

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 19, 1970

The SPEAKER (Hon. R. E. Hurst) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: FLUORIDATION

Mr. BURDON presented a petition signed by 2,603 electors of Mount Gambier and Millicent. It stated that the residents viewed with concern and alarm the proposal to fluoridate the Blue Lake water supply, regarding this as a violation of the rights of the individual. The residents strongly opposed the treatment of the water supply for the purpose of mass medication, and prayed that the House would take appropriate action to prevent the fluoridation of this water supply.

Received and read.

QUESTIONS

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. HALL: All members will have noted the announcement in the Commonwealth Budget last evening and its implications in its general management attitude to the Australian economy for the next 12 months. I notice that the Premier has been loudly proclaiming about its effect on South Australia. One announcement in the Budget of great interest to South Australians is the statement by the Commonwealth Treasurer that the Commonwealth Government has accepted in principle the building of a new railway line from Tarcoola to Alice Springs and that a small allocation of, I think, \$230,000 is to be made for the initial planning of this rail link. As the Premier will know, this will mean the spending of tens of millions of dollars on services and goods in South Australia, and is a welcome announcement of Commonwealth expenditure to be largely increased in this State. Because of the important bearing it has on the commercial sphere of Adelaide, it brings into sharp outline the importance of building in this State, with money supplied by the Commonwealth Government, the standard gauge link between Adelaide and Port Pirie. Therefore, will the Premier reverse his present obstructive attitude to this construction and agree to the Commonwealth Government's proposals, so that not only the north-south line can be built to Alice Springs but also we will have the active construction of the Adelaide to Port Pirie standard gauge line?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government of South Australia is keenly intent on getting a standard gauge rail link from the capital of this State to the general standard gauge line. The present Commonwealth Government has seen fit to leave this the only capital on the mainland of Australia not connected to the standard gauge line. When we came into office we found that a proposal had been put by the Commonwealth Government for building a new line between the standard gauge line and Islington that would connect very little of Adelaide's industry to the standard gauge line. Under that proposal, a majority of industry would not be connected to the standard gauge and would be required to provide transshipment or bogie exchange in order to get to the standard gauge line; goods from the east would have to travel 23 miles further; and this would be at a cost to South Australia in excess of the cost, as estimated by the South Australian Railways Commissioner, of converting the existing line to standard gauge and providing connections for industry in Adelaide, almost without exception, to the standard gauge line. The only exceptions effectively within that price would be the industries at Tonsley Park and Lonsdale, which, as a matter of fact, are not intent on getting a standard gauge link at this stage, because of particular problems that they have in relation to shipping their individual products.

I found to my astonishment that the report of the South Australian Railways Commissioner on adverse effects to South Australian industry, backed up by the Industrial Development Branch, had never been submitted to the Commonwealth Government by the Leader of the Opposition, as Premier, or by his Minister of Roads and Transport. Instead, negotiations had been undertaken to accept without question the Maunsell report, the only minor question raised being the possibility of some additional provision of a link in the Elizabeth area.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: At \$2,000,000 extra cost!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. Immediately we found this we consulted with industry, which we found was appalled at the proposal that South Australia would be faced with a large sum in capital expenditure, with no better effective link for most of our industry than exists now, and with the same provision for most of our industry concerning bogie exchange or transshipment. We wrote urgently

to the Commonwealth Government asking for a re-examination of these proposals and communicating to it a proposal that, if the Commonwealth Government would provide the money at the price proposed by the Maunsell report, we would undertake to standardize the rail gauge in South Australia and be the constructing authority; that we would do it immediately; that we would connect the whole of the major parts of industry in the metropolitan area to the standard gauge line within the price proposed to the Commonwealth Government by its own consultants; and that we would be content to do this under the Commonwealth Government's supervision. Having immediately written to the Commonwealth Government to that effect, we were backed up by industry in South Australia in doing so. I shall be happy to show to the Leader of the Opposition the things that industry had to say about this matter. Since that time, I have been waiting, on this as on so much else, on the Prime Minister. I have had no reply other than a scant acknowledgement from his personal secretary. The only other thing we have heard from the Commonwealth Government is that the Minister for Shipping and Transport (Mr. Sinclair) came here to address a Party conference, not of the Party opposite.

Mr. Rodda: Don't look so hopeful.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think members opposite may have more trouble with that Party than we will have. Mr. Sinclair came to address a Country Party conference of a group which is now apparently being led by a former Speaker of this House and which is proposing to run against honourable members opposite. At that conference, the Commonwealth Minister said that it was disastrous that we should have put this matter to the Commonwealth Government at all! That was a strange way of acting courteously to the South Australian Government when we had put the matter to the Commonwealth and asked for an urgent reply and re-examination and a consultation with Commonwealth representatives about which we have heard nothing. This Government wants to get the standard gauge line built immediately, but it wants it on a basis that makes it an economic proposition for South Australian industry, which completely supports this stand by this Government.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I noticed that, in his reply, the Premier did not refer to the announcement made last night on the north-south rail link.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The Leader didn't ask a question about that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, he did.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not enter into conversation, and Ministers must keep order on the front bench.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Hear, hear, Sir. Can the Premier say whether he is willing to co-operate with the Commonwealth in constructing the link to which I have referred or whether he intends to be as obstructive over that as he is apparently being obstructive in regard to the Adelaide to Port Pirie link?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have every intention of facilitating the building of standard gauge rail links. If the Commonwealth intends now to go ahead with a standard gauge line from Tarcoola to Alice Springs, which will be a more permanent connection to the Northern Territory and some step towards the Commonwealth's obligation to provide this State with a rail link to Darwin (as the honourable member will know, that was a price of our ceding the Northern Territory to the Commonwealth), we shall be only too happy to co-operate.

Mr. Millhouse: That is a relief, anyway.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Metaphorically speaking, I am always happy to relieve the honourable member, if I can. The honourable member talks of obstruction, yet he cannot show where the obstruction lies. Does he really suggest that South Australian industry should simply tell the Commonwealth Government, "We will accept the proposition that you put to us that we should have a standard gauge rail link for which we should provide a considerable proportion of the cost and which will leave us with the same disabilities that now face the majority of South Australian industry in transshipment and bogie exchange"? Is the honourable member saying that it is obstructive for the Government of South Australia to tell the Commonwealth Government that that is not solving our problem? Does he suggest that the only thing we should be interested in, really, is a passenger standard gauge rail link?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He's strangely silent:

Mr. Millhouse: I'm only observing Standing Orders.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In that case, the honourable member is not following his normal course, because he normally does not observe Standing Orders: it is only when he is embarrassed that he does.

SPECIAL TEXTBOOKS

Mr. HOPGOOD: As I understand that some time ago the South Australian Institute of Teachers made a submission to the department about providing special textbooks for Aboriginal and migrant education, can the Minister of Education say whether any progress has been made in that matter?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: From recollection, providing special textbooks for Aborigines is a difficult problem in view of the numbers involved and the relatively high cost. Some progress has been made in regard to providing special textbooks for migrant children. I will get a detailed report for the honourable member and bring it down as soon as possible.

CHOWILLA DAM SITE

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week about whether the Chowilla dam site could be opened to tourists at a set time on certain days?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The matter of permitting limited access to the Chowilla dam site for tourists and interested members of the public has been re-examined, taking into account the necessity to preserve the rights of the landowner concerning grazing, locking of gates, etc. There is one departmental employee resident at Chowilla who is well occupied with taking readings of numerous borehole water levels, evaporimeters and other meteorological instruments, in addition to watering trees, inspecting and repairing houses at Chowilla and Paringa, cutting down weeds, etc. Consequently, it is not possible for him to be available for every-day escort duties. However, to assist in facilitating visits to the dam site, arrangements are being made for the gates to be opened at 2 p.m. on Mondays and Thursdays, commencing on Monday next, August 24, and for the caretaker to conduct visitors over the site. In addition, should any large bus parties desire to make an inspection at other times, this will be arranged, provided the Renmark tourist office makes prior contact with the caretaker by telephone at Murtho 39 in order to arrange a mutually satisfactory time.

UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE ACT

Mr. COUMBE: In view of the proposed constitutional changes at the Adelaide University, does the Minister of Education intend to introduce, this session, a Bill to amend the University of Adelaide Act?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have not considered the matter yet, as I have not been given the proposed amendment to the University of Adelaide Act. Until I receive from the Senate of the University of Adelaide full details of its recommendations for amendment of the Act, I cannot decide what recommendation to make to Cabinet on the matter. Certainly, I agree the Act needs amending. However, I think I should add that the senate hopes to meet and make a final recommendation on the Act at its annual meeting in November, and it therefore follows that no recommendation could be brought before Parliament until some time after that.

WATER STORAGES

Mr. LANGLEY: As wintry conditions have been continuing over the last week, as a result of which there has been rain in the catchment areas, and as water is of such vital importance to South Australia, will the Minister of Works say whether there have been any appreciable intakes of water into our reservoirs? Also, will he say what is the position of our water supplies at present?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Much to the disappointment of the Opposition, this is not a Dorothy Dixey, because I have not the records with me today, although I had them yesterday, and I looked at them then. I am pleased to say that the intake into our reservoirs is much better now than it was at this time last year, although the overall situation is not as favourable because the carry-over was not as good this year as it was last year. The total holdings in our reservoirs at present amount to 27,500,000,000 gallons, or about two-thirds of their total capacity of 42,000,000,000 gallons. In view of the honourable member's inquiry, I shall be happy to obtain the detailed figures for him tomorrow so that he may examine them more closely.

AGRICULTURAL ADVISER

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works received from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked recently regarding the possible appointment of an agricultural adviser to the Southern Murray Mallee?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture states that provision has been made on the sub-estimates of expenditure from the Commonwealth Extension Services Grant,

1970-71, for the appointment of an agricultural adviser for the Southern Murray Mallee area. Subject to formal approval of the estimates, steps will be taken to fill this position.

MAIL ORDER COMPANY

Mrs. BYRNE: One of my constituents has written to me, informing me that she answered an advertisement appearing in a daily newspaper that is circulated in this State offering her part-time work at home. She received from the company concerned an acknowledgment, to which was attached an application form that she was asked to complete and sign. The application form states:

I/We (full name)..... of (full address)..... hereby apply for full details and instructions on making money at home by folding pamphlets. I agree to pay—

here the company's name is mentioned—

a gratuity fee of \$2 from my first week's earnings. Enclosed herewith is my application fee of \$1 (cash/postal order/cheque or stamps) which I understand is fully refundable should my application not be approved.

Instead of completing the form, my constituent, in order to protect herself, sent a further letter to the company asking, first, whether it supplied the pamphlets and, if it did not, whether it supplied a list of contacts; secondly, whether the pamphlets were delivered and picked up; and, thirdly, if they were posted, who paid for the postage. In reply, she received her own correspondence back with the words "Procrastinated. Application not approved" written thereon. If I give him the correspondence regarding this matter, will the Attorney-General have the activities of this company investigated?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will certainly have the matter examined if the honourable member will give me the relevant information.

DULWICH INTERSECTION

Dr. TONKIN: Representations have been made to me by residents living near the intersection of Dulwich Avenue and Stuart Road, Dulwich, who say that, in spite of attention already given to the intersection by officers of the Road Traffic Board, which has resulted in the construction of traffic islands and the marking out of various lanes, accidents still occur with slightly diminished but nevertheless monotonous regularity. The person who approached me says that he is getting a little sick of going down to the corner every time he hears the noise of a collision. Will

the Minister of Roads and Transport arrange for further Road Traffic Board studies to be made at this intersection with particular regard to the need for a "stop" sign applying to north-bound traffic on Stuart Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I suggest that the honourable member send me details of this matter, together with the supporting documents he has apparently received from his constituent, and I shall be pleased to ask the Road Traffic Board for a report.

PORTRUSH ROAD INTERSECTIONS

Mr. SLATER: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of August 5 about land acquisition and traffic lights at the Payneham Road and Portrush Road intersection?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Acquisition at the intersection of Portrush and Payneham Roads is not completed and it is likely to be at least a year before finalization can be reached, as acquisition and accommodation works from the Commonwealth, a church property, and a hotel are involved. It is therefore intended to erect traffic lights on the existing road layout as an interim measure. These traffic lights, together with those at the intersection of Portrush Road and Main North-East Road should be erected in time for the official opening of the Portrush Road extension scheduled for mid-November.

Mr. Jennings: By the honourable Minister?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: By the honourable Premier.

WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. VENNING: It has been Australian Labor Party policy that, if elected, it would do something about wheat quotas. At the conference of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated on July 24, the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Tom Casey) announced that a three-man committee would be appointed to consider wheat quotas. On July 28, I asked the Premier a question about the terms of reference of this committee, but so far I have not had a reply although it is more than three weeks since I asked the question. It is most important to the industry that the Government shows its hand in this matter because as the season is progressing, these quotas will need to be allocated to growers soon. Has the Premier communicated with the industry, and has he decided what terms of reference will be given to this committee?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am sorry for any discourtesy to the honourable member, but I do not have this question listed. However, I will inquire and obtain a full reply for him.

PORT PIRIE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. McKEE: Some time ago the Minister of Education visited Port Pirie and inspected the high school. Although he agreed that a new high school was urgently needed, he said that this could not be arranged for probably two or three years. However, as he considered that the prefabricated classrooms needed painting, I ask him whether any action has been taken to have this work done.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have requested that the work be done, but I will ascertain what is the present stage of progress and tell the honourable member.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It has come to my ears that at a meeting of the Industrial Development Advisory Council about ten days ago it was announced that Mr. A. M. Ramsay (Director of Industrial Promotion) would cease to hold that position and would return to his duties at the Housing Trust, and that applications were being called by way of advertisement to fill that post. I take it from this action that considerable reorganization is to occur in the Industrial Development Branch. Can the Premier say what is the nature of that reorganization? Also, can he say whether the post of Director of Industrial Promotion has been filled and, if it has not been, when an appointment is likely to be made?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I notice that the honourable member did not suggest that I made such an announcement for the council.

Mr. Millhouse: I did not say that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is just interesting to hear. The Industrial Development Branch of the Premier's Department requires some reorganization, and there has been a proposal for this current for some time; it was current before we took office. It is desirable that a full-time Director of the Industrial Development Branch should be appointed. In the meantime, Mr. Ramsay is continuing with his work as part-time Director of Industrial Promotion. I have had discussions with him, and he entirely agrees with some reorganization that is taking place in the

short term in the Housing Trust, and he would return to the trust as full-time director.

Mr. Millhouse: What is the nature of that reorganization?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That will be reported to the House, again in due course. At this stage of the proceedings I cannot outline all the details being considered. What happened at the council meeting, about which the honourable member has evidently been informed by someone—

Mr. Millhouse: That's right.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —was that there was a discussion on the reorganization of the work of that body following the appointment of the new Chairman, who has got down to work extremely well, and I am grateful to Mr. Roscrow for the extraordinary activity and diligence that he has shown in carrying out his work. It was intended to provide a series of subcommittees of the Industrial Development Advisory Council to cover various areas of work now agreed, and specific terms of reference for the whole of the work of the council were canvassed at that meeting. During that discussion the matter of membership of the subcommittees arose, and it was pointed out that in due course the Government would be calling for applications for a full-time Director of Industrial Development—not merely Promotion, but Development. At this stage of the proceedings I cannot say exactly when that will occur. The whole matter is being considered at present, and is being discussed with the Public Service Board, with the policy secretariat, and with the council, and when we are ready to move with the reorganization an announcement will be made. But there will have to be within the next few months a considerable reorganization of the work of the branch of the council, which is now being undertaken, and the fitting in of other development work to the work of the branch. I assure the honourable member that these matters are receiving daily consideration by the Minister responsible.

POLICY SPEECHES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It has come to my attention that a notice has appeared on the door of one of the lecturers' rooms at Bedford Park Teachers College that the policy speeches of the Premier and Deputy Premier would now be available for borrowing from the assistants to the lecturer concerned. Of course, we all realize that we are not opposed—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is not permitted to comment. He may explain the question and then he must ask it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not commenting, but I point out that we are not opposed to any type of academic freedom.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is commenting.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In the light of the information I have received, will the Minister of Education see that the policy speech of the other major Party is made available in similar circumstances?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will certainly not undertake that the policy speech of the other major Party will be made available. I can no more control the willingness of the Leader of the Opposition to provide copies of his policy speech than I can control the willingness of the member for Kavel to provide copies of the Liberal and Country League policy speech. However, I have absolutely no doubt that, if the member for Kavel or the Leader of the Opposition would care to see to it that extra copies of that infamous document were prepared and sent to the appropriate person at Bedford Park Teachers College, those students involved in discussing these matters would be only too pleased to have a copy—

Mr. Jennings: To be used for an appropriate purpose!

The SPEAKER: The member for Ross Smith is out of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: —for reference. I would think that this was the kind of matter that could well be handled by the Leader. I do not even know whether a direct request has been made to the Leader or the L.C.L. office for copies of the policy speech. However, I suggest to the honourable member, through you, Mr. Speaker, that he might care to inquire further about this matter to see what has been requested of his own Party or of his Leader and to see what private arrangements could be made to satisfy the situation, rather than have the department involved in it.

NURSING

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I move:

That in the opinion of this House, a Select Committee should be appointed to inquire into all aspects of nursing in this State.

First, I should like to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the House for the indulgence shown me last Wednesday when I was absent through

illness. Since I gave notice of this motion, the Chief Secretary has announced the proposed setting up of two committees relating in some way to nursing. On August 11 it was reported in the press that a committee was being convened to receive and examine representations from medical and nursing staff, as well as from staff associations in kindred organizations, with the prime object of improving methods of communication within the administrative structure of Government hospitals. It was reported further on August 14 that there was a proposal to set up later this year a committee of inquiry into health services generally; this committee could well take from 12 to 18 months to complete its deliberations; and it was therefore intended as a completely separate committee from the working committee on communication aspects.

I believe that the Minister referred to the Government's consciousness of the recent report of the New South Wales Community Health Services, headed by Doctor K. W. Starr, which contemplates considerable changes in the co-ordination of health services in New South Wales. The Minister said that, while the proposed terms of reference of the committee on health services were still to be finalized, it was expected that it would make recommendations on the type of administrative framework required to ensure an optimum standard of health services for the State over the next two decades. He expected the committee to inquire into the training of nursing staff; the future development of Government and subsidized hospitals, including community hospitals; the nursing, paramedical and social workers' services considered desirable; and he said that he would make recommendations regarding any co-ordination of reorganization of health and hospital services.

Regarding the type of inquiry, the Minister is reported as saying that the Government was of the view that any reorganization of nursing roles could not take place in isolation from associated developments in the medical, dental and paramedical fields, and for these reasons the Government considered that the nature and scope of the inquiry into total health services was such that the inquiry should be undertaken by the type of committee outlined rather than by the appointment of a Select Committee of Parliament. Generally, I welcome the announcement of these two moves; in principle, I think that they are a good thing. I think the move regarding administration within the hospital itself

could well clear up some of the petty misunderstandings which exist at present and which make for ill-feeling and a lack of hospital spirit.

I highly commend the Government for its decision to set up a general inquiry into health services, because I think that this can do nothing but good, and I hope that it will advance the health of the South Australian people over the next 20 years, as it is planned to do. Certainly, there is a need for forward planning, and I agree that sometimes in the past there has not been sufficient forward planning. In principle, then, I support the setting up of both these committees. However, I will reserve final judgment until the constitution of the general committee is announced. Any proposed reorganization of nursing should be considered only when the standard of nursing conditions and facilities is brought up to the level of medical, paramedical and other facilities in South Australia now.

The belief that any reorganization should be considered only in relation to associated developments (and I presume this view is held by the Minister's advisers) is equating the present status and conditions of the nursing profession with those existing in other branches, and is unfounded. In this regard, the Minister (and, I suspect, the Government) is falling into the trap of thinking that nothing is wrong with nursing in 1970. Nursing is lagging behind, and many people in the community believe this. The unfortunate truth of the matter is that nursing has fallen well behind; it has become the Cinderella of the health services and, unless urgent steps are taken to bring it into parity with the other parties to the proposed committee of inquiry, such a committee will be hampered in its function; nursing will again get short shrift, and present inadequacies and inequalities will be perpetuated. In these circumstances nursing will remain one step behind. Thus, I believe that the intended inquiries will serve a useful purpose. However, another much more urgent inquiry must be undertaken now in preparation for the general inquiry into health services generally. In fact, unless we do something now to put nursing back on the plane where it belongs, by helping nurses and encouraging more girls to train as nurses, then, whatever the findings of the general committee to be set up, nurses will still be left behind.

It is not very reassuring to be told by the Director-General of Medical Services (Dr. Shea) that we will probably have enough

nurses by 1980. As we are living in the 1970's, 10 years is too long to allow any sort of critical situation in our health services to remain. I do not think anyone can deny that the problem exists. I commend to members copies of the *South Australian Nursing Journal*. I am sure that the editor of the journal will be only too happy to supply copies of the last two editions to members. I commend those editions to them, as they make good reading, admirably summing up the general feeling within the nursing profession. Of course, some people have said that these reports exaggerate the position, but I do not believe they do. The Royal Australian Nursing Federation has held two large open meetings, one at the Unley Town Hall and the other at the Apollo Stadium, both meetings being fully reported. The report of the Unley meeting states:

A letter was written by five student nurses complaining that they were giving injections without having been given adequate instruction, when they had had no knowledge of the effect of the drugs they were administering, and at times that they were working without a trained nurse in attendance because the sister in charge was supervising more than one floor.

In case anyone believes that that is an isolated occurrence, I have other letters that I have received from nurses, one of which, written by one nurse and signed by five junior nurses, states:

As a junior nurse, I would like to point out several inconsistencies of policy that I and my colleagues have found during our training so far. I have found myself in the position of senior nurse in a ward to look after 16 patients with only nine months nursing experience behind me. This is a tremendous responsibility and places great physical and mental strain on the junior nurse to say nothing of the possibly inadequate care received by the patients. In that capacity, I was administering drugs whose effect I wasn't really aware of, and taking observations, the results of which I could not analyse as a more experienced nurse has the ability to do.

As well as senior work, procedures such as dressings are forced upon a nurse before the lectures have provided adequate knowledge to cope. I was quite horrified after receiving my dressing lectures at how my method, which I had been using for several weeks in the ward, differed from the sterile technique. At times I was left with a junior nurse who had not long been out of Preliminary Training School and this made concentration on senior duties more difficult as I felt that the junior, through no fault of her own, had to be supervised in her procedures.

Occasionally only one sister would be on duty between two wards, so consequently much running up and down looking for sister to

check drugs, etc., was necessary. Night duty which has a completely different routine to day duty is thrust upon first year nurses with no previous orientation. I was occasionally senior on first year nights which once again was unfair as it was physically and mentally exhausting. The increased pressure placed on first year and all other nurses has had the inevitable result in many of them leaving because they felt they just could not cope.

I have another letter written in April this year by a relatively mature person, who has taken up her nursing training at a later stage in life than is usual, and she is an acute observer. Her letter states:

Much has been said and is being said at this time about the present nursing crisis. There is much publicity, much talk, much political shuffling, but little constructive action. Many people say there is trouble in the profession, but few know quite what some of the troubles actually consist of. In the hope that this letter may be of some assistance towards a solution, some of the aspects which have caused me personal worry over the past year or so are brought forward. Most of them are not unique, and many have been shared by other nurses at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The biggest single cause of discontent in the hospital is the continuing policy of negative reinforcements. On serious study of this angle, it was interesting to find that taken in psychological terms all the factors normally accepted in a totally authoritarian regime primarily designed to bring about attitude and behavioural change demonstrated in methods used in China over the last 10 years are actually being used daily in the Royal Adelaide Hospital by senior staff on junior nurses. It can be seen in continuous negative reinforcement at all levels of work, criticism being destructive and frequent, often without explanation. Omissions are noticed and emphasized while conscientious work is overlooked. The week to week roster system upholds the expected state of uncertainty, making any sort of planned social life almost impossible, even to such necessary matters as dental appointments.

Owing to the overwhelming work load, it is not unknown for a charge sister to be seen in tears. Nurses frequently break down and cry, partly with frustration at the physical impossibility of the daily task, partly with sadness that the rushed tempo of the daily shift allows no time for more than bare essentials in patient care, and partly because one's best is never good enough in the eyes of those supervisory staff members who can, with practice, always find a flower vase short of water or a mark on the wall of the ward. Tears, and the tension which leads up to them, are not conducive to a good working environment. This is not a pleasant aspect of hospital training, but it is a very frequent one.

There would appear at times to be active steps taken to avoid any sort of group cohesion, so necessary in any work of task-oriented group in any field. This is done by continuous moving of the staff often without warning and frequently without visible benefit. Some wards

receive extra relieving nurses when fully staffed, while others, noticeably those with young keen charge sisters, are continuously trying to carry out the laid down programme of nursing care with insufficient staff to do so. For example, in the North Wing, one end (say A) will have six patients in two separate bays, with a further four patients in the single rooms. In the mornings in one ward it was normal to have three nurses rostered in the mornings from 7 a.m. to 3.30 p.m. and two for the afternoon shift from 1.35 to 10.05 p.m. The ward under discussion now is an orthopaedic ward, most of the patients with fractures, mainly elderly. In training school it is emphasized that such patients need two nurses to sponge them all over and replace all bed linen. In fact, one nurse does her best with six patients on her own, before 10 a.m. in each of the bays, while the senior nurse copes with the four side room patients, gives out drugs, takes care of intravenous incisions, observations, the telephone, the meal lists, and queries which arise and of course help the medical staff with any procedure they may see fit to carry out during that time.

The complete lack of appeal is a factor in discontent. And the attitude taken by the Matron in the *Advertiser* when a junior nurse, correctly reporting that she felt that the stress of working in the intensive care ward without the experience and training to do so told the press, and Matron replied that this was not so, and was only a means of causing unnecessary worry to the public—as read by the public once again implied that what the nurses say about situations in the hospitals is not true. Even Parliamentary representatives have said as much, and nurses are resentful that those who would be totally amazed if they actually came and worked alongside any nursing team for a day (as were the medical students in their university vacation) are quick to imply that the nursing staff are not stating facts.

She adds much more about the shortage of staff and the blame that is placed on the nurses. She refers to difficulties that a nurse has in managing to keep up with things after a full day's work with possibly even more time involved in attending lectures. As she says, it is difficult for someone emotionally involved in the situation to try to remain objective. When she wrote this letter she was on night duty, so I think she did a remarkably fine job in writing such a detailed letter, and I thank her for it. The facilities for sick nurses during the night concern her, as does the lack of an appropriate nurses' counsellor being available for the 24 hours of the day. She states that emotional breakdown does not keep office hours and that the person chosen would be well aware of this. She continues:

There are many girls with broken homes, romance troubles, and sheer loneliness: no place where the girls can invite their boys

for a chat and a cup of coffee. Is it any wonder they take to the motor vehicle?

