, under the computer system, the roll can be printed at short notice without the enormous amount of trouble and the keeping of type, which was extremely expensive and which was otherwise necessary under the old method of keeping and printing the roll.

In addition, the computer roll provides numbers of savings. For instance, regarding another section of his department, the Attorney-General must know full well that previously the cost of preparing jury lists in South Australia was considerable because every year we had to put on extra staff to prepare them. Now, we use a series of random numbers, which we feed into the computer, choosing the jury list without anything approaching the original cost of doing so. We approached the Commonwealth before we ran our rolls, asking it for its agreement to pay towards the roll which we prepared and which was a roll within the terms of the agreement we had with the Commonwealth. The only thing on the roll that was different were the letters "L.C." alongside some of the voters' names. We did not get a reply from the Commonwealth—it did not say "No" or "Yes". In my view, we were not liable to the Commonwealth for its insistence upon our paying part of the cost of a roll for the Commonwealth, when it had refused to come to the party with our roll.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Your view wasn't the only one that counted, was it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: True, we got information from some public servants at the Commonwealth level that we were not getting co-operation from the Commonwealth because of the colour of our Government.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Nonsense.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not nonsense: it is perfectly true. Indeed, this is the reason why we could not get any satisfactory answer from the Commonwealth about getting one enrolment form, which would have saved a great deal of money and about which there was no difficulty whatever in the design of the form or in administration. I am pleased that the Attorney-General has now been able to get the Commonwealth to adopt a more reasonable attitude. However, it is completely false to suggest that the Commonwealth was not fully apprised of what

was being done, or that this was a great expense to the State and there were no comparable savings in other areas, or that what had been done was done carelessly and without consideration of the arrangement with the Commonwealth.

Mr. HUDSON: The Attorney-General did not answer my question, which related to the possible saving by his department should a common roll apply for all House of Assembly and Legislative Council elections, so that the ordinary roll maintained in the Commonwealth electoral offices, regardless of how it was printed, would apply for all State elections and the one enrolment card used for enrolment for the House of Assembly, the Senate and House of Representatives would be used automatically also for Legislative Council enrolment. We are entitled to know what saving could be made by this change in administration and by legislation enabling a common House of Assembly and Legislative Council roll to be kept. Such a roll, and the administrative procedures adopted, would be dealt with in the various Commonwealth divisional returning offices. This would enable the State Electoral Department to eliminate the work that it now does regarding the handling of cards that people fill in specifically to enrol for the Legislative Council. Can the Attorney-General give information about the saving and, if he cannot do so now, will he obtain the information and give it to Parliament? Apart from anything else, the State's finances are in a sufficiently serious position to warrant that information being made known. It may also enable the Premier to strengthen his case in his dealings with the Legislative Council.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: At first I thought the prettily-coloured computer-prepared electoral rolls issued during the term of office of the Labor Government were a good idea. However, when I knew the cost of this publication, I thought the idea was poor and I longed for the old 20 cent electoral roll. I ask the Attorney-General whether in future we will be required to pay two dollars for the very fine electoral roll of the type we had for the previous Government or whether we will have a cheaper type of roll that can be used for general distribution.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I cannot give the member for Light a precise answer at present about the probable cost of electoral rolls, but I shall get the information for him. I cannot give the member for

Glenelg a precise answer, because I do not have the information dissecting the cost of keeping the Legislative Council roll, as distinct from the general upkeep of the rolls, before me. I do not think it would be possible to get that. The Electoral Department is now doing as it has always done in the maintenance of the Legislative Council enrolments, that is, it is following up through the information given by the Lands Titles Office, those who acquire properties.

Mr. Hudson: Putting the old bias back again.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Neither the previous Government nor the present Government has given it any instructions to do other than this. I have ascertained that. The only instructions given by the previous Government were for the campaign, the cost of which appears in these Estimates. Thereafter, the Electoral Department went back to its old practices, and these have continued. In answer to the Leader's outburst against me regarding the cost of the computer roll and the request for the sharing of the cost by the Commonwealth Government, he must have forgotten about the letter of March 20 written to him by the Prime Minister.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I haven't forgotten about it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Perhaps other honourable members should have the opportunity of evaluating its contents. The letter is as follows:

I refer to your letter dated December 14, 1967, asking that an arrangement be made to indicate in the print of electoral rolls, by a suitable mark beside the electors concerned, that they are enrolled in addition to Commonwealth and House of Assembly rolls, as electors for Legislative Council purposes. From your letter, it has been assumed that you have in mind a single joint Commonwealth and House of Assembly and Legislative Council roll, designated as such and maintained and produced for Commonwealth and all State purposes. While my Government agrees in principle to such an arrangement, I am advised that such a change would necessitate a variation to the Joint Rolls Arrangement and possibly some amending legislation.

I am informed that the change proposed by you would be practical only where rolls are produced from a computer printout. Currently your State Electoral Department is maintaining enrolment particulars on magnetic tape from which it would be possible to print rolls in a form suitable for use at Commonwealth and State elections. Commonwealth authorities are interested in the possibility of the maintenance, alteration and

revision of electoral rolls and the printing thereof by computer-litho processes, and Commonwealth Officers are currently investigating this possibility in relation to all States. Amongst other things, Commonwealth officers are looking at the question of costs, time required for the production of rolls, facilities available, standardization in format and the size of rolls. As rolls produced from computer-litho processes would differ in substance from those envisaged under the arrangement between the Governor-General and the Commonwealth and the Governor of South Australia, you may be assured that no alteration will be made in format or style without consultation with, and concurrence by, your Government.

The following is the significant sentence, in view of the disclaimer by the Leader a few minutes ago:

In the circumstances, it would seem preferable not to make any changes in the existing arrangements until the current investigations have been finalized.

That was the letter of March 20, well after—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: So what!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: —the rolls had been produced here in South Australia at our own expense and without any agreement by the Commonwealth Government to share in the cost. When we came into office that was the position that had been reached. The Prime Minister's letter had not been answered. Admittedly, it was less than a month later that the previous Government went out of office. Since then the negotiations for assistance from the Commonwealth Government because of the work we had previously done have reached a very promising stage.

Mr. HUDSON: Will the Attorney-General ascertain from the Returning Officer for the State an estimate of the saving that would be made as a result of having a joint House of Assembly and Legislative Council roll kept by the Commonwealth, with the qualifications for enrolment for the Legislative Council identical with those for the House of Assembly? Also, would he ask the Returning Officer to estimate the saving in cost of printing cards, in processing cards and other material costs involved, and the wages cost that could be saved? I do not expect an exact figure, but we should be able to obtain an estimate of the saving to the nearest thousand dollars, and it would be information that honourable members should be entitled to have.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I cannot give a direct answer "Yes" or "No" because the honourable member asked several questions. I am prepared to discuss the matter

with Mr. Douglass to see whether it is possible to get part, at least, of the information required by the honourable member.

