

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, September 16, 1970

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

QUESTION EXPLANATIONS

The SPEAKER: Before asking honourable members for questions I should like to state that on Thursday, September 3, I appealed to members to outline their questions before giving the explanation of that question, and I seek the co-operation of members in carrying out that request.

QUESTIONS

TRANSPORT STUDY

Mr. HALL: My question is directed to the Minister of Roads and Transport, and with your leave, Mr. Speaker, and the concurrence of the House I wish to explain it. During previous discussions concerning the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan in this House—

The SPEAKER: Order! I think possibly the Leader misunderstood what I said. I want the question asked and then an explanation given if necessary.

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. May I ask to what Standing Order you are referring in asking the Opposition in the House to adhere to this procedure?

The SPEAKER: This matter applies to both sides of the Chamber. Standing Order 125 provides:

In putting any such question, no argument or opinion shall be offered, nor shall any facts be stated, except by leave of the House and so far only as may be necessary to explain such question.

Unless the question is known it is not possible to determine whether the explanation is in accordance with the question.

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. On reading Standing Order 125, I certainly find it as you have stated: that no explanation may be offered except with leave of the House. However, I draw your attention to the fact that I asked for leave of the House and proceeded without interruption, according to Standing Order 125, to make my explanation. With respect, I suggest that there is nothing in this section of the Standing Orders that necessitates my stating the exact definition of my question until I have given my explanation. I submit that it is not good procedure to have to put the question con-

cisely before the explanation of that question and the need for it is given to the House. May I remind you that the Minister who is grinning and laughing opposite proceeded with this proposition as we have proceeded until now in this Parliament, for the whole two years when he previously sat in Opposition. So, we are following what Government members did when in Opposition previously which, I believe, they had full right to do and to which I never objected. Therefore, Sir, I ask you respectfully what part of Standing Order 125 requires me or anyone else in the House to put the question before the explanation, after leave of the House has been obtained to make the explanation.

The SPEAKER: The Standing Order requires that in putting such question leave may be granted to make an explanation, and it would be most helpful to the Chair if members put the question and then sought leave to make an explanation, so that it could be determined whether it was relevant to the question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With great respect, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that that is putting the cart before the horse and that this is a very big departure from what has been the custom in this House during the 15 years that I have been a member. I suggest, Sir, that there is no reason whatever to require members to put their question and then explain it. The whole idea, as I understand it, concerning this Standing Order is to allow a member to explain the purport of his question and then to put it. If, as I understood you to say yesterday, you would like members to indicate at the beginning the subject matter of the question, that is another thing altogether, and I do not think there can be any objection to it; but if you are to insist that we ask the question and then explain it, I must respectfully object to that ruling.

The SPEAKER: I am asking that the subject matter of the question be stated.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is all right.

The SPEAKER: The Leader was explaining the question before he stated the subject matter of the question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. As I understood your ruling (and that is a ruling with which all members on this side are perfectly happy to comply), it was strictly in accordance with Standing Order 125, which provides:

In putting any such question—

it is the question which must be put—
no argument or opinion shall be offered, nor
shall any facts be stated—

The question is to be put, but the Standing Order then states:

except by leave of the House and so far only as may be necessary to explain such question.

Without the Chair's knowing what the question is, it is not possible to know whether the facts or the matters being stated are, in fact, necessary for its explanation, and there has been much confusion for a considerable time about this matter. You, Sir, and your predecessor have had to call members to order because it has been apparent that matters which were being stated by leave of the House went far beyond any subsequent question which members then sought to put. The Standing Order makes it clear that the question should be put, leave of the House obtained for an explanation, and an explanation then given.

Mr. HALL: I object to the substance of the Premier's argument, because I believe it is advanced in political terms. The Premier's Party and he himself have made use of this Standing Order for as long as they have been in this House.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, this is not a debate. The only matters that can be raised now are points of order directed to you, Sir, on which you should rule. The Leader is now attempting to debate the whole matter, but he is not at liberty to do that at this stage.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This is a very grave departure—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Sit down. There's a point of order.

The SPEAKER: The subject matter that the Leader has raised is another issue now, and he must be heard on the first matter before the Chair.

Mr. HALL: Well, Mr. Speaker, what is your ruling?

The SPEAKER: That the substance of the question should be stated quite clearly before the explanation is given.

Mr. HALL: Did you say "should be" or "must be"?

The SPEAKER: I am ruling that it must be stated.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Are you saying the substance of the question, or the subject matter of the question?

The SPEAKER: The question, so that I can determine—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What? The whole question must be put?

The SPEAKER: You must ask your question and then seek leave to explain it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With very great respect, I must object to this, on two grounds. First, this is a departure from the procedure in this House.

The SPEAKER: Is the honourable member moving dissent from my ruling?

Mr. HALL: I will move dissent. I do so—

The SPEAKER: Will you do that in writing, signed, and seconded?

Mr. HALL: In red tape, if necessary, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has moved the following motion:

That the Speaker's ruling, that the question must be put before an explanation of it is made, be dissented to on the grounds that:

- (1) It is not required by the Standing Orders.
- (2) It is a departure from the practice of the House.
- (3) It will curtail the freedom of members in the asking of questions.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): This is a distinct infringement of a privilege of the members of this House, a privilege that has been freely enjoyed by every member not only of this Parliament but also of previous Parliaments, and a privilege that has been availed of in the past without disagreement from either side of the House. Indeed, I can safely say that in the previous Parliament there was no opposition whatsoever from the Government benches to the long explanations made by members of the Labor Party. It is therefore with intense surprise that I find today this House being asked to accept a severe restriction on the explanation of questions in this place.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It's not a restriction.

Mr. HALL: And, of course, any member who speaks out of his turn and out of his place disobeys Standing Orders. If ever anyone did this in previous Parliaments, the present Minister of Education was the greatest offender, yet the Minister, in his most arrogant manner, is the first to urge the curtailment of explanations of questions being asked by members of the Opposition when he is in Government.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: I have no doubt that, if the Minister holds sway in the House in this matter, there will be a crushing defeat of the Opposition by arrogant superior numbers. Of that there is no doubt. The Premier drew attention to Standing Order 125, which provides:

In putting any such question, no argument or opinion shall be offered, nor shall any facts be stated—

the next word “except” is the governing word—except by leave of the House—

You, Sir, know that before asking my question this afternoon I obtained the leave of the House to explain it—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Read the rest of the Standing Order.

Mr. HALL: —without any disagreement. I did not expect to experience any disagreement, as my question was to be fairly short.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: We didn't know what you wanted to know about M.A.T.S.

Mr. HALL: Members opposite need not believe me, but if they look at *Hansard* they will find that the questions I have asked this session have not been inordinately long (not nearly as long as questions asked last session by the present Minister of Education) and there was no reason today to take action that will affect members for all time. A precedent, curtailing members' explanations of questions, will be set. The Minister of Roads and Transport has already been heard to ask, by interjection, what I wanted to know about M.A.T.S., anyway. However, he would have known from my first few words the subject about which I was asking.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I didn't know the question, though.

Mr. HALL: The Minister knew the subject.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I can't answer your question if you don't say what it is.

Mr. HALL: He obviously agrees with your ruling, Sir, because he wants to know the question before it has been explained. Why should members of the Opposition be curtailed in this way? We remember that earlier in this session it was intended to put all questions on notice, but it was an intention that the Premier soon ran away from. We fear for the privileges which an Opposition must have if it is to honour its obligations to the public.

I draw attention to the word “except” and invite the Premier to get a dictionary definition. Standing Order 125 provides:

—except by leave of the House and so far only as may be necessary to explain such question.

Quite apart from any legal interpretation of Standing Order 125, on what grounds does the Government now oppose something it has used in its many years of Opposition in the House? Why change now? No reason was given in the short explanations presented by the Premier and the Minister of Education. There is nothing I can see in this move other than political advantage to the Government.

I find it distasteful, Mr. Speaker, to disagree with your ruling: I do not want to be in conflict with the Speaker of the House, but I cannot do anything else if I am to safeguard the other public voice in this House and safeguard the freedoms it has—freedoms which have been used by every other Opposition that can be remembered, and particularly by Labor Oppositions in the past. I have therefore moved to dissent from your ruling.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the motion. Traditionally, the asking of questions during Question Time has been one of the privileges of all members, but it is especially prized by members of the Opposition. I very much regret that you, Sir, have given this ruling which will undoubtedly curtail the freedom of members of this House in asking questions, which is one of the privileges of members which you are here to uphold. As I understand it, your ruling today has arisen out of a number of incidents, one of which occurred yesterday when the member for Hanson was asking a question. I wondered about some of your comments during that incident but I do not argue with the request that you made for the member for Hanson not to set out his question but to set out the substance of the question. This is what you said to him yesterday:

Can the honourable member indicate what his question is about?

I do not think any member could object to your request that, at the beginning of the explanation of a question, the subject matter of the question should be stated so that you and the Minister to whom the question was being addressed would know what it was about.

Mr. Clark: Would the exact question make any difference?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, it would.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: But the Speaker will decide—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know whose ruling this is. Is it a ruling of the Minister of Roads and Transport or a ruling of the Speaker? In reply to the member for Elizabeth, it does make a difference because stating the subject matter of the question is part of the explanation of the question.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: May I point out to those members opposite who are laughing that the Minister of Education was the greatest offender in this matter (if offence it was) during the previous Parliament. What has always been the tradition in this House? The tradition has been that a member seeks your leave, Mr. Speaker, and the concurrence of the other members briefly to explain his question. He gives the explanation and then asks the question. Actually, Standing Order 125, which the Premier has presumed to say dictates that the question is to be asked before the explanation is put, does not do that at all. In fact, Standing Order 125 is silent on the question altogether.

It does not set out explicitly whether the explanation should be given first or last and, if you believe that Standing Order 125 should be altered to make it explicit, I respectfully suggest that this matter should be referred to the Standing Orders Committee so that the committee can consider the matter and report to the House, and so that this House may then decide, not that you should spring the matter on us, which is something different from your request yesterday, and then make a ruling that is contrary to the traditions of the House.

I want to say something about the traditions of the House and what has hitherto been the custom and practice, certainly for as long as I have been a member and, I imagine, for as long as there has been a House of Assembly. What is it? A member gets leave to make an explanation and he makes his explanation. If any member objects to that explanation what is his remedy? If any other member objects, his remedy is to call "Question", and then the question must be asked. How on earth can that practice be followed if a member has to put the question first? That gives the complete answer—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: No.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —to the Premier's assertion that a member puts the question first and then makes his explanation afterwards. Any member has the remedy in his hands: if he objects to the way the explanation is

couched, or to its length, or to its possible irrelevance, he simply calls "Question". This has always been a sufficient safeguard, but it has been used rarely. I suppose I have had it used against me more than it has been used against any other member, but it has been used very rarely. However, I suggest it is an effective way of curtailing over-long explanations, but it could not be used at all if your present ruling, Mr. Speaker, is upheld, that the explanation must succeed the question—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Of course it can.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —because the question would have then been asked.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It makes no difference.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Do make the Minister be quiet: he has been interjecting the whole time. He always does it. It is most irritating.

Mr. Jennings: He has been doing it for years and years!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not want to argue the matter on a legalistic basis. I believe that what I have said is correct and that this ruling is not a correct interpretation of the Standing Order. I believe that what I have said is in accord with the traditions of the House, traditions that have been built up as custom and practice in order to safeguard the privileges of members, and particularly of members on this side. I believe the ruling you have given Sir, will severely curtail the opportunity of members of the Opposition to bring before Parliament matters of importance and to give them the proper emphasis that we have always tried to give them when in Opposition, and which you, yourself, and members of your Party have tried to give when you have been in Opposition. That is by far the most serious aspect of your ruling. In effect, whether it is deliberate or not, it is curtailing the rights of members of this place and I ask you to reconsider that ruling in the light of what has been said by the Leader of the Opposition and in the light of what I have said. If you still consider that there is any reason to alter this Standing Order, I ask you to refer it to the Standing Orders Committee and not to impose on us an arbitrary ruling.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The grounds on which the Opposition has based its dissent from your ruling, Mr. Speaker, are that your ruling is in some measure a curtailment of the rights

of members but, when Opposition members are asked how it is a curtailment of their rights, they cannot reply. Now, Sir, what is the position here? Members in this House may ask questions: under your ruling they still may ask questions. Members may get leave to explain their question: under your ruling they may still get leave to explain their question, and they may do so without limit, by leave of this House as before. The only difference that can be pointed to is that you have asked that the question be stated and the explanation then given of that question. You have made it clear that the purpose of the ruling is to see that the Standing Order is complied with, that is, that the explanation shall be given, "so far only as may be necessary to explain such question." That is the gravamen of the matter and it is noticeable that neither the Leader of the Opposition nor the member for Mitcham made any use of those words. The only objection that can be taken to the course you are putting to the House is that members opposite will not be able to speak beyond what is necessary to explain their question. If this is not the objection of the Opposition, what is it objecting to?

Mr. Millhouse: I am objecting to a change in the customs and practices of this House—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: —and you do not deny it. It has been a practice of the House.

Mr. Ryan: Who is interjecting now?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Most irritating!

The SPEAKER: Order! When I am on my feet I am going to maintain order, and I ask everyone to co-operate and give the courtesy that this position deserves. I have made a ruling: there has been dissension in respect of my ruling. The Leader of the Opposition moved the motion to dissent and the member for Mitcham seconded the motion, and the Premier is now stating his point of view. When the member for Mitcham was discussing his point of view he said that order should be maintained. One would therefore expect that the member for Mitcham would at least observe the principles that he had asked everyone else to observe, and that he would show the courtesy to members that he expected himself. I ask that the courtesy be extended.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What is the gravamen of the objection that is taken by the Opposition? Members may ask questions: there is no change in that. They may explain

those questions, by leave of the House, without limit of time unless a member objects and withdraws leave in the way outlined by the member for Mitcham: there is no change in that. The only change here from what has been the usual practice under this Standing Order previously is that you, Sir, have said that, in order to determine that the Standing Order is being complied with, members must state their question and then explain it, so that you may be certain that the explanation is, in fact, an explanation in accordance with the Standing Order, that is, an explanation "so far only as may be necessary to explain such question". Sir, how is that a curtailment of the privilege of members in this House? The only thing that could conceivably be curtailed by what you have ruled is a member's seeking to go beyond the explanation that is necessary for his question. Nothing else in any way can be interfered with on what you have suggested to the House and ruled in favour of.

Mr. Coumbe: Some questions are difficult to phrase unless the explanation is given before asking the question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: With great respect, the honourable member must know that in other Parliaments this is standard practice, and members in other Parliaments have not found it difficult to frame questions and then explain them. The Speaker is trying to ensure that the Standing Orders of this House are observed and that the rights of all members are protected, by ensuring that Standing Orders are not so far transgressed that members do not receive time to ask the questions in this House that they ought to have the right to be able to ask.

The Speaker is acting entirely in accordance with Standing Orders. There is no curtailment whatever of the rights of members under this Standing Order, and I repeat that the only person who can object to having to state his question and then to explain it, without any limit on his right to explain it, is that member who wants to go in his explanation beyond what is necessary to his question, and no member in this House has any case to argue that sort of thing. If there is any curtailment, I shall be grateful if members opposite will tell us what it is, because so far they have been completely unable to do so.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): Mr. Speaker, I am extremely concerned about the attitude that you have adopted in this respect. One of the privileges of the South Australian Parliament, by reason of its comparatively small size, is that members can

speak freely and at length, without undue restriction. We do not have the same situation as exists in the House of Commons and in many other Parliaments of the world. We are a group of only 47 people, and there is absolutely no need whatever to change what has been the traditional practice, as far as I know, ever since this Parliament was established. It is regrettable that your ruling is supported by members of the Government who, in the last two-year session, when they were in Opposition, carried Question Time to its full two hours on almost every day possible.

At one stage, when discussing Standing Orders, having studied this matter I pointed out that in the 36 sitting days up to that stage Question Time had run each day to more than 14 pages of *Hansard*, and that amounted to nearly two hours. Question Time did not always go until the bell rang, but it lasted for over 14 pages on all but three of those 36 days. When I referred to that matter, an interjection was made by the member for Pirie to the effect that it meant that the Opposition was doing its job. Now we see the Government happily ensconced in office and eagerly setting out on its legislative programme, yet it does not have the guts to allow the old tradition to survive; it is going to support your ruling, Mr. Speaker, in order to curtail the rights of members. The Premier asked, "How does this ruling curtail the rights of members?"

Mr. Millhouse: They've got the numbers; they know they can do anything they like.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: We've got the support of the public, which is also very important.

Mr. Millhouse: You won't have it on this matter.

Mr. Goldsworthy: If you keep going like this, you won't have it for long.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: How would the question, to which I am about to refer, be understood, if this ruling is supported? The question is as follows:

Does the member for Eyre intend to proceed with his request to the Government for the appointment of a mousetologist? If so, will he outline the duties required of such a person so that we can inform our constituents who are interested in applying for that position; or, alternatively, will he concentrate on the training of wombats as mouse exterminators?

Members interjecting:

Mr. Clark: That doesn't need an explanation.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Doesn't it? Mr. Speaker, you as the member for Semaphore asked that question last session, and you asked it after giving an explanation that fills a full column in *Hansard*. That just shows the absurdity of a ruling that is taken to these lengths. There is absolutely no need whatever to change the existing practice, unless it is to safeguard a group of Ministers who do not wish to sit and listen to questions with explanations. The Minister of Education has, in the time that he has been here, asked more questions occupying many pages of *Hansard* than I think any member has asked in the history of Parliament over a comparable period.

Mr. Millhouse: Now he's in office, it's different.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The situation has changed; the Minister of Education is willing to support a ruling which, as I have pointed out, gravely affects the rights of members.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Explain why!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Premier said that the only difference would be that the explanation would be given afterwards. As I have pointed out, there must be an explanation to some questions to make them intelligible, and I have strongly objected to the rights of members being taken away. If the Government supports the ruling on a vote, it will prove its arrogance—

Mr. Langley: You ought to talk about that!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: —and it will clearly show the pattern that this Parliament is likely to follow in the next few years. I have pointed out that this Parliament has a tradition of an easy-going sort of debate and conduct. Remembering previous Leaders of this House, I can only say that never before has there been so much concern about the Government's treatment of an Opposition as there has been about the treatment by this Government in the last few weeks; nor have there ever been such undignified, unrestrained replies as those we have heard from some of the Ministers, and I am looking at the Minister of Roads and Transport, as one of the Ministers.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I thought you were cross-eyed.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I detest this ruling and support the motion.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I do not think I have ever before listened to as much irrelevancy as

we have just heard from the member for Alexandra, although extremely irrelevant speeches are made in this House occasionally. The honourable member wants to raise the cry of interference with the rights of members by the ruling you have given, Mr. Speaker, and what he is really saying, if it has any substance at all (and this also applies to the Leader and the member for Mitcham) is that Standing Order 125 is wrong, that members should not be confined to material necessary only to explain their question but should be able to make as long a speech as they want to make.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: And as irrelevant a one as they want to make.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, that is what members opposite are saying. They are really saying that Standing Order 125 should be changed so as to provide:

In putting any such question, a member can, by leave of the House, explain his question in any way that he sees fit and proper.