She then refers to well meaning but inadequately trained tutors, and continues:

The tutorial school has a vastly expensive set of lifts—for tutors only. Why are nurses, just off duty, not allowed to be tired?

She criticizes the hierarchal structure, with one-way communication and no right of appeal upwards. She refers to insufficient and unsatisfactory programming of rosters and the lack of ancillary staff. It is good to know that, since then, clerical assistance has been provided in the ward. I am sure that this will go a little way towards relieving the pressure on change nurses. The nurse also refers to injustices and accusations that are often merely a transference defence mechanism at work. She also lists:

Rigidity and out-of-date nursing methods often imposed by older sisters because they have not updated their training, and the methods taught in the training school, are new to them. Friction from this conflict between what a nurse is taught and what she is supposed to do in the ward and each ward is different. Some ward sisters seem unaware that the Royal Adelaide Hospital is a teaching hospital: very little teaching in the wards, just work.

This is hardly surprising, for the shortage of nurses is such that the training of trainee nurses is suffering deplorably because of the workload expected of the trainees. There is just no time for a charge nurse to take the time and trouble to explain to the young trainee nurse what she is doing. Finally, there is no fostering of pride in the work of the establishment. The nurse continues:

Negation of social life due to short-term, unpatterned rosters. The threat of ward reports: sometimes misused by a ward sister as a means of forcing obedience by nurses. No fostering of pride in the work or the establishment. Have a look at matron's typed instruction on the matter of uniforms, available in all wards—a nice piece of negative reinforcement. (Not, "We have a tradition and a pride in our uniform," but, "Go off duty until it is remedied, and your pay will be stopped," or words to that effect.)

I consider that a pride, a spirit, is important to a hospital, school or any other institution and I know from personal experience on the honorary staff of the Royal Adelaide Hospital that many of the persons who work there have very little pride in the institution. Among other matters discussed at the open meeting at the Unley Town Hall was a report from the ward and departmental sisters section. Mrs. Sumner, the leader of that section, quoted various matters, and the report continues:

At the present time, their efforts are being thwarted by a situation whereby wards and departments are often understaffed by at least 10 per cent to 20 per cent. This position has arisen from the lack of recruitment to our profession and by the most unsatisfactory conditions under which the nursing profession is expected to operate.

Mrs. Sumner suggested an upgrading of salaries for junior sisters, and I am pleased that this matter is being discussed and reviewed. It is an important factor in the critical position regarding nurses at present but it is not the only factor, and certainly not the entire answer. I have already dealt with ward clerks. The report also refers to the need for arrangements to be made to look after the children of married nurses so that these nurses can come back to work. Mrs. Sumner referred to the need for more refresher courses for married nurses. I think the important motion dealt with at that meeting was the following:

That the Royal Australian Nursing Federation take necessary steps to close hospital beds to all non-urgent cases when properly trained nursing staff are not available for the adequate welfare of the patient.

I cannot accept that that is a way out of the present situation. Nurses cannot refuse to treat and look after people, and doctors cannot do that, but that nurses have had to think about these things says something for the present state of affairs. In moving the motion, Sister Hagger stated:

It is important for us to define the standard that is required to maintain a satisfactory level of patient care. The New South Wales Nurses Association has stipulated that the average amount of care a nurse should give each patient is four hours over a 24-hour period, or one nurse caring for two patients during an eight-hour shift. It is essential that we adhere to the standard we define, particularly until the present shortage of nurses is overcome.

She went on to advocate the closing of hospital beds, first as a protection for the patient (who is, after all, our first concern) and also as a protection for the nurses and the hospital. She said:

The clinical observations necessary are not correctly observed due to pressure of work and the failure of the medical and trained staff to openly recognize and admit the problem, often leads the nurse to no alternative but to quietly make up the observations in her head.

I find this allegation most disturbing. I have no reason to suppose that it has not occurred, but I must say that I hope it is not a regular practice. Sister Hagger continued:

An intelligent patient, knowing his doctor's orders, may well recognize this and feel insecure, not to mention the appalling mental strain placed on the nurse.

The patient is also affected by the attitude of the nursing staff to treat him as heart case in bed 24 rather than as an individual human being, and the failure to recognize his social and mental problems can be a deterrent in returning him to health. We must insist that we have time to talk to each patient without having to feel guilty that there are "more important things to do".

The present shortage of qualified staff in some hospitals is resulting in nurses of junior rank being asked to carry out procedures for which they are neither qualified nor capable of handling. The patient is often entirely in their care. The nurse may not have reached a standard of training whereby she is able to recognize certain symptoms and draw conclusions from the observations in an effort to detect the patient's condition. She may therefore fail to report such evidence until it is too late for medical assistance.

The risk we are asking the patient to take is unforgivable and against the ethics of our profession. Would you permit the nurse to attempt the situation and run the risk if the patient was a friend or relation of yours? Of course not, and therefore we have no right to do so with anybody else's loved ones.

She covered much the same ground as I have already referred to regarding mental and physical exhaustion because of the heavy workload given to nurses in duty responsibility and unexpected seniority. She continued:

The result is leading a number of parents to protest at the effect the situation is having on their daughters and with their encouragement she not only leaves that hospital, but the profession. We must enquire more into the appalling wastage rate of nurses in our community, we must respect the nurse as an individual and protect her by closing the beds that we are unable to manage. The "public relations" image that a hospital spends years building up is quickly crushed by reports of suffering and neglect from patients, whatever the degree of severity. Most patients do not fully comprehend the significance of the shortage and simply remain critical of the standard of care. The public in time become wary of admittance at that hospital. For its own protection the hospital board must consider these facts.

I think this is extremely important, because, as I have said, there is little enough hospital spirit and pride in our hospitals, and to build this up we must keep the confidence of patients in our public hospitals. These letters and remarks are typical of many being made by nurses throughout South Australia. They have been made by nurses throughout Australia and many committees have reported, but I cannot agree that closing hospital beds is the answer. I do not really think that the speaker

who suggested this at the open meeting had this in mind as anything other than an emergency measure to deal with a critical situation. I must quote what Miss Kennedy (Superintendent of Nurses at the Royal Adelaide Hospital) has said, since we are dealing with that institution, although these conditions obtain in other institutions; she states:

Closing wards will not necessarily solve our problems. What happens if you are kept out of hospital? It is our duty to help the sick. If we undertake a service of care we should be constructive in our approach to our problem, not frightening the people. We are frightening people unnecessarily.

I tend to agree that we are frightening people, but I am not sure that we are frightening them unnecessarily. This demonstrates clearly the difficult position in which nurses find themselves in the community. One of the most vital and important parts of their function is not only to care for patients physically but also to reassure them mentally and to make them feel that they are being looked after.

By and large, members of the nursing profession will do anything at all to avoid disturbing or frightening a patient. Indeed, they will do anything they can to avoid frightening the community. They are most reluctant to frighten the community, but eventually a stage must come when these matters must come out and, at the risk of frightening the community, their duty to the community must take precedence. When the situation becomes so critical, the public must be told exactly what is happening. The fact that nurses have reached this breaking point indicates the seriousness of the present situation. Because nurses cannot conscientiously close beds or refuse to take urgent cases, and because they cannot withdraw their care of patients or refuse their services to the community in order to draw attention to their problems, they deserve special consideration. At the meeting to which I have already referred a motion was unanimously passed by the many hundreds of nurses present, asking the Government to set up a committee of inquiry into nursing in South Australia. I do not think the proposed general inquiry into health matters for the next 20 years is exactly what they had in mind or what they deserve. I am not saying that is not a good thing because I believe that in principle it is good. However, I do not think that this is what they want now: they want urgent action taken about their conditions now.

Since I gave notice that I intended to move this motion, I have received telephone calls and word-of-mouth communications from many

nurses whom I see during my daily life. I have received letters, signed singly and jointly from more than 90 nurses, and this is now a very live issue. The medical profession has been conscious for some time that a problem exists, but it has, unfortunately, been reluctant to interfere. Inevitably, it must be conscious of the problems that can arise because of the strong affinity that exists between the two professions. Without the nursing profession, the medical profession could not function. Both are directly involved with the physical and mental welfare of patients, and the nurses, even more than the doctors, are well in the front line of treatment in this work.

All members know what a nurse does: she is kept busy, and she has many functions, both simple and important, to perform. She takes temperature, pulse, respiration and blood pressure readings; and, although the subject may be embarrassing for some people, she has to weigh patients, which can indeed be an important function. She may test urine, an aspect of her duties for which she is trained and which she can perform well. In an intensive care or renal unit, the observations of the nursing staff are of great importance. I am sure the member for Torrens will appreciate exactly what I mean. I am sure, too, that His Excellency the Governor during his recent illness had an insight into some of the conditions obtaining in the intensive care unit.

Having completed their basic training, these nurses are highly trained and skilled and they deserve recognition. They administer injections and other forms of treatment. They must be responsible people, as they dress wounds, insert enemas and suppositories, re-insert catheters, regulate I.V. therapy and oxygen administration, generally observe clinical signs and report significant changes in the condition of patients. More than anything else, they must be trained to observe and report signs that may lead to some warning being given of a potentially critical situation developing in a patient. They can assist not only at operations but also in many laboratory procedures. The broader the basic training of a nurse, the more valuable she is in helping to deal with the patient as a complete entity.

The general practitioner depends not only on the nurse in his rooms but also on the visiting nurse from the District and Bush Nursing Society, from the Mothers and Babies Health Association, and the clinic sisters. Nurses also assist with domiciliary services that are being

planned as pilot studies at Murray Bridge and Port Lincoln. In short, the community could not function without adequately trained nurses.

The medical profession has fallen down in some respects in its responsibility to nursing. The teaching and training of nurses has been left much in the hands of the nursing profession, with little attempt being made by those responsible for the teaching of medical students or post-graduates to become involved, except where new special units, such as coronary care or renal units, which involve the need for special medical training for nurses, have been established. Little or no special interest has been displayed in the nurse-patient ratio. While beds are available and a few faithful, conscientious nurses are present in any situation to take over and perform the workload that has been necessary to keep things going, there has been little consideration of nursing staff morale. Matters of financial return, hours worked, facilities and amenities have been regarded as matters beyond the concern and, certainly, the involvement, of the medical profession.

Pride amongst senior members of the nursing profession has, as I have said before, usually prevented any request for moral or physical support from the medical profession or, indeed, from the public generally. In particular, the dignity and decorum of senior members of the nursing profession, with their reflections on conditions and salaries at the time they were training, tends to discourage any more junior sisters or nurses from pressing for changes.

The attitude of charge sisters and tutor sisters to some trainee nurses sometimes reflects the difference in their social life. Rosters for duty could easily be made two or more weeks in advance. The discipline and attire within many nurses' homes is not cognizant of changes in patterns of attire and behaviour, which may be considerable and not necessarily offensive, or a reflection upon all members of the nursing profession. Equal consideration between both generations of the comfort and privacy of the other group must be given so that harmony can exist and mutual respect can be maintained between them. This reticence in making public the problems that face nursing is inherent in the nursing profession because of its background. For many years, nursing was the prerogative of religious orders, and from the 12th century when the Saint Augustine nuns became the first purely nursing order, we have had absolute obedience taking precedence at all times. This tradition of discipline was

reinforced by the military nursing of Florence Nightingale's day, and this is one reason why nurses have not made public details of their problems before now. The medical profession has not taken enough interest in conditions relating to nursing. However, members of the profession are now keen to do so, and I am glad that they are. The *Australian Medical Journal* has now published three leading articles on the critical nursing situation: one in 1968, one in 1969, and one in 1970. The consultant staff in hospitals are now being forced to take an interest because of the effect that the shortage of nurses is having on their work. I have a letter from Doctor Gristwood, who is an honorary consultant aural surgeon, pointing out the difficulties that exist at present, because with the bed shortage and the boarding out of patients from other wards into his ward he finds that he is unable to conduct the operating sessions that he would like to conduct. He states:

The shortage of nurses at the Royal Adelaide Hospital has led to a situation where there has been a limitation in number of patients called in for operation from our waiting lists and also the cancellation on short notice of a number of patients who have already been sent for admission.

He points out that it is an amazing situation that, although we have first-class facilities and well trained theatre staff, the Ear, Nose and Throat Department of the hospital is dealing with fewer surgical patients each year. The number of cases that pass through the ear, nose and throat theatre is decreasing by about 100 cases each year. This situation is not only causing much frustration to the staff but is also seriously hampering the training of junior doctors and registrars in ear, nose and throat work.

At a meeting of the Australian Medical Association on July 2, concern was expressed and the A.M.A. appointed a subcommittee to examine this question. The members were Dr. P. E. Mellows (chairman), Dr. Ruth Dow, Dr. J. F. Harley (of football fame), and Dr. Roger Wurm. On July 15 the members met, after having made independent inquiries to establish whether or not a crisis or problems existed in the nursing profession with which they could help. Doctor Wurm, who has been closely associated with the welfare of the nursing profession in this State for many years, spoke at this meeting. I quote from the minutes, as follows:

In reply, Dr. Wurm said that doctors had a vested interest in the problems of nursing

and that they simply could not get on without their services. He went on to say that the articles which had been contributed to the *Nurses Journal* by himself and other writers were sufficient to exemplify that a crisis existed in the nursing profession at the present time. Among these problems was the question of recruitment and defection to better-paid positions, and that the situation applied with equal force to both private and public hospitals. In support of this, he mentioned that Dr. D. N. Robinson had some interesting comments to make about the \$500,000 burns unit lying idle at the Royal Adelaide Hospital during the last year. Drs. M. W. Sando and Michael Robinson had inside knowledge of staff problems in the recovery room and intensive care units at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Michael Hamilton had some interesting comments to make on the amenities for nurses and the liaison between ranks at the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

It is to be hoped that the Government minor committee may be able to settle some of the minor difficulties. The minutes continue:

So that the question might well be asked, "How many trainee nurses return each year as staff nurses at any of our hospitals?"

A week or so ago I asked the Attorney-General to obtain that information from the Chief Secretary, but I have not yet received a reply. The minutes continue:

Dr. Wurm went on to say that members of the nursing hierarchy who have been to the college of nursing appear anxious not to have an inquiry into nursing, as they maintained that there was no problem. If the true state of affairs was to be revealed, he doubted that many matrons would give an unbiased revelation of what was happening in their hospitals. He felt that the previous Minister of Health had never, in fact, been told how the rank and file nurses felt about the matter, as the nursing heads were out of touch with reality.

I tend to agree with him, and I see signs that the present Chief Secretary is also not being fully informed; perhaps not deliberately, but I do not think that he is in touch with the rank and file members of the nursing profession.

Mr. Hall: He is being insulated.

Dr. TONKIN: That is a good term for it, and I believe that it is the opinion of many members of the nursing profession. Dr. Wurm said further:

I am not trying to belittle any member of the nursing profession. I am conscious of the debt which we owe to them. I have been in contact with many rank and file members of their profession over the last few years and their need of outside help is very much apparent to me. If there are not significant changes before long there will be few nurses

to staff the new Modbury and Flinders hospitals which the Government is building. The same applies to community hospitals.

The subcommittee had much to discuss. Doctor Harley said that the A.M.A. could well ask the Government for a full-scale inquiry into every facet of the nursing problem, and members of the committee were unanimous in their view that what was required was a completely unbiased and unprejudiced investigation into the whole question generally.

When the President of the A.M.A. interviewed the Chief Secretary on July 29, as I understand he was to do, he was to ask whether the committee of inquiry set up by the previous Government was to continue. I asked the same question here, and received an answer on the day that I gave notice that I would move this motion. If the President received the same reply: that is, that the committee was not to function. The A.M.A. asked him to put forward a second motion, as follows:

That he be informed that the A.M.A. is of the opinion that there is an urgent need for a full-scale Parliamentary inquiry into this matter preferably by a joint Parliamentary Committee (similar to the one which investigated the abortion question).

It thus asked that the suggestion be conveyed to the Minister. I shall not deal at length with measures being taken. One proposal suggested by the Nurses Board is that on graduation junior nurses should be required to spend six months at the same hospital before their registration is made a full one. This may be a good move. At one stage medical graduates could go straight out into the community and practise after they had graduated from their six-year course. Now, it is necessary for them to spend 12 months training in hospitals, and I believe this is a good move. It may be a good move to require nurses to spend six months at a hospital after their three years' training in order to better equip them for the duties they will have to do. However, many nurses look on this proposal as a subterfuge and a way of ensuring that hospitals will have a source of junior trained staff to call on: that is not to help the nurses but is to help hospitals with their work difficulties. If that were the situation I would strongly oppose this proposal, but I do not believe that that is so.

In the long run I think this will be a good thing, but we must ensure that nurses are adequately trained and supervised before this provision is introduced. This situation high-

lights the degree of insulation I have said surrounds the Minister. I understand that it has been reported to him that most trainee nurses and junior sisters favour this idea; but I assure him that this is far from being so. I do not consider that the two committees that have been suggested will adequately solve the problems. I think that one is too local and parochial and the other, although admirable, is not what is required to bring nursing standards to a 1970 level.

I am not treating this subject as a political matter. I believe there is a need for an inquiry, and the fact that all these things have been said by nurses proves that they are worried: so worried that they have been forced to speak out. They are concerned that, if they are involved in an inquiry with senior nursing representatives on the committee, they may be victimized in some way. Once again, I doubt whether this would be the case, but that is a belief held widely by many of the nurses who are afraid of such a committee. I believe that we must prepare the ground for a general committee on health, and we must do everything in our power to decide whether or not these problems exist in the nursing profession, determining also just how bad and serious they are and what should be done about them. I think that, as members of the community, we owe this to the nursing profession; indeed, as members of Parliament, we owe this to our constituents, who, after all, will suffer if this situation exists as it has been described.

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): I second the motion. The Minister of Education and other members opposite frequently say that there is a crisis in education. Whether there is a crisis in education is debatable, although I admit there are serious inadequacies, but there is a severe crisis in regard to nursing. This crisis has been brought about largely by a severe shortage of nursing staff in our hospitals and, although this shortage is obvious in hospitals everywhere, it is particularly obvious in Government hospitals. The member for Bragg having referred to some aspects of the present situation, I should like to refer also to some of those aspects and perhaps to enlarge on them. At present at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, because of a shortage of staff, a plastic unit is not in operation, an orthopaedic ward is not being used, and one general ward not being used.

Under these conditions, additions cannot even be considered. Operations have been reduced to a single-theatre session instead of

double-theatre because of the shortage of trained staff. The finest surgeon in the world cannot perform an operation unless there are adequate numbers of highly-trained, specialist post-operative nursing staff. Indeed, there is a serious shortage in the specialist nursing field. As a result of this situation, there are waiting lists in respect of some forms of surgery involving delays of up to 12 months. This is not because of the shortage of surgeons but because of a shortage of trained nursing staff.

What is the point of building the Modbury and Flinders Hospitals in these circumstances? Can they be staffed, or will their situation be similar to that of the Royal Adelaide Hospital's, involving empty wings and wards? One of the main reasons for the present shortage of nursing staff is not concerned with salaries, although the matter of salaries has been brought forward. Although salaries are important, the main cause relates to job conditions, that is, the conditions under which the girls concerned are forced to work.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Have nurses told you that salaries are not important?

Mr. CARNIE: I did not say that salaries were not important, but that is not the only reason to be considered. Other things are equally as important as salaries. One reason for the present situation is a major shortage in junior trained staff, as a result of which there is a heavy load on sisters in charge of wards. For example, the Adelaide Children's Hospital Incorporated, which has always been a popular training hospital, was recently forced to advertise for staff. In addition, few Royal Adelaide Hospital graduates in the past 12 months have returned to that hospital either as staff nurses or as junior sisters. In hospitals everywhere trainee nurses are required to accept too much responsibility beyond the level of their training, and this applies particularly in respect of night-duty work. A trainee nurse on night duty must have trained staff within call for, if she has not, she can develop a lack of confidence in her job, and this has a significant effect on her attitude to nursing generally.

In many hospitals job satisfaction is poor, and this is a major cause of resignations. One cannot blame girls these days for not wanting to continue in these circumstances or to take on an arduous three years of training when they can do better financially, with less responsibility and with better hours, in other

fields. There is a particularly serious problem in country areas. The member for Bragg referred mostly to the city area, because that is where he is mainly concerned. I had occasion recently to attend a conference of the zone 8 hospitals area at Cleve, at which many inadequacies in country hospital training were brought forward. This related not only to hospital training but also to facilities and to a shortage of staff.

For example, there are two trained and qualified sisters at the Cleve Hospital, one of whom is the matron and both of whom are expected to maintain 24-hour supervision over the rest of the staff and to conduct the ward. The minimum number of staff that would be required to do the job adequately and to provide sufficiently for time off is five. However, these two women are expected to do 12-hour shifts. This may not involve 12 hours on duty, but it certainly involves their being on call for 12 hours and in the case of emergencies it could involve being on duty for 12 hours. Training in the country is another serious problem, which I admit will be difficult to solve, because of the lack of cases suitable for training and because of the actual number of cases to be treated. This matter is one that the committee referred to in the motion must thoroughly investigate.

Many girls do not wish to leave the country and come to the city to train; they wish to stay at least near their homes, and for this reason training hospitals must eventually be set up in selected country areas. Nurses as a group have a sincerity, responsibility, loyalty and devotion to their jobs which in the past has caused them naturally to be reluctant to air publicly anything that might damage that reputation or bring about a loss of public confidence in their profession. However, the situation has now reached the stage where nurses are being forced to speak out, and there are many fields in which conditions need to be improved. As I have said, the matter of salaries is important and in certain sections of the nursing profession salaries are certainly inadequate, but this is only one of many aspects.

Training and general conditions are equally important. For example, nurses are forced to attend lectures while they are off duty. In addition, the present standard of training provided is not recognized in certain major overseas countries, and for this reason advanced college training should be instituted. The

Chief Secretary has said that the nursing situation in South Australia is completely unsatisfactory and that there are increasing resignations and a low rate of recruitment. He said also that the Labor Party had made a number of promises regarding nursing conditions and that he would do his best to see these promises fulfilled. This is a good thing, and such action must be taken. However, I contend that the committee set up to investigate general health in South Australia, while being a good one, will not solve the present problem. This is a specialized problem that needs specialized investigation and, although the Government committee is a good one and its work must be continued, I believe that we must also have the Select Committee recommended by the member for Bragg. As the honourable member has covered fully most of the conditions that he believes should be investigated by the Select Committee and has given the reasons for establishing that committee, there is little I can add.

The Hon. L. J. KING secured the adjournment of the debate.

FORESHORE CONTROL

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. McKee:

(For wording of motion, see page 661.)

(Continued from August 12. Page 661.)

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I support the motion. I sought the adjournment of this debate last week because, as the Opposition has no representative on the Subordinate Legislation Committee, we must have a little time to examine motions of that committee that come before the House. Incidentally, I still hope that the Premier will do something about our lack of representation, as he has said that he will. He said he would discuss with another place our membership on the committee, but that statement was denied by the Chief Secretary. Later, when I asked the Premier about this, he said he hoped to arrive at an agreement with the other place. I suppose that I will have to ask him again whether agreement has been reached, whether he has made the slightest attempt to bring about that agreement or whether, in fact, he has given any thought at all to the matter since I last asked about it. Although I do not want to be uncharitable, I suspect that nothing at all has happened. In this case, the Premier should be the spokesman of this House and should see that the Opposition in this House is represented on the committee. I believe we

should look to the Premier for his assistance and that we should get it. Of course, in the past we have had plenty of reason to doubt the judgment of the member for Pirie, who is not a new Chairman of this committee, having been Chairman when the Labor Party was previously in office. On many other occasions we have questioned his judgment and, in a way, I still think our questioning was justified, so we must look at these matters closely.

Having inquired about the matter concerned on this occasion, I have found that the council set out with the worthy object of controlling dogs on beaches in its area, but it does seem to have gone a little too far in its zeal, probably because it found it difficult to draft a by-law that expressed exactly what it wanted to express. I understand that, mainly, the council wanted to increase the penalty that would apply to owners of uncontrolled dogs, that penalty being too modest. Other aspects of the by-law are not related to dogs but concern things that the council has in operation. As we know, it is not possible just to amend a by-law and tidy it up, so the matter will have to be tackled again. As I think that the council is aware of the problem and has adopted a realistic attitude towards it, I have no doubt that it will come back with a proposition that will be acceptable to the House.

Motion carried.

ROAD SAFETY

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Millhouse:

(For wording of motion, see page 661.)

(Continued from August 12. Page 664.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Last week I pointed out that the motion had three sections. I dealt with the first section, which concerns the appalling toll on the roads in South Australia. The second section concerns the appointment of a Minister of Road Safety, and the third section concerns the necessity of co-ordinating the efforts of all organizations concerned with road safety. Dealing with the first point last week, I canvassed several matters that needed attention in our road laws and practice. I referred to some of the research carried out in South Australia in the last few years, notably the investigation carried out by Messrs. Robertson and McLean and Dr. Ryan in the early 1960's.

By coincidence, since I have spoken, I have received a letter from someone who lives in the Hills, although not in my district, which

no longer includes any of the Hills areas. This man lives in a part of the Hills that was formerly in the Mitcham District and he has written two letters to me, the first of which is a covering letter and the second of which contains suggestions and observations on road traffic and safety in South Australia. Because this is so appropriate, I intend to quote from the letter to give the Minister another opinion on matters similar to those I raised last week. In the view of this person, who has written to me to reinforce my case, these matters need attention. Last Monday, I think, I received this letter, which states:

I take the liberty of writing to you and enclosing a letter for a Transport Minister. As I am not very well up in Ministers, I was not sure of whom to send it to. Living in the district, I have heard your name mentioned quite a lot (always complimentary, I may add). I know you are a busy man and I don't like bothering you, but I would like to get the aforesaid letter into somebody's hands, who would perhaps agree with some of it.

Since receiving the letter, I have spoken to this man on the telephone and obtained his assent and approval to use the contents of this letter in the debate. The letter continues:

At least I will have tried, and man can do no more. I am not trying to help a Labor Government. Having been in transport in England for 20 odd years one could scarcely support a Labor Government, but death on the road is everybody's business and it appears to me that Australia is facing a blood bath on the roads. As with all Labor Governments, their theory gets the better of them and they dream of dial-a-bus, or some such pie in the sky to solve the traffic problem. I have not much hope of my letter helping, but I repeat that I will have tried.