Mr. CASEY: The Attorney-General indicated that he would revert to the old system applying under the previous L.C.L. Government, and that people who acquired land would be notified that they were eligible for a vote for the Legislative Council. I understand that, previously, an officer from either the Electoral or the Attorney-General's Department went to the Lands Titles Office every Monday to obtain a list of people who had become property owners, and these people were notified that they were eligible to enrol on the Legislative Council roll. Can the Attorney-General say whether any person who has the qualifications shown on the enrolment card for the Legislative Council roll will be notified, in addition to property owners?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No doubt the honourable member appreciates it is difficult to track down those who are otherwise qualified for enrolment on the Legislative Council roll. The campaign conducted by the Electoral Department under the instructions of the previous Government resulted in a net increase of electors on the Legislative Council roll from about 213,000 to about 270,000. I understand that about 100,000 cards were returned, as a result of which fewer than 60,000 names were actually placed on the roll. This was an enormous undertaking and shows the difficulty of knowing who in the community, apart from landowners, are actually eligible for enrolment.

Mr. Jennings: Isn't that a good reason for abolishing the Legislative Council?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not think it is, but we shall not go into that now. I should like to correct a misunderstanding of the honourable member for Frome. Once the campaign was over, and before the present Government took office, the Electoral Office reverted to its previous practice of sending notifications to those persons whose names were gathered from the Lands Titles Office. This is the only kind of person whose qualification for enrolment can be picked up easily. It is impossible, for instance, to know who in the community is entitled to enrolment on account of war service.

Mr. Langley: Couldn't you get the information for the Keswick Barracks?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not think so. You had better ask your Leader where we could find other sources of infor-

mation for this purpose. The previous Government gave no instructions to the Electoral Office other than to revert to the previous practice. The present Government has given no other instructions.

Line passed.

Government Reporting Department, \$176,265; Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, \$9,504; Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement, \$4,390; Miscellaneous, \$179,920—passed.

PREMIER AND MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT.

Premier's Department, \$420,474—passed.

CHIEF SECRETARY AND MINISTER OF HEALTH.

State Governor's Establishment, \$29,327; Chief Secretary's Department, \$66,530; Department of the Public Actuary, \$101,796; Audit Department, \$317,976; Government Printing Department, \$972,755; Police Department, \$9,681,210; Prisons Department, \$1,859,341—passed.

Hospitals Department, \$25,022,551.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is strange that in this line, so far as I can see, there is no provision for a teaching hospital at Flinders University. During the period of the Labor Government, when plans were prepared for two new major general hospitals, members of the present Government were very fond of making pleas about the necessity for building a teaching hospital at Flinders University immediately. Great play was made publicly, both before and during the election campaign, about the necessity of having immediately a teaching hospital and of giving priority to it above all else, although the whole idea of obtaining another teaching hospital had been that of the Labor Government. However, Young Liberals turned up at my meetings and those of other Ministers, activated by the Attorney-General and other members of the Government no doubt (or so it seems from the things that have been said in this Chamber and circulated by the Liberal Party), demanding why we had not already built a teaching hospital at Flinders University and why the project was not being undertaken immediately. True, no appropriation could be made until the project had passed the Public Works Committee but, so far as I am able to ascertain, it has not yet been referred to that committee—

Mr. Jennings: It hasn't.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:—although the time table set down originally was that this was to be referred to the Public Works Committee in September of this year. That was the design forecast by the Public Buildings Department and given to us in consultation which I had in my office with Dr. Shea, Mr. Dunn, and the respective Ministers. Where is the urgency at the moment being shown by this Government regarding the development of the teaching hospital at the Flinders University? Despite the things that we were told from the Opposition benches when we were in office, we are now informed that the matter will proceed with all due speed when there has been some answer from the Universities Commission, but this was not said previously. We were told previously that it was wrong for us to have proceeded with the Modbury Hospital and that something should immediately be done at the Flinders University. Why is it not being done? Why is there not something on these Estimates concerning the preliminary works in relation to this project which could be provided for other than as a result of the report concerning the Public Works Committee? We could provide quite satisfactorily in these Estimates for certain planning in general preliminary works.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Obviously the same answer applies in the Budget debate as applied in the Loan Estimates debate. We could not provide a line for salaries for a project that was not on the Loan Estimates. If the Leader looks at page 1022 of *Hansard* he will find the answer given by the Minister of Works indicating that soon after assuming office the Minister urgently convened conferences on this matter in an endeavour to fix priorities as well as he could, according to the resources at his disposal and the priorities left by the previous Government. I think that answer still stands. Rough drawings have been made and submissions are being made to the commission.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Premier cannot get away with that one. He says "according to the priorities left by the previous Government". The priority here related to the fact that a submission would be ready for the Public Works Committee in September of this year, and the department told us it could meet that deadline.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Without delay.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There would be no trouble; the department would be able to have a submission made to the Public Works Committee in this September. That was

the priority left to the Minister by our Government. The design staff was adequate. While we were in office we had considered letting out the work for the two major general hospitals, but we were told by the Public Buildings Department that to do so would mean that it would have insufficient work for its design staff. From then on we insisted that urgent priority be given to these works, and we were told this year that the project would be ready for reference to the Public Works Committee no later than September of this year. We were not dealing with rough drawings to go to the Universities Commission. The Minister of Works knows full well what is involved at the design stage in submitting a project to the Public Works Committee, and we were told, while we were in office, that the work was well in hand. When are we to expect a submission to the Public Works Committee? We cannot be fobbed off in this case with a simple answer that the rough drawings have been sent to the Universities Commission.

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE (Minister of Works): If the Leader had followed the suggestion made by the Premier and read a little further the reply I gave on this matter in the Loan Estimates debate, he would have seen (and he would recall) that I said on that occasion that, on taking office, we looked into this whole matter of priorities and of the design work for the hospital to be built at Flinders University at the same time as we looked at the project for the Modbury Hospital. During the previous debate I said that we had had further discussions with Dr. Shea, the Director-General of Medical Services. In the meantime, Dr. Shea had come up with some rather interesting ideas, one suggestion being that some major alterations and improvements could be made in the hospital design. This is referred to in *Hansard*. The ideas of Dr. Shea, in which the Minister of Health and the architects of the Public Buildings Department concurred, were somewhat different from the original concept of the hospital, mainly in respect to the methods of treatment and not so much the number of beds.

Of course, the Leader appreciates that this involves further drawings and some rethinking. The Government desires to incorporate into this new hospital the very latest ideas and designs possible regarding medical and nursing treatment. As the cost of the project is about \$24,000,000, I for one do not want to rush blindly and heedlessly into it.