That is what members opposite really wish to argue on this matter. They have no substance at all in the case that they have put. I admit that when in Opposition, at times I have transgressed that Standing Order in my explanations, and it would have been almost impossible for the Speaker at that time to have stopped my transgressing, because he did not know the exact terms of my question.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: If this ruling had been given in the last Parliament, would you have objected to it?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No. The member for Alexandra and his colleagues are in difficulties.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: It would have been the first thing you would have done.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member asked a question and he has got a reply. Obviously, he was not going to accept the reply, so I do not know why he asked the question. I have never heard anything so pathetic. The honourable member wants to say, "You are curtailing my rights as a member if I am not allowed to transgress Standing Orders as I please."

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Rubbish!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Then, what is the argument? The Speaker has ruled only that a member must ask his question first and then give his explanation. How does that curtail the rights of members opposite? Not one member of the Opposition has yet been

able to tell us (he cannot tell us) how that ruling curtails anyone's rights. All it is likely to do is—

Mr. Goldsworthy: Get you off the hook.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: —make it easier for the Chair to determine whether an explanation is relevant to the question being asked, and avoid the necessity for members to call "Question".

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What's wrong with that right?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There is nothing wrong with the right, but the way it is used is that if a member were to call "Question" on me when I was asking or explaining a question, retaliation would occur.

Mr. Hall: That was your attitude.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader should make a conscious attempt every so often to stop being pathetic. It is everyone's attitude. It has always been the attitude, as between the Government and the Opposition, that if members started calling "Question" on any member on the opposite side, some sort of retaliatory action would be instituted and, as a consequence, the right to call "Question", although I consider it to be an important right, has not contained irrelevant explanations in this House. Every member knows that that is the position.

Mrs. Steele: Why didn't you try to alter the Standing Order when you were in Opposition?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I was not the Speaker, and I am not trying to alter it now. You, Mr. Speaker, have given a perfectly logical ruling, and its only effect—

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: I was wondering how long this Government would last before it started this sort of thing.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Government is not doing anything here. Mr. Speaker, the member for Alexandra is suggesting that your ruling is the result of a direction by the Government. That is a complete untruth, as the honourable member knows. He has a perfectly logical ruling from the Speaker and, further, that ruling is likely to protect members' rights more than is anything else. By containing irrelevant explanations, more questions will be able to be asked in the time allowed until 4 o'clock.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: As long as we get the replies.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Members always get the replies. They are not asking questions of the present Leader now. When he was Premier, he would not give a reply until a member had set sail after him and pinned him down, and it often took a long time to pin him down successfully. If irrelevant and excessive explanations (and I admit that I, as a private member, and other members were guilty of making such statements) will be curtailed and effectively controlled by the Speaker in this way, more questions will be asked in the two-hour period. The member for Alexandra has referred to the number of times during the last Parliament when the whole two hours allowed for Question Time was used.

Mr. Nankivell: You were about the only member asking questions!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I was an extremely curious member. On just about every sitting day in this Parliament, except Wednesdays, Question Time has continued until 4 o'clock and some members have been waiting several days to ask Ministers for replies that the members knew were available. Surely this ruling protects members' rights.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: That is not true.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am tempted to tell the member for Alexandra that, as he has made his speech, he should now let me make mine without interruption, but I know that he would not use those words, so I will not use them! I should be pleased if the honourable member kept asking for further explanations of this matter. Surely the rights of individual members are being protected if more questions can be asked in the two hours available for Question Time. That is also a matter of logic. I should like to ask one further question of members opposite.

Mr. Millhouse: All you are doing is confining Question Time to less than two hours. That's what you want. Having made it up to two hours while in Opposition, you want to reduce it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: All that the honourable member is implying again and again is that he wants to transgress Standing Order 125. He says, "I demand the right to make a speech every time I get up to ask a question and the right to say anything I please, regardless of whether it is relevant to the question." That is what the honourable member is being so nasty about, because he knows

that, if he must give the question first, the Speaker can rule on whether the explanation is relevant to the question. Can any member opposite say how the Speaker can effectively enforce Standing Order 125, which requires that the explanation be confined to material necessary to explain the question, if the explanation is given before the question is asked? The answer is that he cannot and never has been able to, either in this Parliament or in previous Parliaments. As a consequence, Standing Order 125 has been ignored altogether. If members opposite really object to that Standing Order, and if they want to introduce irrelevant arguments and expressions of opinion when explaining a question, they should be raising with the Standing Orders Committee the question of amending or reframing the Standing Order.

Mr. Millhouse: We haven't had much opportunity to do that yet; we knew about it less than an hour ago.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member will have plenty of time to do that if he wants to, but he is now admitting the logic behind the Speaker's ruling.

Mr. Millhouse: No fear I am not. I am merely answering your point that we should raise it with the Standing Orders Committee. I suggested that before.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Well, the honourable member can still raise it with the Standing Orders Committee. The Speaker has merely given a ruling in terms of the—

Mr. Millhouse: It is contrary to the long-standing practice of this House.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That may be so—

Mr. Millhouse: You've admitted it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: —but, in fact, the long-standing practice of this House has been that members have ignored with impunity Standing Order 125.

Mr. Hall: They have not.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: And the Leader is one of the chief offenders.

Mr. Hall: You can't read.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Mitcham is another, and I will admit that, when I had the opportunity when in Opposition to do the same kind of thing as members opposite have done, I did it. I freely admit that.

Mr. Millhouse: But now that you're in Government you're taking away the privilege you enjoyed.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. Millhouse: You enjoyed it; that is what you are saying.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member is now admitting that Standing Order 125 should be infringed; that is the substance of his argument.

Mr. Millhouse: It is not. I said—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member has no other argument than this, because the Speaker's ruling does not prevent in any way the making of an explanation. The only reason why members can object to explaining a question after it has been asked is that they think it will mean that the Standing Order is to be enforced and that they will not be able to transgress it. The talk about the curtailment of rights is just a lot of hooey, as members have been prevented in this Parliament from debating any question prior to 4 o'clock. Of course, if irrelevancies in explanations are eliminated, more questions will be fitted in before 4 o'clock, as a consequence of which the rights of members will be protected, not curtailed. It is those members (and this is a criticism that applies to me as well, so I feel free to make it) who transgress this Standing Order by including in an explanation argument and material not necessary to explain the question that are curtailing the rights of other members, by not letting them have enough time to ask their questions. It is this transgression of the Standing Order, not the other, that involves the curtailment of members' rights. I ask members simply to consider this matter from a logical point of view. Members can all give their explanations and support the commonsense ruling that the Speaker has made on this matter.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): In speaking to the motion, I make the point that the Speaker's ruling has been changed under pressure from the Government, and that the Speaker ruled originally that members had committed no offence.

The SPEAKER: Order! I take exception to the remarks made by the member for Kavel that my ruling was made under pressure from the Government. It was my own ruling and was not made under pressure from the Government, the Opposition or anyone else, and I ask the honourable member to withdraw those remarks.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I withdraw what I said, Sir. Perhaps I did not make the point

I intended to make: that, as a result of argument by Government members, there was further clarification of your ruling. Members of the Opposition understood the original ruling to mean that we could state the substance of our question, proceed to explain it, and then ask the question. However, as a result of clarification, we understand now that the precise question is to be asked, and that it is to be followed by an explanation. The Minister of Education has said that the Government is trying to aid the Opposition.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I didn't say that. I said—

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister said this was being done for our convenience so that more questions could be asked during Question Time. On many of the days since I have been a member of this place, Opposition members have been the only ones asking questions for the last half hour of Question Time, so this ruling will certainly not aid us. Indeed, we do not welcome it. The fact is that the front bench is having considerable difficulty answering questions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Ministers get abusive: they call us liars and say that we are uttering untruths. I refer particularly to the Minister of Roads and Transport, who generally proceeds to answer a different question from the one asked.

Mr. McKEE: On a point of order, Sir, I cannot understand how the member for Kavel is connecting this argument with your ruling.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am making the point that the Government is supporting this ruling, because Ministers are having difficulty in giving satisfactory answers to questions.

Mr. Venning: They are incapable.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: This ruling would make the procedure unintelligible and, indeed, bordering on the ridiculous. The question that needs no explanation is put boldly. If it needs an explanation, it is not understandable without one. If a question requires explanation, how will it appear in *Hansard*? First, the question will be asked, and then it will be followed by a lengthy explanation, during which time the import of the question is lost. This will mean that the Ministers will

experience even more difficulty than they do now. However, it will make it easier for them at the end of the explanation to answer an irrelevant question. That will be the end result.

It appears to me to be illogical that, if a question needs to be explained, the question must be asked first and then explained thereafter. I cannot see the logic in that. We are not asking that the Standing Order be changed: we are merely asking that the sensible interpretation of it, which has existed for many years, be followed. I have sufficient confidence in you, Sir, if someone wanted to ask a question about the road to Bull Creek, to know what would be the substance of the question and to know whether the explanation of it was relevant. To put an unintelligible question, and then to explain it, during which time the original question would conveniently be forgotten by the Minister, is putting the cart before the horse.

Mr. McKee: You wouldn't be able to teach your class that way.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am glad I did not have students of the honourable member's intelligence. I believe the original explanation was satisfactory to members on this side of the House and we ask that the further ruling be reconsidered and the original ruling left to stand.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I suggest that members look at the Standing Orders which are the basis for the Speaker's rulings. Standing Order 124 provides:

At the time of giving notices of motion, questions may be put to Ministers of the Crown relating to public affairs; and to other members relating to any Bill, motion, or other public matter connected with the business of the House, in which such members may be concerned.

That Standing Order provides for the putting of questions. Standing Order 125, which is supplementary to Standing Order 124, provides:

In putting any such question, no argument or opinion shall be offered, nor shall any facts be stated, except by leave of the House and so far only as may be necessary to explain such question.

The Standing Orders contemplate that a question is to be put and Standing Order 125 provides the means for members to explain a question which, standing unexplained, could not be understood. It does not contemplate that every question requires an explanation, and I hope that members would be capable of framing questions which for the most part would not require an explanation. Standing

Orders contemplate, however, that there shall be questions which require explanation, and two conditions are required to be satisfied. The first is that the leave of the House must be obtained. The second condition, which is very important, requires that even with leave of the House the explanation may be given "so far only as may be necessary to explain such question". What question? Obviously, it is a question that has already been asked, because how is it possible to say whether a statement is necessary to explain a question that has not even been asked? What sort of wisdom or insight do members opposite ask of you, Mr. Speaker, to determine whether a statement is necessary to enable the Minister to understand a question when no question has been asked?

Mr. Goldsworthy: The practice has obtained for many years.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The honourable member has been in the House no longer than I have been and he knows as much about the previous practice in this House as I do, and no more. The Standing Orders of the House contemplate the asking of a question, followed by an explanation. If the honourable member can think of no better argument to oppose your ruling, Sir, than to suggest that laxity has crept into the customs of the House which have been observed by past Speakers, I think the argument put by the Opposition is bankrupt of any merit at all. Surely, the duty of the Speaker is to see that the Standing Orders are observed and if past Speakers have allowed laxity to creep in and if—

Mr. RODDA: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is the Attorney-General in order in reflecting on the performance of the past Speakers?

The SPEAKER: The honourable Attorney-General may proceed.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Apparently it is permissible to reflect on the performance of the present Speaker but not to say anything about the performance of past Speakers! If laxity (and I do not know if laxity has crept into the past proceedings in this House) has deprived honourable members of the time in which they are entitled to ask questions without notice, you, Sir, are to be commended for bringing back to this House observance of the Standing Orders as they have been laid down. Further, your ruling introduces into the proceedings of this House what has not been there in the past—the relevance of what is said.

To a new member the aspect that offends most is the amount of time spent on comment that is totally irrelevant to any matter before the Chair. We see much of this in Question Time, when long purported explanations are given at the end of which comes a question that has little or nothing to do with the explanation preceding it. It is a poor answer to a ruling given by the Chair designed to improve the proceedings to say that in some way laxity has crept into matters earlier. Why should that determine what you rule today?

Mr. Millhouse: Because this is one of the precious privileges of members.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The precious privileges of this House—

Mr. Millhouse: You don't give a damn about them when you are in office. Wait till you're in Opposition: it is a different matter then.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The precious privileges of this House are enshrined in the Standing Orders and you, Mr. Speaker, are charged with the responsibility of interpreting and enforcing the Standing Orders, which are the real guarantee of the rights and privileges of all members. It is of tremendous importance that these Standing Orders be enforced to the benefit of all members because, if laxity is permitted to creep in and if members are permitted to make statements that are irrelevant to the question which they finally ask, it simply means that the time of this House is occupied by irrelevancies that cannot contribute anything towards the satisfactory discharge of the business of this House.

I think the member for Kavel said that it was ridiculous to put an unintelligible question and then follow it with an explanation. I say that no question in this House ought to be unintelligible. True, some questions may require an explanation in order to be fully understood, but the Standing Orders contemplate such a situation by providing the right for an explanation to be given and the Speaker can judge whether it is necessary for the understanding of the question that has been put. I fail to understand why a question about a road to Bull Creek, which was the example used by the honourable member for Kavel, cannot be framed equally as well at the beginning of the remarks as at the end of the remarks. After all, if the honourable member wants to ask the Minister of Roads and Transport why he intends to close the road to Bull Creek, why cannot he ask the question?

Mr. Goldsworthy: That would not need an explanation.

The Hon. L. J. KING: If the honourable member wants to go on and explain that he has seen a press report of a statement attributed to the Minister that it is intended to close the road, he can give that explanation and it will be plainly seen by the Chair to be relevant to the question. There is no inherent difficulty at all in framing a question at the beginning rather than at the end. Some members may experience difficulty in framing an intelligent question at any stage of their remarks but, assuming they can, it can be done equally as well at the beginning as at the end. I suggest, Sir, that the ruling you have given provides the framework for the conduct of Question Time in this House. It gives members on both sides a free and full opportunity to put any question to Ministers or members on the matters prescribed by the Standing Orders. It gives them the opportunity to make an explanation that they think is necessary in order to explain the question, and it further enables you, Mr. Speaker, to judge whether the explanation given is necessary to explain the question. In that way it enables you to regulate the affairs and conduct of this House in a way that will enable it efficiently to discharge its business. It enables honourable members to ask questions and then make their explanation, but it requires them, and enables you to require them, to confine their explanation to matters relevant to the question. In that way every member has his full rights, and members who may otherwise be deprived of the opportunity to ask questions, because other members have occupied the time of the House unnecessarily with irrelevant explanations, are protected and their full rights to ask questions are secured. I support your ruling and suggest that the attack that has been made on it by Opposition members is completely without foundation.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): As Opposition Whip, I believe I should make one or two statements about this ruling. I support the Leader's motion. At all times I have tried to co-operate with you, and I have asked members of my Party (after you have asked me to tell them) not to stand in the Chamber or turn their backs on you, and they have co-operated fully. When you asked me to explain to them that they were not to give long detailed explanations of questions, I did this and they co-operated with you. This ruling will interfere with and take away the rights of members, and no-one

can deny that. The Premier and the Attorney-General cannot deny that under the rights that existed for members before you gave this ruling (if it is accepted) a member could explain his question before he asked it, but that right will no longer exist. Government members cannot say that it will exist, because it will have gone. During the last Parliament, when present Government members were on this side, had the Speaker tried to introduce such a ruling those members who today supported it would have been the first to condemn it. The Premier knows that full well, and I believe that we are going to lose this right. The Premier has asked us to tell him what right we are losing, but he obviously knows what it is. Before today we could explain the question and then ask it, but after today (if this ruling is accepted) that right will have gone. That is what we are objecting to.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is an enormous change!

Mr. EVANS: It is a change to the detriment of Parliament and to the effect that Opposition members can have on Parliament, and the Premier knows it. He supports it only because he and his Ministers will have a much easier time. I do not suggest that you, Mr. Speaker, have collaborated with them regarding this ruling, but you must consider this aspect and realize that this ruling, if accepted, will take away from all members a right that has existed until today. I support the motion.

Mr. CLARK (Elizabeth): I oppose the motion. I think that too much unnecessary heat has crept into the debate. All that Opposition members had to do was explain quietly their petulant belief in purported pressures and privileges, give reasons why they were losing anything, and then sit down. No reasons have been given why any dire disability will arise from this ruling, which slightly changes things. The member for Fisher said that in the old days a member could explain a question and then ask it but that that privilege would be lost because one now had to ask the question and then explain it. If anyone can show me the difference, I shall be pleased to hear it. The member for Kavel frightened me, and I am not easily frightened. I was a teacher for many years and at times I resorted to the expedient of glaring at someone with whom I did not agree. However, that glare of the member for Kavel just about shrivelled up Government members.

Mr. Coumbe: About time, too.

Mr. CLARK: Until I visited the Barossa Valley recently (where I have many friends and relations) I had not realized why the honourable member in the short time he had been here had won in his district the nickname of "Sneer": but now I know, because he showed us this afternoon. Today, I went through two or three *Hansards* for this session, and I can recommend it as an interesting exercise. I looked at the explanation given to a question, covered up the question, and then tried to guess what the question was about. I defy honourable members to be able to do this in about 60 per cent of the questions that have been asked. When I was teaching I had a special spot in the corner of the room where the fellows who did not make the grade in weekly examinations were placed. It was called "drongo corner". Apparently, there is such a place on the other side of this House, but the voices there do not speak loudly enough for me to hear. Perhaps they return to their district and tell their constituents, "I had a go at Clark in the House," but I could not hear them.

Mr. Gunn: Sit down!

Mr. CLARK: Will the honourable gentleman who said "sit down" please stand up? Obviously, the way in which questions will now be asked will assist all members. I have every sympathy with Opposition members who wish to ask questions and who have some difficulty in obtaining information. Most of the time I have been a member (and that is since 1952) has been spent on the Opposition benches, and I know how frustrating it can be when a question is side-stepped. I asked my first question in this House of the then Premier Sir Thomas Playford (he was then plain Tom Playford) about an issue that became important during the by-election at which I was elected, but his reply had no connection with my question. In fact, one would have thought he had not heard the question, but he heard it all right. I have every sympathy for members of the Opposition wanting to get information, and I believe that this ruling will help everyone. First, and most important, it will help the Speaker, who will know exactly what the question is and, when the explanation is given, whether it is too long or irrelevant. The ruling will also help the Minister concerned. According to the member for Kavel, our Ministers are so hopeless that they need much help, but that is completely contrary to the general opinion that has been widely expressed to members in this place, including members on this side of the House.