That is the covering letter sent to me. I shall not read the whole letter on road safety, but only the relevant parts.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The parts that suit your case?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister is at liberty to look at the whole letter if he thinks I am using only those parts that help my case. In fact, I am using only those parts that are relevant. The writer states:

My credentials: I am a migrant on my own steam. I came for a holiday, thought I would like your country, bought the above address, went back to the United Kingdom and fetched my wife out, after selling out my business. My business, haulier, I worked up from one lorry after the war to the largest livestock haulier in my neck of the woods. I served as liaison between the Road Haulage Association and the Accident Prevention Committee, amongst other pursuits. I am retired but, as I am only 45, I have been driving a

coach for some six months to keep me out of mischief and I have studied your road conditions well.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Do you say this is relevant?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, this is the man's letter. He continues:

I tell you this so that you will understand that I am not talking about something that I don't understand. I have lived and breathed haulage and driving all my life. The accident rate has so appalled me that I sat and wondered what I could do about it. All I can do is write to you and, as it is Saturday afternoon and I hate writing, it shows I am serious. I know, having read about it, that the Government is setting up a board to examine the problem deep-y—

I assume that is a reference to the Select Committee on the points demerit scheme—and it is with conviction as well as with a desire to help that I place my observations down as to the principal cause of the accident rate, as I have studied it. With the increasing population and wealth of the people it is apparent that mighty decisions are going to have to be made if the roads are not to become slaughterhouses as more and more cars come on the road. People will use their own transport no matter what is legislated or suggested. I consider that the speed limit in the city areas should be cut to 30 miles an hour; the present 35 miles an hour with the present tendency to travel at 38 to 40 is too fast; that overtaking in either lane should be abandoned and only overtaking on the right allowed; that the give way to the right rule is obsolete and causes nothing but indecision and accidents. All stop signs should be rigidly enforced with a points of merit system so that any infringement of that rule and others would entail the loss of licence after three offences in a given time. All driving tests should be more stringent; coach and bus drivers even more so. The test of driving given me to drive a coach was ludicrous. Certain main roads on the fringes of the metropolitan area could, with the removal of the give way to the right system, be designated and signed 40 miles an hour. Certain of these roads should be upgraded in speed but, of course, it can never be done until the give way rule is abolished.

At the same time a terrific campaign on television and by the other means of advertisement would have to be invoked and kept up. That is, as I see it, the only way to reach the drivers on the interstate distance roads who drive at high speed regardless of their tiredness, with the tendency to wander into the path of a semi-trailer. That is, until those roads can be reasonably policed by highway patrols or such. I have found great lack of courtesy to be a part of the Australian road scene, which is, of course, a great accident producer. Once again, only a sustained campaign for courtesy can be effective. I have only touched on the whole causes but I think I have written enough. Maybe you won't

bother to consider any of the points—I do not know you—but I saw a boy of eight lie dying in the road at North Adelaide a couple of months ago and I thought then that I would serve voluntarily on any committee or put my brain to work to try to help stop the sight of a boy lying in his own blood in the middle of the road. Sooner or later some of these suggestions I make will come to pass—they must—but whether in the near or distant future is up to the Government of the day, but they will come.

That is sufficient to show this man's background and to give his ideas. I do not necessarily support them all, but they are matters on which we should be concentrating to improve conditions on the road. I think the last paragraph of the letter relates a frightful experience which he has had and from which, thank goodness, I have been spared, and what he says shows his sincerity in the matter.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I would have thought the objective of the motion was so self-evident that even the Minister would not make an interjection like that. We consider that there should be a Minister of Road Safety, who can collate and co-ordinate the efforts of all authorities concerned with road traffic and road safety in this State, and that was our policy at the last election. It has been put to the Premier by the Leader of the Opposition, and the Premier was most non-committal about it. I know that the Minister will say (and quite properly at this juncture) that it is impossible to make an appointment of this kind, because of the limit on the size of Cabinet. I think both sides of the House agree that, now that we have more members in the House of Assembly, it will be possible to increase the size of Cabinet.

Because of the appalling road toll, because of the gravity of the situation, and because at present there is such a fragmentation of effort in this field, I consider that I am completely justified in moving this motion.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Did you feel like this last year, though?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have referred to fragmentation of effort, and let me now give the junior Minister, the Minister of Labour and Industry, who sits at the end of the bench and interjects, the benefit—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: All right, you're just getting down in the gutter, in your normal place.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I didn't think the Minister would say such a thing about his colleague.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I'm talking about you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is understandable: it is the usual sort of thing the honourable member says about me.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I said it because of the look you were getting from one of your esteemed colleagues.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me not be side-tracked by the Minister. For the benefit of members, I mention that the organizations concerned with traffic in South Australia are the Road Traffic Board, the Road Safety Council, the Transport Control Board, the Municipal Tramways Trust, the South Australian Railways, the Highways Department, the Registrar of Motor Vehicles and, as I think we could properly include, the State Planning Office and the various councils.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: All of which are under the present Minister of Road Safety.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If they are, I wish he would do a little more than he has done and take a little more interest in this matter than apparently has been taken. If there is a Minister of Road Safety, I should be pleased if he would say what he has been doing. So far as we can tell, the only proposal that the present Government has is a points demerit scheme and that is merely carrying on something which the previous Government introduced but which, because of the vote of the present Minister of Roads and Transport and his colleagues in November or December last year, could not be brought into operation.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You know why: you made a shocking mess of it!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We did not make a shocking mess of it and I am fairly sure that the present Select Committee will conclude that the proposals introduced last session by me in this place and by the former Minister of Roads and Transport in another place are sound and should be adopted. The only result of the Labor Party's obstruction will be that the points demerit scheme will commence operating eight or nine months later than it would have commenced. As far as I know, the Government has told the public of South Australia nothing else about its plans for increasing and improving road safety in this State. If the Government is not willing to do what the motion suggests should be done about this problem, which is one of the most difficult and grave problems that we in this community face, what is it going to

do? I hope I have said enough to support the motion for the appointment of a Minister of Road Safety. However, if the Minister of Roads and Transport, who seems to think that the motion has been aimed at him personally, which it has not—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It has!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It has not. If the motion is not carried, what does the Minister and the Government intend to do?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I second the motion and, without in any way wishing to start out on a controversial journey, I reiterate the comment of the member for Mitcham—that this motion is not in any way moved as an attack on the Minister of Roads and Transport. In reply, the Minister kept saying that it was, but it is not. It might be appropriate for me to say that and, if the House chooses to disbelieve what the member for Mitcham and I have said, we can do nothing more about it. There is not the slightest intention in my mind or in that of the member for Mitcham of attacking the Minister of Roads and Transport. We are merely trying to attack our appalling road toll problem. I should have thought there was nothing controversial in that. Perhaps the method of dealing with it is controversial and open to argument, but no-one on this side, any more than on the Government side, would object to there being argument about it. The Minister has been in office for only about two months, so it is hardly reasonable for him to say that this is an attack on him personally.

The report referred to by my colleague was the summary of and recommendations concerning traffic accidents in Adelaide. It was a special report (No. 1 of 1966, by Robertson, McLean and Ryan), on page 277 of which the following appears:

Our descendants will very likely marvel at our seeming indifference for so long to a casualty list which year after year has been on the scale of that of a small war, and at our own inability to agree to take any serious and concerted action about it.

That is a notably clear and accurate statement; it is the justification for this House being asked to consider further the question of road casualties. The statistics are growing worse all the time, and they worry us all (some acutely and some more vaguely). The *Current Affairs Bulletin* states that, for each 100,000 persons, the number killed in road accidents in the Federal Republic of Germany is 27.7; Australia, 27.5; Austria, 26.1; Canada,

25.2; United States of America, 23.6; France, 22.9; Switzerland, 22.4; and New Zealand, 19.4. The countries with the most mountains tend to have the lowest ratios. In any case, Australia is close to leading the statistics in this respect, for it has the second highest ratio.

As the number of vehicles has increased over the years, Australia's ratio has increased. In 1925, for each 100,000 people, the number killed in road accidents was only 12; in 1936 it was 20; in 1961 it was 25; and in 1966 it was about 28. The Senate Select Committee has worked out that in 1968 the cost of accidents was \$230,000,000 and the average cost of each casualty was \$4,000. Those terrible figures should, and do, alarm everyone. Unfortunately, accidents do not happen in such a dramatic way that they always attract attention. Accidents occur all the time and although the research team works out the casualty rate as equivalent to that of a small war it is a rate that does not actually catch the imagination, consequently, people get used to it.

When discussing traffic accidents everyone has his particular remedy and his diagnosis of the main cause of accidents. Of course, very few people deal with the subject comprehensively. We all know that there is plenty wrong but we are not prepared to get ourselves involved in these questions as far as we should. Many people say that it is a person's own fault if he becomes involved in an accident. Of course, that is not true. A certain amount of caution can be exercised and one thinks, perhaps subconsciously, that as long as one is careful one can keep out of accidents. However, a moment's study of the circumstances of accidents shows that it is not possible for everyone to keep out of accidents, no matter how vigilant he is.

The police have a lower accident rate than any other comparable group in the community, because they are professionals: it is their job to be on the road, they are fully fit and trained, and they use equipment that is in good condition. At the other extreme, some people give very little thought to traffic conditions and both they and their vehicles are not in a fit condition. It is these people who cause the accident statistics to increase so greatly and who often involve innocent people who, however observant they may be, sometimes cannot avoid being involved. In his recent report tabled in this House the Commissioner of Police said that, of the 273 people who died in road accidents in the year ended June 30, 1969, 102 (or 37 per cent) were aged

17 to 29 years, and 42 of the people who died were over 60 years of age. The balance of 129 is only about half of the total. The usual defects in drivers are given—inattention and excessive speed.

Of the total number of people killed on the roads, 103 (or 37 per cent) were killed on straight roads where there was an uninterrupted view. A total of 57 (or 21 per cent) died when their vehicles struck fixed objects, and another 32 died when their vehicles overturned or left the road without colliding with anything. The Commissioner made some urgent recommendations dealing with the taking of blood samples. Of the 26,769 accidents reported, 16,719 occurred in the suburbs, where 120 people were killed. A far lower number of accidents was reported in the country, although 147 people were killed there.

I submit that the Government should appoint a Minister of Road Safety, who would have primary responsibility for co-ordinating all efforts to increase road safety. Of all the laws we have to deal with, traffic laws are some of the most debatable. We need a man in the policy-making area of the State, a man who is able to carry through to Parliament recommendations for legislation. Everyone knows that it is not easy. I am not attacking the Minister, and no-one on this side is attacking him. He has an enormous responsibility: also, he has other responsibilities, and I think it fair to say that the road safety problem, with its large casualty lists, which has been described as being almost like a small war, deserves the primary attention of a Minister. We need a Minister who has the time to devote to publicity and to contacting road safety organizations. He has to be a political personality; we should not delegate this sort of thing to a senior public official. Many portfolios do not take up much of the Minister's time, although each portfolio has its problems.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Such as?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will not be side-tracked.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You made a statement and I am asking you to be specific.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra is on his feet.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I was almost about to congratulate the front bench for its decorum and for paying such attention to me. My hopes were high, but now they have been cast down. For 20 minutes the incredible

happened: there was not a single interjection from the front bench.

Mr. Jennings: No-one was listening.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: That would be a record for this Parliament. Members know that several of the portfolios do not require much of a Minister's time. I could list some of them, but as soon as I did there would be spirited interjections to dispute what I am saying. The question of road safety is an important one: a casualty list of 273 deaths with many more people being injured at an incredible cost needs the attention of a Minister. That is why we say that there should be a Minister whose primary responsibility is to deal with road safety. I support the motion.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC WORKS STANDING COMMITTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 5. Page 513.)

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): In supporting the Bill introduced by the member for Torrens, I compliment him on the amount of work that he has done. The honourable member was Minister of Works for about two years and every member acknowledges that he was assiduous in applying himself energetically to his task.

Mr. Millhouse: And he got results.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. My department's thinking on this matter (and mine, too) is much in line. In my short time in this office I gained the approval of Cabinet to introduce a similar Bill. I am pleased to know that this Bill is identical in every detail with the Bill that I was to introduce, and the second reading explanation is also identical. I am grateful to the honourable member for saving me the bother of introducing a similar Bill and for saving the Government's time. I know that the honourable member's intentions were good, but I do not think he would claim (nor would I if I had introduced it) much kudos for it. It is a matter of administrative difficulty, and the honourable member has been genuine in his attempt to obtain what could be called a reform in this area.

As the honourable member explained, the Bill's main purpose is to increase the figure beyond which projects have to be referred to the Public Works Committee for examination from \$200,000 to \$400,000. However, this

does not mean that any project costing under \$400,000 does not have to be referred to the committee. The Minister is competent at any time to refer any project to the committee for examination and, no doubt, this will be done from time to time. I think it was in September, 1955 that this Act was last amended to provide for a sum of \$200,000. Every member will appreciate that the value of money has depreciated since then, by, I think, about 65 per cent. It follows that the increase in the number of buildings each year from 3½ per cent some years ago to 7 per cent now requires more buildings to be considered, and this fact, together with the depreciation in the value of money, emphasizes the need to amend the sum at present provided in the Act.

Neither I nor any department under my control is critical of the Public Works Committee. It has often been said that this committee causes delay, but this is not true. The delay occurs purely and simply because the project has to be referred to the committee. After Cabinet has approved of the expenditure on a project, the department involved has to prepare not only sketch plans and other details but also the evidence that is to be presented to the Public Works Committee. It takes time to complete all the processes before the project is referred to the committee. After the committee's decision, the project is referred back to the department. Meanwhile, the detailed planning that would normally be continued by a special team has to be stopped when the project is referred to the committee. It is then difficult to gather the same team together to allow it to proceed with detailed planning when the reference is returned from the Public Works Committee.

I do not reflect in any way on the efficiency of this committee. Because the Samcon type of building has been developed, it is not now necessary to refer so many projects to the committee, as this is a standard type of construction. Some concern has been expressed that the committee has had to assist in the past by pointing out to a department that a certain site was not suitable. I hope departments recognize that they should be very careful in their selection of sites, if this has been a problem in the past. If they realize that it is competent for the Minister at any time to refer any matter to the committee they will take care to see that the right site is selected. There is the added incentive to do the right thing, because the Minister has this power if he so decides to use it. It is estimated that a

building erected in 1955 at a cost of \$200,000 would cost about \$330,000 or \$340,000 today. The increase in the number of buildings erected today is an added burden on the committee, and these delays that occur are undesirable because the very purpose of the development of the Samcon school was to hasten school construction and to get school buildings into operation quickly.

It will not mean that no primary school will be referred to the committee. Altogether, 71 projects would be referred to the committee this year but, if the amendment is carried, the number will reduce to 56. There will still be overall supervision by the committee on major projects and this will keep the committee very busy. There will be a substantial saving in costs in many respects because, as the member for Torrens will realize, a great deal of time and effort go into the preparation of sketch plans and evidence to place before the committee. This saving will still be made with projects costing below \$400,000, if this amendment is carried. I hope that members will support the Bill introduced by the member for Torrens. I thank him for introducing the Bill, and I am certain that members will see the logic behind it. I support the Bill and hope that it will have a hasty passage through the House.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): It is an unhappy coincidence that I am speaking again so soon, but I will not inflict myself on the House for very long. I fully support the Bill introduced by the member for Torrens to increase the figure in respect of projects that are subject to inquiry by the Public Works Committee. My views on committee inquiries and on committees in general are not in full accord with those of most honourable members; I have found that out as a result of previous experience. I consider that we have so many standing committee inquiries that we do not have the scope to have the special inquiries that we so often want to have. We should be prepared to have special inquiries involving members of Parliament, members of the public, and members of the Public Service. Most of our committees now consist of members of Parliament only. I speak as a result of observations I have made as a member of the Public Works Committee on different occasions (I have also been a member of other committees) and I know that the work of the committee, while useful, is in many cases trivial. All committee members should not have to be brought together

to consider the small questions they often have to decide: it is certainly unnecessary that the committee should inspect every school site.

The committee has frequently made recommendations varying the recommendations of a certain department, and, provided that the recommendations were the correct ones, its work has been justified. The committee is not always right, although no doubt it is right in most cases. I know that when I was a member of the committee it was not always right; in fact, it made recommendations at times that were not good ones. Almost the first recommendation in which I was involved was for a form of wheat loading involving pneumatic loaders, but the Government of the day ignored the recommendation and went ahead and installed a belt gallery, I think quite rightly. Looking back, I think that the idea of pneumatic wheat loaders was a bad one. This was an occasion when the committee was wrong. Nevertheless, it stands to reason that the committee is nearly always right in its recommendations. However, the recommendations that it has to make are, in many cases, trivial and could be done by one man perhaps going to interview the people concerned, such as the people in the district who are interested, or departmental officers. There is no reason for all committee members to be engaged in the same inquiry; one man could do it.

We should have fewer inquiries and allow committee members more scope to follow through their inquiries. I know that the full committee does not inspect every school site but that it usually sends a couple of its members to do this; however, it spends much time visiting sites. If the committee members had time to study their other work, they would probably do much more good for the State than doing the detailed work they are now doing. That is why I consider that the \$400,000 limit is a good one, although it might be too low: I would not have objected to making it higher, but I will not press the point. I know that the Minister of Works and the former Minister of Works (the member for Torrens) know that the committee's inquiries sometimes hold up Government works. However, that is not the committee's fault: it is caused by the fact that in the planning of a large project everything has to be brought together to the point of giving evidence before the committee with a complete or nearly complete plan, and this makes it difficult to maintain the continuity of the project.

Some buildings and other projects will not be commenced for several years, yet money

is already being provided for them by the Treasury and by the Public Building Department. They are all subject to Public Works Committee inquiry, and planning will continue until such time as the committee's inquiries have to be made. At that point, the department concerned must go along with a project that is a virtually complete one to put before the committee, and this interferes with the smooth flow of work. I do not know whether the member for Elizabeth will dispute all this.

Mr. Clark: No.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I assure him I am in no sense attacking him or the members of the Public Works Committee, for I have a great respect for them; I think they are most conscientious. Part of their conscientiousness lies in the fact that, although they do not have to work the hours they do, they do so because it is their job to investigate these projects. I want to see the number of projects reduced. I asked the member for Elizabeth today whether the inquiry into the subdivision of the old sewage farm was completed. I understand it is completed although the report has not yet been printed. All the time I was Minister of Lands, I had the problem that that subdivision was the subject of inquiry by a number of committees and many people, none of whom were completely responsible. As Minister of Lands, I was able to arrange for all the land to be brought under my control.

Mr. Coumbe: Under one title.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes, and a senior officer of the Lands Department was given the job of trying to work out the plan of subdivision. He had to try to meet the requirements of the various semi-government and Government organizations involved, of local government, and so on, and I think he did a good job. I do not know, since I have not asked, whether the committee has altered his plan or what it intends to recommend about it, but when that officer was given the job he at least took the project in hand and some progress was made. I was often asked by the member for Ross Smith, then the member for Enfield, why no progress was being made. To do him justice, he was reasonable in understanding that there was a problem.

Mr. Clark: It was a big project.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes, it was, and its size was matched by its complexity because of the various requirements of industry and semi-government organizations.

The member for Ross Smith asked me questions from time to time about what was going on, and finally we got it referred to the Public Works Committee. I think, from memory (I have not looked it up), we got it there in about November, 1969. The report has not yet reached the table of the House, but I am not accusing the committee of being dilatory. I do not doubt that it is nobody's fault in particular. However, the subdivision has not advanced, to my knowledge, for about eight months, other than there being an inquiry.

I should be interested to know, when the report appears, whether some big change has been recommended. When we say that the Public Works Committee holds up projects, we do not imply that it holds them up through its inefficiency: we mean that in the scheme of things the committee's inquiry must necessarily occupy some of the total time involved in completing a project. There should be fewer inquiries and the members of that committee should be free to do the enormous amount of work that a member of Parliament must do, including extensive reading and studying. They should not have to meet as often as they do; the fact that they do meet so often is an indication of their conscientiousness. I support this Bill, which I think everybody favours. If any member wants to increase the minimum limit now proposed, I will support him.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I support this Bill. Since I have been a member of the Public Works Committee, my impression has been that it has achieved much in respect of projects estimated to cost between \$200,000 and \$400,000. I appreciate that the committee is overloaded with work, which may be one reason why some projects are delayed. I will read a short extract from the Auditor-General's report for the year ended June 30, 1969, in respect of small jobs carried out by the Government:

Generally, because of rising standards and costs, there has been an increase in the cost of various Government projects, such as school, hospital and other Government buildings. I have previously commented that, because of the burden of debt charges, it is essential that projects should be in accordance with what the State can provide from its financial resources. In my opinion insufficient attention is being given to economy consistent with necessity in the standard sought by departments and in the planning and design, particularly where projects do not come within the scrutiny of the Public Works Standing Committee.

So, if we raised the minimum from \$200,000 to \$400,000 we would be creating a bigger area of activity where jobs were not supervised and care was not taken to ensure that reasonable economies were made. For this reason, my first thought was to oppose this Bill. If this Bill is passed in its present form, it will be up to the Government of the day to see that there is some supervising body to check these comparatively small tenders of under \$400,000. In the seven or eight reports of the Auditor-General that I have seen since being a member of Parliament, he has recommended various things that the Government of the day should do, but I can remember scarcely one thing suggested by the Auditor-General of which the Government of the day took notice. It is desirable that with these smaller projects there should be some small body to supervise expenditure and ensure that reasonable care is taken in the spending of Government money.

The unfortunate thing about these internal committees is that we, as members of Parliament, never see their reports. For instance, members representing country areas may be vitally interested in the abattoirs; there have been two or three reports of internal committees dealing with abattoirs but members do not see those reports: they merely hear on the grapevine that certain things are suggested. However, these things are not always carried out. These reports, whenever they are produced, should be made available to members so that they can know exactly what is going on. I support this Bill and strongly emphasize that the Government of the day must ensure some supervision of these smaller tenders so that financial savings may be made in the interests of the taxpayers of the State.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): I, too, briefly support the proposal of the member for Torrens. We can safely say that this is an area of costs increase that has not been legislated for over a period of time. The original limit of £100,000 (which became \$200,000 when we changed to decimal currency) has been in vogue for many years. It is doubtful whether initially it was intended that the Public Works Committee should examine projects of the nature it is presently engaged in investigating. This brings me to the point made by the member for Heysen and also by the member for Alexandra. I refer to the need for the Public Works Committee to involve itself in the tedious duties of inspecting sites for proposed minor construction work. Following

the suggestion made that this duty should not be undertaken at all by the committee, the member for Heysen suggested that it should be dealt with by an internal committee consisting presumably of officers of the Public Buildings Department and what other Government department might be involved in the project in question.

In other words, in regard to a school there would be somebody from the Lands and Buildings Section of the Education Department, together with Public Buildings Department officers.

Mr. Jennings: We have that now.

Mr. NANKIVELL: However, as the member for Ross Smith has said, we have that situation now. One of the things that I noticed most of all in the short time that I have been a member of the Public Works Committee is that in many instances insufficient care has been taken and the committee has inspected proposed site works which, although it is only a lay committee, it has immediately questioned. The committee has questioned not only the suitability of the proposed site but also the matter of whether the site has been investigated as thoroughly and the plans prepared as thoroughly as suggested in the original submissions made to the committee. I cite the case during the last 12 months of the Swan Reach Area School.

Mr. Clark: Bordertown, too.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I thank the Chairman of the Public Works Committee, the member for Elizabeth, for reminding me of that, although I had a note to refer to the Bordertown school, which is perhaps an even more interesting example of what may have happened had the committee not inspected the site. The site for the new Samcon primary school at Bordertown was actually in a natural water-course and our investigations established that the district council engineer had neither been consulted on nor knew anything of the proposed plans for this school. Although members of the local council were co-operative in this matter, they had no knowledge of what might be required of them in the way of providing adequate drainage and stormwater disposal in connection with the site. The Public Works Committee, having observed the site, immediately recommended that the buildings be resited and, after some delay concerning the work (as our recommendation meant that the site plans had to be redrawn), we now have the school building on what is accepted locally as the more logical site; indeed, it is a site which

the members of the committee and I agree is much safer than the one originally intended.

There is another classic example, which probably reflects the other way; that is, the siting of the Geranium Area School. As the member for the district, I attended with the committee at the initial inspection of the site for this school, which has now been built and functioning for some years. However, we still have not solved the drainage problems at that school. Thousands of dollars have been spent on modifying the effluent disposal pondage scheme and on providing pumps to dispose of the water, but still the situation is not satisfactory; it seems that there is still a problem of effluent seeping from one of the ponds back towards the schoolgrounds.

The Public Works Committee has not been involved in this matter subsequently but, although the existing site may have been accepted as the most suitable one, I venture to say from my local knowledge that, if the school had been resited about 100 yards away, there would not have been this problem. This matter involved a departmental decision and departmental submissions, but the investigations and inquiries undertaken by the officers concerned should have revealed this problem and the committee should have been acquainted with it. Some mistakes may be made by the Public Works Committee in regard to its inspecting sites, but not too many matters escape the committee's notice. From the knowledge gained in the short time I have been a member of the committee, I know that it has paid much attention to site planning, as a consequence of which it may well have saved the Government considerable sums of money, simply because of the attitude it adopted in regard to certain matters.

I know that we are not experts, but after a time members of the committee become fairly wise concerning the plans and schemes of various departments, and I think they are competent to judge the submissions made to them. There have been instances recently in which the committee has instituted its own inquiries into certain aspects of floor covering and acoustic tiling, because it has been concerned about the standard planning referred to in the submissions made to it. I think I have justified the work of the committee, and I notice that the Chairman of the committee is watching me carefully.

Mr. Clark: I am just interested.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Although some of the jobs undertaken by the committee have been

claimed to be tedious, I believe that there has been some benefit to this Parliament through committee members' paying attention to and taking notice of the details concerning even the smallest projects. Although I agree that some of the projects being referred to the committee may be considered to be trivial, at the same time I consider that the duties of the committee have been well and faithfully carried out. However, if the Public Works Committee is not going to have the oversight of some of the smaller projects estimated to cost less than \$400,000 (in the light of what has been said, this alteration should be accepted), I concur wholeheartedly with the member for Heysen: such projects should be considered by someone who is competent to do so and who is answerable for any reasonable mistake that may be made in carrying out some of the work that is now carried out by the Public Works Committee. I support the Bill, not only because of the volume of work that the Public Works Standing Committee is now required to do but also because of the limited time at its disposal, bearing in mind the long sittings of the House. However, I question whether it has not been a good thing that the smaller projects have until now been referred to the Public Works Committee for its consideration.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): In supporting the Bill, I wish to pay a tribute to the Public Works Committee, because it is a watchdog concerning the public purse of this State and it gives extremely valuable consideration to public works undertaken by the Government. During the short time that I was Minister of Works, I had a real appreciation of the work undertaken by the committee, and I was aware of the backlog of work waiting to be considered by it. It is this matter that the member for Torrens rightly brings forward, his Bill setting out to correct the position by increasing the cost of works not needing consideration by the committee from \$200,000 to \$400,000. In explaining the Bill, the honourable member pointed out that the increase equates 1955 values with present-day values. The cost of Samcon schools, which are of South Australian design, is less than \$400,000, so that projects involving those schools will no longer come before the committee. The point made by the member for Mallee about sites chosen for projects is a valuable point. As the Bill will preclude the committee from looking at projects the value of which will be less than \$400,000, I wonder whether a rise-and-fall clause can be included in the Bill that

will enable references to the committee of projects of a value less than \$400,000 that involve special circumstances.