We want to make sure the very best ideas are incorporated. In the previous debate, I said we had had discussions with the university and I referred to its submissions to the Universities Commission. Of course, the findings of the commission have not yet come forward. As the Leader will realize, the date for completion of the hospital must coincide with the time we get the first students out of the university medical school; we must have the hospital ready, say, about 12 months before the first clinical students come out of the medical school. The Universities Commission has not replied on the submissions made to it by Flinders University, and this is known perfectly well by members of this place who are on the council.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: But they are working on it.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: Yes, I am coming to that. The university has made its submissions and the Public Buildings Department architects are certainly working on the project. However, as I pointed out, there has been considerable rethinking on it. The reason nothing is provided under "Salaries and wages" on this line is that the matter has not yet been referred to the Public Works Committee and has not been reported on. The last major rebuilding of hospitals in this State inquired into by the Public Works Committee was in respect of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, subsequent upon the erection of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The work on the Royal Adelaide Hospital was a major project (although it certainly did not cost \$24,000,000), and there was a protracted inquiry into it. I was a member of the committee then and the time taken would have been no less than six months.

Mr. Clark: This inquiry may take longer.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I am indebted to the Chairman of the committee for confirming my view. It would probably be incumbent on the committee not only to take evidence in this State but to go to other States, because I hope that this hospital will incorporate ideas that were not thought of when the Royal Adelaide Hospital was built. This project has not been referred to the committee and, if it were referred tomorrow, I doubt that the report would be submitted much before the end of this financial year, certainly not in time for any expenditure to be provided in the Estimates. As the honourable member knows, there is an

item in the Loan Estimates covering investigations and preparation of drawings. Further, items in the Public Buildings Department line cover the labour side, salaries, for this work. I regret that I cannot tell the Leader when this project will be referred to the committee but I assure him that it will be referred as soon as possible and that I will tell him when it is referred.

Line passed.

Department of Public Health, \$1,134,243; Department of the Public Service Board, \$470,701—passed.

Miscellaneous, \$7,504,351.

Mr. RICHES: I should like an explanation of the reductions of \$9,500 and \$10,000 in the provisions for the South Australian Institution for the Blind, Deaf and Dumb, and the Royal Institute for the Blind.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I do not know why this has happened. The requirements vary and there may be a specialist project or some other avenue of revenue that has come the way of the institution. However, I will find out for the honourable member and let him know the reason for the reductions.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I refer to the provision for the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board. This report appeared in the *Advertiser* of May 17 regarding the Chief Secretary's work to establish a new centre:

Mr. DeGaris said this week that he was making a thorough survey of the position and that he hoped to have Cabinet approve finance to be included in the Government's first Budget for a start to be made next financial year. It is understood that, if approved, the centre for alcoholics would provide the courts with an alternative to the present system of either fining drinking offenders or sending them to gaol.

Has the extra \$7,809 anything to do with this new centre?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The explanation I have includes this as part of the means by which this money will be used. The vote is for the use of the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board and advisory centre. The Minister of Works advises me that a new centre is being acquired. It appears that this vote covers at least a part of the running expenses of the centre. I will get more detailed information for the honourable member.

Mr. LAWN: I notice that a certain number of items under the heading "Miscellaneous" have been increased and that one or two have

been reduced. I draw attention to the vote for the Daughters of Charity towards the sustenance of needy people and for the Society of St. Vincent de Paul. The votes are the same as for the previous year. I raised the matter of the Daughters of Charity with the Treasurer prior to his drawing up the Budget and he promised me that this matter would be reviewed next year. The Daughters of Charity feed the poor in the city of Adelaide: they give them two meals a day. The Society of St. Vincent de Paul provides beds for homeless men who cannot get accommodation at places such as the Salvation Army, probably because none is available. The society usually gives one night's accommodation to deserving cases. I hope that next year both these organizations will be provided with an increased vote.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Regarding the line "Betting Control Board—Part cost of administration", the proposed vote is \$56,500, a decrease of \$5,512. Can the Treasurer explain this decrease and why the line is described as "part cost of administration"?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): In a number of cases, such as the one the honourable member has mentioned, various funds and grants are examined by the Auditor-General, who looks at the financial situation of the various institutions. This is not an institution, but my comment applies to a number of lines under the Chief Secretary's miscellaneous lines. Having examined the financial affairs of institutions, the Auditor-General recommends what is, in his view, an appropriate grant to make, having in mind the financial position of the organizations concerned. That explains why in many cases the grants appear to move up and down from year to year. In other words, a decrease in the amount of a line does not necessarily mean that the organization is suffering any curtailment of its activities. It possibly means that funds are held over from the previous year, but I doubt whether there would be a curtailment of the activities of the institution concerned. Representations are made to the Treasurer from year to year about increases, but in all prudence I think the Committee can accept the view that where a particular organization has available to it funds that enable it to carry on effectively and efficiently with a lesser grant than the year before (because of the nature of its activities or of the position of its financial balance sheet), it is not necessary or desirable that the grant

should be increased or even maintained at its present level merely to preserve a cash surplus for that organization. I have examined several applications for assistance, seen the Auditor-General's report, and considered the matters concerned. I cannot say whether these circumstances apply in this matter, but I make this general comment concerning several grants made under this line.

Mr. HUDSON: I am concerned about the number of places for medical cadetships at the university. The need for these cadetships arises because of the shortage of doctors, and for more than five years a quota has been placed on the number of admissions into the medical school at the University of Adelaide. Most members hoped that there would be a second medical school started at the Flinders University in conjunction with the establishment of a teaching hospital for the south-western districts. However, this matter seems to have gone overboard, because I understand from what I have heard from the medical faculty at the University of Adelaide that the faculty has been asked to indicate what arrangements would be required to provide for an additional 30 places under the medical quota.

This is a serious matter, because it means that, at present without any public discussion, the Australian Universities Commission is making arrangements that will influence substantially the future course of development of medical education in South Australia. The implication of the discussions going on at present are, first, that the commission will not be recommending support for the establishment of a medical school at the Flinders University and, therefore, there will be no support from the commission for the establishment of a teaching hospital on a site within the Flinders University grounds as part of the hospital for the south-western districts. This action raises doubts about a south-western district hospital being established on the Flinders University site, and also—

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: What's this got to do with medical cadetships?

The CHAIRMAN: I want the honourable member to adhere to the item relating to medical cadetships. He can make passing reference to other matters.

Mr. HUDSON: This is what I am attempting to do, Mr. Chairman. I think it would be a tragedy if decisions were taken by the Australian Universities Commission at this stage without full and adequate public discussion, especially if those decisions prevented

the future establishment of a teaching hospital associated with the medical school at Flinders University. We must be fully informed about the present discussions on this matter.

Mr. Nankivell: It's all by telephone at present.