The Ministers will know exactly what the question will be. While an explanation may be necessary, I think that far too many explanations are given in this place. If questions were framed well, at least half of the questions asked would not need an explanation.

The ruling will enable the Minister concerned to know exactly what the question is and, possibly most important of all, it will enable other members also to know just what the question is. If members are interested and wish to listen to the explanation, they can do so, and, if they do not wish to listen to it, they can go to sleep. I submit in all seriousness that for a long time, particularly when in Opposition, I personally have been worried about the way in which questions were being asked, and I have seen many instances in the past on which not the questioner but the Minister replying is the person who should have been curtailed. However, Sir, I have confidence in you regarding this matter.

Those members who have had much experience in the House will know that Ministers' replies have at times gone on and on and, eventually, have not told the member concerned very much. Over the years that I have been a member, bearing in mind the thousands of questions to which I have listened in this place, I believe that the greatest sinners in regard to Question Time have been the Ministers replying to questions.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Would you name them?

Mr. CLARK: No, I would not! These Ministers have been at fault, because, when replying, they have made the question an excuse to give virtually a second reading explanation. Finally (and I know this has been said previously), I can only say that surely this ruling curtails nothing for anyone.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Would you have accepted it previously?

Mr. CLARK: Yes, I would have welcomed it. I know the member for Alexandra asks this because he has a sincere desire to learn.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Are you being sarcastic?

Mr. CLARK: No. I know the honourable member and, frankly, I have worried about this matter for a long time. I would welcome all questions being put on notice, but I know that that is not the issue of the debate. I believe that if questions were put on notice they would be better, as would also be the replies, and the statements made would

be completely free of any possible tinge of bias anywhere. However, I know that that is not the point at issue in this debate. I oppose the motion.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): It is with great regret that I find myself having to support this motion. I speak in a personal capacity as a new member of this House, and my "L" plates probably still show. I have been most impressed by the dignity which you, Sir, have shown in carrying out the onerous duties of Speaker in this Fortieth Parliament. Having seen Speakers in other Parliaments, I think that your activities, your impartiality and your rulings compare favourably with those of any other speakers I have seen. If it is in order, I congratulate you on this. However, I cannot agree with you on this ruling. I think it is a little unfortunate that the ruling should have followed at a relatively short time a move by the Premier to change the form of Question Time, because possibly—

Mr. Ryan: When did he change it?

Dr. TONKIN: —this could be misconstrued by some people. I hasten to add that I do not misconstrue it, as I trust that your ruling was given from the Chair and was based on your own opinion. I respect your authority and opinion, but I disagree with your opinion here. As all members will agree, Question Time provides the Opposition's opportunity to test and probe the policies and actions of the Government.

Mr. Ryan: You aren't deprived of that opportunity now.

Dr. TONKIN: We are not deprived of it under the change proposed by the ruling, but the form in which we can use this opportunity will definitely be altered. I think that forms of question are important and that a question makes much more sense if it is asked after a reasonable explanation is given. I agree to the provision in Standing Order 125, namely, that "by leave of the House and so far only as may be necessary to explain such question" shall facts be given. Not only is a question more reasonable after a logical and, I trust, brief explanation is given but it is more sensible and practical. Often, if the question is asked initially, the Minister concerned will have forgotten it when he has to reply.

As the member for Elizabeth has said, we have all received a reply that has not answered our question or has not answered it correctly. Also, I think that replies to questions asked of Ministers representing Ministers in another place do not always come

back correctly. I believe the Minister of Education has gone on record as saying that talk about curtailing rights is a lot of hooey, but I cannot accept that. There is a fundamental right of free speech, and it is the right of every member to be heard in this House, as he should be heard, provided he does not transgress Standing Orders. I suggest that the Minister of Education look at Standing Order 126, to which the member for Elizabeth referred and on which I should like your assurance, Sir, at some stage, if your ruling is to stand: I should like to be assured that Standing Order 126 will be adhered to strictly and impartially, as I am sure it should be.

In the short period that I have been a member of this House I have been struck by the fact that much less courtesy and respect has been shown to you, Sir, and to your office by members on the other side. Indeed, I think that this was demonstrated completely by the way in which this motion was received by Government members: there was laughter and frank joy, and it was not pleasant. I do not think that this places you in an enviable position. As a member of this House, and apart from Party politics, I am at times ashamed of the standard of conduct in this House. Sir, I think that you have done a remarkable job in keeping order as you have done. If I may be permitted to say so, I consider that you do yourself an injustice: I think you have the ability to determine what is relevant and what is not, and I think that in most cases explanations are not abused. In spite of the actions of two or three members, I think we should trust you still to keep things as they are. Sir, I think you are quite able to determine what is relevant and what is not in an explanation before a question. I support the motion.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): This has been an illuminating debate, when two eminent Queen's Counsel—

The SPEAKER: I remind the House that, if the Leader of the Opposition speaks, he closes the debate. I should like the opportunity to briefly direct the attention of members to my statement to the House of September 3, and I find it difficult to understand why that statement has not been studied. I think that, if it had been, there would have been no need for this position to arise today. At that time I stated:

I thought it might be opportune, and beneficial to all members, to remind them of the provisions relating to questions seeking information. Standing Order 125 provides that, in asking a question, "no argument or opinion

shall be offered, nor shall any facts be stated, except by leave of the House and so far only as may be necessary to explain such question". I am of the opinion that the maximum use is not being made of Question Time, because of a tendency for questions to be far too long, to contain argument or opinion, or to give information or state facts which are not necessary to explain the question. Also, answers to questions on occasions are unnecessarily prolix. It would be helpful to the Chair if members, at the commencement of a question, could indicate the subject matter of that question so that the Chair could judge whether facts being stated thereafter were necessary to explain the question. The basic object in asking a question is not to give information but to seek information and press for action. The co-operation of honourable members in this matter will conduce to a more effective use being made of Question Time.

Standing Order 125 is explanatory, and it is necessary for me, as the presiding officer, to be able to interpret that. The Standing Order states:

In putting any such question, no argument or opinion shall be offered, nor shall any facts be stated, except by leave of the House and so far only as may be necessary to explain such question.

I have ruled that it is necessary to ask the question in order that the Speaker may determine whether the Standing Order is being complied with, and I stand by that ruling.

Mr. HALL: I disagree to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, because I say that you have interpreted the Standing Order incorrectly, and so have the two Queen's Counsel on the Government benches, because you and they have ignored completely the meaning of the word "except". I refer to the Concise Oxford Dictionary, which is available on the back shelf in this Chamber so that any member who does not know the meaning of the word may look it up. The meaning in that dictionary is "Exclude from enumeration, statement . . .". Therefore, in the context of Standing Order 125, "except" means that the part before the word "except" is excluded: we exclude "In putting any such question, no argument or opinion shall be offered, nor shall any facts be stated". That is what I understand from the Concise Oxford Dictionary. If the dictionary is wrong, someone should write and tell the author. Therefore, we can, by leave of the House and so far only as may be necessary to explain a question, offer opinion or argument. We have your ruling, and the members opposite ignore completely the meaning of the key word in this Standing Order. Obviously, standing by the explicit meaning of this word,

we say that your ruling is unjust to the Opposition and does not interpret the Standing Order as it should be interpreted according to the English language.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: And you said there were two Q.C.'s opposite.

Mr. HALL: The Minister of Labour and Industry is again making inane interjections. How he bores the House with his yawning and his stupid remarks! It has been illuminating indeed to hear the Attorney-General, the new shining light, pushed into this House by the Labor Party as member for a safe Labor district, to try to upgrade the low standard of that Party here, telling members that their questions have been the cause of time being spent on irrelevant matters. In whose opinion are they irrelevant? They are irrelevant in the opinion of the Attorney-General, of course, so he supports this suppression of the rights of individual members of the Opposition, because he considers their worth to be irrelevant. We are to stand here, while this new member throws aside precedent that for so long has been the safeguard of British institutions. This is his opinion, to be given by his vote.

This is the real first step of dictators, the breaking down of the Parliamentary institution. The Attorney-General will advocate that the persons who sit on the front steps of this House should have more rights than the persons who speak inside the House. That is the type of advocacy that the new broom brings to the Labor Party. He thinks that Opposition members may ask a question or two that is below the level of his intelligence. He cannot quite get down to our level, apparently, and some questions are irrelevant and bothersome, and he wants to cut them down.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He wouldn't want to get down to your gutter level.

Mr. HALL: This is the opinion the arrogant Minister has had ever since he has been sitting on the front bench.

Mr. Langley: You're only a snake.

Mr. HALL: The Premier, in reply to previous questions about the freedom that Opposition members have, gave what we thought was something of an undertaking. We were mistaken, of course, because apparently he can twist words to suit his own desires. There was publicity in the South Australian news media regarding reform which had been promoted, I understand, by someone outside this House and which the Premier commented upon. At that

time we were alarmed because there might be some restriction of the rights of Opposition members. The Premier will recall that we raised the matter with him. It was a matter of some moment to the press, because the media and the public were concerned that their Parliament should be free. After making a long explanation in which he justified his attitude, the Premier stated:

I assure the Leader that I would not support any system that in any way took away from members their rights to obtain effective information for their constituents.

He went on to say:

I would not want to press something that did not have the general support of members.

Mr. Millhouse: Is that right, too?

Mr. HALL: Does he believe that the "general support of members" is only the support of his henchmen?

Mr. Coumbe: What about the minority?

Mr. HALL: Yes, we are being scrapped for an oppressive and totalitarian type of conduct. The Premier repeated:

I assure the honourable member that since it is the purpose of this exercise to ensure that better value is given to all members, including Opposition members, during Question Time, I would not want to do anything that would not be generally accepted.

I remind the Attorney-General of this. Again, as he is so frequently, he is out of step with his Premier. I refer those Government members who said there would be no change to the speech made by the Minister of Education, who said there would be a change. He said that because of that change Opposition members would be able to ask more questions. However, we do not want the change; we want our freedom. We do not want to trade our freedom for change.

Mr. Coumbe: Or chains.

Mr. HALL: That is true. Members opposite have said that a remedy already exists for explanations that do not meet with the approval of any member. Indeed, any member can stop an explanation in its tracks by calling out "Question". We are therefore faced with opposition to one of our privileges: we are to be regimented. The Premier may frown or laugh, and the junior Minister of Labour and Industry may interject.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: We are only laughing at the drivel you are talking.

Mr. HALL: We know that if this vote is successful we will be told to alter our ways.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair wishes to hear the Leader of the Opposition address the House, but it cannot do so unless there is silence.

Mr. HALL: Thank you, Sir. We are to be regimented and told that we must alter our ways. If there is any doubt that this is so, I was stopped today from asking my question in the way I have asked questions in this House for over 11 years. Neither Government members nor the Speaker can deny that Opposition members are to be told that they must alter their ways when putting forward the public viewpoint by way of question. If we do not comply with the Standing Order we must get out of this Chamber into the streets. The way things are going in this House one might get more freedom there, anyway. Is it any wonder that members are so concerned at the rejection of the traditional freedoms that have been built up over many years in the British Parliamentary system, a system of which members opposite have made more use than any Party in this State?

I look back with pleasure on the many years that members of the present Government had in Opposition. Indeed, the Labor Party was in Opposition for a tremendous length of time, during which its members made full use of the little green books (or, as they used to be, the little brown books) containing Standing Orders. It was not unusual to see them thumbing through Standing Orders to see what were their rights and privileges, and I remind the Attorney-General who was not here to see this—

Mr. Millhouse: And who has never been in Opposition.

Mr. HALL: That is correct. I remind the Attorney-General of the use made by the members of his Party of the privileges given them. Not once were they told that they were to be regimented as we are.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You're not being regimented.

Mr. HALL: I wonder whether the public knows about the arrogant and insolent attitude of the Minister of Roads and Transport.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You have been telling them for long enough.

Mr. HALL: He continually insults members on this side and degrades members of his own Party. I only hope that enough of the public sees him insolent, arrogant, school-boyish attitude.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr. HALL: They would soon be able to see this by his own words and interjections. This has not been a happy afternoon for the Opposition. As the Opposition Whip and I have said, we have continually offered to co-operate with you, Sir, in your administration of this House, because we believe fervently in this House. We reject this attempt to regiment the Opposition, and I reject entirely the attitude of the Attorney-General who does not like irrelevancies and who would close us up to this degree and abolish the Upper House. What a wonderful combination this is: not to fight one's Opposition, but to get rid of it. What a statement from a democrat, who comes early into this House with his opinions on the irrelevancies expressed by members on this side. For those reasons, and many others that I have not time to voice this afternoon, I disagree to your ruling, Sir.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall (teller), Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

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

Majority of 6 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr. LANGLEY: My question is on the sittings of the House and with the leave of the Speaker and the concurrence of the House I will explain it.

Mr. Millhouse: What is the question?

The SPEAKER: The Speaker is here to administer Standing Orders. Under Standing Orders, members are not permitted to interject. The member for Unley is asking a question concerning the sittings of the House.

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Premier indicate what are the expected sittings of the House in the future?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is intended that the House shall adjourn on Thursday of next week and resume after a fortnight's

break. It is then intended that the House shall sit until the first week in December. It is also intended that we shall resume in the new year, but at this stage I cannot say exactly what date is proposed for the resumption. However, I ask members to be prepared for a sitting in the early part of next year for about six to eight weeks.

PRACTITIONERS' CHARGES

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That the rules of the Supreme Court under the Administration and Probate Act, 1919-1960, in respect of charges of practitioners, made on July 31, 1970, and laid on the table of this House on August 25, 1970, be disallowed.

I consider that a rise of 33½ per cent cannot be justified realistically. I realize that all professions are entitled to be rewarded for their services. If we consider the plight of the—

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

The SPEAKER: Order!

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Notices of Motion (Other Business) to be proceeded with.

Motion carried.

Mr. GUNN: When we consider the plight of the rural industry with depressed prices, low incomes, and high-cost expenditure, and the fact that succession duties are one of the major costs affecting this industry, these charges cannot be substantiated. The charges are assessed on a sliding scale and on a percentage basis: between \$50,000 and \$60,000 the charge is \$123 and between \$80,000 and \$100,000 the charge is \$143. Over the years the value of the estates has risen through inflation and the legal people have had their remuneration increased through inflation, therefore I do not think that these charges can be justified and I have much pleasure in moving the motion.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I second the motion for the reasons so ably put by the member for Eyre. One of the things that makes me see red in connection with this is that it is associated with succession duties, something which I believe should be wiped out completely in Australia. This is no reflection on the legal profession in our State, the members of which I believe do a magnificent job in their avocation. I am indignant that these charges should be increased by 33½ per

cent when, in fact, the value of property has increased over the years, and solicitors handling succession business have been permitted to base their charges on the value of the estate involved. With values levelling out, unfortunately to a lower level, solicitors are seeking that their charges be increased by 33½ per cent.

The first syllable of the word "succession" is "suc". We all know what that means: "suck" means to draw out to the very last. In talking about the noble profession of law, I am reminded of a story told by a lawyer named Len Strange. Talking to his family about his affairs, he said that when he departed this world he wanted five words on his tombstone: "Here lieth an honest lawyer." People passing would say, "That is Strange." I support the motion.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): The mover and seconder of the motion are asking the House to act in a capacity in which it does not possess competence, namely, as a price-fixing tribunal. In the nature of things it is not possible for the House satisfactorily to go into the basis for an increase in legal charges. The increase is made by amendment to the Rules of Court, and that amendment is made by the judges of the Supreme Court. It is their responsibility to examine the evidence submitted to them as to increases in costs and other relevant factors, and to fix the appropriate charges for the work. The judges have considered the matter and have fixed an increase of 33½ per cent as being an appropriate adjustment to legal charges for this type of work.

It seems to me that it would be quite impertinent (perhaps that is not quite the right word), when judges have examined the evidence and reached a conclusion, for members of this House, without the opportunity and without any means to examine the evidence in the same way as the judges did, to reject that conclusion and disallow the rules. I will summarize some of the factors considered by the judges when they made this alteration. Perhaps one comparison that will interest honourable members relates to the salaries of members of Parliament during the relevant time. Although there has not been an increase in these fees since 1957, there has been an increase of 134 per cent in salaries paid to members of Parliament, and the salary of puisne judges of the Supreme Court has increased by 119 per cent in that time. There have been general increases in remuneration

to other persons who may be regarded as being in a comparable position to legal practitioners: for instance, the salary of the Commissioner of Police has risen in that time by 138 per cent; for a professor at the University of Adelaide the increase has been 100 per cent; and for a reader at the University of Adelaide the increase has been 106 per cent.

Mr. Venning: These are all fixed wages, aren't they? A lawyer can fix his own charges.

The Hon. L. J. KING: That is so, but we are debating an amendment to the Rules of Court, which fix the remuneration for professional work done in relation to the administration of estates.

Mr. Venning: He does other work as well.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes, and that is regulated in the same way. At present an amendment to the rules is lying on the table concerning other litigious work, and that amendment provides for a similar increase of 33½ per cent. Under the rule that is being considered, the increase is 33½ per cent, and there has been no increase since 1957.

Mr. Millhouse: Was it not 1959?

The Hon. L. J. KING: On the information given to me, I understand that the last increase was on February 1, 1957. One or two other comparisons are interesting: for the Deputy Crown Solicitor the increase in that time has been 82 per cent; for a senior solicitor in the Crown Law Office it has been 115 per cent; and medical fees for a consultation have increased by 140 per cent.

Mr. Venning: There is a difference, isn't there?

The Hon. L. J. KING: This is the first increase since 1957 (or since 1959 if the member for Mitcham is correct), and it is a reasonable increase in all circumstances. I appreciate the argument that has been advanced by the member for Eyre and supported by the member for Rocky River that these charges are a percentage of the value of the estate, and they seek to make a distinction. This aspect was fully considered by the judges, and it was for this reason that, when the last increase was made in the general scale of Supreme Court costs in 1965, no increase was made in the administration and probate scale. That distinction was based on the reason given by the member for Eyre, namely, that it was a percentage scale fixed in proportion to the value of the estate.

However, experience has shown (and the judges came to this conclusion) that this is now working a substantial injustice to people engaged in this work, because costs in legal offices have increased substantially. Since 1957, the salary of a typiste has increased by 72 per cent; the rental of typical premises occupied by a solicitor in the city has increased by 42 per cent; telephone charges have increased by 308 per cent; stationery by 38 per cent; printing (calculated by a printer) by 115 per cent; and postage by 72 per cent. The actual overhead costs in a solicitor's office have increased by far more than 33½ per cent in that time.