Mr. Clark: That can be done now.

Mr. RODDA: I am glad to have the committee Chairman's assurance, because this is a major concern if there is some doubt about siting. The Bill allows for the escalation in costs that has taken place since it was last amended. During the short time I was Minister of Works, I saw the considerable backlog of references which caused some embarrassment to officers of the Public Building Department. While a reference waited to come before the committee, the design teams and architects who had prepared it went on with other work. I am not criticizing the committee for the delay, which was caused by the large volume of work. This short Bill seems to solve that problem. As the member for Torrens has covered the points that I could make, I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. CLARK (Elizabeth): It is a refreshing change to be able, for once, to speak on a matter that, as far as I can see, has no politics in it at all. I can remember my old friend and, I suppose, political enemy, Mr. Howard Shannon, while he was Chairman of the committee for several years, sometimes being chided in a jocular way in this place because he had a habit of referring to the committee as "my committee". However, he was intensely interested in the committee, which involved a real part of his life; probably he obtained more satisfaction out of that job than out of any other job he had in his career.

Mr. Coumbe: Parliament was indebted to him.

Mr. CLARK: Yes, I believe the honourable gentleman did a particularly fine job. I had the opportunity to serve as a member of the committee for several years while he was Chairman, and he ran a very harmonious committee.

Mr. Jennings: A taut ship.

Mr. CLARK: Yes. I appreciate the kind references that have been made to the committee this afternoon by three former Ministers, even if one Minister did not have the opportunity of being a Minister for long. I believe that what they said was completely correct. The members for Torrens and Alexandra have had personal knowledge of the workings of the committee, having been valued members of it. I believe that the committee does a good job, its members doing valuable work.

The member for Alexandra said that sometimes the committee has to pay attention to matters which do not need much attention but which must be investigated in view of the provisions in the Act, and there is something to be said for that remark, as all investigations take time. Of course, some take much longer than others, particularly when they are long and complicated drainworks, such as the southwestern suburbs drainage scheme. Frankly, as Chairman I was happy to see the finish of that project, which had worried us over the years as the costs escalated far beyond the level that anyone expected when the project was originally mooted. This sort of thing is always a worry for a Government and for the committee concerned. In the last five years, it has been most noticeable that the cost of projects has increased greatly, and this applies to all sorts of project that come before the committee. Sometimes members of the committee are astounded at the costs of a project but, on investigation, we must resign ourselves to those costs.

Like the members for Heysen and Mallee, when I first saw the Bill I was rather inclined against it, mainly for the reasons already given this afternoon. Without reflecting on Government departments, the committee has managed to make improvements in regard to sites in some cases, and I was somewhat concerned that in future several school projects, in particular, would not come before the committee for consideration. I am not trying to insinuate that a large number of projects has been involved, but an appreciable number has. However, the Minister of Works has given me his personal assurance that even more careful checks will now be made than have been made in the past and, if that is so, I am happy to support the Bill. I realize that if the Government is concerned that a particular project needs extra investigation it will still be able to refer such a matter to the committee, even if its cost is not above the sum referred to in the Bill.

Over the years I have found much interest and personal satisfaction in working on the committee. In my experience on the committee, it has functioned as a happy family and has worked hard. Of course, if members get the opportunity, as they do occasionally, they engage in a little joviality together. My thoughts go back to some of the members that I have served with and I think of Howard Shannon, whom I have mentioned, the late Fred Walsh, and the late Hon. Frank Condon.

I could name other members whose service on the committee was of great value to the Government of the day and to the State.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): Possibly, I am the only member who does not support the Bill. Two members who have spoken today have stated why the Bill should not be supported at present. I consider that, if another authority is set up within the Public Buildings Department or elsewhere to investigate projects costing between \$200,000 and \$400,000, there will be justification for passing this Bill. However, we are being hypocritical when two members say that another body should be set up to carry out this investigation and that we should let the Bill pass before that body is established. We may have the personal assurance of the Minister of Works that proper supervision will be carried out, but I do not think any other authority will be established to carry out these investigations.

Mr. Clark: Are you thinking of a Public Accounts Committee?

Mr. EVANS: I made no comment about that. Members have used the argument that the lower limit set for projects referred to the Public Works Committee was \$200,000 and that that figure should be increased because of inflation. However, perhaps the figure of \$200,000 was too high in the first place. We all respect the Public Works Committee, which does good work in the interests of the State, but every member of the committee who has spoken has said that it has had to recommend that many errors be rectified before the particular projects went ahead. This is admitted, yet we are asked to vote on the basis of taking for granted that similar errors will not be made in future. They have happened in the past and they will happen in future. I consider that we are being two-faced. Until another authority is established within the Public Buildings Department or another department to carry out investigations on buildings costing up to \$400,000, I cannot support the Bill.

Mr. JENNINGS (Ross Smith): I shall be very brief in my remarks.

Mr. Ryan: Brevity is your second name.

Mr. JENNINGS: Brevity is the soul of wit. I have been and am a meritorious member of this committee, probably an illustrious member. As the member for Elizabeth has just left the Chamber, I can say that I should be the committee's Chairman. This afternoon

members who have had experience as Ministers or as members of the Public Works Committee have submitted the kind of argument that I can use. I do not agree with what the member for Fisher has said. Although he has a good point, as far as I can gather we are discussing a measure only from the point of view of the change in the value of money, and we have reached the stage where the Public Works Committee can scarcely continue to cope with the references made to it. The very important projects must still be referred to the committee, but the minor projects will not be referred.

Perhaps the suggestion about a departmental investigation is not satisfactory because we have been told for years that these investigations go on now, whereas we have found, perhaps by accident, that some investigations have been extremely cursory. Also, sometimes when we have been told in the past that various departments have got together and worked out details of a project, we have found on investigation that the liaison has been extremely loose and that in many cases one department did not know what the other was doing. However, that is beside the point of the general argument.

The member for Alexandra—I think that is still his district: I think the reason that kept him here was that the electoral boundaries were altered—was once a member of the committee. I am sorry to intrude this note when I was going to be nice to the honourable member. I had forgotten that for the moment. When the honourable member was Minister of Lands, I asked him many times about the future use of the Islington sewage farm. I could not understand the delay that was occurring but, when the Minister eventually took me into his confidence and explained the various difficulties to me, I understood the position. Then, when the use of the land was referred to the Public Works Committee, I was a member of the committee. The committee did not really take long to deal with the matter. However, as some land was made available to the Education Department, some to the Municipal Tramways Trust, and some to other organizations, the committee had to take evidence from each of those organizations, and that took time. I do not know where the former Minister got his information, but the report was completed and tabled in this House on June 4 last as Parliamentary Paper 74. Therefore, it did not take very

long, even though, because of the details to which I have referred, it was a long investigation.

Mr. Clark: Which project are you referring to?

Mr. JENNINGS: The Islington sewage farm.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Gawler must not interject.

Mr. JENNINGS: I did not take it as an interjection, Sir. I thought the honourable member was just kicking my shins, because I know that is one of his habits. I am sure future Ministers of Works will follow the practice of referring other matters to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, even though not bound to do so, long after the present Minister of Works retires with his family of about 25 children around him. All members will recall that the former Chairman of the Public Works Committee (the then member for Onkaparinga, Mr. Shannon) tried hard to have the gas pipeline project referred to the committee. Unfortunately, he was not doing it in the interests of the State: he was procrastinating, so that the Labor Government would not obtain the credit for introducing that legislation.

Mr. Ryan: In other words, Party politics entered into it.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, Party politics undoubtedly came into it on that occasion. At the moment the committee is completely free from Party politics. What the member for Torrens had in mind when he introduced the Bill, and what the member for Alexandra, the Minister of Works and the Chairman of the Public Works Committee said about it is correct and justified. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I thank those members who indicated their support of the Bill. I have carefully noted their criticisms of it and the points they have made about it. As I said during the second reading explanation of the Bill about a month ago, in 1955 the obligatory figure was \$200,000. If this Bill is passed, that figure will be amended to \$400,000, which equates fairly well with the 1955 figure. As a result, we shall be maintaining the *status quo*. Having served as a member of the Public Works Committee for over 10 continuous years (which is the longest period that any present member has served on it, with the possible exception of the Chairman, who must soon have been on it for the

same period) and subsequently having been Minister of Works and seeing the valuable effects of the committee's work, I thought it was about time that the amount I have referred to was amended. Had I still been Minister of Works, I would have introduced this Bill, anyway.

I thoroughly concur in the comments of the present Minister of Works in this regard. The intention of the original legislation, when it was introduced in 1927, was to deal with major public works. When I joined the committee in 1958 many types of project now considered by the committee never reached it, because their cost was less than \$200,000. This is one of the reasons why I believe that the committee's main function should be to consider major projects.

At present the committee has to consider relatively minor projects, too; Samcon primary and infants schools costing up to \$330,000 have to be considered. In recent years costs have been increasing at the rate of 3 per cent to 3½ per cent per annum, and this year the rate is 5 per cent. In one way the inclusion of these relatively small projects is defeating the original purpose of the principal Act. In connection with the reference of the member for Victoria to rise and fall provisions, I point out that the committee is available to investigate any project that the Government refers to it, irrespective of cost; however, the Government is obliged to refer only those projects that cost more than the sum mentioned in the Act, which I have moved to increase.

Mr. Clark: What about the Chowilla project? It would have been a good idea if it had gone before the committee.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member should not reply to interjections.

Mr. COUNBE: The honourable member has reminded me of an occasion when that matter was discussed in the Public Works Committee; at that time legal advice was given by the then Attorney-General (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) that the matter need not be referred to the committee. I am sure the present Minister will note the points of criticism raised in this debate. Because of the amount of work it does and the responsibility it has, I have always regarded the Public Works Committee as the senior committee of this House. It is not within my power to alter the stipends of the committee members: only a Minister of the Crown can do that. At one time the committee was regarded as a training ground

for Cabinet rank. It is interesting to look back and realize how many committee members have finished up in Cabinet.

Mr. Clark: Members from both sides.

Mr. COUNBE: Some are "Price-less".

Mr. Ryan: You cannot buy them at any price.

Mr. COUNBE: I thank members for their support for the Bill, and I commend it to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Duty to submit proposals for new public works to committee."

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Because the Islington sewage farm development was estimated to cost \$1,716,000, it was clearly a project that should have had the full attention of the committee, and it got it. It was referred to the committee on September 25, 1969, and the committee made its report on June 4, 1970. So, nine months elapsed between the referral of the project and the committee's report. This lapse of time was partly due to intervening holidays and to the many witnesses that had to be examined. That investigation is a perfect example of the type of study that the committee should be undertaking. I support the clause because it will eliminate many trivial matters that have previously been referred to the committee.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the member for Torrens say what action he believes the Government should take to see that there is sufficient supervision of contracts valued at less than \$400,000? The Auditor-General has said that, because contracts under \$200,000 are not supervised sufficiently, there is wasteful expenditure.

Mr. COUNBE: If the Government decides to go ahead with a project, it is necessary for it to see that the work is carried out efficiently and that the cost is kept within bounds. When I was Minister of Works these duties were carefully carried out by the accounts departments of the Public Buildings Department, the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Marine and Harbours Department. I cannot speak for other departments. The Auditor-General is right in referring to this matter. There is one catch: there may be a delay of 12 months between the start of the committee's investigations and the letting of a contract (for example, a contract for

extensions to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital or the Royal Adelaide Hospital). Some contracts are let several years after the Public Works Committee has issued its report. In that time, there would have been incremental costs mainly as a result of increases in costs of labour and materials. From my experience as a Minister, I am sure that the Government department concerned carefully vets this. I suggest (and I think the Minister of Works agrees with me in this regard) that this practice should continue, as it is the duty of any Government to watch this matter carefully.

Mr. McANANEY: The kind of criticism of the Auditor-General I had in mind was in the planning and design of smaller projects. The Public Works Committee now examines these, but in future it will not. There must be some supervision of all future Government schemes.

Mr. CUMBE: Supervision is, and should continue to be, given to all types of design. The Minister today undertook to see that this supervision would continue. Just because a project is minor in terms of money it does not mean that the same care must not be given to it as would be given to a larger one. The Minister also undertook to see that this care would be given by the relevant departments; particularly by the Public Buildings Department and by the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 and 6) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

OMBUDSMAN

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Evans:

(For wording of motion, see page 513)

(Continued from August 12. Page 665).

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I support the motion. Honourable members who were here (and I was not one of them) at the time will recall that when the member for Fisher (the member for Onkaparinga, as he then was) moved a similar motion in 1969, an amendment was moved by the present Minister for Roads and Transport seeking to define what was meant by the term "ombudsman", by means of substituting the expression "Parliamentary commissioner" and adding certain qualifications or refinements. The amendment was defeated, although the motion

was carried by a substantial majority of members. All members of the Labor Opposition voted in favour of the motion. The member for Fisher in moving this motion expressed himself clearly and forcibly on the function that an ombudsman could perform in this House, and expressed himself in a way that made it clear that the notion he had of an ombudsman was substantially similar to that incorporated in the amendment moved by the present Minister of Roads and Transport in 1969, namely, the concept of an official whose function it would be to act on complaints referred to him by members where other remedies had failed and with power to examine official files and documents and to report to the House about his findings on matters referred to him. That being so, and that being the meaning attached by the mover to the term ombudsman, I am pleased to support the motion.

I believe that a functionary of this kind has a useful and, indeed, important part to play in the way this Parliament manages its affairs and in giving real effectiveness to the work of members in representing their constituents. Probably it is more important and more effective for Opposition members than it is for Government members. In the nature of things, Opposition members can be at a disadvantage from which Government members, because of their relationship with Ministers involved, sometimes do not suffer. I think it is important that all members should be able not only to ask Ministers for replies to questions but also to institute an effective inquiry into an administrative decision that affects one of their constituents.

I was surprised to read in one of the daily newspapers, following my maiden speech, the observation that the Attorney-General could have said but did not say that citizens were entitled to protection against the action of the Government. This was in relation to my comments on consumer protection. If I did not refer to that topic it was because it was impossible in one speech to refer to all topics that might occupy the attention of Parliament, but I believe firmly that citizens are entitled to protection against administrative decisions, and that we have only begun to explore the remedies that should be available to citizens who are affected by these decisions.

With the gradual development of complex governmental administrative institutions, many of the most important decisions affecting the rights of citizens are made at an administrative

level, and often decisions made by courts and subject to the right of appeal are relatively unimportant compared with the decisions made at an administrative level. Often, there is no right of appeal and no way of getting behind these decisions. An ombudsman is one aspect of this matter that occupies the attention of Parliament at present because of this motion. I believe that an ombudsman, understood in the sense in which I understand the term and in which it is obviously understood by the member for Fisher, has an important part to play in the functioning of this House.

True, much thought will have to be given to the precise definition of the role of an ombudsman when it becomes a matter of preparing legislation. I have had a cursory look at Acts operating in the United Kingdom and New Zealand, and there are differences between those Acts. An ombudsman operates in Scandinavian countries but with a different scope, because Scandinavian Parliamentary traditions are different from ours. At present a Bill is before the Tasmanian Parliament, but I have not yet seen it. However, much thought will have to be given to the precise details of the legislation.

Mr. Millhouse: Will it be this session?

The Hon. L. J. KING: No, it is in this Parliament.

Mr. Millhouse: But not in this session?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am not prepared to say that, but it will be in this Parliament, as mentioned in the motion. It is important to consider carefully what the role of the ombudsman should be, and it is important that substantial agreement of all members should be obtained to this proposal, because it affects all members. I hope that in the long run there will be substantial agreement about the role of the ombudsman, his powers, and the way in which his duties fit in with the traditional practices and functions of this Parliament. At present this Parliament is concerned only with the principle of whether it favours the concept of an ombudsman; refinements can be left until later. I strongly support this motion and urge members to vote in support of it.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): It is good to hear the Attorney-General say that the Government will support the efforts, first, of Mr. Robin Millhouse in introducing this subject, and then of the member for Fisher, who took up the cudgels and, with the support of some of us, has finally achieved success. I think this is a most important decision, because Governments are interfering

more and more with the freedoms of individuals. An ombudsman has become more necessary as both the previous Government and the present Government were and are interfering seriously with consumers and others, an action that may deprive people of some liberty. They should have the right to object, but often people are prevented from taking action against the Government because of the expense involved. If someone could safeguard their interests, as could an ombudsman, the community would benefit. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. D. N. Brookman:

That in the opinion of this House the Government should consider increasing forthwith the payment to all independent schools, on behalf of each primary school child, from \$10 to at least \$20 per annum,

which Mr. Hopgood had moved to amend by leaving out all the words after "That" and inserting in lieu thereof "this House supports the decision of the Government to allocate an additional \$250,000 to independent primary schools in 1971 on a needs basis".

Mr. EASTICK (Light): I believe that a case has been made out for both issues. I have no doubt that the member for Alexandra has completely made out a case for increasing the payment, which I believe is a mere pittance having regard to the money spent by independent schools on behalf of the education system of this State. The sum mentioned in the motion could well be spent by this or by any other Government. By the same token, I do not reject the suggestion made by the Minister, and subsequently by the member for Mawson through his amendment, which I will not support, because I intend to adhere firmly to the original motion. I could support the amendment if it were subsequently moved as a motion on its own.

It is difficult to determine where the real need for financial aid lies. The debate seems to have revolved around the question whether money should be made available to the schools or to the individual parents. However, I see nothing in the motion directing who shall receive the assistance. The motion simply seeks the grant of a sum on a per capita basis; and it does not indicate or direct specifically who shall benefit from that grant. It has been said that, as many

of the schools are wealthy, they do not require the sum suggested. However, although a school may be wealthy, that does not necessarily indicate that the parents of a child attending that school are wealthy. On this basis, I ardently support the motion, because I, like many other members, find it difficult to determine who should be the recipient.

For instance, if we draw a parallel and consider a scholarship, who shall we determine is to receive a scholarship, unless it is specifically stated that it shall be made available to a person who is in financial difficulty? How do we determine who is to receive a scholarship, other than by making it available to the person who is best qualified academically? Although this parallel may not be totally apposite, I suggest that it ought to be considered in this case. The figures prove (and this cannot be denied) that independent schools are saving the State Government a considerable sum of money. Although I will not reiterate the figure that has been quoted, I know it is a substantial sum. We find that South Australia is behind a number of other States in respect of assistance given by the State to the education system or, more particularly, to the independent schools. Therefore, I can pledge support subsequently to a motion in terms of the amendment moved by the member for Mawson.

In certain other States, sums of money are made available for capital works on a no-interest or low-interest basis, particularly for classrooms and residential accommodation. Although the alternative to the motion indicates that individual schools would receive a consideration on the basis of their need, I doubt whether the sum referred to would be adequate to cover the funds required by independent schools for capital works. Therefore, a case exists for funds to be made available for capital works on a low-interest or no-interest basis. Let us not fool ourselves: there is a precedent here concerning the funds made available free of interest to councils for the purchase of heavy equipment. These funds are allocated according to the needs of an individual council and help a council considerably in financing its activities.

The Minister referred to a Christian approach and to the fact that we needed to ensure that we did not create second-class citizens. However, he immediately contradicted that statement by saying that he would give to some people but deny the requests of others. Where is the equality in this

matter if we are to do this? This matter can be argued backwards and forwards, much the same as can the motion and the amendment. The Minister said that a person in the high-income group enjoyed a considerable taxation advantage, which a person in the low-income group did not enjoy. No-one can refute the figures that he quoted, although the figures did go a little high in that the scale extended to persons who received an annual income of \$32,000. The figures quoted in a quarterly review of Australian education to which I will refer presently would indicate that in 1968 only 8.9 per cent of the population received an income of more than \$5,000.

The Minister's figures did go further than was perhaps necessary but, although a person on a high income may enjoy a taxation advantage in this regard, he does not have the advantage of a pension or of medical help at the age of 65, so that this matter, too, can be argued backwards and forwards when one is trying to find a break-even point. I refer to the publication *Quarterly Review of Australian Education* (December, 1969), entitled *Australian Catholic Schools into the Seventies*, by J. E. Bourke. The fact that it relates to Catholic schools does not detract from its value in relation to other independent schools, and I know that it is the only publication of its kind immediately available relating to the projected needs of independent schools in the immediate future. The book shows that South Australia has the lowest percentage in the Commonwealth of children enrolled in Catholic schools. For instance, figures for 1968 show that 10.47 per cent of children at primary schools in South Australia and 8.46 per cent of those at secondary schools attended Catholic schools. By averaging those two figures, the total enrolment of children attending Catholic schools was 9.84 per cent, compared with an Australian average of 18.46 per cent. Therefore, South Australia's percentage of children attending Catholic schools is 50 per cent below the Australian average. Table 8 in this publication is headed "Estimate of number and proportion of Catholic children being educated beyond Catholic schools", and figures for 1968 show that 56.32 per cent of Catholic children in South Australia are being educated outside Catholic schools, that figure comparing with a figure in New South Wales, for instance, of 38.6 per cent. On page 21, the book deals with pressure from increasing educational expectations and states:

The second pressure acting on schools is the rising educational expectations in the community. This pressure has two components. The first is increasing affluence, both of Governments and individuals. All States have lifted minimum leaving ages. There has been more scholarship and bursary support to assist more sustained schooling. Despite pockets of poverty still remaining, few children are forced to leave school because of parental inability to support them or because there is need for them to assist family earnings. These factors alone have lifted retention rates in secondary schools.

The book also contains much other useful information. Later, it deals with projections of increases in the student population of Catholic schools, showing that there has been an average increase between 1963 and 1968 of 1.7 per cent a year.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: In South Australia?

Mr. EASTICK: No, on an Australian basis.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That isn't true of South Australia; numbers in South Australia remain static all the time.

Mr. EASTICK: Later, I will relate this to another factor, and this may help the Minister. The only figures I have been able to obtain for independent schools have been from the schools themselves. Before 1963, the increase in enrolment was 3.2 per cent a year.

In 1970, the total student population at Lutheran day schools is 1,083. These students are distributed in 13 schools, with a total of 52 teachers, the average being 20 students a teacher. The expectation for 1971 in Lutheran day school classes (and this is apart from any consideration of Aboriginal training) is 1,119. This shows an increase of 3.32 per cent in the Lutheran school system. I have no figures of the expected increase in the Lutheran secondary school system, but that system now has a total of 720 students. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADVANCES FOR HOMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

EUDUNDA AND MORGAN RAILWAY (DISCONTINUANCE) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND BANKING GROUP BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 11. Page 608.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Mr. Speaker—

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE: At the risk of repeating myself, I will say again all that I said on this matter before the bell rang. Mr. Speaker—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Now sit down again, as you did when the bell rang. You've made the best speech of your life.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am sure that the Minister will not be disappointed at my speech this evening: it will be up to its usual high standard. The object of the Bill is to amalgamate, in this State, the English, Scottish and Australian Bank, and the Australia and New Zealand Bank, both in the trading bank sphere and the savings bank sphere, and the Bill is yet another example of the present Government's carrying out the intentions of the previous Government.

Some months ago (probably nearly 12 months ago) I, as Attorney-General, was approached by the solicitor for the two banks and by the managers of the banks in South Australia to facilitate the merger of their banking businesses in this State. I submitted the matter to Cabinet, which agreed that, to facilitate the business of private enterprise, we would introduce legislation to effect the merger of the banks in South Australia, so long as the Government was not thereby out of pocket. The matter was subsequently raised at the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General and I seem to remember some hesitation on the part of some of my colleagues, the argument being that already there were processes at law by which the merger could be effected without special legislation. However, as the Attorney-General has explained, that process would be cumbersome and inconvenient for the banks, their staff, and several Government departments. Indeed, I congratulate the Attorney on the way he argued the case. It almost seemed that he expected opposition to the Bill, because he put every conceivable argument in favour of proceeding in this way. I think the Attorney

has put, in his explanation, all the arguments that I used at the standing committee meeting to try to persuade my fellow Attorneys to do what we are doing this evening. Therefore, the Attorney-General and other members opposite will not be surprised to know that I and the Opposition support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee, consisting of Hon. L. J. King, Messrs. Becker, Lawn, McAnaney and McRae; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on September 1.

COMMONWEALTH BUDGET

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That this House calls on the members of the Commonwealth Parliament representing South Australia to take action in the Commonwealth Parliament to protect employment and development in South Australia from the impost on the sale of wines of 50c a gallon and from an increase of 2½ per cent in sales tax on motor vehicles and electrical goods which are proposed in the Commonwealth Budget and which will adversely affect South Australia far more than any other State.

I do not believe that any member of this House can have listened to the Commonwealth Budget speech or have read it without grave concern for the attitude of the Commonwealth Government towards employment and development in this State. In two specific imposts the Commonwealth Government has seen fit adversely to affect this State in a way in which no other State is affected. This is not something that was unknown to the Commonwealth Government; or, there is no reason for it to be unknown if the Commonwealth Government had done its work to see what should be done in the Australian economy and what would be the effects of what it intended to do. However, the matters that affect South Australia in this regard were brought to the notice of the Commonwealth Government by the Government of this State and by the industries concerned in this State over a considerable period before the Commonwealth Budget was introduced.

The wine trade is the one area of South Australian rural production that is reasonably buoyant. It has not been buoyant for long: I vividly remember that in 1965 the Labor Government had to find \$500,000 from the State Bank to finance a growers' co-operative to crush the grapes of wine-grape growers who were not getting the cost of production on their

grapes in South Australia. They could not sell them at all and we had to find the money from the State to support that area of industry. It is the one area of rural industry that has not been a mendicant to the Commonwealth Government, and in recent years thank goodness the Commonwealth—

Mr. Rodda: The South-East is holding out.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member gives me heart that the South-East, which he represents, is holding out, whereas other areas of the State are not.

The SPEAKER: The member for Victoria is out of order in interjecting when he is out of his seat.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I assume the reference was to the part of the honourable member's area that is concerned with meat production, but the honourable member will know that the major expansion in his own district in rural production, particularly at Padthaway, is in vine plantings. This production concerns South Australia far more than any other part of Australia because we are supplying 70 per cent of Australia's table wines. True, the figure is sometimes put rather lower than that, but that results from the kind of labels that get on to our wines from other areas of Australia. The honourable member will know that far more wine is sold under the Hunter River label in New South Wales than is produced in the Hunter Valley, and much of it comes from our area. We produce most of the Australian wine. This is the area of major expansion in rural production in South Australia at a time when rural industry is facing the most crucial time in the history of this nation this century.

Mr. Rodda: Surely not.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member may scoff at this, but I can only tell him that, as a result of the present drought in much of the rural area of South Australia, most grave problems face rural entrepreneurs in South Australia of a kind that we have not seen since the Second World War. Because of falling wool prices, the wheat quotas, and the fact that many people have not caught up on the loss of their reserves from the previous drought in 1965-66, many South Australian primary producers are facing bankruptcy. One area alone that can show real buoyancy (and it is only just on the way up), is the wine industry.