Mr. HUDSON: This is what I can gather. If a decision is taken at this stage to provide for an increased quota for medical students admitted to the Adelaide University, it will prejudice the establishment of a teaching hospital in the south-western district. Everyone knows that it is not possible to convert any of the hospitals mentioned in connection with this line into a teaching hospital, because such a hospital must have a certain minimum size and facilities for bacteriological, pathological and other work. Any hospital not planned from the beginning with these facilities in mind will not, in fact, make an effective teaching hospital because difficulties always arise in respect of using it as a teaching hospital. Such difficulties arose in connection with the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and also, over the years, in connection with the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Such difficulties also arose in connection with the Repatriation General Hospital at Daws Road when attempts were made to use it as a teaching hospital.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will see that this line deals with living allowances and fees of medical cadets.

Mr. HUDSON: I am taking it also in relation to the Medical Board of South Australia, which has a general responsibility for overseeing the admission of graduates and the registration of doctors.

The CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member adheres to those two lines I shall allow him to continue.

Mr. HUDSON: The work of the Medical Board follows what happens in relation to the admission of students into the medical faculty and the ultimate registration of doctors.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not objecting to the honourable member's speaking on those lines.

Mr. HUDSON: If there is an increase in the number of students admitted into the medical faculty at Adelaide University now, a situation will develop over the next few years that will prevent a medical school from being established at Flinders University until possibly 1985 or 1990. If the south-western districts hospital is built prior to that time it will be unsuitable for teaching purposes unless the

Government can afford a large investment of funds. Consequently, the Universities Commission's decision in relation to Adelaide's taking extra medical graduates now may well mean that the south-western districts hospital is planned as a non-teaching hospital and that the future establishment of a medical school at Flinders University will be prejudiced as a result. I think the Government at this point of time must seriously decide whether or not it will go along with an increase in the number of admissions in the medical quota, not next year but in a few years' time (because this cannot be done immediately; it requires investment in facilities within the university and the existing medical school before such expansion can take place).

The Government will have to decide whether it will accept an increase in the quota at Adelaide in two or three years' time and, by accepting that, postpone a second medical school for 20 years or more at Flinders University and also condemn the south-western districts hospital to be a non-teaching hospital from the word "go", without adequate provision ever being made for the future grafting on of teaching facilities. It is not possible to take an ordinary hospital and convert it into a teaching hospital: the latter needs to be planned that way from the outset, and additional facilities will be required. I suggest to the Government that there is a case for saying to the commission that in the long run South Australia will gain more from having a second medical school and, if sufficient funds could not be made available in this coming triennium (1970-72) for the medical school and the teaching hospital at Flinders, it would be better to postpone it until the 1973-75 triennium rather than put up with a makeshift at the Adelaide University which prejudices the whole future development of a second medical school at the Flinders University, of the south-western districts hospital as a teaching hospital, and of medical education in South Australia.

Mr. Casey: The Australian Medical Association is definitely in favour of this.

Mr. HUDSON: This is not altogether clear, because one of the things that has happened in relation to the admission of extra medical students into the Adelaide University is that the academic members of the medical faculty at that university are painfully conscious of the inadequate facilities that they currently have. They have had a case for a considerable time for the expenditure of money at Adelaide University to provide for additional

facilities just to cater for their existing students. They are overcrowded at the present time, and they see—

The Hon. R. S. Hall: This is not on the line; you've had a fair go.

Mr. HUDSON: The Medical Board supervises the number of doctors who are registered, and the number of doctors who are registered is influenced by the admission of medical students. What has been happening at present—

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: I think the honourable member has made his point, though.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair has been tolerant of the honourable member. I think he has made his point in connection with the medical cadetships and the Medical Board.

Mr. HUDSON: I have one additional point to make which comes into the decision the Medical Board has to make.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to adhere to the line to which he has referred.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The number of doctors the Medical Board of South Australia will have to register will be determined critically by the decision made over the next few months, and I believe the academic members of the faculty at the Adelaide University, because they want an expansion of facilities, are at the moment tempted to agree to allow the increase in the quota by 30 in the hope that sufficient money will be spent not only to improve their existing facilities but also to provide for the admission of an additional 30 students. I suspect that at present, in terms of the likely allocation of funds that the Universities Commission will make, they are being deluded in their view, that the commission will make available only sufficient provision to cater for the additional 30 students and that, when the expansion building programme has taken place, the medical faculty at the university will find itself in no better position with respect to the standards of facility that apply within the faculty than it is in at present.

I am led to believe that the view among the non-academic members of the faculty is more in favour of the establishment of a second medical school and against the increase in the quota at the Adelaide University. As the whole future of medical education in South Australia is tied up in this critical recommendation the Universities Commission has to make

over the next few months, I hope some information will be given us now by the Government so that we can effectively debate and discuss the issues involved in it, because they are of the greatest consequence in the training of doctors and the general future of medical education.

Mr. BURDON: I refer to "Bethesda, Mount Gambier", which is a home that has been established in Mount Gambier by the Lutheran Church for the rehabilitation of men and women. It has been in existence for only a few months and already valuable work in this field has taken place. The Lutheran Church is to be congratulated on setting up such a home, and I join with the Church in its appreciation of the action of the Government, which has recognized that this organization is doing an important job and has provided \$1,000 towards the operation of the centre.

Mr. CASEY: I refer to "Adelaide Highland Games—appearance money for pipe bands". In the Treasurer's district there is the Tunarama Festival at which pipe bands play as they do at the Poinsettia Festival at Port Augusta and at the Peterborough Railway Carnival. Unfortunately, at these country events the local people have to pay for the pipe bands. I realize provision has been made for the appearance of pipe bands at the Adelaide Highland Games in previous years, apparently since the Highland Games were first held. I understand that the proceeds from the games go to charity. I know that most of the functions held in country districts also contribute to charitable and semi-charitable organizations. Can the Premier say why money is allocated for the appearance of pipe bands only in respect of the Adelaide Highland Games?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I cannot say how this practice originated or what was the reasoning behind it. As the honourable member said, sums have been allocated previously: \$2,000 was voted last year and the actual payments were \$4,000. This year the sum of \$2,000 is proposed. I will find out for the honourable member what is the historical situation and whether this has any relation to the Festival of Arts or to any other function.

Mrs. BYRNE: I refer to "Provision of artificial limbs for thalidomide children". Last year \$1,606 was spent. Can the Treasurer say how many children received this service in the last financial year?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have not the answer, but the amount provided is almost

similar to the amount spent last year and is \$500 above the amount voted last year. I will try to get the information.