Experience has shown that the average value of estates has not increased in a way that provides compensation. Honourable members can speculate on the reasons for this: it may be that nowadays a testator is inclined to consider ways and means of keeping to a minimum the actual estate which he leaves by will or which passes in intestacy. Many devices are well known to solicitors and accountants who practise in this field and who advise clients, so that estates can be kept to a minimum and advantages passed to dependants in other ways. The result is that the average value of estates (and the judges were satisfied on this) has not increased in a way that would compensate practitioners for their work. The theory that the percentage of the value of the estate (the basis on which charges are based) will automatically compensate by reason of the depreciating value of money has not worked out.

Although it has never been the practice automatically to apply each increase in the general scale of costs to the administration and probate scale, the judges were satisfied in the circumstances that, on the information before them, it was appropriate to grant the increase. I think that covers the matter, and I submit that it would be wrong of us to attempt to disagree to the view taken by the judges after carefully considering all the factors involved. I suggest, with all respect to the member for Rocky River, that it is quite frivolous to introduce considerations of succession duties into this discussion. After all, whatever he may think of succession duties and of the Government's proposals for succession duties, it is a little hard to saddle solicitors who have to do the work with responsibility for this. Indeed, the honourable member has paid a high tribute to the legal profession, a tribute which I am sure is well deserved, if I may say so, and I

think it follows from that, surely, that the practitioners who perform this work should be justly remunerated for the work they perform.

If the member for Rocky River has some views on succession duties or some differences of opinion with the Government on that topic, there is a time and place to debate that, but it cannot have any relevance to the sheer injustice that would be involved in disallowing rules of court which, on the judges' view of the matter, having considered all the evidence, provide just remuneration for the service provided by the solicitor. For these reasons, I oppose the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I, too, oppose the motion. I agree with, I think, all the points made by the Attorney-General in opposing the motion. I have had an opportunity in the last couple of minutes to check, and I find that it was on December 17, 1959, that the scale was altered (I have the *Government Gazette* here); so the scale of charges has not been altered since 1959. As the Attorney-General said, it was not altered in 1965, when there was an alteration in the general scale, and the alteration now is approved and, in fact, made by Their Honours the Supreme Court judges who, of course, have no personal interest in the matter.

Mr. Venning: Wouldn't they be solicitors, too?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: A Supreme Court judge would have been a solicitor at one time but, in fact, he is a judge and cannot have any personal interest in the matter. I suggest in all seriousness to the member for Rocky River that it is not quite proper to suggest that the judges would have had any personal interest when they made this alteration, because I am sure they would not. I have been supplied by the Law Society, as I have no doubt that the Attorney-General was supplied, with a copy of the letter which the President wrote to the Chief Justice in October last setting out the reason why the profession requested an alteration in the scale, and I intend to quote briefly from the letter to reinforce the points made by the Attorney-General, because this is what Mr. Magarey said:

Rule's made under the Administration and Probate Act: This scale of charges was not increased in 1965. As I understand the reason, it was that as the charges are based on the size of estates it was thought that practitioners' costs would automatically increase with the rise in the value of estates. I think it would be fair to say—

and this is the point that I ask the members who moved and seconded this motion particularly to note—

that experience has not substantiated this reason, probably because of the various measures commonly taken to decrease the value of estates before death. I submit with this letter a memorandum which includes and itemizes a bill of costs drawn on the present general scale—

that is, not this scale but the scale for general solicitors' work, as opposed to proctors' work—for work which is done preparatory to taking out a grant of probate in a normal or average case of an estate of a value of \$8,000.

Perhaps honourable members will note that that is about the average value of an estate for which probate is taken out, and that is far below the value of the country estates with which they have been dealing. The letter continues:

It can readily be seen that the amount of costs for work done when based on the general scale is approximately double the amount which would be allowed under the present fixed scale.

That is the scale we are considering. The letter continues:

I further draw attention to that portion of the memorandum which sets out work which is encountered in unusual cases where affidavits or other documents are required and for which no allowance is made in the fixed probate scale.

That does not matter so much. That is the experience of the profession in this matter, and I may say that I personally have no interest, either, in this matter. I am practising not as a solicitor at the moment but only as a barrister, but I have never practised as a proctor, who is the person who does this type of work. Perhaps there are two other points that I should make: first, the honourable members concerned have referred (I think both of them did so in their speeches) to succession duties, and they protested. I must support them, certainly to a measure, in their protests about succession duties and about the intentions, so far as we know them, of the present Government to increase those duties. However, these charges are but a tiny percentage of the duties levied when there is a succession.

Mr. Venning: It is the last straw.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It may be, but it is a small percentage of the total amount which must be paid; and, in any case (and the Attorney-General will correct me if I am wrong here, but I am confident that I am right), these amounts are taken into account and are a deduction, as it were,

when fixing succession duties, because the fees paid under this scale or charged by the solicitor are deducted from the successions before the duty on those successions is fixed. Therefore, as with income tax deductions, the higher one can get those deductions the less the duty that is paid. The honourable member may say that that is only a small point, but I suggest that it is a relevant point.

The final point I make is one which I do not think was covered by the Attorney-General, but I think I should put it to the honourable members concerned because, as I understand it, they are most concerned with country successions and with the duty that is paid. I had figures taken out of the number of wills that have been proved this year between January 1 and August 31; during that time the total number of grants of probate was 2,962. Judging from the addresses (and this was the only way in which this figure could be reached) of the deceased, there were only 756 estates of that 2,962 in which there could be a possible connection with primary production because the persons involved lived in country areas; and, of the 756, 268 were females. Some proportion of those females would be engaged in farming on their own account, but many of the others would not have been so engaged. If we take the whole of that 268 from 756, we get 488, and 488 out of 2,962 represents only about one in six. Although this is only an approximation (and I do not hold it out to be any more than an approximation), it shows that only about one estate in six during the eight months of this year probably has had any connection with primary production.

Mr. Venning: Who's going to look after them if we don't?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I make this point to rebut the point made by the honourable members; that is, that this increase in some way was directed against or would be particularly hard on people in country areas, particularly primary producers. In fact, five out of six of the estates, if this calculation is accurate (and I believe it is approximately accurate), apparently have no connection with primary production. I do not think that the honourable members are worried about the city, but this increase will not bear harshly on and it is not directed against country estates. The effect will not be harsher treatment of country estates than of metropolitan estates.

These are the only additional points that I make. As I have said, I agree with the Attorney-General that there has been a sub-

stantial increase in costs of living and in the remuneration received by members of Parliament and every other section of the community, and in all equity there is no reason why the legal profession should not have increases that are about the equivalent. This scale has not been increased for nearly 11 years, a substantial period of time. I hope honourable members will see that there is ample justification for this increase and that it will not work a hardship on those whom they particularly seek to protect by moving the motion.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): Although I do not want to deny the legal profession its proper payment, I am mindful of the motive that presses the member for Eyre and the member for Rocky River to take this stand in their capacity as primary producers. The problem of the primary producer has been aired in this House recently and conferences throughout Australia have discussed the circumstances in which the great primary-producing industries find themselves. I think the member for Mitcham pointed out that only one of every six estates had a country relationship. Whilst this point is properly taken, it underlines the dire conditions being experienced by our great primary industries. No-one denies members of the legal profession their rights.

Mr. Millhouse: This motion does, though.

Mr. RODDA: I must support my colleagues but, as we are in a minority, the learned members need have no great fear about the result. I consider that we must take this stand to highlight the dire circumstances of primary producers, who are selling on a world market and producing on an internal cost economy, and are not able to pass on any of these costs.

I was interested to hear the Attorney-General say that this House should not set itself up as a price fixing authority. I think that is what he said. To turn that argument around, why bring the matter here at all? If it cannot be blessed here, it should not be capable of being disallowed here. Perhaps, as I am a layman, I could be excused for taking this view, but I am speaking as a primary producer and I know that these increasing costs are killing the goose that lays the golden egg. If we have no geese, we will get no eggs. I know the value to the State of the legal profession, but the community becomes lop-sided when one section of it is going under, as the primary producing industries are.

Mr. Venning: Have you heard of one lawyer who has gone broke?

Mr. RODDA: I cannot say I have, but I have known some unsuccessful lawyers. I think it was not their profession but their method of living and some of the things they did outside their profession that sent them broke, however. I do not deny the legal profession its right to increases, because in the cost factor that confronts us I think everyone wants escalation. It behoves us to consider the fiscal system. We hear talk of devaluation, and the Social Credit people have what they claim to be a solution of the problem. Adequate payment for services is a symbol of exchange and everyone (including the legal profession) is entitled to his fair share. I take issue with this increase not to deny lawyers their proper rights in this ulterior community in which we live but to underline the plight of our primary producers. I support the motion.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I am at a loss to know how to vote on this matter.

Mr. Millhouse: I could tell you.

Mr. EVANS: I know that the honourable member, being a lawyer, would be willing to tell me. I am in this difficulty because it is hard to justify an increase of 33½ per cent in any particular charge in the community. If the argument that the charge has not been increased since 1959 is valid and if the 1959 charges were genuine, the increase is justified. However, we do not know whether the charge was too high in 1959, so this basis of argument cannot be used.

Mr. Millhouse: We can assume the 1959 charges were genuine, because otherwise Parliament would have altered them.

Mr. EVANS: The average man in the street is losing respect, because he cannot obtain legal services without using the legal aid scheme, and I suppose that he is looking for a one-armed lawyer, because a lawyer will say, "On this hand you may win, and on this hand you may lose." In those circumstances, the client must wait until the difference has been fought out. If this increase of 33½ per cent is not made, lawyers may tend to avoid this sort of work and it may get into the hands of persons who are not as capable as they should be. Also involved in this is the point that, in statements made in relation to succession duties, people are often fined heavily because lawyers are too slow to submit returns. I know of a matter involving a person who has been fined \$1,000 by Government authorities for late submission of returns. In my opinion, the lawyer in this

case is at fault, but the client's only redress is to sue the firm of lawyers for negligence, and how hopeless it would be to ask one lawyer to sue another! In the eyes of the average man in the community, members of the legal profession have been just as much downgraded as have members of Parliament in the past few years. For all that, I cannot support the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (5)—Messrs. Allen, Gunn (teller), Mathwin, Rodda, and Venning.

Noes (37)—Messrs. Becker, Brookman, Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Carnie, Clark, Coumbe, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Groth, Hall, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, Lawn, McKee, McRae, Millhouse, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, and Slater, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Virgo, Wardle, and Wells.

Majority of 32 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

RURAL INDUSTRIES

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): I move:

That in the opinion of this House, a committee of inquiry should be set up to inquire into and report upon the economic problems besetting rural industries in this State and to recommend what action should be taken to solve such problems.

I wish to tackle this motion from two angles. First, I should like to establish some of the reasons for the present situation that now exists in the rural community. I will deal with these not in the order I have placed them but in their order of importance. We in the agricultural world are faced with what is known as a green revolution. Malthus said that we would die of starvation because we would never be able to feed the peoples of the world. Today, with an ever-expanding population, and because of the advances made in the science and technology of plant breeding, we are finding that we are able rapidly to multiply production of certain of the richest producing lands in the world. I refer to countries that have in the past been some of the principal importers of foodstuffs. The dwarf wheats, as they are known, developed in Mexico to solve the food problems of that country, have found homes in India, Pakistan and, no doubt, in China, just as we have been able to use them here to some degree to increase production of our traditional wheat varieties in this country. They have completely revolutionized production.

In the Philippines a similar project was undertaken in the development of new rice varieties. The plant breeders were able to develop a fast, maturing strain of rice that would enable three crops, instead of the traditional two, to be grown each year, and also to enable rice crops to be grown continuously. Indeed, in certain areas three crops a year have been grown continuously for five years. This is a significant development in the carbohydrate foodstuffs field that has taken place in the last four or five years. It is significant for the future of our export industries, particularly wheat, because most of these countries either import wheat when they need it or import it as a supplement to their crops when their traditional crops are short. This is something we have to bear in mind when we are considering the future of a particular industry, particularly the wheat industry. We must not overlook the fact that America has restricted production: she has bought her farmers out of production by paying them not to produce. Perhaps this year she may have a poor wheat harvest because of seasonal and disease factors, but she can turn on the taps next year and quickly make up any deficiencies.

It may be said that droughts in the world at present may affect production and will make things easier for Australia, but this factor may be insignificant for us in the long term. It may be an effective short-term method of clearing some of our present surplus supplies. We have to consider another serious aspect concerning primary industries producing wine, citrus, milk and to some degree meat. Those industries in Australia have had a traditional export market to Great Britain. For about 50 years that country has acted as a blotting paper and absorbed our surplus production and, until recently, she had always given priority to Commonwealth nations. She has given them preferential treatment in her markets, but this has been diminishing. Not only have we lost our priorities but the quantities she has purchased from us have been reduced.

Now we are threatened with the real prospect of Great Britain joining the European Economic Community. She will do this for industrial reasons, as she will have a tremendous market for her industries and, after all, Great Britain is an industrial nation and that is why she has had to purchase so much foodstuffs. Now she has to accept the provisions of the agreement relating to agricultural production if and when she enters the community. That action will have a significant effect on much of our industry

that has traditionally exported to Great Britain, particularly on the citrus and dairy industries, less particularly on the wine industry (which exports 1,000,000 gall. of wine), and specifically on our butter production. Great Britain is the highest consumer of butter exported from Australia and New Zealand.

These are market factors that are outside our control: they are matters of international development in techniques and marketing, but they have been coupled with other factors that have been too prevalent in this country for the last seven or eight years. I refer to the incidence of droughts, which have become more frequent in Australia. At this moment not only are there parts of South Australia in the grip of drought but also Western Australia, Queensland and New South Wales are severely affected by it. This has an effect on our internal markets and means that surplus stock has nowhere to go except to be exported, because there is a limited area that can provide the necessary food to maintain the present annual increase in the number of stock.

Usually when there is a drought in one part of Australia another part of the country is more favourably treated. In the past South Australia has been able to send sheep to Western Australia or has sold sheep to Queensland and New South Wales. This procedure can act in reverse, and we have imported sheep from Western Australia, New South Wales and Queensland from areas that have suffered from drought in those States. This year we find there is nowhere other than a restricted area in the southern part of Australia (in the western districts of Victoria and the more favoured South-Eastern portion of South Australia) where there seems to be surplus feed and a market for this kind of stock. Hence we find that in the general market situation prices are depressed except for beef, because not only has the home consumption of beef been expanded but also we have been able to export an increasing quantity to North American markets. This has proved a profitable outlet for certain types of beef produced in Australia and has enabled us to expand this form of production.

However, the general farming community has problems with the high capital cost of changing from one form of production to another. If stability is required there must inevitably be some form of control. In the wheat industry we now have a quota of production used to control surplus production within Australia.

I suggest that had it not been for the expanding market in Japan for low-fat cheese we might well have found ourselves (and might still find ourselves) in the position where quotas of dairy production may have to be introduced in Australia if we are to retain the present stabilization and expect the same support from the Government to maintain prices.

We find our wool competing with other fibres. I pay a tribute to the staff of the International Wool Secretariat in London. I spent two days with these people during my visit to London in June of this year and I have a high respect for their work of promoting wool in areas where one would expect other fibres to have an advantage. They were promoting research work done in Australia by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization in shrink-proofing and in making materials dye-fast, to the point where this year they will sell such dye-fast shrink-proof woollen garments in West Germany. They were so confident that the dye would not come out and that there would be no shrinkage that they promoted the product into the largest expanding market in Europe with the idea of "Throw your woollens into the washing machine". This is something that the manufacturers of nylon and other synthetic fibres will not do: they tell buyers to treat their garments with care, because they are made out of delicate fibres.

Members of the staff of the International Wool Secretariat have also improved spinning techniques; they have improved techniques and speeded up action in the mills, and this has effected economies. These people are now entering the carpet field intensively and, as a consequence of their activities here, we have witnessed a tremendous upsurge in the demand for cross-bred wools, which are carpet wools, as opposed to the demand for acrylic fibre, and I think that is to the credit of those people, who, on behalf of wool producers throughout the world, are promoting wool as a fibre.

This must be done within the context of people's having a choice, and here I refer to the problem with which we are confronted today regarding wool prices. While wool is a premium fibre it is not the only fibre, and it will only bring a premium price in certain areas. The majority of wool production is in competition with the manufacture of synthetic fibres, the price of which will largely determine the upper price limits of wool. Therefore, while there is not likely to be any quota on

wool production, there is the problem of the person who, deriving his livelihood from producing wool, has to produce it at the prices currently being paid for wool on the world market. Unquestionably, there is a continual decline in the price of wool, and this decline has occurred most obviously during the last two or three years.

This matter has caused much embarrassment to people, including members of this Government, and I know that the member for Mount Gambier, as Chairman of the Land Settlement Committee, will agree with me that, in arriving at a budgetary figure regarding the production of a property, it has been almost impossible to assess the return from the wool produced, and this has affected forecasts made four and five years ago and financial arrangements entered into in good faith on the assumption that certain prices would prevail. Properties have, from being profitable enterprises, fallen into the category of marginal enterprises. As I have said, this is the result of the falling price of this commodity. We are now being told that there has been over-production in the rural industries and that we should have kept people other than farmers out of the enterprise of farming. I refer here to the Rundle Street and Pitt Street farmers, the professional people, who have gone into farming but who should have been kept out of it and who, as a result of their activities, have added to production and, therefore, to over-supply.

Mr. Clark: You wouldn't put certain Ministers in that category, would you?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I would place them in another category altogether. I refer to people in high places, notably Ministers in the Commonwealth sphere, who were well informed and who should have informed more fully the people they represented in rural matters.

Mr. Millhouse: You mustn't talk like that.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I cannot help it if that is the position. Farmers were encouraged to increase production and to become more efficient, and they were told, "We'll have no trouble selling it to China. She'll take it all. Just grow it, because we need it to finance the development of Australia." Fortunately for Australia, just when the rural markets of the world started to pack up, along came the mineral boom, and so we see today not only the mineral boom but also (despite what some people may say) an upsurge in industry, particularly in the export of industrial products. We find the interesting situation that over the past 10 years, whereas the value of rural

exports has increased by only \$615,000,000, the total of all exports has increased by \$1,746,000,000. There has been over \$110,000,000 worth of increased production from sources other than that of rural production, and this increased production has enabled us to maintain and balance our export income.