At a time when South Australia is relying on this area of expansion in rural industry the Commonwealth Government chooses to place

an impost of 50c a gall. on wine. It will not be 50c a gall. to the public: it will be much more than that. The excise duty will be compounded before it reaches the public. The effect on table wines in South Australia will be an increase not of 50c a gall. in retail prices but of \$1.25 to \$1.50, because after the excise is added, licence fees, additional transport costs, and additional mark-ups must be considered. The price structure is based on a mark-up on the wholesale cost. The total result from the homework that the industry has done today (and I have been speaking to representatives of the industry during the day) is that the cost to the public will be an additional \$1.25 to \$1.50 a gallon.

What will this impost do to the one area of rural trade that this State can rely on as expansive at present? It will knock it hard, and no other area of Australia will be knocked as hard as this area. Representatives of the industry appealed to the Commonwealth Government before the Budget was introduced: so did the Government of this State. I had a curt acknowledgement from the Prime Minister to my appeal and the industry received no more. How much consideration was given to the effects of this impost was shown in the Commonwealth Budget last evening. This undoubtedly hits South Australia in a way that will hit no other State, because this is the wine-growing State of the Commonwealth.

Let us consider the position of the motor car and electrical appliance industry in this State. Of our secondary industries 71 per cent is comprised of motor car and home appliance manufacture, consumer durables saleable largely on the Australian domestic market. The Commonwealth Government intends to increase sales tax in the 25 per cent sales tax area to 27½ per cent. This will increase the price of the small car by about \$30 and that of the large car by about \$30, and already we are finding resistance to sales of motor cars on the Australian domestic market. There has been a tapering off in the demand for Australian motor cars on the domestic market, because the Commonwealth Government viewed the present situation in Australia as being an inflationary one and considered that the inflationary pressures should be relieved by providing a Commonwealth Budget surplus of \$500,000,000 overall.

That Government was not going in for selective expenditure to stimulate certain areas of activity. It refused us any use of a part of that money to stimulate certain activity that

was shown to be lagging. The Commonwealth had a \$500,000,000 surplus and, in addition to this, its credit restrictions in Australia meant that people did not have the money available to trade in cars or to purchase new cars. Within this State and elsewhere, hire-purchase companies have not had the money to lend which they have previously had, and this has meant a reduction in the buying of motor cars. In fact, two months ago, on behalf of South Australian industry, I appealed to the Commonwealth Government to the effect that the credit restrictions it had already imposed were having visible effects on the plans involving South Australian employers in the motor car industry and that they had already caused a cut-back in employment.

I said that credit needed to be eased and that it would be utterly disastrous for South Australia to have an additional impost placed on the sale of its products on the domestic market, particularly on the sale of motor cars. That plea was supported by every industry in this State. I did not ask for special consideration to have a differential sales tax, as has been charged to me: what I did appeal for was that the Commonwealth Government should realize what the results were in this area of the Commonwealth from credit restrictions and from increasing sales tax on consumer durables. At the Premiers' Conference, I raised these matters concerning what would be the effect on South Australian development and employment, and I was told that this was noted. Well, so little of it has been noted that not only do we see no easing in the credit restrictions but also we now see an additional 2½ per cent impost, which has brought from South Australian motor car manufacturers and from the manufacturers of electrical appliances (a large section of South Australian secondary industry) the protests one would expect.

We have made our pleas to the Commonwealth Government, but they have fallen on deaf ears. All that we can now do is say to the representatives of this State in the Commonwealth Parliament (and, after all, we are the representatives of the State), "We ask you on behalf of the people of this State to take up in the Commonwealth Parliament the matter of the needed protection for this State from the effects of Commonwealth Government financial policies, because those financial policies have simply not taken account of the effect on this area of the Commonwealth of the imposts which the Commonwealth Government has put on table wines, motor cars and electrical

appliances. This State has much of its expansive area in rural production in wine trade; it is the largest wine producer. South Australia has a large section of its secondary industry in motor cars, electrical appliances and the supply industries to them: it has far more involved in this than has any other part of Australia. Therefore, the general impost throughout Australia on these areas of goods will affect South Australia adversely in a way in which no other part of Australia will be affected."

What sort of activity have we seen in the Commonwealth Budget to compensate us for the depressing effects on our industry and employment of the two measures to which I have referred? There has been one thing: there has been the proposal for investigation to the extent of \$230,000 this year of the Tarcoola to Alice Springs railway. One would welcome the planning work on that rail link, but no-one can suggest that this will compensate for the depressing effects of the economic policies to which I have referred. There is no sign in the Commonwealth Budget that we will have other Commonwealth expenditure in South Australia that will in some way stimulate activity here. The proportion of Commonwealth Government construction expenditure in South Australia has fallen to 4 per cent of the total, and we get no sort of assistance in the Commonwealth Budget to try to stimulate South Australia's economy, when the Commonwealth knows that there are unused resources and manpower in this State.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Particularly in the building industry.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Exactly. The Master Builders Association of South Australia Incorporated went to the Commonwealth Treasurer, outlining to him the fact that, although building approvals had gone up, building commencements and completions had not done so significantly. There are many plans in South Australia, but only yesterday a leading Adelaide architect was asked where some steel construction work could be obtained in the Adelaide city area and he could not point to one building. The fact is that, although approvals went up, activity did not.

Mr. Hall: What has your Government done about the position?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am talking about the results under the Leader's Government because, of course, the results under our

Government are hardly to hand as yet. I had hoped that this matter would not be debated in this place on a partisan basis.

Mr. Millhouse: What are you doing?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I should have thought that members opposite were representing South Australia.

Mr. Harrison: You wouldn't think so.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If members opposite do not have any interest in the wine, motor car, and electrical appliance industries, perhaps they will get up and say so. I should have thought that they had an interest: I gave them credit for acting as though they had.

Mr. Millhouse: No-one could believe that you are not being partisan.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At present I do not make any apology for suggesting that South Australia needs to be protected. I do not suggest, and I did not suggest at the time, that the Leader, when he went to Canberra and came back saying that South Australia had received a lousy deal, was being partisan; he was right and I supported him. I hope that members opposite will be South Australians on this occasion.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): In seconding the motion, I indicate my full support for the Premier. The effects on the economy of South Australia and also on the State Budget that will be introduced early next month will be severe, and I consider that the effect on employment in South Australia will be disastrous. As I represent the principal wine producing district in South Australia (Chaffey), my special concern is with regard to the tax that is to be imposed on wines. I believe that the imposition of this tax is ill advised, and it is also a vicious and premeditated attack on the only primary industry in Australia that is not at present seeking Government help. It is not seeking the help that it sought in 1964 and 1965. As the Premier pointed out, both the wine-grape growers and the winemaking industry were in dire straits in 1964 and 1965, and it was only the action of the Labor Government at that time in setting up a Royal Commission and, following the report of that Commission, in bringing down amendments to the Prices Act to provide for the fixing of minimum prices at which wine grapes could be bought or sold that brought about the stability and prosperity of the industry which is now threatened by this vicious tax.

The winemakers and the growers in the industry stated (they told me this only today) that they desire to retain the present system of price fixing, and I have assured them that the present Government will do everything possible to ensure that that situation is maintained. The opinions that have been expressed by various leaders are, I think, reflected in the remarks of Mr. Stephens (Secretary-Manager of the Wine and Brandy Producers Association) in today's *News*, which reports:

In the most bitter comment by a wine industry executive on the tax, Mr. Stephens said: "The tax results from a combination of decadent thinking and an apparent desire by the Government to reduce all primary industries to the begging level. The damaging effect on wine sales could lead to a crisis next year in disposal of the grape crop. The wine industry is clearly being penalized for being self-sufficient—it has not asked for help in spite of a history of struggle."

I fully support the opinion expressed by Mr. Stephens. I have been talking today to Mr. Tunbridge and Mr. Palmer, both of whom are wellknown members of the wine industry, and they are adamant that the tax will spell disaster for the wine-grape growers of South Australia and of Australia as a whole. They expressed the view that it was most inappropriate to introduce at this time a tax of a nature that can only depress sales. It is interesting, in studying the history of the wine-producing industry in South Australia, to note that we are now approaching a period of rapid expansion. We have increased plantings in the last few years, and the production from those plantings will reach a peak in about two or three years, and I am sure that, even without the imposition of this tax, which will depress sales, there would have been grapes available surplus to normal market requirements. The statistics of plantings indicate that the very large increase in plantings has occurred in South Australia. Therefore, this State will be affected very adversely by any tax of this kind.

To give some idea of how South Australia and the Chaffey District will be affected, I shall quote statistics. In 1969, the last full year for which figures are available, in Australia as a whole 122,470 acres were in bearing and 25,646 acres were not bearing. An estimated 10,000 acres will be planted or has been planted during 1970, and the total vintage figure is 295,000 tons. In South Australia we have 53,213 acres in production and 7,361 acres not bearing, with a vintage of 201,000 tons. The figures for the Murray

district (and this includes the southern Murray district, which is represented by the member for Mallee) are 24,394 acres in production and 3,809 acres not bearing, the total vintage being 144,101 tons. To indicate the tax already paid on the production of the Murray districts, over the weekend I checked with wineries, and I found that the total excise on brandy paid by the four wineries with which I checked was, averaged over the last two years, \$4,720,000 and the wine excise paid was \$175,000. In addition to the excise on brandy, there is also sales tax of 15 per cent.

Those figures show how much money the Commonwealth Government is obtaining from the Murray districts and from this industry as a whole. To indicate further how inappropriate this new tax is at present, I mention that the United Kingdom Government is making strong efforts to join the European Economic Community and, if this happens, doubtless Australia's exports of dried fruit, which at present amount to about 20,000 tons a year, will be replaced by imports from other producing areas, and that will result in another 100,000 tons of fresh grapes being available for the Australian wine producers. I have no doubt that they would be rather reluctant to have anything to do with these grapes. The production of fortified wines in South Australia is a major item, particularly in the Murray districts, and I make no apology for stressing a point in relation to those districts and the irrigation settlements.

Many of the settlers who will be detrimentally affected by this tax are war service land settlers who were put on their properties by the Commonwealth Government. The war service land settlement scheme was initiated by the Chifley Government but carried on by succeeding Liberal and Country Party Governments. Most of these growers have some wine grapes growing on their properties. Since the Commonwealth Government has spent money to establish them and maintain them on their properties, I am sure the settlers must be mystified as to why the Commonwealth should introduce a tax like this, which will ensure that they will never make a paying proposition of their properties.

A large proportion of the production of co-operative wineries comprises fortified wines and table wines which are sold to merchants. The tax of 50c a gallon will be levied at the point of sale—the cellar door. As the Premier has pointed out, because this tax will be included in the price of the wines

at each point of sale, the percentage mark-up of merchants and retailers will be applied to both the cost of the wine itself and the tax. This means that there will be an increase in the retail price of far more than 8c a bottle. Today I was told that the increase might be about 15c a bottle.

Mr. Venning: What is the excise on beer?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order.

Members interjecting:

Mr. CURREN: It is amazing that the honourable member, who no doubt supports barleygrowers, should ask why the excise on beer was not increased.

Mr. Gunn: Do you want country people to carry all the burden?

Mr. CURREN: A wine industry executive told me today that there would be a reduction in the sale of wines not only through consumer resistance to the increased prices but also through people buying two bottles of beer instead of one bottle of wine. The barleygrowers can thank their lucky stars not only that there was no increase in the excise on beer but also that there will be added sales of beer. I wholeheartedly support the Premier's remarks and have much pleasure in seconding the motion. I trust that Opposition members will give it their full support.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): This motion was presented to me in written form at 7.42 p.m. It is supposed to be an important motion, but no notice was given to the Opposition of the intention to suspend Standing Orders, nor was any notice given of the wording of the motion. This indicates how sincere the Premier and his followers are in presenting this motion to the House. However, before I discuss the Premier's political motives, which are quite transparent, I quote some remarks attributed to him in his rather meteoric or bright way through the financial paths of Australia in the last few months. On June 8, the Premier was reported as saying that South Australia's turnover tax had to stay in force, although the State Government thought it undesirable. The report continues:

Mr. Dunstan said today the Labor Government viewed the tax as undesirable because it was regressive and did not take into account the ability of the taxpayer to pay.

On June 25 the Premier sent a letter to the Prime Minister in which he stated:

I would urge that no other steps be taken (for example an increase in sales tax) to depress further the market for our products.

In the same article he is also reported as asking for an increase in capital works expenditure for South Australia. His request that there be no further increase in sales tax was in conjunction with a request for an increase in expenditure on capital works in this State. Not a remarkable statement I suppose, but one that is significant, as I will point out soon.

Mr. McKee: You are not going to win too many friends now.

Mr. HALL: The member for Pirie displays clearly the transparency to which I have alluded. He is not deep in his approach to arguments in this House and is one of the first to give away, as you would know from your observations, Mr. Speaker, the intention of Government members. The honourable member, by his interjection, wants to put the Opposition and the L.C.L. on the wrong side of popular opinion.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: One, two, three, four, five, six members interjected.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You can count, too.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Ryan: Why don't you get up out of the gutter?

Mr. HALL: It would seem that I have unearthed a vocal nest by that remark, because the discussions on this matter have now become plain to the public and this Parliament. On June 24 the following report appeared:

Mr. Dunstan, who will fly to Canberra early today, said that by a reasonable deal he meant the replacement of receipts stamp duty revenue, extra revenue, and relief from the interest burden which was bearing heavily on the State Budget.

On that occasion the Premier wanted to replace the turnover tax with extra revenue in order to get relief from the interest burden. He said that South Australia was hoping for a significant reduction in the interest burden. In addition to all this, the Minister of Education set up a plan of his own for spending an extra \$3,000,000 on school buildings in South Australia. This was a grandiose detailed plan, and the Minister said that he could provide extra schools in members' districts of such and such a type, at such and such a place, on such and such a date, but the catch was that he said this could be done only if the Commonwealth Government provided the money.

Mr. McKee: What was wrong with that?

Mr. HALL: I think the Minister said that the Commonwealth Government had a moral obligation to provide the money.

Mr. McKee: And everyone in the State would agree with him.

Mr. HALL: The member for Pirie confirms the attitude of Government members: more money for South Australia.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr. HALL: We have an absolute majority, as you would know from your count of this House, Mr. Speaker, in favour of more money for South Australia.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr. HALL: Time after time the Premier has refused to condone the use of taxation to raise that money. On what issue has he recommended to the Commonwealth that it should grant his request for capital works and more revenue to relieve the interest burden? In what way has the Premier ever said, regarding a Commonwealth Government proposal, "Well, that will be providing the money we are asking for"? Has the Minister of Education ever said, "This is the avenue; I would even grudgingly approve of the Commonwealth Government's adopting that course to provide the money I want"?

Mr. McKee: We're paying too much now.

Mr. HALL: The member for Pirie has said we are paying too much now, and the Premier, I believe last evening, said that he approved of the reduction in income tax rates. So we approve not any increase in Commonwealth taxation, but we do approve a reduction in the rate of income tax, and we want more money!

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Haven't you read the Budget?

Mr. HALL: What I have said illustrates the pettiness to which this Government is reducing the problem of Commonwealth-State relations. We have descended to a petty situation in regard to the management of Australia which every thinking person recognizes as being a tremendous responsibility. To guide this nation through one of the greatest difficulties there is, namely, that of maintaining some stability in costs and in the rate of growth in a developing situation, is one of the most difficult economic challenges that any nation faces. There has to be a constant adjusting change to the economic challenges arising, yet the Government would deny the Commonwealth Government the right to make those changes.

I remind members opposite, not in the context of political popularity but in that of good commonsense planning for the future development of Australia, that the day the States descend into six separate entities Australia will divide and fall. That is what this type of motion does for Australia—divides and weakens the country! I consider myself an Australian, and I make no apology for that, and members opposite, in their hearts, know that what I have said is correct.

What have other people said about the Commonwealth Government (this ogre which happens to be in Government and which prevents Mr. Whitlam from governing at present)? Mr. Whitlam said last evening, I believe, that not nearly enough was spent. I believe he would like to see further taxation. That is a corollary of his statement, unless he has some magical means of providing the finance. Perhaps he would not have to manage the inflationary pressures of this community; perhaps he has some other weapon to use. He said last evening that more money was required for all of Australia. Is he going to join with the Premier here and say, "I deny you the right to raise the money"? Following the Premiers' Conference an article appeared on June 7 in the *Australian*, which has constantly been a critic of the Commonwealth Government, headed "Mr. Gorton is surprisingly generous to the States", but the other half of the headline stated, "But how to finance it".

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What did it say about South Australia?

Mr. HALL: On the previous day there was to be a \$320,000,000 windfall to cut debt charges—"Prime Minister offers the States \$700,000,000 fund boost"! We have heard in other debates that have taken place in this House the details regarding a significant increase, under the formula, in the financial reimbursement to each State, including South Australia, thereby introducing an innovation based on value which the States had been seeking for years and which relieved the debt structure of the States on two fronts. This was a move to take over each year an amount of debt that already existed and to provide each year a significant amount of Loan moneys free of interest, South Australia's involvement being, I believe, \$27,000,000. This money has to be collected from the Australian community. Members opposite should not for any reason, whether through ignorance or for the transparent political purpose involved this evening,

try to fool the South Australian public into thinking that there is some magical source of funds, and that we can approach the Commonwealth Government by some spurious method such as that used by the Minister of Education when he set up his own fund saying, "This is what we will do if the Commonwealth gives us the money." Let us not do that and make people think that the Commonwealth can foot the bill.

The very success of the States at Commonwealth conferences and the success of all the approaches made to the Commonwealth, whether from the rural sector, which has received over \$100,000,000 increase, from the States, which have received nearly \$300,000,000 increase, from people interested in welfare, payments for which have been increased by \$107,000,000, or from people interested in education, payments for which have been increased by \$63,000,000 up to \$312,000,000 (the total increase overall being 11.2 per cent), is the reason (and of course inflationary pressures within the community are always involved when a community is developing at the rate in which Australia is developing) that these funds must be raised. To deny the Commonwealth the right to collect money, when this Government and the previous Government have made demands on the Commonwealth, is extremely foolish. It is also foolish to deny the justice of the Commonwealth's need to manage the economy so that it will not produce cost increases that are extremely damaging to the whole community. When one looks at the international scene, one can appreciate the controls and adjustments that are necessary from time to time. Recently, the Australian Industries Development Association has issued Bulletin No. 211 in which the following article appears dealing with the phenomenal economic growth in Japan:

Japan is the nation most likely to equal or surpass the United States in standard of living and industrial productivity in this century; the twenty-first century may be Japan's. It is important to examine what is happening in Japan and why it is happening.

Mr. McKee: Do you support the motion?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow interjections to continue in this way. I remind the Leader that he is addressing the Chair and that he must not reply to interjections. Interjections are out of order, and it is out of order for the member addressing the Chair to reply to them. I ask honourable members to conduct themselves in an orderly fashion.

Mr. HALE: I thank you, Sir, for your protection. A further part of this article states:

Japan's success then, is not a temporary phenomenon and is not the result of cheap labour or exports or copying. It can be attributed to the efficient function of a very special system, all of whose parts interact to stimulate growth . . . The upshot of all these factors (corporate structure, business practices and historical and sociological influences) is a national economy that behaves as one huge corporation.

It is quite obvious that Japan's success, which is unparalleled in the world, does not occur on the sort of policies that are provided by members opposite. It is a success which is achieved by careful management with optimism, and this is just what last night's Budget provides. It provides the careful change that is inherent in good management.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: Members opposite are again wildly interjecting, as you can see, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I will not keep on asking members to refrain from interjecting; on the next occasion I will name an honourable member.

Mr. HALL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will not pursue that item further. It is sufficient to demonstrate one economic community on this earth which is progressing but not because of the type of policy of members opposite, who in the past have criticized the Commonwealth Government of stop-go policies. What are they advocating today? They are trying to deny the Commonwealth Government the right to manage the Australian economy when the Commonwealth Government, as I have said, is trying not to be popular but to be courageous in front of the challenges that are presenting themselves to it. But we are to have a double appeal to the Commonwealth. The Premier has been to the Commonwealth Government and he has come home and complained about getting a lousy deal and about other things. I wish to quote from an excellent speech given by the Commonwealth Minister for Health at a recent conference in South Australia. He said:

The great issues on which Commonwealth elections are fought and won in other States are obscured in South Australia in waves of parochial indignation. It allows Mr. Dunstan, who is obviously pursuing a well thought-out policy of vilifying the Commonwealth with the aid of a large number of Government-paid press secretaries, by these means to attempt to escape the political consequences of his

socialist policies. It allows him to squander the revenues available to the State on all sorts of unproductive purposes and evade the consequences by accusing the Commonwealth of not providing sufficient funds.

I again refer to the Premier's approach to Canberra. He came away saying that he did not get enough. Why did he not get enough from the very good offer to the States collectively? It was his own inability to get it. He stands as a failure as a negotiator with the Commonwealth. He is unable to get replies from the Commonwealth Government, and he blames the Commonwealth all the time. What responsibility does he bear in this matter? Having come away dissatisfied from the Commonwealth financial conference, he has approached the Commonwealth Grants Commission. I hope he has a well-prepared case, because he has very good officers to support that case. But we are not to just rest South Australia's disabilities with the Grants Commission: we have a motion tonight to press for some alteration of Government Budget policy as well.

Where does the Premier stand in his negotiations with the Commonwealth? I asked him a question today about railways in South Australia. The Premier is obstructing the construction of about \$50,000,000 worth of railway lines in this State when such construction could start this year. He is responsible for the delay in the commencement of the construction of that line. He comes here and says that proposals put forward in the Maunsell report did not cater fully for industries in the metropolitan area and that the previous Government did not show the Commonwealth the objections that the South Australian Railways Commissioner had to that programme. When we came to office in 1968 we found that the previous Labor Government, of which the present Premier was also Premier, had presented to the Commonwealth Government a plan of the South Australian Railways Commissioner for the standardization of lines north of Adelaide. We presented that plan again, and it was refused again. The South Australian Government then entered into lengthy consultations with the Commonwealth Government and the upshot was that we appointed independent arbitrators to consider this long-standing dispute in which the Railways Commissioner had been a full participant previously. The Government agreed, as the Premier knows from replies to questions members of this Party asked in this House, to the appointment of independent consultants who were of very high repute in Australia because of the practical

work they had already done, and this was one way to settle this long-standing dispute. We received their report. As the Premier said today, it did not recommend enough connections for metropolitan Adelaide industries.

Mr. McRae: When are you going to mention the wine industry?

Mr. HALL: For the benefit of the member for Playford, whose interjection I must now ignore—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members know that it is the responsibility of the Speaker to keep order. The House should not become disorderly, but it is. There are avenues open to the Speaker if the House continues as it has been proceeding, and I will exercise those responsibilities if members do not refrain from interjecting. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. There is before the House a motion, which states:

This House calls on members of the Commonwealth Parliament representing South Australia to take action in the Commonwealth Parliament to protect employment and development in South Australia from the impost on the sale of wine of 50c a gallon and from an increase of 2½ per cent in sales tax on motor vehicles and electrical goods which are proposed in the Commonwealth Budget and which will adversely affect South Australia far more than any other State.

With great respect, I point out that neither of the matters mentioned in the motion has been mentioned once by the Leader of the Opposition and, whilst we have waited to hear how he would connect his argument with the motion, he has not done it so far, and I submit that it is not surprising that members on this side want to call his attention to the matter before the House. I respectfully submit that the Leader should address himself to the matter before the House.

Mr. HALL: May I respectfully suggest to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this motion was put on my desk at 18 minutes to 8 this evening and, therefore, members of my Party and I have not had much time to study it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I sustain the point of order. As a matter of fact, when I called the House to order, I was halfway through reading the motion, because I was considering whether I should remind the Leader of the Opposition that he was not speaking to the motion. At that stage I had to call the House to order, and the point of order was taken. I sustain the point

of order. The matters contained in the motion are the matters before the House and, in my opinion, it would be out of order to refer to the Maunsell report or some other matter in the detail in which the Leader has referred to it. I ask the Leader to stick to the motion. I think he has a copy of it.

Mr. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I can see that you, too, have not had much time to study this motion, as you have said. You have been caught between reading the motion and keeping unruly members opposite in order. However, I know that that subject is embarrassing to members opposite and I will not pursue it further. I must refresh my memory by reading the motion, because I have not read it many times. The tax on wine is to bring in \$12,500,000 in the present financial year and \$15,200,000 in a full year. Of course, the projections of sales tax are not so easily worked out for South Australia: they have an Australia-wide application. South Australia is the major wine producing State in the Commonwealth, but the question of excise and sales tax does not apply only to this State.

This could well be the type of import that the Premier wants to get across to the people of this State—that they are being singled out for the Commonwealth action mentioned in the motion. Of course, South Australia is not being singled out—any more than it is being singled out for the works which appear in the Commonwealth Budget and which will be of significant value to this State. It is so easy to criticize the Budget regarding items that do not appeal to us, but surely we are not going to be such an undisciplined and unruly mob that we cannot accept the measures that will collect the revenue to provide the expenditures that we consistently demand. The member for Chaffey said that he fully supported the motion. What does he support? Does he support Australia? Does he support South Australia as a separate entity? Or, does he support an attack on the Commonwealth Government for Senate election purposes?

Mr. Curren: I support South Australia first.

Mr. HALL: Here we have the same old parochial indignation—"Let us forget that we have any Commonwealth responsibilities and let us concentrate only on State responsibilities." The type of courageous attitude displayed by the Commonwealth Government exists in my Party throughout Australia. We will not run

from responsibility. Part of this motion suggests that South Australia is being singled out. The Premier has an application before the Grants Commission, but he does not know what the results will be.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Yes, I do.

Mr. HALL: If the Premier knows, why has he not told us?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Because the Prime Minister has asked me not to.

Mr. HALL: Because I can understand that there are times in State-Commonwealth relations when one must observe confidences, I will not press the Premier to divulge them. All I can say is: why is he going to the Grants Commission if he already knows? That seems to me to be a waste of time.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We are bound to the Grants Commission.

Mr. HALL: The Premier is being singularly uncommunicative with the Parliament and the people on this matter.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We told you we were going to the Grants Commission.

Mr. HALL: Yes, and we were told that the Premier was going to get an interim payment from it. If this is an interim decision there will be another payment, and therefore the application must still be before the Grants Commission. Most likely it is still being considered or we would have received all the grant in the first payment, so the Premier's indignation falls to the ground on that point.

Mr. Burdon: Get back on the rails.

Mr. HALL: Yes, we should get away from the distractions and consider the argument that a sales tax policy applied to 12,000,000 people should be varied because of 1,200,000 people in this State. In essence, this is what the Premier is saying in relation to sales tax. I ask reasonable members whether this is a proposition that any central Government would or could listen to. Members know that it cannot listen to it, because the suggestion is not reasonable. It is one thing to make submissions before a Budget is issued, but the Premier's contradictions, as shown by my quotations of what he has said, are manifest to everyone; the contradiction of demanding money without giving the right to collect anything is something for us to wonder at for a long time.