Mr. RICHES: The capital provision for the Mentally Retarded Children's Society is reduced by \$4,000 this year, although capital expenditure is necessary at many places in the country so that this essential service can be provided. Can the Treasurer say what conditions attach to these grants whether the grants are available for country areas as well as the metropolitan area and, if they are, how application is to be made?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The provision is for subsidy on a \$2 for \$1 basis towards the cost of alterations to the junior hostel building at Mount Gambier. The Mount Gambier institution, of course, is in the country, and what I have said apparently accounts for variation in the capital grant this year. The honourable member will see that the provision for maintenance is about \$500 more than was spent last year. Recommendations on these grants are made by the Auditor-General and I think the Treasurer has agreed, as a general principle, to adopt these recommendations. I do not recall having made any arbitrary decision contrary to the Auditor-General's recommendation.

Mr. RICHES: Do you subsidize services and buildings in the country?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have just said that, on the capital side, the amount of \$6,667 is a subsidy provision for the Mount Gambier building.

Mr. HUDSON: I refer to the provision of \$5,000 as maintenance grant to the Phoenix Society and also to the item dealing with transport concessions. Some people do not take advantage of the opportunities provided in sheltered workshops, with which the Phoenix Society deals, because the costs of travel are too great having regard to the pay they receive. There is therefore a strong case on social grounds and the general needs of the community for the extension of travel concessions to the few people who are in this category. It is not a decision that would cost a significant sum, but it would make the work of the Phoenix Society and other groups in this field a great deal more worth while. They would be able within their own resources to offer a much greater incentive over and above the costs of travelling to and from work if concession fares on public transport could be provided for anyone travelling to and

from a sheltered workshop. Certain people who go to a sheltered workshop have to be taken there privately.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Some cannot go on public transport.

Mr. HUDSON: Quite. This limits the cost of such a concession. Will the Treasurer look into this question of providing concession fares to such people?

Mr. GILES: The line "Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board—Maintenance" shows an increase of \$7,809. Will the Treasurer say what is the board's method of operation and whether the increase indicates that there has been a 25 per cent increase in alcoholism and drug addiction? Has there been a general increase in the board's running costs?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: This matter has been discussed earlier. The Premier pointed out that the advisory centre is coming into operation and that the increase is probably due to the increased activity in that regard. I will try to obtain additional information for the honourable member.

Mr. HUGHES: I wish to comment on the subsidies made to hospitals under the line Medical and Health Services. The subsidy to the Kadina Community Hospital for 1967-68 was \$5,628 and to the Moonta Hospital \$2,059. Prior to March 1, 1968, the Kadina Community Hospital had been closed for some time, but the people of Kadina and of the surrounding areas considered there was a great need for a community hospital at Kadina. A public meeting was called in the Kadina Town Hall at which it was decided that the hospital should re-open. Thanks to the generosity of the service clubs, which did much voluntary work, and of the hospital auxiliary, which was still in existence, together with the assistance of the former Government, the hospital was able to re-open on March 1, 1968. I express the hospital board's appreciation and my appreciation for the assistance given the board by the former Government to enable the hospital to re-open.

I also commend the present Government for the assistance it is continuing to give to the hospital. Since March 1 the Government has subsidized this hospital for various equipment required, and I express the board's appreciation not only to the former Government but to the present Chief Secretary for the sympathetic consideration he has given in continuing to pay subsidies so that this hospital can continue to give a service to the community of Kadina and the surrounding areas.

It has been said that, without Government assistance, the hospital would not have been able to re-open because there was a substantial overdraft owing to the bank, but I can tell the Treasurer that this overdraft has been paid off and the present board is pleased with the functioning of the hospital and the good response it has received from the people in the community both by voluntary and financial support. On behalf of the board, I express appreciation to the present Government for its continuing valuable assistance to the Kadina Hospital.

Mr. HUDSON: The proposed maintenance grant to Meals on Wheels is \$18,000 and the capital grant is \$17,000, both the same as last year. I understand that the Auditor-General examines the accounts of these organizations, but it is not possible, without a detailed knowledge of the accounts, to know whether the provision supports the same amount of spending, or more spending, or less spending, during the coming year. If at the end of June, 1968, Meals on Wheels was more liquid financially than at the end of June, 1967, the same provision this year supports an increased spending by the organization during the current financial year, but if the reverse applies the same provision results in a reduction on what it was the previous year.

In considering this provision one is impressed by the good work done by these people in the community at little cost to the Government. I venture to say that, if this organization did not exist at all, the extra cost to the Government of subsidies of one sort or another to private institutions and the extra cost of public institutions would be much greater than the \$35,000 made available to Meals on Wheels.

Many elderly people in the community would have to be cared for in an institution, possibly in one directly or indirectly supported by the Government, if Meals on Wheels did not provide them with one hot meal a day. This is an important organization, and I am disappointed that in the last six years or so there has not been a rapid rate of increase in the financial provision for Meals on Wheels. I believe that the great majority of elderly people much prefer, if it is possible, to avoid going to an institution and to stay in their own homes or pensioner flats. The provision in this Budget for Meals on Wheels helps many people to do this. Therefore, it is very short-sighted, from the viewpoint of the whole community, not to assist Meals on Wheels to develop as rapidly as possible.

We must encourage the organization to establish new kitchens in as many locations as possible so that the day will soon come when 100 per cent coverage of the metropolitan area is achieved. Any money the Government invests for this purpose carries with it a very substantial return to the community, first, in terms of the welfare of the elderly people who receive the meals and, secondly, in terms of the financial return. Over the last 10 or 12 years increases in assistance to various hospitals and institutions and increases in the cost of the Government's own hospitals and institutions arising from the growing number of elderly people who must be cared for have been very sharp indeed. All members must develop a general attitude that ensures that, whichever Government is in power, Meals on Wheels develops at a rapid rate. If the Treasurer is not particularly interested in the organization itself, he should look at it from a crude financial viewpoint and from a Budget viewpoint.

Mr. VENNING: I commend the Treasurer for increasing by \$49,000 the provision for maintenance of the St. John Council for South Australia and also for the provision of \$60,000 for capital purposes. The St. John organization does excellent work throughout the State and it is increasing its activities, particularly in country areas. Much voluntary work is done for the organization. One wonders just how country people got on in days before the St. John organization was established in their areas. The people concerned are working in with country hospitals and providing an excellent service, and I am sure that all those connected with this wonderful organization appreciate the contribution made by the previous Government and the action of the present Government in augmenting the contribution to the excellent work involved.

Line passed.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL

Attorney-General's Department, \$339,271.