As a consequence, Australia is not embarrassed in the area of oversea reserves. Having replaced agriculture to some extent by some other form of production, we now find agriculture becoming more of a Cinderella industry in Australia. We have only to look at what has happened in the financial areas affecting the rural community over the last few years to realize the significance of this situation and to see how dramatic has been the change. Since 1959, the indebtedness of the rural industries has increased; between 1967 and 1969 it increased by about \$300,000,000. In 1967, the total indebtedness of the rural industries to the financial institutions was \$631,000,000, and in 1969 it had risen to \$1,037,000,000. It is rather interesting to note the areas from which finance was drawn during that period: the banks provided an additional \$188,000,000; the pastoral houses generally provided an additional \$53,000,000, and in South Australia they provided an additional \$26,000,000.

The Commonwealth Development Bank provided an additional \$42,000,000 and insurance societies provided an additional \$34,000,000, whereas the other Government institutions, including State Banks, provided only \$4,000,000. In other words, most of the lending occurred in the private or development sphere and not through the normal Government banking channels. In fact, regarding war service land settlement, there was a decrease in the debt from \$92,000,000 to \$83,000,000. Therefore, there was a decrease in the indebtedness of the industry to the Government sector, whereas an increase occurred in the private sector. One of the problems facing the rural industry today is that in 1967, when the Labor Government introduced the primary producers emergency assistance legislation, it required that, to obtain assistance, a person must have exhausted all other avenues of obtaining finance. I suggest that at present most people have exhausted all their other sources of finance. The capital value of land has decreased, and this is rather interesting, because possibly it will be reflected in land tax, if land tax honestly reflects what is happening in the rural community today. Land values have decreased by about 30 per cent. This is on

recent sales, but it is not clearly defined as a general pattern, for the simple reason that people remember what happened in the depression years. In the country areas, people say, "This looks like what happened in 1931." The banks are extremely cautious about taking action against their debtors, saying, "We will not lend you any more money: you have exhausted your equity, but we will not sell you up."

Mr. Becker: They're not game to.

Mr. NANKIVELL: As the member for Hanson says, the banks are not game to do that, so these people go to pastoral firms and borrow in a new area of borrowing against their stock. This is why the amount of lending by those institutions has increased tremendously. These firms are not bankers: they provide a brokerage service to their clients and they have had to borrow money from the banks, under arrangements, to finance their clients. Today the average pastoral firm is paying more than 7 per cent interest for the money that it is lending to its clients at 8 per cent.

We have heard the Attorney-General and other members saying this afternoon that there have been tremendous increases in the servicing costs of the legal profession, that the increase in the wages of clerks and the increases in costs generally justify a substantial increase in prices fixed for services in that profession. Similar cost increases apply in other areas, and at present the pastoral houses cannot service money profitably at 1 per cent. In many instances, to try to assist their clients to get out of a predicament, they are actually borrowing money at a price higher than that at which they are lending to the clients. Most of this money is being borrowed not for development or expansion but for what is known as carry-on finance. In other words, in the last two years, as a result of changes in prices and the introduction of quotas, and as a result of droughts, most of the farming community in South Australia have been drawing upon all their sources of liquidity to the maximum and, as a consequence, they are now in an extremely serious position.

Only today a taxation return accountant told me that it would be very illuminating in some ways and very frightening in other ways if all the facts that had been placed before him in the last few weeks in respect of the financial position of many of these people were made public. They are the people whom the member for Price refers to as the wealthy cockies.

These people are not any longer the wealthy people that certain members in this House once considered them to be. They are almost in the position of being mendicants, just as South Australia has again become a mediant State. As I have pointed out, the plight of these people has resulted from a change in the international sphere and of the circumstances existing in Australia. The position is now being aggravated by what is known traditionally as the cost-price squeeze. I think it is time my colleagues on this side took similar action to what they took in a debate earlier this afternoon. When one is on the end of the line, there is no-one else to whom one can pass the buck.

Mr. Keneally: You didn't support the motion this afternoon.

Mr. NANKIVELL: No. Those who did were supporting a principle, while I was supporting the regulation. We cannot really relate the two, but the members who supported the motion were making a protest on an issue, a principle. If we look at the index of prices received in the rural industry, as quoted on page 50 of volume 23, No. 1, of the *Quarterly Review of Agricultural Economics*, we see that the index received for all products in 1967-68 was 107, taking the index for the base period from 1960-61 to 1962-63 as being 100. The prices received for all products were indexed at 107 in 1967-68. The index in September in 1968-69 was 108 and things looked a little better then. However, in September in 1969-70 the index was back to 101, back to the same position as prevailed between 1960 and 1963, the base years.

In South Australia we were back to the base years index. Whilst the index for all products in Australia was 101 in September in the 1969-70, in South Australia it was 100. In other words, we were back to that position, but what had happened in that time regarding prices paid in respect to services and goods provided? We find there was a progressive increase. The index figure for the total prices paid in Australia in 1967-68 was 118, again using the period from 1960-61 to 1962-63 as the base years, with an index of 100. Prices had increased in those eight years from an index of 100 to an index of 118. In September in 1968-69, they had increased further to 119 and in the year after they had increased again to 120, virtually keeping line ball with the consumer price index.

The point I am trying to make is that during that period the prices paid for rural production

declined, whereas the prices paid for services and goods continued to increase. In that way we have what is known as the cost-price squeeze. This is what hurts, because we cannot do anything about it. What happens in industry? Taxes are increased and immediately an application is made to the Prices Commissioner for an increase in the price of controlled goods because of the increased costs. These applications are made in respect of such cost increases as occur for postage and telephone calls, and increases in the price of petrol if a delivery operation is involved.

All these items cause cost increases, so we have this continuation of the profit control and, as I said in this House yesterday, we cannot have one-way control. I agree with members opposite that, if we have control, we must control everything. We do not agree with that type of control here, and that may be why conditions are as they are at present. If the position were otherwise, conditions may be even worse. This is where we are in trouble. We cannot do anything about our costs except continue to borrow against our equity in the hope that something will be done to salvage the issue before it is too late. I venture to say that it is almost too late. The Minister for Primary Industry—our Country Party friend in Canberra—has suggested that certain action should be taken, such as an immediate examination of means of helping farmers to restructure their debts, an immediate study of the means of carrying out farm reconstruction in the wool industry, and an urgent examination of the question of the establishment and operation of the proposed wool authority, and so on. Unfortunately, the horse is through the gate. Whether we can catch it before it gallops away is another matter. What is now being done should have been done prior to this, so that some action could be taken.

I am concerned not just because this affects the primary producer. I know that the members for Chaffey and Mount Gambier, as well as other country members opposite, will agree that we cannot have a prosperous rural community, including the country towns, if the surrounding country is not prosperous. The situation in most country towns today is one not of prosperity but of waiting and seeing. Many of the people who are providing an additional area of credit to the farming community, as well as the merchants and the agents in country towns, have expressed concern that something should be done because they

do not know how they can continue providing credit to these people. This is indeed a serious situation that affects not just a group of people but the whole community. It is, therefore, important that something be done to highlight these problems so that action can be taken more speedily than it is at present.

While it is mooted that these things should be done in the Commonwealth sphere (where we know the resources lie to enable action to be taken), it is important to highlight the situation here in South Australia. That is why I have suggested in the motion that a specialist committee (I have not said so precisely in the motion but that is what I refer to) and not a Select Committee should be set up to establish as speedily as possible the position obtaining in this State, and to enable action to be taken at the Government level to stimulate whatever action has been taken in other areas regarding this problem before it becomes an even more serious one.

Mr. Burdon: You would agree that this is primarily a Commonwealth matter?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I have said that it is a matter that the States cannot control or correct. However, we, as a responsible body of people, can highlight the problems of those whom we in this House represent. This is, I believe, where we can, even at this level, prepare a strong case to establish these points and to establish what should be done in the long term to adjust the matter as cautiously as possible so that as few people as possible are hurt. The matter does not rest entirely at the Commonwealth level. Some areas in this State affect this Parliament and are under its control.

I have already referred briefly to the fall in land values and the effect it will have on land tax. We have spoken today about increases in charges in administering probate in estates. Those affected most by capital tax and credit restrictions are people who are new settlers, those who have expanded their production, or those who lose one of the principal members of a partnership. Today, many farms may seem to be progressing profitably: the owners may have no serious indebtedness, and they can live within their own production provided they live down to a standard and not up to a standard. It only requires someone with a capital interest in the property to die and they are immediately faced with the question of how to find money to pay for the capital taxes required by both the State and Commonwealth Governments.

Everyone says, "Let us strip the money off the capitalists." The member for Mawson

sees succession duties as the source of more money. Let me tell the honourable member something which I think he may understand. The honourable member will appreciate that in public companies there is a multiplicity of shareholders whose funds provide the money for people to be employed. If one small shareholder dies, someone buys his shares and the company continues without any problems. If a major shareholder dies there are ways and means of distributing his interest in the company so that it is not affected to any major degree. The people employed are skilled tradesmen, people in office work and people in whose interest he is concerned. On the other hand, there are people whose business is farming and whose trades and skills are in farming, and those people have no alternative forms of occupation. Their future is immediately jeopardized by the fact that too much capital is taken out of the enterprise and cannot be replaced from any source except a lending source at a high rate of interest. From being in a reasonably comfortable state, it is suddenly found that there is no longer room for some of the people employed on that property, and they may have to give up the business of farming because they cannot afford to borrow the money to carry on.

This is happening, and is a serious matter because today the cost of money is continuing to rise and there is no prospect of borrowing money at less than 8½ or 9 per cent in order to pay probate when the cost cannot be passed on in the return from the product and cannot be absorbed because the margin of profit is not there. This is an area in which the State has some responsibility and about which it should seriously consider future legislation.

The other important aspect in which the State has responsibility is in education in country areas. Honourable members will know that as long as I have been a member I have tried to promote the advancement of higher education in rural areas, because it has been inevitable (and it is even more so now) that young people living in rural areas today will have to go elsewhere to find employment. So that they will not suffer any disability in job opportunity, they must have educational opportunities equal to those available to children in city areas.

Mr. Curren: We are doing our best to provide that.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The State has some interest in this aspect, but it is not going quite as far in some areas as I would like, despite what the member for Chaffey has said. I

have inquired about the position of hostels in Tasmania that are operated by the Education Department. Where we have two or three schools in an area in which the children cannot go beyond the fourth year teaching because of numbers of students, we should perhaps consolidate the schools by providing accommodation in a central area. I make this point because I believe this is something that we must do in order to provide the highest opportunity for an education for the children. We must do our utmost to provide the highest level of teaching that we can in rural areas for children whose parents cannot send them away to attend school.

The other alternative is that we do something about increasing the boarding allowances to ensure that there is no disability with respect to a child living away from home in order to enjoy the opportunities of education that may be available only in some other area. These are matters which affect the rural community and in which the State has influence, and they must be considered. They have to be considered from all aspects, including the aspect of stabilizing our industries so that we maintain the maximum number of people in country areas and restore the balance of stability to rural communities and towns. We should provide the education necessary to ensure that these children who have to leave areas through circumstances beyond their control can be gainfully employed without disability wherever the job opportunity exists. I believe that if we follow to its fullest extent an inquiry into this matter we will help to find some of the answers. By promoting it at this level I hoped that we would get quicker action than seems to be taking place now. We must get the action that is necessary if we in this House (particularly country members) are not to be faced with a multiplicity of problems both social and financial in our rural communities.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I second the motion, and reserve my right to speak.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT REGULATIONS: LAND SUBDIVISION

Order of the Day No. 2: Mr. McKee to move:

That the regulations under the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1969, in respect of the control of land subdivision, made on June 18, 1970, and laid on the table of this House on July 14, 1970, be disallowed.

Mr. McKEE (Pirie) moved:

That this Order of the Day be read and discharged.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I should like to move that Order of the Day No. 2 be adjourned. I am in no mood to support the motion to discharge it. As I have explained previously, a representative of the Opposition in the House of Assembly is not on the Subordinate Legislation Committee, so my Party has not the advantage of knowing what its deliberations are. The whole purpose of that committee is to inform Parliament and to advise it on what action it should take in relation to by-laws and regulations, but the committee has done nothing about informing the Opposition. The Chairman of the committee has put a motion on the Notice Paper that he will move that these regulations be disallowed. Before we can find out what they are, what his arguments are and what, if any, proceedings there have been in the committee, he has moved that the Order of the Day be read and discharged.

We have had a discussion earlier today about the way to keep the House running smoothly and the way not to: this is the way not to. I have complained previously (and I shall complain again) that I am just not prepared to accept this sort of treatment from the Government or from the member for Pirie. If he is prepared to put a motion on the Notice Paper, he should at least have the courtesy to explain to the Opposition, or some member of the Opposition, what it is all about and what he is trying to do. He has done nothing whatever; he has made no move to do it. I do not believe he gave any member on this side any warning of what he proposed to do and why.

Mr. McRae: It is your responsibility as much as his.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The member for Playford has not been here very long but he should know that the Subordinate Legislation Committee is an institution that was probably first instituted in this Parliament, above all others. It has been a useful instrument of Parliament because it can do what the private member cannot: it can hear evidence and examine all the regulations if it likes. No private member can ever do that. The member for Playford probably knows that already. Occasionally, a private member has the opportunity to examine a regulation and interview people interested in it. What he should have the advantage of is advice from

that committee, but that committee does not give us any advice; it gives us no help and no courtesy.

Mr. McRae: Why are you blaming the Chairman of the committee? There are six members.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Chairman should be able to look after himself.

Mr. McKee: I can look after myself all right; don't worry about that!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member has never tried to help us.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Alexandra.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The member for Pirie is no doubt referring to his sporting activities but, as far as the debate in this House goes, I reckon he has done the poorest job any Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee has done.

Mr. McKee: That is a compliment, coming from you.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Only one member at a time may speak. When I call for order, I expect my call to be observed; otherwise, I will name a member directly. I have asked for order. The member for Alexandra should be heard.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I was depending upon advice about what these regulations are about and what the attitude of the committee is. Instead of that, without any warning, we have a motion that this Order of the Day be read and discharged. I oppose that motion because I have not been given any information. It is about time the Chairman of that committee woke up to his responsibilities and realized that he is not just a Labor man: he is the Chairman of a committee whose duty it is to advise the whole House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the member for Alexandra in this matter. Apart from the matters he has raised, we are in this difficulty that, if this motion is carried, Order of the Day No. 2 will be read and discharged and it will not then be possible for any other honourable member to give notice of disallowance, because the time has, I understand, expired.

Mr. Clark: It has been on the Notice Paper a long time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is so, but honourable members are entitled to expect that either it will be moved, so that they can then make up their minds, or they will be informed that it will not be moved so that they can take it over. We are left in the unfortunate situation that, if this motion is carried, every other honourable member, no matter on which side of the House he is—

Mr. McKee: You could have done something about it. You have been a member of this committee and you should know about this.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I was Chairman for six years.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: And a good one, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This sort of thing did not happen in those days. The first I knew of the committee proposing not to go on with this matter was some time today—just before lunch, I think. The member for Pirie says I could have done something about it. What on earth is the committee there for? Are not members of this House entitled to rely on some help from the committee? We know that it has no member from this side on it, so we must rely upon some sort of explanation from the member for Pirie. I speak for myself but I think I also speak for the member for Alexandra when I say we are not—

Mr. McKee: Don't you—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We are not making this protest or taking this stand merely *in vacuo*. A member on this side is particularly concerned about this because he may want to take some action, but it will be two or three weeks yet before he knows. What we could do, if the member for Pirie would entertain this suggestion, would be to adjourn this debate, so as to keep the motion alive.

Mr. McKee: It can still be dealt with in the Upper House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is all very well. It is surprising to hear the member for Pirie suggesting that we depend on the Upper House to do our work. I do not take that view: I take the view that, if a matter is before this House, it should be settled here and not in another place.

Mr. Clark: He's a great supporter of the Upper House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am a supporter of the bicameral system of Government, yes. I

remind the member for Elizabeth (and I know that he does not need to be reminded) that this is a matter which is our separate responsibility, and the Upper House has its own responsibility. There is no reason why we should abdicate our responsibility in this matter. I ask whether the mover of this motion will adjourn the debate in view of the reasons given by the member for Alexandra and me, so that the member for Murray may be able to complete his inquiries and not be prejudiced by losing altogether his opportunity, as he will do if this motion is carried. I have put the case and, as I say, it is not done for any other reason than to preserve an opportunity, which will otherwise be denied us, to keep the debate alive. Can I get some sort of indication from the member for Pirie whether he is prepared to do what I have said?

Mr. McKEE (Pirie): In view of the polite plea made by the member for Mitcham, I am prepared to meet his wishes if he considers that he needs further time to consider the matter. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

RENMARK ZONING

Mr. McKEE (Pirie): I move:

That by-law No. 41 of the Corporation of the Town of Renmark in respect of building alignment in residential zones, made on November 11, 1969, and laid on the table of this House on April 28, 1970, be disallowed.

We have had negotiations with the Renmark corporation regarding this regulation, and that corporation has requested that we disallow the regulation so as to enable it to submit a new set of regulations.

Motion carried.

NURSES

Adjourned debate on the motion of Dr. Tonkin:

(For wording of motion, see page 824.)

(Continued from September 2. Page 1219.)

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): I am sure that the member for Bragg was sincere in moving this motion; indeed, through his profession, he would have a good and thorough knowledge of the problems confronting the nursing profession. With other members on this side, I have listened to the remarks of Opposition speakers who, in the main, have eulogized the nursing profession, and we on this side agree with those sentiments. In the past year the problems facing the nursing profession in South Australia have received much publicity, and no doubt they will receive

more publicity. These problems are not confined entirely to South Australia, for similar problems exist also in the other States and in such countries as New Zealand, Canada, the United Kingdom, and Sweden. Our Party, fully appreciating the problems of the nursing profession, gave prominence to this subject in the policy speech enunciated by our Leader, who is now the Premier. I will not read the relevant paragraphs in that speech concerning this matter, because they were read to the House by the member for Ross Smith. The Liberal and Country League made some reference to this subject in its policy speech, but did not deal with it to the extent that it was dealt with in Labor's policy speech, and there was no reference in the L.C.L. speech to appointing a Select Committee. The following is part of a table appearing in the Auditor-General's Report under "Hospitals Department" and headed "Table of Patient Costs and Statistics" and the figures given relate to the year ended June 30, 1970:

Hospital	No. of In-Patients treated	Beds available at June 30
Royal Adelaide	26,339	1,226
Queen Elizabeth	18,582	536
Barmera	1,260	35
Mount Gambier	5,708	169
Port Augusta	2,677	94
Port Lincoln	2,455	71
Port Pirie	3,109	156
Walleroo	1,028	79
Whyalla	9,486	212
Glenside	2,926	1,175
Hillcrest	2,312	842
Enfield Receiving House	552	69

The House will be aware that the general hospitals in South Australia under the Government's control are the Royal Adelaide and Queen Elizabeth Hospitals, the Port Adelaide Casualty, and the Barmera, Mount Gambier, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, Port Pirie, Wallaroo and Whyalla Hospitals. Mental hospitals and clinics include Glenside Hospital, Hillcrest Hospital, St. Corantyn Day Hospital, the Community Mental Health Centre (Woodville), Eastwood Receiving House, Enfield Receiving House, Palm Lodge, Intellectually Retarded Services, the Child Guidance Clinics at Adelaide and Prospect, Marden Hill Hostel, Carramar Community Mental Health Centre and Torrensview Day Centre. Other hospitals include Adelaide Children's Hospital, Queen Victoria Maternity Hospital, Kalyra Sanatorium, Ashford Hospital, Calvary Hospital, Minda Home, the Home for Incurables, Lyell McEwin Hospital, Murray Bridge Hospital, Yorketown

Hospital, Kingston Hospital, Townsend House, Clare Hospital, Tailem Bend Hospital, Jamestown Hospital, Peterborough Hospital, Renmark Hospital, Whyalla Hospital, Meningie Hospital, and St. Andrews Hospital. This list is not exhaustive; it does not include the Repatriation Hospital, Springbank, private hospitals and many small nursing homes. It would be interesting to know the total number of patients treated during 1970, but I do not know that figure. The nursing profession has cared not only for in-patients but also for many out-patients.