The Premiers' Conference has ended, the Grants Commission application has been concluded, and a course has been set for the year.

The Commonwealth Budget has been presented but we are trying to alter it. What nonsense of financial management is this? Mr. Speaker, you well know that the Commonwealth Budget cannot be altered now. It is impossible at this stage to amend the careful calculations made by the Commonwealth Treasurer and introduced last evening. Whatever our feelings may be, these cannot be altered. I emphasize that I am concerned at the effect that these things may have on the wine industry and on the employment situation in South Australia, but other minds that think about financial matters have considered these problems. An article in the *Australian Financial Review* under the heading, "After the Fiscal Shocks, more Buoyant Money Market" states:

At first sight bearish because of the higher company-tax and indirect taxes, last night's Budget may yet turn out bullish for the sharemarket in the medium term as its monetary impact takes effect.

Certainly it may have some bearish short-term implications for individual stocks—wine-makers who have enjoyed a very long-term rising market for their products and their shares and who now face an 8 cents excise duty per bottle, though the consumer market is so strong it can probably cope with that, oil companies and motor distributors.

Perhaps the sales-tax rise of 2½ per cent will not be really significant for those shares as in the consumer markets it will be offset by the higher disposable incomes arising from the new income-tax schedules.

Can Government members say how much more finance is to be raised by these measures? It will be \$12,500,000 this year.

Mr. McKee: How much for a full year?

Mr. HALL: It will be \$15,200,000. Is the burden of the indirect taxation increase greater than the benefit of the income tax concessions? Government members cannot answer "Yes", because they have not thought about it, but the Commonwealth Government, because of its financial policy, is putting more money into the hands of the citizens of Australia than it is taking from them in indirect taxation. This is something that Government members quickly and conveniently ignored. The impost on wine, for instance, will be met by the consumer, and the fear expressed here by industry representatives and in the motion is that this increase will perhaps reduce demand, thereby reflecting on the capacity and viability of the wine industry at vineyard and winery level, but there is no proof of this. We have experienced similar adjustments previously. We have been through the 1961 credit squeeze, which no-one in Australia enjoyed.

No-one wants to see the heavy hand applied like that again. How can we prevent its being applied? We can prevent that by moving within sufficient time now; not by introducing disastrous financial remedial measures next year but by having sensible management measures now in order to prevent the catastrophic economic run-away situation that could arise. All members opposite know of the inflationary pressures which are evident in this community and to which they referred recently at the last election. Surely, in the light of the experience of the previous three years of Labor Government in this State, when we saw the impact of recession and disturbance through an uncontrolled State administration, members opposite can understand the necessity for a Commonwealth central administration and for proper management at this time.

I regret the effect that the impost, if it is to be called an impost, will have on the producers or on the markets served by South Australia's productive capacity, but I am sure that all members of this Parliament have only one desire: that is, to promote the proper growth of South Australia; to raise South Australia's living standards; to increase our capacity to take in more people; and to provide the services we all need. There is no doubt about that, but the question is: how are we to do this? I ask the Premier and his supporters opposite to take a responsible attitude. I regret as much as they regret any reduction in demand which the Commonwealth Government's measures may have on South Australia's industries, but I should like to look a little further ahead than they are looking: I want to see the Australian economic community healthy, viable and demanding next year and not subject to belated catastrophic regulation, which has previously proved to be disastrous for South Australia. Let us make our representations to Canberra, but let us not fight this great national issue with a parochial indignation, which in this instance is stirred by nothing more or less than political expediency.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I find it rather difficult to follow the Leader of the Opposition because it has been difficult to follow his speech this evening. I am grateful that the Premier drew the attention of the Deputy Speaker to the motion before the House, for I think this had the desired effect, to a certain extent anyway: the Leader, for the first time during his speech, then spoke to the motion before the House.

I think the Leader finally realized, during the last few sentences of his speech, that perhaps he had been a little too outspoken and had not paid sufficient regard to the industries affected in this State by the Budget introduced last evening, so he thought he should square off a little.

Mr. Clark: That's what will be published.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes; but, on the other hand, when he reads his speech tomorrow he may have some regrets about what he has said. He had to defend his colleagues in the Commonwealth Parliament, but he may have disregarded the real responsibility which he has in his present position and which is, of course, the welfare of the people of the State. We are complaining about the discrimination that has taken place. I think all members appreciate as much as the Leader appreciates the problems that confront the Commonwealth Government in connection with its Budget, and no-one denies it the right to control its own finances, but no-one should deny to anyone else the right to criticize the way in which it does that.

Mr. Nankivell: As long as it is constructive.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I always try to be constructive. I have no hesitation in supporting the motion, because I believe this is a matter of discrimination. In three ways, this State has been discriminated against in the Commonwealth Budget. First, it has been said already that two-thirds of the wine produced in Australia is produced in this State. The members for Chaffey, Kavel and Victoria have a special interest in this matter. Secondly, South Australia is a large producer of motor vehicles, so that the sales tax on motor vehicles must have an effect on that industry in the State. In the secondary industry field, the State depends on the motor vehicle industry. Thirdly, the sales tax affects consumer durables and home appliances. It has often been said that 71 per cent of our secondary industry is based on consumer durables and anything that affects that market affects South Australia drastically.

Mr. Clark: Particularly in some areas.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, such as that represented by the honourable member. The sales tax increase in respect of motor vehicles, home appliances and wine is the reason why the Premier has decided to raise this objection with South Australian members of the Commonwealth Parliament about discrimination against the State in the Commonwealth Budget.

We do not deny that the Commonwealth Government has the right to manage its affairs, but we think that we have a perfect right and, indeed, a responsibility to draw the attention of South Australian members of the Commonwealth Parliament to what we believe is not a reasonable deal for this State.

The Leader said that, as well as taking something away, the Budget is giving something, and he referred to income tax relief. I was under the impression that the Commonwealth Government intended to spread this income tax reduction affecting middle income earners over three years, but I doubt that there will be any further reductions in the next two years. Talking about political motivations, one can probably connect this with the Senate election. It amazes me that people with a taxable income of \$30,000 will get some relief, yet the relief was supposed to relate to the middle and lower income brackets. If one runs through the scale provided in the *News* one sees that people earning \$10,000 or \$11,000 a year receive about \$400 rebate in addition to what they received previously. The Leader is saying that this is a good thing but that, in order to do it, more money has to be raised, so it is all right to hit the wine growers for \$15,200,000 in a full year.

The extra sales tax on motor vehicles will mean an increase of from \$35 to \$70 in their price. This will make it more difficult for people to purchase cars, and if there are fewer purchases industry in this State will suffer. True, the future of the motor vehicle industry is not exactly in jeopardy but it is not all that rosy, either. Chrysler Australia Limited and General Motors-Holden's would be far happier if they were selling more cars than they are now selling. This sort of thing will not assist them. The same thing applies to home appliances.

The Premier, in my view, wanted to give this House and every member in it a reasonable and rational way to express to South Australian members of the Commonwealth Parliament, whether in the Senate or the House of Representatives, our objection to the singling out of South Australia in the Budget and the discrimination that has been displayed against us. I think it is perfectly reasonable that we do this; indeed, we would be letting down the people in one of our important primary industries if we did not do this. I refer to the wine industry, which is possibly one of the few primary industries today that is going reasonably well; I think every honourable

member will agree with that. It is the only primary industry that I know of that does not go to the Commonwealth Government for a subsidy or is not seeking tariff protection, as other primary industries have had to do to survive: indeed, those industries are not surviving very well; they are only just managing.

Are we to get these people into the same position that the other primary industries are in simply because the Commonwealth Government sees this as an area to which it can apply a tax? I think we would be remiss as South Australians, particularly as this is such an important industry to South Australia, if we did not raise the sort of protest we are raising tonight. I consider that the Premier is to be commended for taking the earliest opportunity available to him to do this, and I want to disabuse the minds of members of the Opposition who say that we are doing this purely and simply for political expediency.

Mr. Millhouse: You haven't done that yet.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: One could not disabuse the mind of the member for Mitcham on this because I think he could be fairly described as a political animal. He knows this as well as I do. He sees politics in everything from the time he wakes until the time he goes to sleep.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you deny there is politics in this?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member would not accept anything from this Government. If he does not promote something he automatically assumes that there is politics in it. I have a genuine concern about this, and I think it is a right and proper move to inform South Australian members in the Commonwealth Parliament that we as State Parliamentarians are concerned about the effect of the Budget on our State. We want to draw this to their attention and ask them to do something about it. If the member for Mitcham thinks that is being political, that is all right, but in my view it is not being political. We are not being parochial either, as we have been described by the Leader of the Opposition. I think we have a responsibility to stand up for the rights of the people in the industries about which I have spoken. Obviously, members of the Opposition would not do that because they would be afraid of upsetting their senior partners in Canberra.

We are asked by the Leader of the Opposition not to do this although he did try to square off with the industries concerned at the end of

his speech. Not only that, but we are also required by him to tell the Commonwealth Government how to solve all these problems. I have mentioned one matter that I think should be eased in a little more gradually, and if that were done perhaps these imposts would be avoided. However, I am not going to tell Mr. Bury how to run his Budget: I am just telling him that as a South Australian I am not very happy about the deal he has given South Australia. That is the point we are making. I hope that the resolution will be conveyed to members of the Commonwealth Parliament and that they will act accordingly. The Leader of the Opposition has said that this situation cannot be changed. He is wrong about this: it can be changed in either the House of Representatives or the Senate. However, we all know that that would lead to another election.

Mr. Millhouse: You will keep on hoping that.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am hoping that the honourable member will see fit to support us in what I believe is a genuine effort to draw the attention of South Australian members in the Commonwealth Parliament to something that we in this State consider is unfair and unjust. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): The Premier, when he moved this motion, had the hide to describe members on this side as partisan. This was as a result of interjections by me and, I think, by the Leader. Apparently, he tried to pretend that there was no partisanship in this motion. I was therefore interested and rather amused when the Deputy Premier was honest enough to avoid giving me a direct answer to my interjection when I asked him whether there were any politics in this. He went right around the point. He was honest enough not to give a straight-out answer to that, because no reasonable person would for a moment ignore the political motives behind this motion. Of course it is a political motion. It is a very clever political ploy on the part of the Government and all the interjections earlier from the Government side, (and you would have noted that nine-tenths of the interjections came from that side, Mr. Speaker) and the speeches by the Premier and the Deputy Premier have been designed to focus attention on the wine industry, the motor vehicle industry and the consumer durables industry.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's the purpose of the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Why has this been done? It has been done for a twofold purpose: first, to help the member for Chaffey, who is in a rather shaky electoral position. He won the election by 34 votes, on Country Party preferences, and if anything can be done to support him—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —the Government will do it.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in this motion about the results of the election in the Chaffey District. The honourable member for Mitcham must confine his remarks to the motion before the House and honourable members on the Government side must cease interjecting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Quite apart from that matter (and I need not refer to it again and, out of deference to you, Mr. Speaker, I will not) there is also the little question of the forthcoming Senate election.

Mr. McKee: That's not in the motion.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, but it is in the mind of every member opposite, and that is just as good and far more significant. Those are the reasons why this motion has been moved. The Deputy Premier said rather piously that this motion would give every member an opportunity, in a reasonable and rational way, to convey our views, I think he said, to members of the Commonwealth Parliament from this State. That sounds pretty good but, if he and the Government were really genuine and if there were no politics in the matter, why did the Government wait until this evening to move this motion? After all, the Commonwealth Budget speech was delivered last evening and we have been sitting since 2 p.m. today.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: This afternoon was private members' time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is why it was not moved this afternoon! Apparently, the Government has a tender regard for the rights of private members and the business that those members want to debate on Wednesday afternoon.

Mr. Langley: We curtailed Question Time, as well.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, it is very good of Government members to have such consideration for us and to wait until this evening to move the motion. Let me take

the matter a step further, because I guessed I would get that answer from Ministers. If members opposite had such a tender consideration for the business that members on this side wanted to put before the House, why were we not given some notice of this motion so that we could be ready for it? Why was this motion pushed on us at about 7.35 p.m., without any notice whatever that there was to be a suspension of Standing Orders? I was speaking at 6 p.m. and I resumed speaking at 7.30 p.m. It was not until I had finished my speech that notice of the motion was given to members on this side. Why was this?

If the Government intended to give members an opportunity in a reasonable and rational way to make their views known to their Canberra colleagues, why did it not give us notice of this motion so that we could be prepared for it? Why did the Premier foist this motion on the House without any notice whatever? He had the whole afternoon to tell my Leader that he proposed to move the suspension of Standing Orders. I have no doubt that the Labor Caucus met this morning and planned this line of action. Why were we not told about it? The answer is that the Labor Caucus wanted to trick us, to take us by surprise. Well, they succeeded to an extent in taking us by surprise, and I will give them some marks for that, but it gives the lie to what they have said—that they want a bi-partisan approach and that there are no politics in the motion. If they had been genuine and decent in this matter they would have told us that this motion was coming, but we heard not one word about it until the honourable gentleman got up to move the suspension of Standing Orders. I should be very glad if members opposite would answer that point, but I notice, for the first time during this debate, that they are silent. Let us leave that point, because I think I have made it sufficiently strongly.

Let us get on to another matter that arises from the motion and the debate—the pious speech with which the Premier moved this motion. No-one likes paying taxation. I know that the Labor Party likes to impose it on people whom it does not regard as its supporters but, apart from that, no-one enjoys levying income tax or any other form of taxation. So, it is very easy indeed for the Government of this State to move a motion of this nature to criticize the Commonwealth Government which (and I think I should mention this in case it has been forgotten) is composed of people of

the opposite political colour to the Party in power in South Australia. It is very easy to do that, and I have no doubt whatever that many people in South Australia will feel sympathetic, because we all hate paying taxation. We do not like having additional imposts put upon us and, naturally, there will be sympathy for this motion.

Let me make one point even clearer than it now is: it is in the interests of members opposite to denigrate the Commonwealth Government and criticize it at every turn because they want it to lose and they want to get it out of office. They do not want to lose any seats in the Commonwealth Parliament; indeed, they want to pick up a few more seats if they possibly can. However, when we hear criticism of the Commonwealth Government from the Labor Party, let us remember that such criticism is coloured by the partisanship of members opposite. Whom do they support in the Commonwealth sphere? They support Labor Party members in the Commonwealth Parliament because they are of the same Party, and anything the Government Party here can do to support their colleagues in Canberra they will naturally do; but they do not support the Commonwealth Government. If one remembers that, it discounts by a great measure the motion that the Premier moved with such unctuousity tonight. It is easy for this Government to criticize the Commonwealth Government for its Budget, for the taxation that has been imposed, and for the concessions it has allowed to the people of Australia. It can criticize the Budget both ways, because it is entirely irresponsible in this matter. It does not have any responsibility to the rest of Australia. The Government overlooks, or would like the people of Australia and of this State to overlook, that the Commonwealth Government has a responsibility to the whole of this continent and not only to one part of it. If ever there was partisanship and politics in any motion it is in this, and it is utterly irresponsible, apart from the partisanship and politics to which I have referred.

I have criticized, and other members here have criticized from time to time, the present working of the federal system, but what we see tonight is merely one more example of irresponsibility in the working of that system. Here we have a Government which has been in office not three months, but which loses no opportunity to criticize the Commonwealth Government's niggardliness for what it will not give to South Australia by way of money.

It has done it every day. I think within a day of the Premier's coming into office this attitude started, and he was going to bring the Commonwealth Government to heel at that time. We have had it every day since and now it is coming in the other way. This Government is criticizing the Commonwealth Government, not because that Government has failed to give funds to South Australia but for raising funds.

Only one who thought of politics above all else and who did not give a damn about the welfare of Australia, or of the true welfare of the people of this State, would do what the Premier has done. It is the height of irresponsibility to criticize the Commonwealth Government for not forking out enough while at the same time criticizing it for collecting money through taxation. That is what we have tonight. What else are we asking our Commonwealth members to do? It is easy for Commonwealth Labor members to accept this motion, and they will use it with alacrity. No doubt it has been discussed with them. It will help them in Canberra during their attack on the Budget next week. One does not have to be a clairvoyant to know that that will happen. But what about the Commonwealth members who support my Party? What does the Government really expect them to do? Does it really expect them to take notice of a motion that will be pushed through this House by weight of numbers by their political opponents, because what would the result be if Liberal and Country Party members in Canberra supported this motion or took note of it and acted on it? It would be tantamount to turning the Commonwealth Government out of office.

Everyone knows that a Government lives or dies on its financial proposals as contained in the Budget. If the Budget is defeated the Government falls, and that is what the Government members are asking South Australian Liberal members to do: they are asking them to defeat their own Government. It is beyond my comprehension that Government members should believe that anyone who thinks about this would swallow that, and yet that is what this motion does. I do not think there is any need for me to say more. The Leader covered the field, I thought rather to the surprise of members opposite. No doubt they thought they would take him unawares, and hoped he would not have any material prepared to rebut the arguments and to put the other side of the case as he did, and I do not need to cover those points again. This is a bare-faced

political move, the sole object of which is to embarrass us as an Opposition and to embarrass the Commonwealth Government, utterly irrespective of the true interests of the people of this State or of the true interests of the people of Australia.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): Let me make this clear: we would not have the intention of embarrassing the member for Mitcham about anything: he is unembarrassable! Let me say also that I knew about this motion before the member for Mitcham knew about it: I knew about it at 7.30 this evening.

Mr. Millhouse: And not before?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: And not before!

Mr. Millhouse: Oh!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member may disbelieve me if he wishes, but that is the position.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We actually did have some submissions from the industry this afternoon.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member made no attempt to reply to the charge of discrimination, and this is the basic issue involved in this motion and in the Commonwealth Government's attitude. We believe that the Commonwealth Government is not facing up to its responsibility to the whole of Australia. We believe that it is prepared to contemplate actions which it knows will discriminate against South Australia and that it does this in the knowledge that the credit squeeze that is imposed, because of South Australia's dependence on the motor car industry and on consumer durables generally, will discriminate against South Australia and produce a proportionately greater contraction in employment in South Australia than anywhere else in Australia. That is the background to this Commonwealth Budget. The existence of a Commonwealth Government credit squeeze has an adverse effect on South Australia to a relatively greater extent than on any other State.

It is in that context that the tax on wine and the increased sales tax on motor vehicles and electrical goods have to be viewed. The Commonwealth Government's action also needs to be viewed in the context of the form of reduction of income tax that the Commonwealth Government has proposed in this Budget. Were it not for the particular form of reduced income tax that the Commonwealth

Government has proposed, these imposts, which have a discriminatory effect on South Australia, would not have been necessary.

I was interested this afternoon to hear the member for Light quote the figures, which I think he said related to 1968, and which he also said indicated that not significantly more than 10 per cent of Australian taxpayers had a taxable income greater than \$5,000 a year. Having checked on the latest report of the Commissioner of Taxation, I point out that in 1967-68 there were 3,303,000 taxpayers, of whom 384,317 had a taxable income greater than \$5,000; so that 11.6 per cent of the taxpayers in Australia in 1967-68 had a taxable income of over \$5,000. Only 222,404 taxpayers (6.7 per cent) had a taxable income greater than \$6,000. I ask members to check in the *News* this evening to note the reduction in income tax that applies to the top 5 per cent of income earners in Australia. For a person earning a taxable income of \$5,000, the reduction in tax is a little over \$2 a week; at \$7,000, the reduction in tax is \$4 a week; at \$8,000, it is \$5 a week; at \$10,000—

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Minister resume his seat. Would the honourable member in the Speaker's Gallery return to his seat and cease entering into conversation. Otherwise, I will have to clear the gallery. Please take your seat.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: At \$10,000 the rate of reduction in income tax is \$7 a week, and fewer than 5 per cent of the total number of taxpayers earns \$10,000 or more. At \$16,000 the rate of reduction in income tax is \$10 a week. If we assume that at present there is a relief, on average, of \$5 a week or about \$250 a year for the top 400,000 income earners in Australia, that tax concession amounts to \$100,000,000, which is almost half of the total benefit provided in income tax reduction and which will go to the top 10 per cent of income earners in Australia; they will earn anything from \$3 to \$4 a week up to as much as \$10 a week. The Commonwealth Government puts forward that proposition and, in order to finance it, has to introduce taxes on wine and companies and, in particular, the other taxes, which discriminate against South Australia on motor vehicles and electrical goods. This is the circumstance confronting us at present, and it is to this that we take objection.

The Leader referred to our view on school buildings, so I will restate the position for his benefit. When the Commonwealth Government introduced State aid for independent

schools, namely, a payment of \$50 a head for each secondary school child and \$35 a head for each primary school child attending an independent school, the argument used was as follows: why is nothing to be paid to Government schools whose problems over educational standards are just as great as, if not greater than, those of many independent schools? The answer that came after great criticism and protest from all sections of Government education throughout Australia was that a survey would be undertaken by the State Ministers of Education co-operating with the Commonwealth Government to find out the educational needs of Government systems of education throughout Australia. That survey having been undertaken, it indicates a gap, between the finance available and what is needed over a five-year period, of \$1,400,000,000 over the whole of Australia and \$200,000,000 for South Australia.

At the time of the last Commonwealth election, the Prime Minister said that, when the result of the survey was known, methods of assistance for the States would be looked into and discussed. As a result of the change in the income tax reimbursement formula, the Commonwealth has said that it does not intend to give assistance on recurrent expenditure for education. I point out that this new formula provides a significant change in the percentage increase in income tax reimbursement grants for only this financial year. In the next four financial years of the five-year agreement we revert back to a percentage rate of increase in the income tax reimbursement grant that is little different from what it was for the previous five years. The formula is determined by adding the percentage increase in population to the percentage increase in award wages and a betterment rate of 1.8 per cent.

Mr. Nankivell: Is this in the motion?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am answering the Leader of the Opposition. The previous formula had a betterment factor of only 1.2. If there is a population increase of 2 per cent and an award wage increase of 5 per cent, under the previous formula the percentage increase in the income tax reimbursement grant would have been 8.2 per cent; now it will be 8.8 per cent after this year. That is the effective change, so there is a gloss this year and then the same old trouble for the remaining four years of the five-year period. The Commonwealth Government has now made a decision on this. However, it

has made no decision yet on whether it will meet what in my view are its moral obligations in respect of the school-building programme. Nothing was announced in the Budget last night. However, I am informed that nothing has yet been said to indicate that the Commonwealth Government has rejected the special pleas for assistance for capital purposes that were made by each State Minister of Education. It is a pity that the Commonwealth proposals were not announced last night, because we in this State are ready to spend the money if it is made available. I hope that it will be announced soon.

Let me put this point to the Leader of the Opposition: it is important, if the Commonwealth says "No" on this score as well, that the consequences of its saying "No" be dramatized to the people of South Australia. People do not understand what it means to miss out on \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 or \$7,000,000, for those figures do not have any real impact, in my view. However, they do understand when we say that if we are not going to get, say, \$3,000,000 these projects such as the one I announced cannot be undertaken.

Mr. Clark: They have been urgent for years.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, projects that we have wanted to carry out for ages. This is a way of getting across to people just what the Commonwealth assistance means. Of course, if the Commonwealth assistance does come, the people likewise know where the assistance has come from to enable this building to take place. I make no apologies whatever for the announcement that was made on this score.

The main issue in this whole matter is the matter of the Commonwealth Government's seeming almost to adopt an attitude of "Well, we can kick South Australia in the guts because they voted the wrong way, anyhow."

Mr. Lawn: That's apparently what they're doing.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This is how it appears. Surely the Commonwealth Government is aware that the effect of the credit squeeze, because of South Australia's concentration on motor cars and on consumer durables (things that have to be financed by credit), is that South Australia will suffer a proportionately greater adverse impact than any other State. After all, when we came into power our case at the time of the Premier's Conference for additional assistance for

school buildings was that the credit squeeze would have a sufficient impact on the building industry to give us the excess capacity to go ahead with this, and the Commonwealth Treasury recommended a special grant for South Australia for school buildings; in other words, it accepted that the building industry here had the capacity. However, the recommendation was knocked over at the political level.

Mr. Nankivell: What credit restriction?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member has been overseas and he may not be aware that interest rates have risen to a record level for this century. Also, credit restrictions are operating through the banking system and credit generally is extremely tight. If the honourable member has not yet heard the news, I suggest that he consult his colleagues about what has happened while he has been away. I describe this as a credit squeeze, and money is tight.

Mr. Becker: You may describe it as a credit squeeze.

Mr. Ryan: So do other people.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the member for Hanson thinks that an interest rate of nearly 7 per cent on Government bonds is not a sign of a credit squeeze, I would not know what he would say about the kind of interest rate (3½ per cent) that applied during the Second World War on long-term Government bonds. I suppose that must have been hyper-inflation! When interest rates increase to the extent that they have increased on bank borrowing and on Government bonds, the average citizen is paying interest at a much higher level than that, and this has an impact not just on the willingness of people to borrow but also on the availability of credit. This is what has happened. Banks have tightened up and hire-purchase companies are tightening up. Because of this tightening up, particularly by hire-purchase companies, we are getting an impact on those industries in South Australia that depend on the provision of hire-purchase credit.

Mr. Becker: They've run out of money.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member claims to be a banker. No bank runs out of money in February.

Mr. Becker: I'm talking about hire-purchase companies.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No hire-purchase company in Australia runs out of money under present conditions without a

severe credit squeeze first being imposed on the banking system and without a drastic adjustment of interest rates to push up the interest rates on assets that are competing with deposits or debentures issued by the hire-purchase companies, and hire-purchase companies run into money difficulties only when they start to run into difficulty about repayments and when they have their own liquidity troubles. This is the sign of a credit squeeze. Normally, mild restrictions that operate through the banking system have little impact on hire-purchase companies.

South Australia produces 35 per cent of the total Australian production of motor cars and a high percentage of the Australian production of refrigerators, washing machines, and stoves. We rely on those industries for employment for our workforce. The sale of these products depends on the availability of hire-purchase finance and, consequently, the kind of credit squeeze we have will adversely affect those industries. The Commonwealth Government has expert economic advice and it knows that South Australia, as a result of any credit squeeze, will experience a bigger proportional impact than will any other State, yet it has seen fit to introduce taxation measures that will increase that impact.

Mr. Becker: Are you blaming the economic experts?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No. I am saying that the economic experts would be able to tell the Commonwealth Government that the impact on South Australia of the taxation measures proposed by the Commonwealth Government will be proportionately heavier than the impact on any other State will be.

Mr. Becker: Are you saying the economic experts were ignored?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is what I said. If the honourable member cannot understand what I say, he had better listen more carefully, because this is not a lecture and I should not have to repeat things four or five times for the benefit of people who cannot understand.