Mr. HUDSON: I refer to the position regarding the Parliamentary Draftsman's Branch, in which I notice a change from the \$10,468 provided last year to \$18,279 for this financial year. I presume this relates to the changeover from Dr. Wynes to Mr. Ludovici. The provision under "Senior Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman, Assistant Parliamentary Draftsmen, Legal and Clerical Staff" seems to be nothing more than the ordinary increment one would expect as a result of rising

salaries over a time. Can the Attorney-General supply any information in relation to the staffing of this particular branch? Is it fully staffed at the moment? Further, am I correct in assuming that the provision envisages much the same staff as applied last year and does not provide for any expansion?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: With regard to the item "Parliamentary Draftsman" the increase arises from the fact that Dr. Wynes, who has unfortunately retired on the grounds of invalidity, had much leave due to him, so that his retirement does not, in fact, become effective until May, 1969. Therefore, in effect, we are at the moment paying him the sum to which he is entitled, and we are also paying Mr. Ludovici's salary, he being Dr. Wynes's successor as Parliamentary Draftsman. That is the reason for the increase there. At the moment the establishment of the branch is a Parliamentary Draftsman, a Senior Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman, a Second Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman, a Third Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman, and a Legal Officer. Of those postings, the Senior Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman's position is vacant (that is the position Mr. Ludovici held before his appointment as Parliamentary Draftsman), and the Third Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman's position is vacant.

We are looking for staff, but draftsmen and those who are interested in becoming draftsmen are difficult to find, and it has not yet been possible to fill these positions, although we hope that the junior position will be filled, and we have a prospect. There are effectively at the moment only three members (Mr. Ludovici, Mr. Docherty and Mr. Hackett-Jones).

Mr. RYAN: Can the Attorney-General explain the terrific increase under "Office of Minister" in the item "Payments to dependants and officers retiring or resigning—long service and recreation leave", \$860 having actually been paid last year and \$14,783 being proposed this year? Would this be as a result of some of the circumstances he has just outlined?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It is owing to the retirement of Dr. Wynes, when that takes place in May, and also owing to the retirement of Mr. Sowden, the Registrar of Companies, who is to retire at about the same time.

Line passed.

Crown Solicitor's Department, \$259,127—passed.

Public Trustee Department, \$343,697.

Mr. HUDSON: Although I am not sure whether the information is correct because I have not seen public statements in the press, I have been informed that the Government proposes certain increased charges for work carried out by the Public Trustee; for example, in relation to the filling out of a form U for succession duties purposes, the charge has been increased from \$6.30 to \$12. Can the Attorney-General give any information about the charges made within the department and about increases proposed by the Government?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No doubt the honourable member has diligently studied the Auditor-General's Report in which he will have seen that this department is not at present breaking even. The aim is that the department should break even (not make a profit, but break even). The only way this can be done is to increase charges. My recollection is that these charges are fixed by rules of court and that they are at the moment being considered by the judges. Our aim is to increase charges only sufficiently to break even.

Mr. HUDSON: I understand that the charges proposed have already been gazetted, that they may be before the Subordinate Legislation Committee and that in one or two cases (as in the example I gave earlier) they involve increases of almost 100 per cent. If that is the case, it would seem that the increase in revenue obtained would be much more than would have been the case in any previous year for some considerable time. Therefore, can the Attorney-General say what increase in revenue is likely to accrue to the department as a result of the changes proposed and whether, in fact, it is the case that these increased fees have been gazetted and are now before the Subordinate Legislation Committee?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, there are some regulations and, if the honourable member looks at the Notice Paper, he will see them. As I said, I think there are also certain increases being considered by the judges as well. I cannot give him figures at present, but my confident recollection from the docket is that the estimate of the increased revenue is sufficient only to make the department break even. In fact, when the recommendations were first made to me and I saw they would have resulted in a small surplus, I sent them back for review, because this is not the aim of the department. However, in

view of the honourable member's question, I will get the precise figures and let him know what they are.

Mr. HUDSON: Arising out of these matters, I should also like to ask the Attorney-General whether the increased revenue is merely a recovery into the coffers of the Treasury or whether there will be any increased activity in the department as a result of the extra revenue collected. If there is no such increased activity, the additional revenue is not a return to the Attorney-General to finance his own activities but is a recovery to the Treasury and another example of charges which have been increased by the present Government without adequate publicity. Therefore, I ask the Attorney-General whether any activity now being carried out by the Public Trustee is to be expanded because of the increased revenue, or whether the position will be the same as it was last year.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The increases are made merely to meet the general and normal increases in the expenses of running the department, such as the payment of salaries. Expenses are increasing in all departments and throughout the community.

Mr. HUDSON: I take it from the Auditor-General's Report that the Public Trustee Department is not conducted as a separate accounting miracle. The Auditor-General says:

The Public Trustee is allowed a commission at rates fixed by Rules of Court under the Administration and Probate Act out of which he is required to pay the costs of administration of the estates. The receipts from commission are paid into Consolidated Revenue

In 1964 the department had an excess of receipts over payments of \$35,528. In 1965 the excess was \$84,290 and in 1966 it fell to \$31,409. In 1967 it fell to \$21,818 and in 1968 there was a deficit of \$10,622. I am surprised at the Attorney-General's statement that the effect of the intended fees will be only to raise revenue by about \$10,000, sufficient to eliminate the deficit last year, particularly because of the steep nature of the increases, the smallest change being an increase of, I think, 50 per cent.

The increase or otherwise of these fees would not affect the work carried out in the department, because payments for the department are made from Consolidated Revenue, and receipts are paid direct into that account. The only result of these increases will be to improve the Treasurer's revenue position.

Certain work of the Public Trustee is obviously designed to assist people and if the Public Trustee continues to carry out this work he would be entitled to say that for that part of the work the department ought to be subsidized.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Why should the department be subsidized?

Mr. HUDSON: In relation to certain kinds of work and the administration of certain kinds of estate.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: What sort?

Mr. HUDSON: The ones that may involve complications over a period of time, the administration costs of which are great. I am told there are private companies that are making losses in administering such estates. If this is the case, then the same could be said about the Public Trustee. It must be remembered that the Public Trustee is the poor man's probate broker. In the main, the Public Trustee handles estates that are smaller in value on average than the estates handled by trustee companies. It is the average John Citizen who goes to the Public Trustee and he will, therefore, be the one who will pay the increased fees that have been imposed by the Attorney-General, allegedly because he accepts the need specified, presumably by the Auditor-General, to balance the books of the Public Trustee Department, although in no case do I think the Auditor-General comments adversely that receipts from commissions were insufficient to cover the cost of administration: all he says is that the commission rates have remained unchanged since January 4, 1960.

In the making of wills and in the determination of how property will be left to one's successors, if one goes to the Public Trustee he is concerned to find out the wishes of the individual, but he is not particularly concerned to find a way of organizing the individual's estate so that succession duties are minimized. When making out wills and seeking advice on these matters many people go to the Public Trustee. It is the smaller individuals who do this. There are some estates, particularly in the examples quoted by the former Attorney-General when the succession duties amending legislation was last under discussion in the House, which showed clearly that the people whose estates had been administered by the Public Trustee had gained almost no advantage from the provisions of the Succession Duties Act, yet these are the people whom the Attorney-General wants to charge increased

fees. This is another example of where the Government's values are completely and utterly distorted.