Nurses have been prepared to make many sacrifices in the interests of their profession. However, nurses have noticed the improved wages and conditions in other fields of employment. Although wages are not the only consideration, nevertheless they are important. Last month wage increases for nurses were announced, but their general working conditions must be upgraded, too. Since coming to office only 3½ months ago the Government has moved in this direction. Already the nurse-training curriculum is being revised to fit the future nurse for her increasingly responsible role.

Many more hospitals will become training schools for enrolled nurses. The nursing adviser of the Hospitals Department has already commenced visits to every Government and subsidized hospital, to explain the new proposals. To assist country hospitals, a central training school is to be established in Adelaide, because of the urgent necessity to provide more staff for country hospitals. This school is being set up partly at Eden Park and partly at the Glenside Hospital. There will be about 50 places in all, but the two schools will operate as an integrated unit under the control of the nursing adviser.

Residential facilities will be provided and girls selected by country hospitals affiliated to the school will attend for an initial period of one month of intensive training. The girls will then return to their own hospitals and will do further studies and projects under supervision, with practical instruction being given by their own hospital staffs. The girls will then return to the schools for a further two weeks and will later sit for an examination conducted by the Nurses Board of South Australia. The length of the course will probably be 12 months, but the programme in this central school will give hospitals about 300 enrolled nurses a year. In some instances girls will attend regional enrolled nurse training schools developed in various country centres under

the same arrangements as for the central school. The Eden Park section of the central training school for enrolled nurses will open for the first intake of trainees in the next six months.

Nurses have had some of their valuable time utilized on other matters in the past. At the request of the South Australian Hospitals Association a small medical committee was set up to recommend a basic set of medical records that would be suitable for country hospitals. The various forms have now been printed and sample sets were recently sent to every hospital. They will also be made available to all subsidized hospitals free of charge. The Government is sponsoring home care services under the recent Commonwealth legislation, and a scheme at Murray Bridge has already been approved. A further scheme based at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and designed to serve a community of about 70,000 people will soon be submitted to the Commonwealth for approval. A further scheme for Port Lincoln is currently being formulated, and it will be discussed with a special committee that has been formed at Port Lincoln. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

THE BUDGET

The Estimates—Grand total, \$376,760,000.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 15. Page 1371.)

THE LEGISLATURE

Legislative Council, \$48,969.

Mr. JENNINGS: Last evening, apparently there was some misunderstanding between the esteemed Government Whip and me about having progress reported, so I shall be mercifully brief.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Who was right?

Mr. JENNINGS: The Whip, of course, is right in these matters; he must be. This Budget is so good that gilding the lily is unnecessary and, further, there is no need to answer Opposition criticism because it consisted of only token criticism and empty protestation. We had the usual ranting, raving and rabbling type of speech to which we have become accustomed from the Leader of the Opposition. He spoke about the moratorium and suggested that the Labor Party's attitude to it was altered because the Treasurer was absent. Above all, he criticized this

Government for criticizing the Gorton Commonwealth Government for its parsimonious attitude to this State.

To some extent, the member for Mitcham followed this line, but in a more sophisticated way. Strangely, late last evening we heard the member for Light (he did not throw much light: certainly not perpetual light) saying that the Premier had gone overseas to avoid the upheaval resulting from this Budget. The most violent upheaval is going on throughout Australia today about the Budget, but not about the South Australian Budget: the Gorton-Bury Budget is attracting much opposition because of its shameful treatment, its sales tax imposts, and its niggardly neglect of the pensioners in this country. That Budget should cause all Liberal and Country League members to bow their heads in shame at being members of the same Party as is in Government in the Commonwealth Parliament.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: If their Leader goes to Canberra, do you think that will improve the Commonwealth Government?

Mr. JENNINGS: I think that would reduce its potency. We have come to expect L.C.L. members to take umbrage at Labor Party criticism of the Commonwealth Government. Of course, members opposite have forgotten what Sir Henry Bolte and Mr. Askin have said over the years. I think I should remind the Committee what the present Leader of the Opposition said at a Premiers' Conference in Canberra. This is reported in the *Advertiser* of June 27, 1969, and was written by Mr. Eric Franklin, whom the *Advertiser* calls "Our political reporter". Mr. Franklin is well known to and highly respected by every member of this place. I hope he is listening.

Mr. McKee: It won't do you any good.

Mr. JENNINGS: The article states:

The South Australian Premier (Mr. Hall) today triggered the sharpest clash in recent years at a Premiers' Conference when the Prime Minister (Mr. Gorton) refused to give an undertaking that the Commonwealth would provide the States with more in taxation grants. Mr. Hall said bluntly at the end of the general discussions that the system had broken down. Addressing the Prime Minister, he said: "Whether you agree or not, the States are back to the impossible situation of knowing that they cannot provide for their State needs." When the conference rose for lunch, Mr. Hall's immediate reaction to reporters was: "If we are to get only what the formula provides, then to all intents and purposes the Premiers will come here next year as representatives of claimant States."

Mr. Broomhill: Is this the same Mr. Hall who is the Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes it is. The article continues:

"That will be their tacit position because the Federal-State system will no longer be working."

Mr. Hall said during the general discussion that the basic wage increase had cost the States \$13,000,000, but the Commonwealth had collected an extra \$24,000,000 in income tax.

If this represented a profit to the Commonwealth Government, what did it do with it? he asked.

Mr. Gorton: The money was used to offset a deficit.

Mr. Hall: You spent it?

Mr. Gorton: We have not spent it.

Mr. Hall: Would your deficit have been higher if you had not done this?

Mr. Gorton: Yes, of course it would.

Mr. Hall: In other words you have spent it.

Under a subheading "Festival hall query" the article continues:

In another outburst, Mr. Hall said: "I look around at this beautiful city of Canberra and think of my Government's proposal to build a festival hall. If I have to cut the next State Budget, do I cut the Festival Hall?"

I do not think that it was the festival hall that he should have cut. The article continues:

"If I do that when you are putting up fine new buildings, then I must ask why should there be a lesser standard in my State. Sir, this is resented in the States."

Mr. Hall then took the Federal Treasurer (Mr. McMahon) to task for referring to the Premiers and their constituents. "I remind you they are also your constituents," he said.

Mr. Rodda: I thought you were a forward looking Government; but you're looking back.

Mr. JENNINGS: I am pointing out the fallacy of the Opposition's argument. Let me remind the member for Victoria that if he has any more asinine interjections to make he should read an article on the front page of this morning's *Advertiser* that states that head transplants are now a feasible project. I should think that it would be in his interest to follow this matter further.

Mr. Rodda: You always make sarcastic remarks to get out of trouble. What about 1970?

Mr. JENNINGS: The article continues:

"These constituents are beginning to grasp from these unedifying wrangles the bewildering complexity of State problems brought about by wage rises and the interest charges of the public debt."

The Prime Minister told Mr. Hall that his line of debate was more in keeping with Loan Council discussions.

"Nobody is going to deny that the citizens of Australia are the constituents of both State and Federal Government," he said.

"You would not want us to increase the burden of tax on your constituents?" Mr. Hall said he did not accept that. The South Australian Government had increased taxation by \$9,000,000.

He admitted it. The article continues:

"We are saying there must be an equitable sharing of resources and the public debt structure in Australia," he said.

Mr. Hall said the Premiers needed at least a share of an extra \$12,000,000 built into the allocation or their Budgets would be in chaos. The list of economies and curtailments made in South Australia during the current financial year had been extreme.

Mr. Gorton: Inherent in your argument is the suggestion that special assistance grants made over and above the formula entitlement should be included in years to come.

Mr. Hall: I am saying that this is a holding operation until a new and more equitable formula is agreed upon. If this is the way the financial agreement is to work, then it is breaking down.

He later described the South Australian public debt (about \$1,200,000,000) as a "tremendous deadweight".—

and he was not the only dead weight in those days—

giving no direct return and involving the payment of as much interest as was spent on schools. South Australia was in solitary isolation with a financial status significantly below any other State.

And now we are criticized when we criticize the Gorton Government! I remind the member for Heyssen that he is talking about a hand-out. This "hand-out", as he calls it, which has been described by both the former Premier and the member for Mitcham as a better deal for South Australia than it got when they were in power, was from the Grants Commission. We had to put our case to the Grants Commission, and it was the Grants Commission that gave us the extra money as an interim payment. That commission is an independent commission, and our case was so good that we got an interim payment of this extra money. The former Premier in his statement in the *Advertiser* talked about our coming back as a claimant State. The Labor Government did something about the matter: it went to the Grants Commission. No doubt, if the Hall Government had done that it would have received a "hand-out", as it is called. Perhaps the former Premier did not want to embarrass his Commonwealth colleagues.

There are things in the Budget that I do not like—for instance, the expenditure on the Legislature. I do not think we should be spending so much money on the Legislative Council, which has a new member for Midland,

someone who formerly was discarded by the electors in his Assembly district. When he stood for the seat of Wallaroo, he was defeated ignominiously. When the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris (and I use the term "Honourable" in deference to Parliamentary etiquette), stood against our Deputy Premier he, too, was defeated, and when the former Minister of Agriculture (Hon. C. R. Story) stood he could not even beat an Independent, and neither could the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan. I do not like the sum we have to spend on the Legislature in regard to the Legislative Council, but I am not blaming the Treasurer for this: it is merely a constitutional incubus that we have to carry for the time being, and certainly, one hopes, it is not for long.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: These are representatives of the permanent will of the people.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, although that has never been defined. When we look at this Budget we see that the education grant has been increased not by 15 per cent but by 14.7 per cent, as we have been reminded by honourable members opposite. Grants for tertiary institutions and independent schools have been increased by 23 per cent on last year's payments; grants and subsidies to medical and health services have been increased by 20 per cent on last year's payments; and there has also been an increase in the allocations for law and order and for the Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs Department. The member for Torrens the other evening said what he would have done had he continued as Minister of Education, and he told us what his proposals were. Surely, even the member for Torrens does not think that we are so naive as to accept this argument. Any Opposition could say, "This is what we intended to do. We intended to do something better than you are doing."

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It's a pretty weak argument.

Mr. JENNINGS: It is an impossible argument to uphold. When he was Minister of Education, the member for Torrens made a statement about school librarians: as far as I know, and according to what I have been told by the present Minister of Education, this extended to a press statement and nothing else, and I am prepared to accept the word of the present Minister in this case, and in every other case, of course.

Mr. Clark: In any case, they didn't expect to win.

Mr. JENNINGS: No, and one can promise anything in such circumstances. I believe that this is an excellent Budget, which compares wonderfully well with the Budget introduced by the Commonwealth Government. Despite the difficulties that still confront South Australia, it will mean that the people of this State, through our Government's going to the Grants Commission, will have a much better deal than they would have had if electors had been sufficiently unwise to re-elect the Hall Government. The member for Flinders said he considered Sir Glen Pearson the best Treasurer South Australia had ever had. I, too, think Sir Glen Pearson was a very good Treasurer: he could add and subtract, and they tell me that when he was younger he could even multiply. When the Hall Government took office it was obvious that the present Leader of the Opposition was not anxious to take over the Treasurership, and it was obvious, too, that Sir Glen Pearson was eased out when he refused to introduce a dishonest Budget. The present Leader of the Opposition, when Premier, wanted a Budget that would attract votes. However, Sir Glen Pearson believed in balancing his Budget; because this did not suit the then Premier, Sir Glen Pearson resigned as Treasurer. I think there have been many good Treasurers in South Australia, but I cannot remember them! The best Treasurer I have known in South Australia is the present Treasurer.

Mr. Coumbe: What about Mr. Frank Walsh?

Mr. JENNINGS: He would be the second-best Treasurer. Of course, we have heard much about Sir Thomas Playford. However, during most of his period as Treasurer South Australia was a claimant State. Because Sir Thomas Playford was not interested in social services and interested only in the primary producer and industry, South Australia was deprived of millions of dollars. He was not a good Treasurer, nor was he competent to go to the people with a fair electoral scheme. I support the first line without any hesitation whatever.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): This Budget is a strange document because it is not at all specific and it contains no assistance for primary producers. During the last election campaign the Labor Party circulated an interesting document; the copy I have contains a photograph of the member for Unley. The

front page of the document says, "If you need help." This document refers to "a better deal for the man on the land". I should like to know just where in this Budget delivered by the Treasurer there is any evidence whatsoever of assistance to the rural community. In fact, I challenge members opposite to show where there is evidence of any such assistance.

During the address the Treasurer gave to farmers in Elder Park the other day he made many promises, but we have not seen the result of any of those promises. We now hear that he intends to increase certain succession duties and, as he is a Socialist, this is what we would expect from him. We learned tonight from a television programme that it is intended to increase driver's licences by \$1. I point out that we heard that not in this place but on a television programme.

Like the member for Ross Smith, I shall be brief. The Labor Party has been fond of criticizing Liberal Governments, but I repeat that nowhere in this Budget has it shown any intention to do anything for the man on the land. As a representative of rural electors, I am most concerned at the plight of the rural community, and I would like to know just what this Government is going to do in this respect. We have been told that because the country people are subsidized in respect of their water, land tax has to stay as it is or even be increased slightly. Many new blocks have recently been released in my district, and the rents of these blocks are absolutely astronomical. As a result of the Treasurer's attitude at the farmer's march I was hoping that he would look at some of these problems and offer some assistance. I will not say any more on that subject now but will save further comment for the lines.

In conclusion, I wish to make a passing reference to the moratorium group which is on the front steps of Parliament House. I have had two or three interesting discussions with these people. I consider it a disgrace that the Parliament of South Australia has to put up with having on the steps of this building a group of people like this who in my opinion are nothing but a mob of fifth columnists who would like to sell the country out to the Viet Cong.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the first line. In looking through the table of deficits and surpluses in the Auditor-General's reports for the past 20 years, what sticks out like a beacon is that in 1965-66 there was a deficit of \$6,834,136; in 1967-68 there was a

deficit of \$2,859,872; in 1968-69, when the L.C.L. Government had resumed the Treasury benches, there was a surplus of \$460,000-odd; and in 1969-70, the year just concluded, there was a surplus of more than \$2,900,000.

As I say, this sticks out like a beacon in these tables, and it would seem to be more than coincidence that in the years from 1965 to 1968 we had a Labor Administration occupying the Treasury benches for the first time in a good many years. The first observation that springs to mind as a result of this perusal is that we sincerely hope that the Labor Government has learnt something from its previous experience. It took two years of sound financial administration to put this State back on its feet. We well remember the hardship in this period during the State's history. We ceased to attract the percentage of migrants that we had attracted for many years previously. In fact, migrants who had come into an area not far from where I live were leaving the State in droves.

Mr. McKee: Did you hear about—

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I cannot catch the interjection but, as I understand that interjections are out of order, I will refrain from taking much notice of them. Most of them are inane, anyway. We well remember the period in the State's history to which I have referred and we fervently hope that history will not repeat itself now that the Labor Party again occupies the Treasury benches. We hope that that Party has learnt something from previous experience in Government. This Budget seems to be a more cautious document, perhaps, than we were led to expect from the Labor Party's policy speech. There seems to be a note of caution.

However, there is a lack of definition in the Budget, as there is in many measures that the Government introduces. These matters have been mentioned by other members on this side. There is a lack of definition of the matters referred to in the Government's election policy statements and of statements made by the Government's rural spokesman in a speech delivered at the Gawler Town Hall. To refresh the memories of members opposite, which seem to be pitifully short, I will quote from this policy speech.

However, before doing that, I wish to mention that the overriding impression that I gained from the Budget was an attitude of "Here we go again." In the preamble to the Budget the Government makes the usual criticism of the Commonwealth Government,

the same criticism as Government members make in their speeches or in replying to questions. We thought this criticism would not be repeated in the Budget, but it was. For about 1½ pages of this Financial Statement the Treasurer complains and whinges about the Commonwealth Government, but when we got down to the details of the Budget I was pleased to notice constant reference to the fact that financing was becoming easier because the Commonwealth Government was altering the financial arrangements with the States. I shall mention some of these references to verify this point. We have this statement:

The total of actual receipts, \$338,498,000 was \$12,477,000 greater than estimated. This very large excess was due principally to three factors; firstly, an increase in Commonwealth grants much greater than had been anticipated.

On the next page there is another reference to the Commonwealth Government under the heading "Commonwealth grants", which states:

The first of these was an amount of \$1,340,000 which was South Australia's share of \$12,000,000 made available by the Commonwealth as an additional grant towards overcoming the current Budget problems faced by each of the six State Governments, particularly in respect of the cost of major awards.

Later in the statement the Treasurer, when referring to Loan arrangements, states:

The new arrangement for the Commonwealth to advance some of our capital funds as grants instead of loans . . .

I think common sense tells us that it will not have an immediate impact, but it will have one in the life of this Government if it decides not to have an early election for some other reason, which does not seem clear to us. I am making the point that we are to be subjected to this constant barrage of criticism of the Commonwealth Government for political purposes solely, followed by, I believe, a proper and just acknowledgment of the fact that the Commonwealth is trying to help the States in what we are not denying is a financial predicament. If anyone has been in business on his own he will realize that it is not easy to operate a business or a rural property and maintain financial stability. I believe that the Labor Party failed to learn this lesson previously, but I hope that it will have learnt it now. I have said before, and do not apologize for saying again, that attacks on the Commonwealth Government do not do this State any good. If the Government adopted a more responsible attitude in its approach to the Commonwealth its negotiations would be more satisfactory in the long term.