Mr. Mathwin: Are you suggesting that this Budget was brought in specifically against South Australia?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am suggesting that the Commonwealth Government has shown that it does not care much whether or not it discriminates against South Australia; otherwise, it would have been more careful in

working out its taxation proposals. I suggest, too, that only the grossly inequitable income tax proposals (designed allegedly to help the lower income groups but, in fact, helping the upper income groups) have made these tax proposals necessary. I suggest, further, that the Commonwealth Government has discriminated against South Australia in its public works programme for some years. In recent years only 4 per cent of its works programme has been directed towards South Australia, even though this State has over 9 per cent of Australia's population. All these things have been building up.

The Commonwealth Government is trying to adopt a political attitude by saying, "Get into line, South Australia, or we are going to continue our tough attitude towards you." This seems to me to be obvious discrimination, to which we ought to object. True, the Commonwealth Government has a responsibility to the whole of Australia, but it has a responsibility to treat each State equitably and not to introduce measures that clearly and patently discriminate against one section of the people. Where that happens the people who are discriminated against have every right to voice the strongest and most determined protest. The Commonwealth Government is trying to tell the people of South Australia in this rather unpleasant way, "You have to be taught a lesson for what you have done in the Commonwealth and State elections." This seems to be the kind of attitude being adopted, but it is wrong and we object to it. I emphasize again the point made by the Premier: the one rural industry in South Australia that is doing reasonably well is grape-growing and winemaking; South Australia is responsible for 75 per cent of Australia's production in this industry.

Mr. Nankivell: What about the dairying industry?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is in difficulties in some places. If a dairy farmer has a metropolitan milk run, he is all right. The beef industry will not be healthy for very long. As the member for Mallee should know, when farmers are in difficulties in other forms of production and there is a profitable avenue in beef production, it will not be very long before beef production expands considerably and the returns from that form of production are substantially reduced. Furthermore, the signs in the North American market are not very favourable.

Mr. Gunn: How long does it take to build up a beef herd?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It takes some time, but does the honourable member suggest that there will not be a move into beef production in South Australia?

Mr. Gunn: No, but it will take some time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, but the consequences of building it up will increase production over a period and adversely affect returns in that sector. If members opposite seriously want to say that the South Australian rural economy is healthy, all right—but they know full well that it is not. They know full well that the prospects in a year or two in beef production are not very bright, particularly as a consequence of recent events in the North American market and of the attitude of the United States Congress towards meat exports from Australia. Ever more stringent regulations may be imposed against meat from another country, in order to protect the American beef producers. Opposition members should know these facts. The wine industry in South Australia has been progressing because of development in metropolitan areas and because people have become better off and have developed a taste for wine, thus causing the gradual expansion of the wine market.

Mr. Gunn: What about promotion?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is not only that: it is a consequence of a higher standard of living, which has resulted in more and better restaurants in cities and therefore larger sales of wine. Only a few years ago the wine industry was in difficulties; surplus grape production existed in 1965. At that time the average winemaker was probably earning 4 per cent on capital. Now the industry is expanding and is relatively healthy, and as a result the river districts have been able to get by, and the excellent market for grapes is offsetting the effect of adverse markets for other products from those districts. This is the one really healthy industry there, and it will be knocked on the head.

Mr. Becker: What about the areas that depend solely on wine?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Such as the Barossa Valley? That does not depend solely on winemaking.

Mr. Becker: Some areas do.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not think so, but nevertheless I imagine that the member for Kavel will support this motion because of the impact of this impost on his district.

However, I think he would say that his district was not entirely dependent on grapegrowing and winemaking; important, vital, and critical to his district though these industries are. We know that Opposition members represent rural areas, and they must be disturbed because a healthy rural industry is to take this taxation knock in circumstances where so many rural industries are in grave difficulty and in circumstances where so much of the North, Mid-North, North-East, and Mallee districts are experiencing drought conditions.

The attitude of the Commonwealth Government in these circumstances should be condemned and we should be asking South Australian representatives in the Commonwealth Parliament to voice their protest, because I believe that it is not too late for the Commonwealth Government to back down and decide not to impose this duty on wine. After all, as a result of protests in the past it has backed down on issues. We live in a democratic country: if we do not express our opposition to the action of Governments we will never get the kind of effective democratic opinion properly expressed that we want. I support the motion.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra) moved:

That this debate be now adjourned.

Mr. GUNN seconded the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman (teller), Carnie, Eastick, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (25)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, Lawn, McKee, McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Evans. No—Mr. Ryan.
Majority of 8 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: At the outset, I wish to protest at the well-nigh incredible discourtesy of the Government.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I've never heard you get up before and start with a protest!

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is out of order in interjecting.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This motion, which is a no-confidence motion in the Commonwealth Government, was moved without any warning being given to the Leader of the Opposition. I have been a member of this House for 22 years during most of which time the Premier was Sir Thomas Playford, and he was never guilty of anything like this in his life.

Mr. Ryan: Whom are you kidding?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: On no occasion did he show any kind of discourtesy; he always considered the Opposition. I have also been here as a member of a Government led by the present Leader and he, too, was most considerate of the Opposition's rights and wishes, as no-one can deny. I was a member of the Opposition when the late Mr. Frank Walsh was Premier, and I could make no complaint about the way he treated the Opposition, although one exception to that is not relevant here because it was not a matter of discourtesy. On the other hand, I have observed in the last few weeks a string of arrogant discourtesies to the Opposition and, indirectly, to the people of South Australia. We discussed into the early hours of this morning a Bill that the Government pushed through, having decided that it was so urgent that the Loan Estimates and other legislation must be put aside. Now suddenly a motion of no-confidence in the Commonwealth Government has been moved by the Premier without the Leader's even having a copy in his hands at the time. I went to the Clerk at the table and, when I asked him for a copy, he said that copies were being run off and would be available in a few moments. By that time, the Leader had been speaking for about 10 or 15 minutes. I know of no better example of arrogance than what has happened in this case. It was more than arrogance: it was also a neat little plot to get the maximum political benefit from the vast army of public relations officers appointed at public expense.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That isn't in the motion.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Premier is a very good performer; he has performed on the stage and he speaks and controls himself well. Unfortunately, his followers do not control themselves as well as he does. A string of interjections coming from the Government benches, "What about the wine industry?" gave away the whole plot. There was not one interjection that I can recall referring

to the motor car industry or the refrigerator manufacturing industry or anything else. Furthermore, there seems to be a rather shabby attempt to pretend that members on the Government benches did not know about this, for the Minister of Education said that he did not know about this until 7.30 p.m. tonight. Unfortunately for his credibility, he had previously interjected when the member for Mitcham complained about this motion's being introduced without warning; when the member for Mitcham asked why it was not brought on earlier, the Minister said that they were considering private members' business.

Mr. Millhouse: Yet he said they did not know about it until 7.30 p.m.

Mr. Langley: I said that.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Education said that, and he left an unfortunate and blatant credibility gap which he ought to explain instead of treating the House to an economic lecture simply so he can get it put in print and then show it to his army of people, whether they be Commonwealth members or anyone else. Most of his speech had little or no relation to this motion.

Mr. Langley: When are you going to start talking to the motion?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: As everyone knows or should know, I represent a district that plays an important part in the wine industry, and I have arranged to meet the winemakers and grapegrowers in the district at the first opportunity after the House rises.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You ought to give them a copy of your Leader's speech, too.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: No sort of warning was given to me that there was to be any sort of motion like this, that there was to be what I call a no-confidence motion in the Commonwealth Government. There is much information in relation to the wine industry in general and much information regarding the effect of the Commonwealth Budget on that industry that is not available to this House. People certainly cannot agree on the amount of mark-up regarding the price of wines. In fact, it has not even been decided, and a meeting is to be held tomorrow on that, yet the Premier wants to push this motion through in order to make a little stink for the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Clark: They have done that themselves.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I grant that the Premier is an expert in abusing the Com-

monwealth Government, and he has spent much energy in doing so. He has asked for a completely open-ended commitment; he wants everything and will grant nothing; he asks for stamp duty release and a reduction in the interest burden; he appealed that there should be no steps to increase sales tax; and he wants an increase in Commonwealth capital expenditure. All these are requests to the Prime Minister, sometimes with phrases such as "The Commonwealth must come to heel". He described the Commonwealth's offshore minerals law as a massive exercise in centralization of power.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: So does every Liberal Attorney-General in Australia.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It is interesting to see that the Premier appears to have turned into a States-righter, when only a few years ago he said:

The only successful answer to the whole problem is that Australia shall have one enlarged sovereign Parliament, with a central administration in some things and a decentralized administration through a county system—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Can the honourable member assure me that he will link his remarks with the motion?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I ask for your indulgence to complete the last two or three lines, and then I shall do so. The whole sentence states:

The only successful answer to the whole problem is that Australia shall have one enlarged sovereign Parliament, with a central administration in some things and a decentralized administration through a county system subject to that Parliament.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford interjected and stated:

Is the honourable member stating his personal or his Party's view?

The present Premier replied:

My Party's view.

That is the man who claims to be a States-righter, but he harasses the Commonwealth Government to spend more money in South Australia and on South Australia yet he has no regard for the Commonwealth Government's responsibilities in other matters. That man apparently is not in the least interested in the Commonwealth Government's defence commitments. We know that, although the Commonwealth defence expenditure is being increased in this Commonwealth Budget, the increase is not as great as it has been in the

previous year. We also know that the Commonwealth Government has many vast responsibilities, not the least of which is the balance of the economy. None of those matters is recognized in this State Government's complaints. This Government simply wants to abuse the Commonwealth Government. That is its only objective, and it has set out to do that this evening. If anyone still doubts the correctness of that statement, let me remind the House of some of the comments that have been made. The dignified Minister of Roads and Transport said, "Get out and defend your rotten Liberals."

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You tell the people in the street what you're saying this evening and see whether you have to defend yourself.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: That is a dignified statement indeed.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: There's a lot of dignity in the 50c they gave the pensioners, too.

Mr. Venning: That's not on the point.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The member for Pirie said sarcastically to the Leader, "You're going to win some friends in this debate." The member for Pirie knew that the Leader was criticizing the motion. The member for Playford also interjected and said, "Why don't you tell us about the wine impost?" The member for Playford has not the slightest interest in the wine impost. He should have an interest in motor cars and manufacturing, but he was only able to make this cry about the wine impost, showing that this whole debate is nothing more than a silly ploy.

Mr. Clark: The wine impost is part of the motion.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Opposition members are prepared to hold their heads up and not descend to that sort of abuse. I have never known this Parliament previously to indulge in the undignified criticism of a Government in another Parliament such as we have had this evening, and I hope it does not happen again. Just imagine the reverse situation, with a Labor Government in office in Canberra and something similar to what has happened in the Commonwealth Budget happening here. Can you imagine members of the Government Party here criticizing their own Government in Canberra? I have been here long enough to know that they do not do that, because they are frightened of doing it even if they want to.

The Hon. L. J. King: What would have been your attitude if a Labor Government in Canberra had introduced this Budget?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The only member who was not afraid to speak up was thrown out of the Labor Party, and he then became a useful member for many years afterwards. We know the ironclad type of discipline that rules the Labor Party, and we know how absurd is the hypothetical situation of Labor Party members criticizing a Commonwealth Labor Government. The Attorney-General asked me what my attitude would be toward a Commonwealth Labor Government. I should be happy to criticize it if I felt like it: it is so obvious that it is a silly question. However, what I have never done and would never do would be to come into the House and read a motion asking the Opposition to support me in a no-confidence motion in the Commonwealth Government without even having had the courtesy to let the Opposition know in advance or even to let them know the terms of the motion until it was read out. I would not do that. That is the answer to the Attorney-General. Inflation is not a worry to this State, nor is defence. We have to defend this country somehow, but we cannot do it by defying the National Service Act. One day someone may come along and want to occupy this country, and we will expect to have a Commonwealth Government that has a sufficiently responsible attitude towards defending it. The Commonwealth Government's efforts at defence are now being seriously sabotaged by the statements of people such as the Premier, who has said he would defy the National Service Act.

The Deputy Premier, who is Minister of Works, was asked a simple question—so simple that he would not answer it. Apparently, it was too simple. He was asked, "Do you deny that there are politics in this motion?" Everyone in this House witnessed that he did not say "Yes" or "No". He was asked the question several times but he hedged without answering it. Of course, he would not answer it: he did not want to say "Yes". The fact that there are politics in the motion is so obvious that I do not know why he bothered to hedge. It shows a further lack of dignity in the Government's attitude.

Mr. Wells: Are you being political now?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Because I am a politician I am prepared to speak

politically, to be honest about my political opinions, and to give them to people when they ask for them.

Mr. Wells: What is your opinion on the motion before the Chair?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I do not like the humbug displayed by the Government, and I do not like its arrogance in treating the House in the way it has in the last few weeks. I do not like the Government's setting out with an all-embracing motion that amounts to a no-confidence motion in another Government in another Parliament. That is not any kind of dignity or good behaviour for a Government to adopt. Imagine the anguished squeals that would be heard if Mr. Gorton introduced a motion about the South Australian Government: it is almost unimaginable that that should happen, but here we have the Government doing that to the Commonwealth Government. Almost no reference, apart from the brief one by the Premier, was made to other matters included in the motion. The member for Chaffey, who of course was well prepared, having been given plenty of notice about the motion, had stacks of notes, and made some observations about the wine industry, but completely forgot to say anything about the other parts of the motion. The whole exercise is to have a vote to ascertain whether the Opposition will satisfy the Government by voting against the motion.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Would winemakers agree with the view you are expressing?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have already discussed some of the behaviour of the Minister of Roads and Transport that I find disgusting.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Abuse won't get you anywhere.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister is showing the political bias that motivated the moving of this motion, although the Minister of Works would not admit it. This evening I asked for the simple courtesy of an adjournment of this discussion in order to obtain more information. The Commonwealth Budget was introduced last evening when we were sitting; we sat for hours afterwards, and have been sitting for most of today.

Mr. Lawn: Did you ask the Government for the adjournment and give your reasons in a courteous manner? It may have considered your request to adjourn the motion.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: About 20 minutes or half an hour before the Minister of Education finished speaking in this debate the member for Victoria, acting as Opposition Whip, told the Government Whip (the member for Unley) why I wanted the adjournment. I asked the member for Victoria what was the reply and he said, "Well, there was no reply. He acknowledged your request but did not say whether it would be granted or not." What more courtesy could I have shown in the circumstances? Good manners in the face of bad—that is what it was.

We should have an adjournment before this motion is decided, because I want more information. A distinct difference of opinion is apparent about the mark-up for wine; there has been no deep assessment of the effect of this impost; and a study should be made not only of the wine industry but also of the other matters included in this motion. However, the Government is not prepared to wait for that study. Usually it is interested in real information but this time it is not chasing information but is chasing a political advantage. I hope that this political advantage will turn into a blatant blue duck. I shall make no secret where I go of what I think of the Government's action, and I make no secret of the fact that, when I meet my constituents, I will tell them that I am extremely concerned about the effect of this duty on the wine industry imposed by the Commonwealth Government in its Budget.

I want to find out what the effect will be, not by following a flash of oratory from Government members who have not done any homework on this subject, but by discussing with leaders of the industry just what the effect will be and by finding out, as well, the results of the meetings, which have been taking place and which will continue tomorrow, dealing with the mark-up on wines. How can a Government seriously claim that this motion should be carried, in spite of the information, to which I have referred, not being available? I do not mind considering this motion, if the debate is to continue at a later stage; indeed, I will examine the motion with the idea of making a respectable amendment to it if the debate continues, say, tomorrow. But I will not support the motion this evening, because it represents a blatant political trick brought about by an arrogant Government.

Mr. WELLS (Florey): At the outset, I point out that this measure was not brought before the House as a matter of political

expediency but that it was conceived of a righteous indignation when it was recognized that the Commonwealth Government, through its Budget, had imposed on two vital areas of our economy stringent restrictions which will in all probability bring great hardship to those particular areas. I cannot understand the member for Alexandra reiterating again and again that this is, in fact, a motion of no confidence in the Commonwealth Government. If it were possible, and if we could achieve anything out of it, it certainly would be a motion of no confidence but, of course, that is not the case.

Through the motion, we are merely asking the Commonwealth members from this State to express their opposition to these imposts on the wine-producing industry and on the motor car industry in this State. Already, we hear news reports on the radio and read in the newspapers that resistance to the buying of motor cars has increased immeasurably over the past week to 10 days, because of the expected 2½ per cent increase in sales tax on cars and accessories.

This increase now being factual, the resistance will increase and undoubtedly we shall find that we have an unemployment situation in the motor car production industry in this State, simply because this additional taxation has been imposed. As the Premier explained, the wine-producing industry was at last, after a long period, on its feet and entering into a sphere of profitability, but this did not satisfy the Commonwealth Government. That Government saw, in our wine industry, an opportunity to seize an extra \$15,000,000, and this it has done with ruthless abandon and with a contempt for the people concerned in the grape-growing and wine-producing industries in this State. It is my opinion that Mr. Gorton, with members of his Government, is smarting because the people of South Australia emphatically rejected his Party's policies at the last Commonwealth election.

Mr. Clark: That is why he sacked Kelly. It was a most petulant act.

Mr. WELLS: Added to this, the Liberal and Country League State Government was rejected and, again, Mr. Gorton was very angry. He delights in attacking the Premier of this State. Members on this side were accused of being discourteous to Opposition members, but Mr. Gorton has been proved to be a most discourteous man in his dealings with the Premier, who approached him in his official capacity as Premier of the State.

Mr. Clark: And not only this Premier, either.

Mr. WELLS: True. What will be the position of members opposite when they go back to their grapegrowing areas? Surely the whole Opposition Party must be concerned at the plight in which the State might find itself.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You wouldn't think so.

Mr. WELLS: True; I am trying to get some reaction from the Opposition. Will the Opposition permit its representatives of the grapegrowing areas, apparently including the member for Alexandra, to go back to their districts and tell the people there that they opposed the protest at the impost of 50c a gallon excess duty on wine? Will they do that, or will they say what I believe is in their hearts and that is, "We recognize that this is wrong and we will side with the Government in this respect, expressing our displeasure at the actions of the Commonwealth Government." Led by the Leader and the Deputy Leader, the Opposition has fought a clever rearguard action. Opposition members have spoken on many subjects, skirting right around the question of the Budget: at no time have they actually confronted the motion. However, ultimately each Opposition member has hesitantly stated, almost at the conclusion of his remarks, that he does not agree to the impost. If that is the position, I imagine that there will be a unanimous decision on this motion. Much has been said about this Budget's balancing and about the benefits flowing to South Australia from it. However, although there is an additional 10 per cent rebate on income tax, the indirect taxation increases more than gobble up any saving that the average wage-earner will make at this juncture, and the position will worsen as the year proceeds. Opposition members must realize the creditability of the Government's action in bringing the motion before the House and in seeking support from Liberal and Labor Commonwealth members to have some measure of justice accorded to the South Australian fruitgrowers, winegrowers and people associated with the automotive industry. If the South Australian members of the Commonwealth Parliament are united on this matter, we can get some action. The Labor Party members will do their bit, but will the Liberal members do something?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: If they did, there would be a majority on that side.

Mr. WELLS: True. Finally, I firmly believe that the Gorton Government is attempting to

punish the voters of South Australia for bringing into power a Labor Government at the last State election. The Government in Canberra vented its spleen on the people of South Australia by rejecting our Premier at the Loan Council and by giving him shoddy treatment. There is now a further exhibition of that spleen and spite in the imposition of two unjust and unwarranted imposts in the Budget in respect of two of the most vital areas of our economy. I do not think this is good enough, and I believe that the people of South Australia will soon make known to everybody concerned that they will not tolerate such shabby treatment from the Commonwealth Government in respect of the industries which mean so much to South Australia. At the next Commonwealth election, whether it be as a result of a double dissolution (which is spoken of so often) or whether the people will have to wait for the Government's full term to end, the people of South Australia will again demonstrate that they will not tolerate any such shabby action as far as their industries and livelihood are concerned.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) moved:
That this debate be now adjourned.

Mr. BECKER seconded the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Ferguson, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (25)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, Lawn, McKee, McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Evans. No—Mr. Ryan.

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Members opposite have started interjecting before I have commenced my speech. In reply to one interjector, I point out that we have had little time in which to get any instructions. This motion was moved immediately after the dinner adjournment, and no-one on this side had seen it before. We are supposed to assess the motion and speak on it, whilst members opposite have been well prepared for many hours. Government members expect us to line up behind them and treat this as a sensible and responsible protest to the Commonwealth

Government. It is a political ruse of the sort to which we are becoming accustomed from this Government. The idea is to put members on this side at a distinct disadvantage.

The member for Chaffey prepared his speech so well that he claimed that his district was the major wine-producing area in the State, producing the largest quantity of wine and the best quality. On the contrary, the Barossa Valley is the vineyard of this State and I represent part of that area, the other part being represented so ably by the member for Light. We have been challenged this evening, and I particularly have been challenged to state my position, which I shall state unequivocally. I would lend all my support to any responsible move that I thought would help the wine industry, but this motion is a totally irresponsible, farcical, transparent, hypocritical move by this Government to embarrass us and the Commonwealth Government. One does not have to be a seer to understand this simple fact.

Mr. McRae: Do you support the principle, though?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If I thought this motion had any merit and any chance of achieving anything, I would be prepared to support an amendment. However, it has been conceived to embarrass Opposition members and the Commonwealth Government for political reasons. In these circumstances we are not prepared to support it. We must get this matter in its right perspective. Who are these great financiers on the other side who exhort us to castigate the Commonwealth Government? The Premier referred to the rural industries and the entrepreneurs in the country. I wonder how many country people would like to be referred to as entrepreneurs. I do not think they would take this term very kindly. The Deputy Premier referred to country people as "cockies" and talked about their taxation deductions. There is plenty of evidence of what the Premier and Deputy Premier think of country people, yet they stand up here and pose as the saviours of the country people. How hypocritical can Government members get? What does the Government intend to do for primary producers? We have heard much about what it will do in connection with land tax, but we are still waiting for it to be spelt out. What will the Government do about succession duties?

Mr. McRae: Do you support the wine industry?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, but I do not support a hypocritical motion pushed in front of us without a minute's notice.

Mr. McRae: Do you support the motion?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course I do not. I support the wine industry, not hypocrites. We asked for an adjournment so that we could frame an amendment, but did we get it? No, of course not!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. I ask that the honourable member be given the courtesy of being heard in silence.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Alexandra said that he was willing to move an amendment. After I had considered it, I might have been prepared to support it. But have we had the opportunity to do these things? Of course not! The Premier has already announced in the daily press that he intends to increase taxes in South Australia. Of course, he is blaming the Commonwealth Government already, but we are getting heartily sick of this tactic—the only political tactic the Government has. What are these financial wizards going to do for us? They have said that they want taxes reduced yet they want increased benefits. Labor Party members do not like the Commonwealth Government's health scheme because they say that not enough is being given away. I do not know how many Government members have been in business on their own account. I have a fair idea how many have run a rural property. Government members say they want reduced taxes and more to be given away. These are the financial wizards who criticize the Commonwealth Government! Let us consider the Government's record since it has been in office, because this matter must be considered in its proper context. In his first flush of success the Premier said that he would bring the Commonwealth Government to heel, so off he went to Canberra, the big new Premier of South Australia, with the idea that he would put the world right.

Mr. Langley: You look like the Statue of Liberty.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is more than I can say for the honourable member. What was the result of the Premier's visit? According to the renegotiated Loan formula, he obtained a significantly increased grant for this State, but what was the reaction? He said that we have had a lousy deal: that is the reaction of a spoilt child.

Mr. Keneally: Do you think we did not get a lousy deal?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Under the terms of the Commonwealth Grants Commission formula we received what we were entitled to receive. Let us consider the relative part of His Excellency's Speech in opening Parliament.

Mr. Ryan: What has this got to do with the motion?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Plenty: the motion is concerned with finance, and I am trying to put it in its proper perspective. The motion expresses disapproval of the Commonwealth Government's financial policy. Paragraph 47 in His Excellency's Speech—

Mr. Clark: This is not the Address in Reply debate.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: —states:

The Consolidated Revenue Account for the year ended June 30, 1970, showed a surplus of \$2,920,000, whereas the Estimates presented to Parliament in September 1969 indicated a possible deficit of \$2,240,000. Whilst expenditures were higher than estimated in consequence of increases subsequently awarded in wages and salaries, those increases were largely offset by increases in . . .

Mr. RYAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member is referring to the Address in Reply debate which has already been concluded and which has no connection with the motion before the House.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order and ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the motion before the House. He must link up his remarks with it and he must not debate any subject that has been dealt with previously by the House. The Address in Reply debate has concluded.

Mr. RODDA: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member for Kavel is quoting from His Excellency's Speech. That document is available to all members.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order of the member for Victoria. The member for Kavel.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We finished with a surplus of \$3,000,000 because of the increased Commonwealth Government grants, and this has been acknowledged. What about the record of our friend or, as someone on this side called him, the little monster, or is it the Minister, of Labour and Industry? The Minister complained as loudly as anyone else that we had not had a good deal from the Commonwealth Government, but what has he done? He says that we do

not have enough money, but gives out \$6,000,000 in margins, not even knowing where the money is coming from. What sort of financial responsibility is this?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Labour and Industry is out of order.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It is wrong to spend money when one does not know where it is coming from.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Anti-working class!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It is a question not of being anti-working class but of having commonsense financial responsibility. The only political tactic this Government has is to whip the Commonwealth Government at every opportunity, and the people of this State are getting thoroughly sick and tired of it.

Mr. Clark: Don't you believe it!

Mr. Langley: Go and have a word with the pensioners!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McRae: Tell us about the wine impost!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Alexandra has pointed out that, given the courtesy of having time to consider this measure, we would be able—

Mr. Simmons: To get instructions!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have seen a Party that receives its instructions; I have heard members on the other side this evening. They had their speeches prepared, but they are not getting instructions! If we were given reasonable time to consider this matter and if the member for Alexandra were accorded the courtesy of being given an opportunity to frame an amendment, there would be every chance that members on this side would support the motion, but we are not prepared to support a motion, which is so obviously phoney and hypocritical and which is conceived simply to embarrass members on this side and the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen) moved:
That this debate be now adjourned.

Mr. RODDA seconded the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney (teller), Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

M2

Noes (25)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, Lawn, McKee, McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Evans. No.—Mr. Ryan.

Motion thus negated.

Mr. McANANEY: I protest at sitting such long hours after the late sitting last night. However, having been a farmer I guess I can continue for some time yet. The Premier has referred to the wine industry. We candidly admit that four or five years ago that industry was in considerable trouble. The growers had had a good harvest and they could not dispose of their surplus grapes for two years. Those growers were financed to a certain extent by the then Government. Prices were fixed by the Prices Commissioner when previously they had been fixed as the result of a general arrangement with the industry. This move was given legality in 1965.

The member for Chaffey knows that in the first year of minimum prices some of the growers were not paid the fixed price because there was a surplus; the law of supply and demand worked, and some growers had to be paid the price for a variety of grape different from the variety they supplied, because that was the only condition under which the grapes could be accepted. Things have now changed, because we have more migrants who have been used to drinking wine and more people generally have begun to drink red wine, particularly; the demand is greater than the supply, with the result that some growers are receiving more than the guaranteed price for their grapes. There is now an excessive demand for wine, and much of it is being sold before it has matured. Possibly some of this excess demand has been created because people are stocking up cellars and not actually consuming the wine. This could mean that the supply and demand will eventually balance.