The arrangements for the administration of estates and the making of wills under the auspices of the Public Trustee do not involve arrangements that result in the Under Treasurer losing one cent of succession duties that he should get. Yet, the people who use the good offices of the Public Trustee and probably pay in relation to the size of successions involved a disproportionate amount of succession duty compared with similar sized successions being processed through any private company will be charged more by the Government. This is unsatisfactory. I am not satisfied with the explanations given by the Attorney-General. I think that what has happened is that the Treasurer has said to the Ministers in Cabinet, "You have various fees under your control. Look around and see how you can scrape up a few extra thousand dollars."

No doubt instructions have been given by the Treasurer to each Minister to re-examine fees charged by each department. The position, as explained by the Attorney-General, is unsatisfactory. Examples given when the Succession Duties Act was last debated showed clearly that people whose estates had been handled in this way were, in the main, small estates with small successions involved, but they also showed that no advantage had been taken of the loopholes that existed in the Act. The Public Trustee is the little man's broker in these matters, and I suggest that the Attorney-General has not thought clearly about these fees. He is levying fees against the little man and not against those who can afford to pay them.

Mr. HUGHES: As provision for salaries for the Deputy Public Trustee, other trust officers, and clerical staff has been increased this year by \$11,733 can the Attorney-General say whether this provides for an increase in staff or is it to cover the normal increases in wages?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It covers the normal increases in wages.

Mr. HUDSON: It is most unfortunate that the Attorney-General has been secretive about fees. Will he obtain a full list of the fees charged by the Public Trustee that have not been increased? I want information not only in respect of the specific charges that have been increased but also in respect of charges that have not been increased. Since the charges

that have been increased have gone up by 50 per cent to 100 per cent and since the increased revenue will be of the order of \$10,000, which is an increase of only 2½ per cent—

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I did not say it was \$10,000. That was the figure you used.

Mr. HUDSON: But the Attorney-General did say that the increase in fees would be sufficient only to cover the deficit which, according to the Auditor-General, is \$10,600. The fees I know about have gone up from \$4 to \$8 and from \$6.30 to \$12. The only way increased charges of that order can lead to an increase in revenue of the order of only 2½ per cent is that many other charges have remained unchanged.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall get all the information possible. I have, however, some doubts whether it will satisfy the honourable member. I am not to be bound to the figure in the Auditor-General's Report, because we look to what is the estimated deficit under the present scale of charges, not only to what happened in the past.

Line passed.

Supreme Court Department, \$345,037; Local Courts Department, \$616,384; Adelaide Magistrates' Court Department, \$186,387; Registrar-General of Deeds Department, \$434,948—passed.

Miscellaneous, \$92,973.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that the word "Criminal" in the second item in this line should be struck out.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, I should be obliged if that could be done.

Mr. RYAN: Dealing with the provision of \$42,750 as a "grant to Law Society of South Australia for cost of administration in connection with legal assistance to poor persons" (the same wording as is contained in the Auditor-General's Report), I point out that whereas \$38,500 was voted last year, the allocation has been increased this year by \$4,250. In my district I recommend that many people seek the assistance of the Law Society and I know other members do the same in their districts.

Mr. McKee: They have a bit of trouble getting it, I believe.

Mr. RYAN: That is the point. In some cases my constituents tell me they are dissatisfied with the services provided for them. Can the Attorney-General say whether the total sum proposed is used for the purpose of

helping the poor? Is the allocation made on a profit and loss basis and totally used for the purpose? What are the actual terms of the payment? Does part of the sum relate to the preliminary examination of a person who requires assistance? Finally, will the Attorney-General say what proportion represents any payment that may be made to a solicitor in this respect?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am surprised to hear the criticisms of the scheme voiced by the honourable member. No scheme, of course, is perfect and I suppose this one is not either, but we in South Australia are proud of our system of legal assistance for those who cannot afford to consult a solicitor in the normal course of private life. I am sure my predecessor will bear me out when I say that.

Mr. Clark: Was this a general complaint?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It is a complaint which in my experience is not justified, except in the most exceptional cases. Members of the profession are prepared to do work for those who either cannot afford to pay anything or cannot afford to pay the normal fees, and those who are in this position need only to go to the Law Society to apply. Their applications and their means are scrutinized by a committee and, if the committee considers it is a proper case for assistance, the person concerned is assigned to a solicitor who is under an obligation (and I believe all solicitors, or most of them, in Adelaide aim to carry out this obligation) to act for that person in exactly the same way as he acts for a private client. This is certainly not remunerative work from the profession's point of view. The society asks for a considerably greater increase in its grant than we have been able to give it, much to my disappointment. In fact, \$2,250 of the increase will go to increased costs of the society itself in administering the scheme, and \$2,000 of it goes towards the costs of practitioners. After a matter is finished, the practitioner renders a bill to the society for the work done just as he would render it to a private client. That bill is then assessed by the committee of members (I think it is the same committee that did the work in the first place) and an amount is fixed for the bill on what is regarded as a proper basis (either the amount the solicitor has chosen himself or some lesser amount) and it is adjusted so that it is standard. Then that is regarded as the fee payable.

Sometimes that sum is recovered in full over a period of time by instalments from the client: it depends whether the society has given assistance on the basis of no payment or some payment. I assure the honourable member that the dividend that members of the society receive for the work they do is well under 50 per cent. It varies between civil and criminal matters, and my recollection (and I do not want to be bound by these figures) is that for criminal matters it is about 30c in \$1 and for civil matters rather less—quite a small dividend for the work done. I emphasize again that this is a system which we have evolved in South Australia over 20 or 25 years or more and which we think is satisfactory or as satisfactory as we can make it. If satisfaction is not gained in all cases, then we are sorry about it but it is through no fault on the part of the profession in trying to render a service to those who cannot afford to consult a solicitor privately.

Mr. LAWN: Over the years many people have come to me who have either not gone to the Law Society and whom I have told to go there and who have then come back and told me that the society would not assist them, or who have first been to the Law Society and been refused assistance. As the Attorney-General has said, I realize they are subject to a means test, but the people who have come to me have told me that they have not had sufficient money to brief a lawyer and that they have suffered simply because they could not do that.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you think the means test is reasonable?

Mr. LAWN: I do not know what the means test is, but to me the position is not satisfactory and certainly nothing to be proud of. I should like to see the day when we can progress to something else. The Attorney-General said that, after the committee has assessed the ability of a person to brief a solicitor, such a person is sent to a solicitor if it is satisfied assistance is justified. When the matter is concluded the solicitor sends a bill to the Law Society in the same way as he would send a bill to a private client. Then the Law Society assesses the solicitor's charges and, if it considers them proper, they have them paid.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: They do not actually pay them at that stage: the committee certifies an amount to be charged.