Mr. Simmons: In other words, the Prime Minister is vindictive.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know him personally, but during my brief sojourn in this Chamber I have been able to assess some members of the Government, and in the light of what I heard this afternoon I realize that vindictiveness is not peculiar to that gentleman, although I do not believe that he is vindictive. We receive much vindictiveness from the Government side of the Chamber.

Mr. Simmons: You insinuate that the Prime Minister is vindictive?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If you do not have the wherewithal to understand what I am saying you should listen more closely. If your approach to the Commonwealth was more responsible you might do more for this State.

Mr. Langley: We have done better than you have done.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: What are you whingeing and moaning about if you say you have done more.

Mr. Langley: You are not satisfied now.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: You are never satisfied, but if you had adopted a more responsible attitude towards the finances of this State we would not have a repetition of the position that obtained in this State when you were last in office.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the honourable member take his seat. The honourable member must address the Chair, and in doing so he must not refer to "you" all the time. He must refer to honourable members. The honourable member for Kavel.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I quote from the Labor Party rural policy. As a representative of a rural district, and having been engaged in primary industry for many years, I consider that this matter is important. This is what the Deputy Premier said when delivering the Labor Party's rural policy speech in the Gawler Town Hall. I shall not quote at length, but there are points that I think are particularly pertinent to the state of rural industries in South Australia. He said:

All the powers the State possesses will be utilized in an effort to create strong, vital country communities supported by buoyant rural conditions and markets.

After some padding in the policy speech, the report states:

Detailing Labor's plans for succession duties, Mr. Corcoran said remissions would be given to a spouse inheriting a house and to inheri-

tors of smaller estates. Additional remissions would be given to inheritors of primary producing properties. Then, in view of the grave difficulties in the rural sector, we will act to increase exemptions on land tax for primary producing property.

"We will not increase land tax, and we will review the assessments due to go out in July, since they were made before the current rural recession had affected land values." More than 80,000 Australian farmers had taxable incomes of less than \$2,000 and just under 40,000 had incomes below \$1,400, Mr. Corcoran said.

I emphasize the following part of the statement, when he said:

This was a level no Government should accept.

What does this Government propose to do for the rural industries? What does this Budget enunciate on their behalf? The Treasurer has written a letter to the Prime Minister, thus introducing politics into the matter and throwing it on to the Commonwealth Government, but this Government is not prepared to do now what it did in 1967. In the Farmers Assistance Fund, according to the Auditor-General's Report, there stands an amount of \$609,712. In 1967 a Bill was brought before Parliament to start this assistance rolling. If the Government would take the first step and say that it was prepared to advance \$500,000 (and the money is there) to the rural producers, I believe one of the most satisfactory ways of doing this would be to make the money available to district councils so that the farmers could maintain themselves. After all, no farmer is looking for a hand-out. They can be employed by the council authorities to work on roads and in other ways. This will tide them over this difficult period. It can be done because the money is available.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That legislation empowers certain loans to be made and certain other financial arrangements to be instituted through that fund.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Let me quote what the Hon. Mr. Corcoran said when he was Minister of Lands and was speaking to the Bill in 1967. This is what was done then to start the ball rolling to do something for these people:

Acceptance by Parliament of this Bill will enable the Government to deal with applications for assistance as they are submitted without waiting for a final determination by the Commonwealth, and then, if the Commonwealth agrees to assist, to continue with assistance in accordance with the terms and conditions of such assistance.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That does not cover grants to councils.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: But it would start the ball rolling. I should like some clear statement in the circumstances, in answer to the interjection, that the Government is prepared to do something in this regard from State resources. Money is available in this fund. I believe that, if the Government was genuine in its desire to pull out all stops to help people in a crisis, which the Treasurer says is more serious than the position was in 1967, it would do something. In one of the appendices to the Auditor-General's Report we find, under "Primary Producers—Debt Adjustment Fund" which, I believe, is administered by the Farmers Assistance Committee, an amount of \$804,636, so I am far from convinced by the Treasurer's statement that any help is beyond the competence of this State Government.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Neither of these funds could give money to the local district councils.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Be that as it may, if that minor detail is not in substance correct, the State Government could make a clear statement on what it could do. It has the money to assist the rural industries. If one peruses the letter sent by the Treasurer, one sees that this is a satisfactory way of assisting primary producers, because they need to maintain their measure of self-respect.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Yes.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I believe they are expecting in this rather fulsome letter of the Treasurer that things can be done. If I am wrong, I am quite prepared to be corrected. I believe that the State Government, if it is genuine in its attempts to assist these people, should do something. Frankly, one cannot help but get a little cynical when one hears some of the comments about the rural position, coming not only from the back bench but also from the front bench. We know that the Government does not gain its chief electoral support from the country; that is obvious but, if the Government is genuinely in office to see that the welfare of the whole community is to be safeguarded, it should consider these people. The basis of the interjections that we frequently hear (interjections coming even from the Deputy Premier: "Look at the tax deduction the cockies get" is one I remember) is such that one cannot help but be a little cynical about statements made in the policy speech.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Having to listen to you blokes is really intolerable at times.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The feeling is completely mutual. One thing I notice is the tendency of Government members to become abusive and to make slighting personal comments when they are in difficulty. However, that simply reflects on them and it is not to our discredit. Nothing in this Budget will give relief to the rural producers. In fact, other references in the Budget, on which members of this side of the Chamber have elaborated, regarding land tax and succession duties, are also delightfully vague. I think it is time that this Government had the courage of its convictions and spelt out exactly what, in fact, it intends to do. There are one or two things which, in the short time that I have been a member, have pleased me, and one is the statement made by the Minister, who is so fond of interjecting, that he is becoming conservative. I think the exact words were, "I believe we must take a more conservative view on these matters."

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Come on, don't be pathetic!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister made much of the fact that the 18.7 per cent increase in the Education budget that occurred during the term of the last Government was largely absorbed in salary increases, and we do not deny this; but the fact is that this money was found. There was an increase in expenditure of 18.7 per cent and, as I said, there was a surplus of \$2,900,000. If one studies the Financial Statement and the considerably smaller percentage increase this year, one finds that the increase is absorbed in paying increased salaries and salaries for additional staff. If the Government wants to claim credit for increasing its expenditure on education, we must be consistent and apply the same standards as the Minister would wish to apply to the 18.7 per cent increase that occurred during the term of the last Government.

A large proportion of the increase last year and this year consists of increased payments to teachers and ancillary staff, etc. If we view it in this fashion, I think we must agree that the percentage increase is quite modest. However, as I said earlier, I am glad to see that the Minister has taken a more conservative view. Referring to the statements that the Minister made in 1965, I think the first matter that came to my notice was an article in a publication called *Left Wheel* published, I think, by the

University Labor Club, and it referred to the sort of policy enunciated then by the Minister, when—

Mr. Coumbe: Quite a big wheel.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Come on, get your facts right. It was no different then from what it is now.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Minister waited until I finished the comment he would not make such an interjection. The things he was saying then he has said consistently up until the time of his appointment as Minister of Education.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I am still saying them.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Then there was a change of heart. Of course, the Commonwealth Government was mentioned, but much was made of what the Labor Party would do if it was elected to office. We had the propaganda about the crisis in education, and during the election campaign we saw on television a rotten chair and youngsters eating their lunches in a dingy corner that the Party managed to find in some schoolyard. The Labor Party seems to have gone quiet on that matter since the election but I do not think there has been any significant change in the Education Department. Of course, there are considerable difficulties in connection with education, but I do not think the Minister advances the cause of education when he announces that he will spend \$3,000,000 that he has not got. We even had the details: he was going to spend \$3,000,000 of Commonwealth money that he had not got, and it took him two days to realize that he did not have it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You are distorting the facts.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am telling the truth.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You are not.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know what grounds the Minister had for his announcement; I think one of the press secretaries must have got out of hand—one of the people whom the Government put on the payroll to look after the Ministers.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: If you want to criticize anyone criticize me, but leave my officers out of it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: All right. I do not know the details, but the Minister announced a scheme involving \$3,000,000 that

he did not have. The Minister chided the member for Torrens with one of his finicky interjections and said that he had no evidence that it was intended by the Liberal and Country League to increase book allowances. However, the policy speech of the L.C.L. said that book allowances would be increased at the beginning of 1971, but that was not good enough for the Minister: he had to have the thing documented in black and white from the previous Minister of Education. The present Minister announced that he had \$3,000,000 to spend. We said, "Have you got it in black and white? Have you got a promise?" The next day the Minister did not even have a promise.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You are distorting the facts.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Since the last election the Minister has tried to make much out of nothing. In the Budget there is a modest increase in the provision for education.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Government gets abusive when it is cornered, but I take that abuse as a compliment. It is clear that the Government is worried. The Budget is vague, because the Government has not made up its mind on some of the proposals. The Budget is typical of the Government and is in character. Since the election we have had the referendum fiasco: the Government could not make up its mind. However, it has found an escape route. What has happened in the last week or so? This Government was going to support the Vietnam Moratorium Campaign and thus throw its weight behind this group on the front steps of Parliament House. I have taken the trouble to read some of the literature that this group has distributed, some of which refers to the A.L.P.'s behaviour in this matter. This is what the Labor Party's erstwhile friends have to say about its claims:

The Vietnam Moratorium Campaign policy had not and has not changed. The fact that the A.L.P. had done nothing significant to help the V.M.C. to that date suggests that the Party was looking for an excuse to get out of the moratorium and so had to lie to provide an excuse.

The literature states that the claims made by the Labor Party in this matter are false.

Mr. Payne: What's this got to do with the Budget?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am just pointing out the inconsistency of this Government.

Mr. Payne: Who wrote that?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The people who are organizing this shemuzzle on the front steps. You can get a pamphlet from them for nothing.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have asked the honourable member once before this evening to refer to honourable members as such and not to use the words "you" or "your".

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If honourable members opposite like to go outside they can get the pamphlet from which I am quoting. It was written by the people who are organizing this campaign. I repeat that the literature states that the A.L.P. was looking for an excuse to get out of the moratorium and so had to lie to provide an excuse. This is typical of the behaviour of this Government since coming to office. It wants to have two bob each way: it wants to string along with something in which it sees some political advantage, but as soon as things go bad it gets out, like rats deserting a sinking ship. We have never been on the ship and we never will be.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You accept the word of these people, yet you have referred to them in a most disparaging way.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am merely quoting from the publication of an organization which until about a week ago had the official support of the Labor Party. I am not saying that I agree with the statement these people have published. In fact, quite frankly, I would not go as far as to use those terms.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: But you accepted what those people said as being true.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not saying that. I wish the economist from the London School would listen long enough to absorb what I am saying. For the benefit of honourable members who cannot understand my point, I am saying that this is typical of the Government's change of attitude. No-one can deny that there has been a change of attitude. I am simply quoting what the organizer of this campaign that the A.L.P. saw fit to support is saying. It is my view and, I believe, the view of a good many citizens of this State that the Labor Party, seeing that the politics of the situation had gone sour, got out. I believe this is typical of the performance of this Government. In fact, this Budget bears that out. Here is a Government that cannot make up its mind. There are serious weaknesses

in the Budget, the chief one being that there is a lack of definition in the parts that affect the primary industries, which the Government stated at considerable length it would do its utmost to help. I support the first line, but I believe that the remarks I have made are extremely pertinent at the present time.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I cannot become very enthusiastic about the contents of the Budget. It lacks strength, confidence, and encouragement, and does not give initiative to free enterprise to expand and develop. When free enterprise is not being encouraged to develop, South Australia will be in an extremely sad state, because if we do not seek and encourage new industries to come to the State and if we do not encourage migration, where is South Australia headed?

To those who are left to live in South Australia, the Budget does nothing to encourage savings and investment in the State. I notice from the estimates of income that the Government graciously dodges the matter of gambling. The Treasurer has said that the Government will look at gambling. In other words, to obtain additional revenue, the Government will expect to derive some income from gambling, and the only area in which this can be achieved is the horse-racing industry. All members know that horse racing is suffering, and it has been crippled by various taxes.

The estimated receipts in 1970-71 from betting ticket tax are \$116,000, whereas in 1969-70 receipts from this source were \$111,252. There is a slight increase there. In 1969-70, receipts from the totalizator tax were \$303,115, and the Government expects to receive \$310,000 in 1969-70. From small lotteries and dog-racing control licences, the Government expects to receive \$3,000 this year, and in 1969-70 receipts from that source were \$30. The income from commission on bets and from the winning bets tax in 1969-70 was \$532,844 and the expected income in 1970-71 is \$505,000, so there is a decrease of \$27,844 there.

In 1969-70, the Government received \$947,241 from taxes on gambling, and it expects to receive \$934,000 in 1970-71, which is \$13,241 less than receipts last year. To justify its case, the Government in my opinion has conservatively estimated that the tax on gambling in South Australia will decline. This is one way in which it will argue the case for an increase in tax on gambling and lotteries.

The metropolitan racing clubs are suffering. The horse-racing industry in the last few years

has encouraged the breeding of race horses of good quality. South Australia can be proud of the new industry in this sphere. Many thousands of dollars is spent annually by Australian race horse owners in purchasing horses from New Zealand. If South Australia can establish a breeding industry comparable to that in New Zealand, the income will be of great assistance to the State. However, if the racing industry is taxed there will be no point in having a horse-breeding industry in this State. If the Government increases taxation on this industry, it will be crippled and will die. South Australian horses are sent to other States to compete in the main races, because stake money in this State does not justify the cost of training and racing a horse today.

Mr. Harrison: What about the punter's tax?

Mr. BECKER: Many people attend race meetings but do not bet, and they are being deprived of the opportunity of seeing some of the best racehorses in Australia.

Mr. Brown: What did the Liberal Government do about the winnings bets tax?

Mr. BECKER: It abolished the winning bets tax in 1968, and that is something the Labor Party cannot do. Concerning stamp duty on insurance and workmen's compensation, Government members know that an employer must make provision for workmen's compensation, but the Labor Party is to increase these charges. In some aspects workmen's compensation benefits are not high enough. Two years ago I fought in a campaign when white collar workers were deprived of the benefits of workmen's compensation.

Mr. Keneally: Your Government fought against it.

Mr. BECKER: I was not a member of Parliament then. I appreciate the points made by members who spoke earlier this session. This tax will affect the average working man and white collar worker. The only chance they have of providing for their future is by investing in life assurance, but if increased charges are to be placed on this the insurance companies will pass them on to insurers. This Budget is vague because the Government is awaiting the reaction of people: if it is criticized loudly enough perhaps this matter will be ignored. It amazes me how the Government can estimate that there will be an additional income of \$900,000, because there is only nine months left of the financial year. Whatever the magical figure is for this tax, I am sure it will be considerably higher.

One light-hearted side of the Budget is that the Government has continued the contribution of \$1 to the Field Naturalists Society. This donation was first made in 1967 for one reason: so that the organization would not have to pay land tax. I realize that a token contribution has to be made, but why only \$1? It probably costs the Government about \$5 in administration costs to make this contribution. We have heard much about industrial development and of the Treasurer's recent visit to Asia. In reply to a question that I finally got off the ground yesterday he said that one could not expect someone to go overseas, look at Asian markets, inquire, and come back with a new industry in his pocket. I can remember Sir Thomas Playford doing this many years ago, and he did not bring back only one: he brought back several. If the Treasurer had been a good enough negotiator and had done his homework properly before he went (I would be surprised if he had not) and had been provided with enough information from the Industrial Development Branch, he could well have come back with something. We are not giving enough towards publicizing and providing information about the State. The Government will provide \$85,000 for promoting industrial development. The previous Government allocated \$85,000 but spent only \$43,000.

Mr. Brown: Which Government was that?

Mr. BECKER: It does not matter which Government. I want to see the Government get some benefit from spending \$85,000. Perhaps the Treasurer will act on the suggestion of J. P. Young & Associates which was publicized in the *Advertiser* of September 9. I will now have the opportunity to read the article, which I could not do yesterday. It states:

South Australians did not realize the advantages of their State and so were not exploiting them to the full, Mr. J. P. Young, Chairman of John P. Young and Associates Proprietary Limited, management consultant, said yesterday.

"There has been a stable and steep rise in the growth of South Australia," he said. "It has a lot of resources, a lot of assets, a lot of industry—but it needs merchandising. To make the most of all this, South Australia has to be sold relatively to other States. South Australians should realize what a gold mine they have and let the rest of the world know about it. Sound, vigorous promotion can change that quite quickly."

I agree with Mr. Young because I have been advocating that for many years. We are not

doing enough and are not attracting the top business executives. We should be seconding them from industry and private enterprise and sending them overseas. Politics should not enter into promoting and developing South Australia.

Mr. Simmons: What would you do about it?

Mr. BECKER: Send me overseas and I will show you. We should all be behind the Government of the day. I am sick and tired of reading about it—I want action.

I come now to consumer protection. This has been batted around, shoved and kicked around, but what is being provided in the Budget to the Prices Commissioner? What has he been given to establish research, to appoint inspectors and to look into consumer protection? It is high time that those who are advocating price control and want consumer protection did something about it: it is in the power of the Government to do something about it. If it is not going to do anything about it, it should not say anything about it.

I turn now to tourism—the dear old Aunt Sally of all the Government departments. Overall, the Government's proposed allocation in this area is static. It helps very little in the development of the South Australian tourist industry. While efforts are being made by the Tourist Bureau to encourage to this State people from other States and overseas, what is being done to encourage local residents in the metropolitan area to get to know their own State? What is being done by the Government and by the Tourist Bureau to induce people from the metropolitan area to go out into the country areas? What is being done in the country areas to encourage people in the metropolitan area to visit those areas to see their historical points of interest? This is where the Government makes a big mistake. The following paragraph appears in the Governor's Deputy's Speech:

My Government will promote tourism in South Australia, and the Government Tourist Bureau will carry out research into and promote the State's unique tourist potential. The Government's special attention will also be given to beach maintenance assistance to sea-side councils.

Not one dollar has been provided in the Budget for this purpose. What is the Government up to? Are we getting ready for another election?

Mr. Langley: You'll be in trouble if we are.

Mr. Groth: You're lucky to be here as it is.

Mr. BECKER: The best man won. If I dropped as many catches as the member for Unley dropped at times, I should be worried.

If the Government is planning on an election (at present, I do not think it is), I think it has much more to lose than I have. It would be foolish to leave out provisions such as those for tourism, because we could shoot the Government down in flames next time there was an election. I would welcome a snap election, because during the last election campaign so many points were raised by both Parties that the important features of the former Government's policy were overlooked by the people, who are now sorry that they voted for a Labor Government. They are particularly sorry, now that they are aware of the Government's proposed amendments to the Local Government Act to provide for compulsory voting.

Mr. Langley: And adult franchise.