I asked a question in this House only last week about the wine industry's possibly running into trouble because of excessive plantings. It is the opinion of leaders of the wine industry and those who think about the future of the industry that before long there will be a surplus of production. Whatever levy the Commonwealth Government might have

decided to apply, this situation would have arisen. I suppose that the Commonwealth Government has taken the advice of experts such as officers of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. We have heard from the Minister of Roads and Transport that rather than use any common sense he prefers to listen to experts. This was evident when he promised to meet me in Stirling, saying that he would bring an expert and that he would not take any notice of my opinion or rely on his own opinion.

Mr. McKEE: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I cannot see how the honourable member can relate his remarks about the Minister of Roads and Transport's visit to Stirling to the motion before the Chair.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order. The honourable member for Heysen.

Mr. McANANEY: I thank you for that very wise ruling, Mr. Speaker, because I was about to show the relevance of my remarks. When the Minister agreed to meet me in the streets of Stirling to inspect a road there, he said that he would not take any notice of what I might say but that he would listen to the expert. In my opinion, the expert made a decision that lacked common sense because there was no proper appraisal of the situation. I point out that the question had nothing to do with the quality of the road; I would not dare to argue with an expert on that.

Mr. McKEE: I again rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member is talking about the quality of the road at Stirling, and I cannot see how he can possibly relate his remarks to the motion before the House.

The SPEAKER: I am the arbiter of that. The member for Heysen may continue.

Mr. McANANEY: I will not dwell on this point. The matter comes down to whether one accepts the advice of experts.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must speak to the motion.

Mr. McANANEY: I am dealing with how experts are affected. The Minister of Roads and Transport broke his promise to me and then said on television that the road—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must link his remarks with the motion.

Mr. McANANEY: The Commonwealth Government would have sought advice from experts, and it has made a concession regard-

ing spirits used for fortified wines. Any surplus at present will be in the fortified wine, because the people are drinking much more red wine as table wine. Less sherry and other types of wine are being consumed, and they are the dangerous types, because they contain much more alcohol than other types and are not really good wines to drink to excess. The Commonwealth Government, having noted the surplus, has made a concession on fortified wines, and this will assist the industry to sell sherry.

Mr. Ryan: You're not fair dinkum!

Mr. McANANEY: The member for Florey made the extraordinary statement that, because of the proposed increase of 2½ per cent in sales tax, people would not buy motor cars last week. I think people would rush in and buy motor cars if they thought the price was going up. A member of another place bought a large quantity of whisky, thinking the price would increase, and he had this large quantity of whisky on hand. Members opposite have not mentioned the concession on fortified wine or the fact that the increased customs duty on imported wines will prevent any undue competition from imported wines.

I think the effect of the Commonwealth Government's tax on wine will be felt by the consumers, not by the grapegrowers. It may be said that the increased tax will reduce the demand for wine, but we must remember that the Commonwealth Government is reducing income tax and some wage earners will take home an additional \$2 a week, which will allow them to pay the increase of 8c a bottle for their wine. The average wage in Australia will possibly increase by \$10 a week this year, so the demand for wine will not be reduced because of the increased tax. Although red wine is a luxury we can do without it, but people seem to buy the most expensive wine on the menu when they go to a restaurant. I do not always like high-priced wine: I prefer good red wines produced in Langhorne Creek or McLaren Vale. The Government has not presented a logical case as to how this impost will affect the primary producer. I point out that farmers in dry areas will receive \$30,000,000 as a result of assistance to the wool industry. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has asked for leave to continue his remarks.

Mr. RYAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In accordance with Standing Order No. 180, I point out that a similar request was

made only 10 minutes ago. So, I ask whether the honourable member's request is in order.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member's request is out of order, because he cannot request leave to continue if a similar request has been made less than 15 minutes earlier.

Mr. McANANEY: This will not be a severe penalty to the wine producers: the consumers will pay the extra cost, and South Australians do not consume more wine per capita than people in other States. It has been said that the Commonwealth Government is picking on South Australia, but I point out that this State is getting more money for rail standardization than any other State. The Minister of Education said that medium-income groups were receiving relatively small cuts in income tax and high-income groups were receiving relatively large cuts. However, if we consider the amount of money left after paying tax, we realize that people earning \$6,000 to \$8,000 are proportionately better off than people in the next income bracket. Of course, people earning more than \$32,000 a year do not receive any concession. During the life of this Parliament the Minister of Labour and Industry has announced increases, involving \$6,000,000, in service pay for Government workers. Also, this House recently considered a Bill to increase salaries in the \$14,000 bracket. Were those increases of the same order as the increases in service pay? No! The increases in the higher salaries were increases of a few thousand dollars a year. This principle is accepted throughout the world. Any member who suggests that the reverse should apply is expecting Utopian conditions. Although Utopia has been made to sound interesting, conditions may be more difficult when one arrives at such a place. The Minister of Education has no need to criticize the Commonwealth Government because the largest taxation concessions were made to white collar workers who have objected to paying increased taxation and, in addition, the lower wage earners have also been granted concessions. The Premier has been speaking about an impending credit squeeze for months, but what has happened? About six months ago the Commonwealth Government had let too much credit and there was a great demand for goods, but now the Government has wisely reduced credit availability so that there is a reasonable balance between the demand and our capacity to produce. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No.

The SPEAKER: There being a dissentient voice, leave is not granted.

Mr. McANANEY: In proportion to our population we have received more than 11 per cent of the taxation reimbursement and over 12 per cent of the capital grant, although our population is only 9.2 per cent of the total. The Minister of Education, who was a senior lecturer and who is well versed in economics is, as I have called him before, an economic charlatan because he twists and misconstrues facts. He did this when he said that the Commonwealth Government had granted this State an extra sum this year but that next year we would receive a 1.8 per cent increase only in the betterment factor. He admitted that this had been increased from 1.2 per cent, but this fact has not received its proper emphasis. Because of the excellent conditions relating to the capital grants and interest-free loans made available by the Commonwealth Government for the next five years, in addition to the 4.7 per cent increase we received this year because of the increase in the betterment factor, millions of dollars will be saved by this State because of the reduced payments for interest, and this will benefit the State. Instead of moving this motion the Government should have explained an alternative way of keeping down Commonwealth expenditure. Had that been done we might have listened. However, not one member opposite has advanced a logical argument on what the Budget should have provided.

Mr. Lawn: You can't convince us.

Mr. McANANEY: I am the world's biggest genius if I can convince the member for Adelaide of anything. The percentage increase in allocations to the States is far greater than the percentage increase in taxation to be raised by the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Clark: But that's not supposed to be the point under discussion.

Mr. McANANEY: I really should not answer the member for Elizabeth.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is wise not to answer interjections.

Mr. McANANEY: I am not answering an interjection, Sir; I am just telling you that I am not answering it. One member opposite criticized the pension rate, but that has been increased, although members opposite say it should have been increased by more. The allocation for repatriation services has been increased; everything has been increased. What does the Premier suggest

should have been reduced? One must always come up with a constructive alternative. I read in the *News* this evening that, because of the Commonwealth Budget, the Premier would have to increase taxation. What has that Budget got to do with his increasing taxation? It is a colossal nerve to ask this Parliament to carry a motion instructing Commonwealth members from this State to vote against certain measures included in the Commonwealth Budget and to try to put the Commonwealth Government out of office. The Premier has yet to show that he is capable of running the State's finances, without his telling other Governments what to do.

Mr. Groth: Tell us what you think of the pensioners' increase?

Mr. McANANEY: I never answer interjections, but this introduces another line of thought with which I shall deal. I believe in helping the aged and the sick, but we must decide what to take from one section to give to another. We have been asked whether we believed in granting service pay: naturally we all believe in giving the workers as much as possible, but we must decide whether, say, we grant service pay or whether we build a school.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much conversation.

Mr. Clark: Tell us about little Red Riding Hood!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McANANEY: We come to the national survey on educational needs.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in the motion about that.

Mr. McANANEY: The Minister of Education referred to the building of schools. Although I do not know much law, I think that once a precedent has been established one can deal with the matter in question, because the scope of the debate is widened. The Minister of Education spoke at length about school buildings.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing about school buildings in the motion. The honourable member must relate his remarks to the motion.

Mr. McANANEY: You have deprived me of the right to reply to what another member said in his speech.

Mr. McKEE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is obvious that the member for Heysen is sparring, having no knowledge of the motion.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Pirie is entirely out of order. I ask the honourable member for Heysen to continue, speaking to the motion before the House.

Mr. McANANEY: Although I have dealt adequately with the wine industry, I have not referred to the motor car industry. I hope members opposite take notice of what I say and comment on it; I can be convinced by a logical argument. If this motion were carried and acted upon at the Commonwealth level, it could mean a double dissolution of the Commonwealth Parliament. Therefore, I hope at least some of the new members opposite will oppose the motion. No-one likes to see taxes affect the motor car industry, inflating costs. However, the States have demanded and received much money. Large grants have been made from which more schools can be built and other benefits provided so long as the money is not diverted to some other unproductive source, as has happened in the past. No-one likes to see anything that increases the cost of production. Many cars are purchased for private use, and that does not increase the cost of production. Admittedly that increases the cost of living but, under the provisions in the Budget, there will be much more money available to be spent, so that I cannot see that an increase will inflate the demand for motor cars.

It is fortunate that at this time the motor car industry is increasing its exports to other countries, for this will take up any slack in employment that may occur through what happens here. We must have a wise Budget which balances and is not entirely restrictive but which does not do anything that will add to inflation. We do not want more demand inflation in this country that will deprive us of our ability to export so that we can exchange goods, get them from other countries and raise our living standards. It is up to the Commonwealth to decide whether to give more money to the people to spend as they like, and possibly they will still buy motor cars although, if the present Minister of Roads and Transport does not give us a freeway on which to run our cars, there will be more congestion than there is now.

We must consider all these things. We admit that motor cars are an important factor. However, I have never yet been able to work out from the quarterly statistics in respect of what is produced in South Australia the alleged high dependence on sales to the other States.

We have a very keen demand for goods in every State in Australia. However, that was not the position four years ago when, because of the lack of confidence in this State, the local demand for motor cars fell tremendously. If sales tax is increased on a motor vehicle it means that the secondhand vehicle is worth more when it is sold. Consequently, the demand for motor cars will not be restricted to a very great degree.

I admit that the tax on household appliances is not one that I like particularly. However, until the Labor Party thinks of a better system of getting money for schools and other necessary things I cannot see how it can have the gall to say that this is something that is wrong. It has to come up with some satisfactory alternative. It is difficult to disprove anything that members of this Government say, because they have not actually put up any sort of a case. This Government should come up with a reasonable alternative and should make an assessment of where it can get more money instead of taking the action it has taken today. Its action is ludicrous, and I could not possibly support it.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): When I examine this motion I wonder just what members of the Government expect a person in my position to do. They ask me as a member of this House to take action to influence members in another Parliament. Well, if I received a letter from members of another Parliament telling me what to do in this House I would take no notice of it. I say that because they, like us, are answerable to the electors they represent.

Mr. Ryan: And they will get their answer all right.

Mr. NANKIVELL: That is their responsibility. I am speaking on this subject because, like the member for Chaffey, I have some responsibilities in this House to the electors of the Mallee District in the Loxton-Paringa-Moorook area. I am grateful to the member for Chaffey for inviting me to join him in discussions with other members of the wine industry this afternoon, and, as he has been informed in these matters, so have I. I have checked some figures, and that is why I have not asked for leave to continue my remarks. Wine production in Australia is increasing tremendously. Production in the last year was about 6,000,000gall. more than production in the previous year. The volume of production in the next 10 years is expected to double.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That was before this tax was announced.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I will reply to that interjection as I proceed. A vineyard takes five years to come into production and stays in production for 40 years or more, depending on how it is maintained and on other circumstances. The rate of present plantings indicates that production of wine in this country will double present output. There are other problems. The biggest importer of Australian wine is the United Kingdom but, when that country enters the European Economic Community, countries such as Italy, which at present exports wine to Australia, will exploit the United Kingdom market to our exclusion.

Because of this, Mr. Tunbridge, the Managing Director of Co-operative Wineries of Australia Limited, to whom the member for Chaffey and I spoke this afternoon, will go to Canada to try to expand our exports of wine to that country. In 1967-68 Canada imported 409,000gall. of wine from Australia, which is about half the quantity imported by the United Kingdom. Canada provides a significant market for Australian wines, particularly to co-operative wineries, which produce most of the wines for this market. Most of these co-operative wineries are in the Murray River districts.

I would be irresponsible if I did not have some concern about what is implied in this tax. I have been told that only 10 per cent of the wines sold in Australia is sold through restaurants and hotels. Sales mostly in flagon lots, of either sherry or port, account for 80 per cent of wine sales. These wines get rid of most of production, and they are in competition with other beverages. We have been told today that, if these wines become too expensive, people will buy beer instead. There is no point in comparing wine with beer. A quantity of 50gall. of beer can be made from one bushel of barley, but wine production is a completely different matter. If we produced nothing but malting barley, we would have no problem selling it because there is an unlimited world market for it, but this is not so with grapes.

I make these points because I am concerned that this could have an impact on sales of the particular type of wine grape grown in bulk in my district. It is not so much the 8c a bottle or the 50c a gallon as the unknown factor that will create outlet problems. The mark-up is 40 per cent on the gross price, and this multiplies the cost to the consumer.

after the mark-up has gone through the wholesaler and then through the retailer. It was suggested that it was 8c a bottle and 50c a flagon.

Mr. Clark: At the cellar door.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes. When we consider the mark-up, we are not sure whether it is 12c a bottle and 35c a flagon or 15c a bottle and 44c a flagon, depending on what other costs are added into the price. The member for Alexandra drew attention to these factors tonight.

We know that certain things are intended, but we are presuming what the ultimate outcome of negotiations will be. This industry is currently buoyant but, like any other rural industry, it depends on exports to dispose of its increasing volume. I am concerned about anything that interferes with the sale of the products of this industry either in Australia or overseas. I therefore express my concern on behalf of my constituents. I regret that the tax has had to be imposed, but I do not think I have any responsibility to direct members in another Parliament how to exercise their responsibilities. Therefore, having expressed my concern, I oppose the motion.

Mr. EASTICK (Light): Earlier, the member for Kavel said that he and I represented the largest grape-processing area in Australia. In my district is the largest winery in the Southern Hemisphere—the Gramp-Orlando winery at Rowland Flat. There is another large winery at Seppeltsfield. The previous speaker (the member for Mallee) said that, at the invitation of the member for Chaffey, he had had discussions this afternoon with representatives of the grape-growing industry. Because I did not know until this evening that I would have the opportunity to discuss such a vital matter, if the Government is sincere it will allow me to continue my remarks on another occasion. I therefore ask leave to continue my remarks.

The SPEAKER: That the honourable member have leave to continue.

Government members: No.

The SPEAKER: There being a dissentient voice, leave is not granted.

Mr. EASTICK: The attitude of the Government is a fair indication of its sincerity. Earlier, the Minister of Roads and Transport asked the member for Kavel to watch what appeared in *Hansard*, because the honourable member's constituents might not like it. I think the Minister probably does not realize

that one thing country people do not like to see (and they will certainly see it in *Hansard*) is that others are taking a rise out of them. If comments from the Minister and other Government members do not represent an effort to take a rise out of people in the grapegrowing industry, I am very much mistaken.

In any situation that demands an alteration (and this must be what the Premier had in mind when he asked us to agree to this motion), consideration must be given to the situation that must be resolved: there must be constructive criticism. We have not been told by members opposite that there is to be no excise on the production of wine up to 400 gall.; that is, for every 400gall. of wine made in the backyard or in small units there is no impost of 50c a gallon.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I am glad you acknowledge it as an impost.

Mr. EASTICK: I am anticipating the member for Playford. It seems that there is a \$200 advantage to people engaged in the industry for every 400gall. of backyard production.

Mr. McRae: Tell us whether you are disappointed with the impost.

Mr. EASTICK: The parrot has given out with its catch cry. Last year more than 1,000,000gall. of wine was produced by the backyard industry, and if each unit averaged 200gall. it would seem that some action should be taken with respect to this production. Wherever there is an increase in taxation or charges in an industry there is an automatic reaction by consumers, and generally the industry suffers. However, history has proved that the pendulum swings back, and it can be expected that, although there is a brief period of resistance, an improvement follows. Until I have been able to discuss this matter fully with my constituents involved in the industry I cannot support the motion.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson) moved:
That this debate be now adjourned.

Mr. RODDA seconded the motion.
The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Becker (teller), Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (25)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller),

Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, Lawn, McKee, McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Evans. No—Mr. Ryan.

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. BECKER: I shall be short, sharp and to the point. I have been most disappointed this evening to hear members on both sides digressing from the motion; I believe we are here to legislate and not to stir. The motion before the House is a typical piece of over-emotional electioneering. The Premier is play-acting: I think he is trying for a television logie. I regret that an impost has been placed by the Commonwealth Government on the sale of table wines. However, I do not believe that the small impost will eventually affect the sale of wine. Through good promotional effort by the wine industry in the last few years, the sale of table wines in South Australia has increased considerably, and I believe that good quality table wines will sell irrespective of price.

Mr. Clark: As long as there is a demand.

Mr. BECKER: There is a market and a demand for retail sales. The cheap wines that we know as plonk will not sell. If grapegrowers cannot sell their crop, I will support a move for Government assistance for the wine industry. As there has been no stock-piling of wine in the past few years, I am confident that the industry in South Australia will survive. It is about time that we did something to stamp out backyard wine manufacturers who do not pay any tax or face any impost.

I do not think that the increase in sales tax will unduly affect the sale of motor cars in the next 12 months. As competition in the industry is keen, I believe that retailers and manufacturers can absorb the cost without passing it on to the public. I hope that there will be no recession in the motor car industry and that we in Parliament can avoid this. It is up to the unions to take a realistic stand and do the right thing. I thank the Minister of Education for his interesting lecture on economics, which I thoroughly enjoyed. During the next few months I shall be interested to see what the Prices Commissioner will do about the various matters affected by the Commonwealth Budget; in that area lies the real challenge to the new Government in South Australia. I oppose the motion for

reasons of Party principle. Realizing how members opposite appreciate Party loyalties, I trust that they will acknowledge my stand.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I rise to say something about this motion that was moved hastily and without any warning.

Mr. Ryan: That was hours ago.

Mr. RODDA: When we came back from the dinner adjournment we were faced with the consequences of a motion moved by the Premier. I think members of the Opposition in the hours that have intervened have conveyed what they think about the action of the Government in asking us to agree to request members of the reigning Government to do something that Labor Party members would not do themselves if they were in that position. However, the Opposition has not been idle, and it has considered this matter. As is our position in a federation, we believe in the function of Australia. On behalf of the Opposition, I move:

To strike out all words after "That" and insert "this House inform the Prime Minister that the interests of the wine industry and the manufacturing industries in South Australia will be beneficially served if the increased taxes on the sale of wines and consumer goods be removed as soon as possible".

We on this side believe that it is recognized that anomalies exist in the Budget as it affects the people of this State. We wish to point out in a dignified way that the Prime Minister can look at the issues before him. He has to make the decisions, and he has to raise the money. The Premier and the Minister of Education are not going to have this finance to do the things that he himself wants to do for me and for other people throughout this State. We are sincerely moving an amendment in a dignified way, and we believe that this underlines the problems that the people in this State and the industries that we speak of are facing.

[Midnight.]

This is a genuine and sincere attempt to bring before the House the matters that are of vital concern. We recognize that we cannot have pay-outs if we cannot get revenue in. The amendment puts the matter as simply as the Opposition can put it and does not remove from the Prime Minister the obligation to raise necessary finance but underlines the plight of some people.

Mr. Clark: Will you give us a chance to consider it?

Mr. RODDA: We have tried unsuccessfully several times to have the debate adjourned.

Mr. Clark: This amendment is hastily conceived.

Mr. RODDA: I cannot agree. We have considered the matter while what some members have described as a filibuster debate has been going on.

Mr. WARDLE seconded the amendment.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I support the amendment. I think it is a sensible way out of the dilemma in which the Government finds itself. I am grateful that at last I have been able to get a photostat copy of the motion. I think we all have an objection, great or small, to paying any taxes, whether they are stamp duties, Commonwealth income tax, or sales tax such as is referred to in the motion. However, I will not go so far as to say that we have a conscientious objection to paying the taxes. Most of us abide by the law, but I do not think we can do anything but regret the imposition of these taxes, because they will affect South Australia to some extent.

I am sure that the Commonwealth Government did not impose the taxes as a deliberate attack on South Australia and, if Government members suggest that it did, they should consider the matter again. The Commonwealth Government carefully considered the need to impose these taxes, as members would be well aware. I have no doubt that the original motion, which required this House to direct members of the Commonwealth Parliament in the way they should carry out their responsibilities, would be effective in relation to the eight Labor Party members who represent South Australian electoral districts in the Commonwealth Parliament. Those eight members comprise 66 per cent of the total South Australian representation in the Commonwealth Parliament, yet they received only 52 per cent of the votes. Those eight members may well be directed by the Trades Hall and the Party machine. I am sure that Government members in the Commonwealth Parliament will be far more responsible.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Have you read the amendment?

Dr. TONKIN: It is excellent, because it will bring to the Commonwealth's attention the problems that exist. I am sure that action will be taken to remove these imposts as soon as possible. The motion, which is intended to appear positive and full of concern for South Australia, is really evidence of a

negative attitude on the part of the Government. The Government should actively consider measures to assist the promotion of the products of the wine industry, and it should be paying attention to the problems that will be created through air pollution. The motor car industry will suffer as a result of pollution controls. If the Labor Government expects its grandiose public transport plans to work, it should be taking active steps to protect South Australia's motor car industry, because sales of motor cars will decrease if more use is made of public transport.

Mr. Ryan: Sales of motor cars will decrease as a result of this tax.

Dr. TONKIN: I do not agree. The amendment puts the position clearly, but I am sure these impositions (to use the term of the Minister of Roads and Transport) of 50c a gallon on wine and 2½ per cent on motor cars were considered most carefully before they were decided upon. I am sure that they were not intended as a direct attack on South Australia.

Mr. Hall: They never were.

Dr. TONKIN: I support the amendment, which makes much more practical sense than the original motion, which can be interpreted only as blatant electioneering.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I am afraid I cannot accept the amendment. I draw the attention of the House to the fact that what the member for Victoria is asking us to do in his amendment is no more than draw the Prime Minister's attention to facts that were drawn to his attention before the Commonwealth Budget was introduced. These are matters about which every member should know. The matters referred to in the motion are not new and are not something that cropped up overnight. Fears as to what would happen to South Australian industry and employment from a sales tax increase on motor cars were expressed early this year in a widespread form. I addressed to the Prime Minister a letter that received considerable publicity.

Mr. Millhouse: As most of your letters do.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I certainly was asked by industry in South Australia to supply them with information in it, which I did. The honourable member knows he is talking about something which was not a representation to the Prime Minister, but he is obviously trying to get off the track and

does not want the House to have its attention drawn to the fact that his protests and those of his colleagues this evening (about this being a matter that was sprung on them and for which they needed to have time to know about) ring very hollow indeed. The whole danger to the South Australian motor car industry and the electrical goods industry from an increase in sales tax had been obvious and widely manifest for months before the Commonwealth Budget was introduced. More recently the wine industry got wind of the fact that there was a proposal to put an impost on wine, and again there were widespread reports from the wine industry and the grapegrowers council. The leaders of the wine industry met in Adelaide on August 12, and at their behest I sent the following telegram to the Prime Minister:

With reference to press reports that the Commonwealth is considering introducing in its Budget a tax on wine in the order of 15c a bottle—

and representatives of the wine industry now tell me that, as a result of the particular impost, it will increase by 20c a bottle—

the South Australian Government is most concerned at the adverse effect this would have on the sales of wine throughout Australia, and consequently on the wine-grape and winemaking industries in South Australia, which produce more than two-thirds of Australia's wine requirements. We urge that this or any similar tax be not imposed by your Government so that stability in the wine industry may be preserved and not be subject to such pressures as have adversely affected other rural industries.

That telegram was acknowledged by the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister had had representations on both these aspects before the Commonwealth Budget was introduced. What use would it be now to say to him, "Please now consider representations that you had before you made the decision, and ignored"? What sort of help would that be to South Australia? The representations that were made to him with respect to the motor car industry were not representations made on a political basis, because it cannot be suggested that the leaders of this industry in South Australia are wildly Labor partisans. No-one here could suggest that.

Mr. Millhouse: No-one has.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am glad to hear that, but judging from what the honourable member's Leader has said it seems that he is suggesting that we have become the instruments of big business and the tools of Capitalism. Concerning the wine industry, I point out

that Mr. Preece, Mr. Seppelt, Mr. Palmer, and Mr. Tunbridge travelled to other States and on the strength of the publication of the danger of the impost of this tax on the wine industry they sought support from Liberal Governments in those States. As a result, Sir Henry Bolte, Mr. Askin and Sir David Brand all agreed to send telegrams to the Prime Minister.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: And did so!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. Ryan: Were they playing Party politics?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They were being wildly Party-political! Apparently, these gentlemen have joined the Labor Party in making protests of this kind.

Mr. Clark: The Prime Minister ignored them all.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: True; but the plain fact is that, the Prime Minister having ignored all the representations made to him, no-one can deny that the effect of these taxes is far heavier on industry and employment in this State than in any other State and that our industry and employment are particularly vulnerable. With those facts in view, I should have thought that honourable members opposite would be keen to make representations on behalf of this State. To listen to the Leader, any such suggestion would be irresponsible, unfair and not in the national interest.

However, during the course of the debate, apparently some other members opposite thought that that was not entirely the point of view that ought to be expressed by them and that something else ought to be said: that is, that it would be wise for South Australia to have these imposts taken off as quickly as possible. True, we ought to have them taken off as quickly as possible, but the quickest way to get them off is for members from this State to stick up for this area of Australia and to say that the Commonwealth Government has not, in looking at the national interest, sufficiently appreciated the adverse effects on this part of the Commonwealth of the action it has taken. South Australia is part of the Commonwealth and we ought to be considered as part of the Commonwealth. The results to any part of the Commonwealth of an overall national policy ought to be taken into account before it is adopted. That is what we are seeking: that our Commonwealth representatives should insist on this in the Commonwealth Parliament. I ask all members, on behalf of the citizens of the State, to support the motion.

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda (teller), Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (25)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, Lawn, McKee, McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Evans. No—Mr. Ryan.

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (25)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark,

Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, Lawn, McKee, McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall (teller), Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Ryan. No—Mr. Evans.

Majority of 7 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.28 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 20, at 2 p.m.