Mr. LAWN: Who pays the amount?

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Often it isn't paid at all.

Mr. LAWN: I thought the Attorney said that the Law Society paid 50 per cent sometimes. If a solicitor worked for client A in a private capacity, he would send the account to the client privately and the client would have to pay that account, having no redress by way of reassessment or reduction of the amount by 50 per cent; whereas if a solicitor, sponsored by the Law Society, did work for client B, the account would be sent to the Law Society, which could consider the charge. Therefore, it seems that there could be overcharging or improper charging in relation to work done privately without the society's having the right to reduce the amount.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I ask the Attorney-General what progress has been made in the negotiations with the Law Society and banks to institute a system similar to that operating in other States for the payment of interest on trust accounts into a fund that would assist the poor persons' legal assistance scheme. It had also been intended that certain other functions would be performed in connection with that fund. The suggestion that the fund comprising interest from trust accounts should provide a provident fund to meet negligence or default by solicitors did not seem to me to be particularly desirable.

I personally thought that a fund of this kind should be provided by solicitors themselves, not by interest on trust accounts, although something may be said for having some form of legal education assistance provided from such funds. There had been general discussions when I was Attorney-General, but no concrete proposals were advanced. I would have thought that by this time the matter would have proceeded further, because Queensland, Victoria and, I understand, Western Australia have a scheme operating.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: When I came to office I found that the negotiations between my predecessor and his Government on the one hand and the Law Society on the other were hung up about whether the trust funds should be deposited with one of the semi-government banks (the Savings Bank and the State Bank) or whether they should remain in the private banks with which practitioners had their trust accounts. Apparently, this matter had been argued for some time and the society was most anxious that practitioners

should not have to break their links with their own banks. We are working out a compromise that I hope will be satisfactory to the Government and the Treasurer as well as to members of the society. I am awaiting advice from the society, following discussions between its representatives and the Under Treasurer. I may say, in charity to the society, that on several occasions in the last two months or so I have asked whether the society was able to discuss detailed proposals with me and last week I was told that it was not ready to do that. However, we are proceeding as quickly as we can. We hope we have been able to resolve the point on which the matter was hung up until the middle of April last.

Mr. HUDSON: I wish to comment on the operations of the Law Society on its provision of legal assistance. In the cases that I have had referred to the Law Society where a person has qualified for legal assistance, I have little to complain about the work done by the society, although I understand that occasionally there are difficulties. The relationship between solicitor and client is occasionally a situation that can produce dissatisfaction for the client. What concerns me is the number of situations that arise where the person goes to see a member of Parliament with some legal problem because he cannot get assistance through the Law Society and because he cannot afford to take the risk of losing an action before the court.

Only the other day a person came to see me. This person had been summoned in relation to a very small debt. The person had offered to pay on a particular day, but the summons was issued the very next day through a private firm of solicitors. There had been some argument on this person's property when the discussion over the debt arose and there were various extenuating circumstances to explain how the difficulty arose. The person who was owed the money proceeded to instruct his solicitors to issue a summons for the recovery of the debt.

My constituent came to see me on receipt of the summons, which contained the debt, court fees of \$1.10, and certain solicitors' fees, so that the total of the debt was more than doubled. In view of all the circumstances, it was clear that this person had a good case to defend the summons. However, he could not afford to risk losing the case, and even if the chance of losing the case had been of the order of 20 per cent or 30 per cent, that was too big a risk for the person to take. Ultimately,

I contacted the solicitors who had issued the summons and the clerk of the court and pointed out the rather peculiar nature of the case, whereupon certain adjustments were made that left my constituent in the position of paying the court fees and the debt but not the other party's solicitors' fees.

The position this person was then in was to accept the settlement, which involved an extra cost relating to court fees, or run the risk of defending the action in court. It seems to me there are many people in the community who are continually forced to take the second best solution because they cannot afford to take the risk of losing a case before the court. Because this happens time and time again it is clear that if this position is allowed to continue it will mean that the person who is well off can afford to take an action before the court, because the risk of loss and incurring costs is a risk that he can afford while, on the other hand, the person on the low or medium income cannot afford to take this risk.

[Midnight]

Consequently, he has to accept second-best and reach a private compromise or, in some cases, he just has to accept an unsatisfactory situation. I believe that, for this reason, there is a real need for a drastic change and an easing of the means test applied by the society. It operates in such a way that a person would have to be in needy circumstances before qualifying for assistance, and a person on the lower-middle income would not qualify. Solicitors will agree that the class of person who most deserves assistance, in that he has all sorts of legitimate complaints which deserve investigation, and in some cases action before a court, often cannot afford to take the risk of incurring costs should the action fail and consequently accepts some sort of second-best solution. Some cases considered by the Law Society involve persons who qualify for assistance but who, on moral or ethical grounds, do not deserve it, whereas others who deserve assistance on those grounds do not qualify under the means test. The amount of the grant to the Law Society and the easing of the means test should be seriously considered in the future, and I share the Attorney's disappointment that this financial year he could not provide a substantial increase in the grant to the society for the specific purpose of easing the present means test.

Mr. CLARK: Can the Attorney-General say why the provision for the National Liter-

ature Board of Review is shown under his department?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: In this State the Attorney-General has the responsibility for this matter, and the sum provided is \$400. The Commonwealth Government pays 90 per cent of the cost of the National Literature Board of Review; the remaining 10 per cent is shared by the other States on a population basis, so this State pays only between 1 per cent and 2 per cent. Under the Police Offences Act the Attorney-General must give a certificate before certain prosecutions for circulating indecent matter can be made, and I have found that this is one of the less pleasant duties of my office.

Mr. RYAN: I brought to the attention of the Attorney-General genuine criticism from constituents of mine who had raised this matter with me. There are many people who, if they are genuinely dissatisfied with the services rendered, prefer to change their solicitor. This is not always as easy as one may think, and a person does not always get satisfaction by changing horses in mid-stream. Nevertheless, it is true that it can be done, because a person has freedom of choice if he can pay for it. Some people are not satisfied with the services rendered under the Law Society's scheme. Can the Attorney-General tell me what procedure a person would have to adopt if he was not satisfied with the solicitor allotted under the scheme? Would it be an appeal to the society, and would it not then be an appeal from Caesar to Caesar?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: These situations do occur, unfortunately. If someone who has been assisted through the Law Society is not satisfied with the solicitor acting for him, it is simply a matter of going back to the society and asking for a reassignment. Naturally, the society will reserve the right to inquire into the circumstances in which the request is made. If the circumstances are genuine and there are good reasons why there should be a change, there is no reason why the client should not be assigned another solicitor.

Line passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.9 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 2, at 2 p.m.