Mr. BECKER: Do not worry about adult franchise. There is nothing in the Budget to indicate that the Government will undertake more research with a view to increasing water storages in South Australia. But, worst of all, no allocation is made in the Budget to clean up South Australia's reticulated water. The Minister of Works must be sick and tired of the questions and letters he has received from various members on behalf of constituents, complaining about Adelaide's dirty, filthy, slimy, greasy water. It is not the Minister's or the department's fault: it is the Government's fault for not doing something about it. My Leader promised during the election campaign that his Government would filter Adelaide's water supply. The present Treasurer replied that it would be cheaper to supply a water filter to each house in the metropolitan area. He did not make a promise to that effect, but he said that it would be cheaper.

Householders right throughout the metropolitan area are continually complaining about the dirty metropolitan water supply, and people visiting South Australia from other States consider it to be the greatest joke of all; they do not know whether they are drinking beer or mud out of the tap or whether it is, in fact, water. It is a shame that this situation exists, and it is high time that the Government of the day did something about it. But what will the Government do about it? Is the Government going to let this slime come through the taps, or will it clean the drains and filter the water supply? It does not matter what it costs. I want the Government to do something about Adelaide's water supply very quickly. If the Government is planning

a snap election, I will make sure that this issue is so highlighted that the Government will be tossed out of office.

What has the Government done to promote cultural activities in South Australia? It has allocated \$150,000 to the performing arts. One has to go from page to page of the Budget documents until one finally finds that the Government has provided very little for the promotion of the performing arts in South Australia. In the previous Budget the then Government provided \$49,795 for the Adelaide Festival of Arts and \$104,100 for the performing arts. I am surprised that the member for Kavel did not raise this point, because one of the functions that used to receive a benefit in this connection is the Nuriootpa school band competition. However, it no longer receives such a benefit. I cannot see how the Government can afford not to continue its contributions to such worthy purposes; if anything, it should be increasing its contributions.

What will the provision of \$150,000 be spent on? No-one has any idea. It is under the control of the Treasurer, and he will have a ball in spending it! I will watch this matter very closely. As a result of the activities of the Workers Educational Association more people are taking an interest in painting and pottery. If someone develops his artistic talents it will cost him \$200 to hold an exhibition in a private gallery. It would be more profitable to be a professional gallery promoter than it would to be a member of Parliament. The Government should make grants to councils so that suitable premises can be provided free of charge for art exhibitions. We are doing nothing to encourage the artistic talents of the present and future generations.

The only sporting organization that receives any direct benefit from the Budget is the South Australian Amateur Swimming Association, which has been provided with an additional \$1,000: its grant has increased from \$2,000 to \$3,000. When one considers the worth and the benefit to the community of this association, one sees that \$1,000 is a paltry sum.

There are many amateur sporting organizations in South Australia, including the South Australian Olympic Council, that receive no help or encouragement from the Government. Many active teenagers going through college or high school take an interest in and are encouraged to participate in sport, particularly athletics. But once such a person leaves high school or college, what happens if he wants to pursue a career in amateur athletics? Not

only does he have to give the best he can to the sport but he also has to hold functions and arrange raffles and quiz competitions and spend half his own personal income for the sake of his interest in the sport. He may then be lucky enough at some time to represent the State, and he might even then be selected to take part in an Australian championship. However, he would then have to work very hard again and save his own personal money in order to raise his fare so that he could participate in that championship. To do this he might have to arrange competitions, barbecues and socials to raise the money. Then, if he is very lucky, by the time he reaches the ripe old age of 21 years he could perhaps represent Australia at an Olympic sport.

I remind this Chamber what happened to the British Commonwealth Games team. No-one showed very much interest in this team, which went away under a cloud and about \$13,000 in the red. Suddenly, when members of the team won a few gold medals, everyone welcomed them back as heroes. Just imagine how hard those people had to work in order to represent their country. However, the Government does not give them one red cent. This Government, particularly as it is a Labor Government, should hang its head in shame. I come now to the subject of pollution, which apparently is a dirty word. It seems that this is something new that everyone dreamed up! In fact, everyone has jumped on the band wagon.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Go on; you are not doing too bad.

Mr. BECKER: I am going to hammer and push this subject as much as I can.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What did your Government do about it?

Mr. BECKER: I hope the Minister will support me in doing something about pollution.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Your Government never did anything.

Mr. BECKER: I am now challenging the Minister's Government to do something about it, and I want the Minister to back me in keeping the Patawalonga, the Torrens, the Murray and every other stream and beach and anything else we have in South Australia free of pollution. I hope the Minister will do something about the Tramways Trust buses. I hope he will bring in some legislation to prevent those buses and private buses from spewing out filthy black fumes all over the metropolitan area.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Are those fumes dangerous?

Mr. BECKER: Yes, I believe they are cancerous.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You ask Dr. Tonkin what he thinks about it.

Mr. BECKER: I say they are extremely dangerous. Pollution is a great problem, and I am disappointed that the Government has not provided anything in this Budget to deal with the matter. I am pleased that the Minister of Roads and Transport is present, because I now want to say something about the line dealing with road safety. I cannot see any provision that will promote road safety in South Australia. The state of our roads is declining but the Government is not doing anything about that. There has been no vigorous campaign. In the last few months I have not seen any advertisements in the press to make people aware of the increasing road toll.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Will you apologize if I show you a press statement I made today about what we have done?

Mr. BECKER: If the Minister shows me a copy of his press release, I will apologize to him. I realize that he has not a press secretary as other Ministers have, and he is probably wise in not having one. I sincerely hope that the Minister's campaign on road safety will be effective. Since my election to Parliament I have been concerned about the crisis in the rural industry. All members have a duty to be concerned about persons in the rural community, but the Government has done nothing in that regard since I have been here. One way of assisting would be to adopt a similar method to that adopted in successful exporting countries overseas, namely, to encourage industries to compete on world markets by giving the industries bank overdrafts at considerably lower interest rates than apply to the rest of the community. The State Government should put pressure on the Commonwealth Government for finance and should, through the State Bank, lend this money to the rural community at 3 per cent or 4 per cent. If I were a wheat farmer and could not sell my wheat, I would tell the Government that a scheme for export overseas would have to be established. The farmers must assist but we should be seeking overseas markets. I would go overseas and create a market.

Members interjecting:

Mr. BECKER: I am making the suggestion but, unfortunately, Government members are not interested in listening to it and are not interested in giving the farmers any assistance. If this is their attitude they do not deserve a vote from the farmers. What amazes me is that we hear so much about the underprivileged countries and about the starving millions. We cannot send unprocessed wheat to them.

Members interjecting:

Mr. BECKER: I suggest that the Government could establish factories in these countries to process our wheat.

Mr. Ferguson: Haven't we tried that?

Mr. BECKER: If this has been done then it should be continued, because if we cannot establish markets for our wheat, what can we do? We must be able to sell our wheat, and the Government should help in every way. I have been disappointed at the lack of Government speakers, but I enjoyed what was said by the member for Florey. I liked his suggestion about a national shipping line, but I think he realizes, as I do, that to extend this line would cost too much money. The capital need is almost beyond our resources at this stage. However, this would be an opportunity for the Government to increase development in South Australia and keep industries going at Whyalla. At least the member for Florey made a suggestion, and that is more than other Government members have done. In summing up this Budget I consider that it does three things: it promises everything; it gives the people nothing; and it takes it off them before they get it.

Mr. FERGUSON (Goyder): I have heard some people speak about the hidden mysteries of nature and science, but I think we can call this a Budget of hidden tax impositions. I say that because the Budget does not spell out in detail how taxes will be imposed. I heard the member for Eyre say that the Budget would not assist primary producers: I go one further and say that the Budget will make impositions on them, in the form of increased wharfage fees and increased rail freights. We have heard much talk about concessions in land tax and succession duties for primary producers but, so far, these have not been spelt out in detail.

The Minister of Agriculture went to some trouble after his appointment to make a statement in the press to the effect that his Party did not promise any reduction in land tax. He gave as a reason that the sum saved would be assessable income for the primary producer. I do not believe that any tax,

whether land tax or not, was ever intended to bring the taxpayer to the brink of bankruptcy. In some cases, land tax is getting near to doing just that. Statements have been made on behalf of the Government that certain areas will be reconsidered in respect of the new quinquennial assessments when they are announced. Some areas are still being farmed as ordinary farmlands in South Australia but, because of their locality, they are being taxed as other than ordinary farmland. I refer to the area of the Northern Adelaide Plains, described in the Northern Adelaide Plains Ground Water Study, section 3, page 1, as an area of about 300 square miles, four miles to 25 miles north of Adelaide, extending from Pooraka to Two Wells and Gawler. About 200 square miles of this area is now covered by proclamation, bringing it under the restrictions of the Underground Waters Preservation Act. Of this area, only 9,000 acres is currently being irrigated by underground water, leaving 119,000 acres in use as other than irrigated land.

Land held in its original broad acres subdivision at present has no more value than land in wheatgrowing areas 30 miles or 40 miles from the city. Without water for irrigation, its earning capacity is no more than the wheatgrowing capacity in an area with 16in. or 17in. annual rainfall. So the right of the landholder to subdivide his land no longer exists in this area in and around Virginia. All proposed subdivisions are now considered by the Advisory Committee on Underground Water and an indication is required from that body whether the provision of water by boring to service the blocks will be permitted. The usual reply by the committee to requests made in this way is in the form of a resolution, which is generally given to every applicant and which is as follows:

That the advisory committee inform the Minister of Mines that consideration has been given to the effects of the proposed resubdivision of part section . . . hundred of . . . submitted by the State Planning Office for report, in that applications could be lodged for permits to drill additional wells as a result of such resubdivision.

That the Minister be advised that the committee is of the opinion that, if applications for permits to drill any additional wells on this land for irrigation purposes were received, it is unlikely that the issue of permits would be recommended. It should be pointed out, however, that all applications are considered on their merits, and all recommendations made only after careful consideration of all aspects of the particular case.

That it is to be noted also, however, that an application for a permit to obtain a domestic supply only would be regarded in a more favourable light.

That is the type of reply received by people who apply for permission to subdivide an area and to sink a bore in order to use underground water. I have been informed that the subdivision of a 10-acre block on the Womma Road into two five-acre blocks was refused recently on the grounds that water was not available, even though the Engineering and Water Supply main passed the full Womma Road frontage of that property. I think we must agree that any value that may have accrued to land in this district through its subdivision potential has been removed in recent years as a result of restrictive Government action. Many landholders in the Virginia area who have acreages similar to those I have quoted are suffering because of that action and because they are not permitted to subdivide, their underground water supplies being restricted. I know of a landholder in the area whose wheat quota last season returned to him a first payment of \$1,484.70, less \$114.20 cartage to the silo leaving a net return of \$1,370.50.

If that landholder had paid land tax amounting to \$1,321.54 he would have been left with \$48.96 from his first wheat cheque. The landholder concerned requested an increased quota to help meet the high taxes on this district, bearing in mind that others are using parts of the area as ordinary farm lands, but he was refused. This kind of drain on a person's income does not give him much incentive to struggle and to improve annual production in the area. Increased production is necessary if the people concerned are to be able to pay their taxes, including the rate of land tax that has been imposed on them. During the last five years, as a result of the drain on his income through rates and taxes, the person to whom I am referring has been forced to delay maintenance work and effecting improvements to his farm, with the result that many miles of fencing requires replacement, and his machinery must also be replaced if production on his property is to continue. So, a more just system of taxing landholders in this district should and could be devised, because at present they are being slowly but surely strangled by the demands made on their resources.

On a 550-acre property near Waterloo Corner the land tax is \$3,556, although it is very unlikely that this property could be subdivided because it lacks a suitable water supply and

it is difficult to drain the area. On a 720-acre property to the south-west of Virginia the land tax is \$583, although much of this property is salt-affected and would be unsuitable for closer settlement. On an 882-acre property to the north of Virginia near the Gawler River the land tax is \$1,836, although there is no water available to this property. On an 800-acre property to the east of Virginia the land tax is \$1,524, although no water is available for irrigation. On a 496-acre property to the west of Virginia the land tax is \$576, although no water is available for irrigation. On a 1,000-acre property to the north of Virginia the land tax is \$3,680, although no water is available for irrigation. The total area of the properties I have mentioned is 4,448 acres, and the total annual land tax imposed on them is \$11,755. No farmlands in South Australia can carry such an imposition. The area adjacent to the Virginia district, which, in part, has been subdivided, is used mainly for vegetable production. The area surrounding these gardens still remains ordinary farmland, and it should be given special consideration for a reduction in land tax.

In connection with tourism, some years ago Wardang Island was leased by Broken Hill Associated Smelters for the purpose of extracting flux that was used in the Port Pirie smelters. When the company relinquished its lease, the previous Government leased the island to a Mr. Price so that he could develop it as a tourist resort. I give him full marks for the way he has done this work. When the Government first decided to lease the island to Mr. Price, many people were sceptical about whether that venture would be successful. However, I am confident that the work Mr. Price has done in developing the island will result in its becoming one of the tourist attractions of South Australia.

At the time this island was leased to Mr. Price, there were suggestions that is should be given to the Point Pearce Aboriginal Reserve. I believe that some years earlier the reserve had the use of the island, mainly for pasturing sheep and cattle. However, the Point Pearce people had never occupied the island or lived on it. I believe that the decision to lease the island to Mr. Price was the correct decision. I consider that he has made a success of the venture, and I hope that he will be able to continue with this work and thus develop the island. Although the island apparently had no potential, I believe that eventually it will be turned into one of the important tourist attractions of this State.

I believe that the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs in the previous Government announced that the Point Pearce reserve would be taken over by the Aboriginal Lands Trust. If the trust is to be given the opportunity to experiment in taking over an Aboriginal reserve, I do not think there is a better reserve than Point Pearce to be taken over for this experiment. If the trust took over the reserve it would, in my opinion, be in the nature of an experiment, because I do not think the trust has previously taken over any such reserves. I believe that not only the native residents of Point Pearce but also the officers on that station would like to be given some idea just how the reserve would operate after the trust took it over. When it was first announced that the trust would take over this reserve, there were some hard feelings not only amongst the natives of Point Pearce but also amongst residents of the areas surrounding the reserve. I think the trust will take over the reserve, and I hope that the venture will be successful and that it will be to the benefit of the natives on Point Pearce. I support the first line.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I rise to support the first line and, in so doing, to make a few general comments. The first point that I think needs to be made is that the position in the Budget this year is slightly easier because of the slight improvement in the tax reimbursement formula. This improvement, unfortunately, will be heavily concentrated in the first year of the new five-year agreement, because the first year combines two effects: the effect of the slight change in the base on which the formula operates and the change in the betterment factor from 1.2 per cent to 1.8 per cent. However, for the remaining four years of this five-year agreement the change in the formula will take into account only the improvement in the betterment factor.

Consequently, South Australia, which under the formula obtained a 12½ per cent increase in its tax reimbursement grant this year, will revert to a more normal increase in the tax reimbursement grant for the remaining four years of the agreement, and in a real sense this means that the Commonwealth Government, at this level, has not made an adjustment in the formula that will solve the basic problems of the States. Under the previous formula, the increase in the tax reimbursement grant was obtained by adding together the percentage change in population, the percentage increase in award wages, and the betterment factor of 1.2 per cent. With population

increasing at, say, 2 per cent and award wages increasing at 5 per cent, and the betterment factor of 1.2 per cent, this gave an increase in the formula of 8.2 per cent, and for the remaining four years of the new agreement, with betterment at 1.8 per cent, the change would be, with the same conditions of population increase and award wages, 8.8 per cent instead of 8.2 per cent.

Therefore, it is likely that, under the new agreement reached between the Premiers and the Commonwealth Government, for the remaining four years of the five-year period over which the new agreement will run the percentage increase in the tax reimbursement grants that will be obtained by the States will revert to the kind of percentage increase that was obtained under the previous formula. All that has been done at this level for the States is to provide a little extra relief in the first year of the new formula, as a consequence of the alteration in the base.

True, we have these other changes with respect to debt readjustment that will involve some budgetary relief for the States. Nevertheless, it is clear from the proceedings at the Premiers' Conference that the States were disappointed first, that the Commonwealth Government was not willing to allow a bigger adjustment than was allowed in the base on which the new formula was to operate and, secondly, that the Commonwealth Government refused to increase the betterment factor to a more realistic figure of 2.5 per cent or 3 per cent. Strong arguments were put by the States at the Premiers' Conference for that sort of change, but they were rejected by the Commonwealth Government. This year all States (and the position as I have explained it for South Australia applies generally throughout Australia) have a better than usual improvement in their budgetary situation, but that improvement is a one-year change, in the main.

This is unfortunate, because the Commonwealth Government has taken the occasion of the Premiers' Conference, together with further statements made by the Treasurer in the Budget Speech and by the Minister for Education and Science, to state that the change in the income tax reimbursement formula effectively dealt with the recurrent needs of the States for education, as determined by the national survey. This is not the case. True, we are able this year to bring about a percentage increase in expenditure that is more or less in line with that contemplated in the survey, but it is unlikely that the new financial arrangements that apply with the States either here or any-

where else will be able to keep in line with the survey on current expenditure for the remaining four years. It is for that reason that the States and the State Ministers of Education have every right to feel disappointed and to think that the case that they put in relation to the survey has not been adequately considered by the Commonwealth. After all, the survey was undertaken partly at the suggestion of the Commonwealth and with its co-operation. To undertake such a survey and to have one whole section of it rejected is disappointing and upsetting, particularly (and I am sure the member for Torrens will agree with me) as we in South Australia said that, no matter how difficult our position was on capital account for school buildings, the main long-term problem was with recurrent expenditure, and it was on this matter that we most needed assistance.

I refer to the events of the Premiers' Conference and the subsequent \$5,000,000 grant from the Commonwealth Grants Commission, because Opposition members in trying to make the best of a bad thing, together with their colleagues in Canberra, have tried to represent the grant from the commission as an example of the Commonwealth Government's generosity. The facts are that South Australia's case for special assistance was rejected at the Premiers' Conference. The Treasurer of this State was told in an off-hand manner that he could go to the Grants Commission, and this we proceeded to do in order to apply for an interim grant. The Commonwealth Government appeared at the hearings of the Grants Commission, and its representative opposed many aspects of South Australia's case presented to the commission: that is, the Commonwealth Government itself attempted to knock over South Australia's case.

Mr. Millhouse: Is that an unusual procedure?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It indicates—

Mr. Millhouse: Is it unusual?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No, it is not, but it indicates that the position of the Commonwealth Grants Commission is that of an independent arbitrary authority or equivalent to that, adjudicating on the claims made by States as a result of special disadvantages arising largely from size, but in South Australia's case arising from other reasons as well, and that the Commonwealth's approach to this matter concerning South Australia was an attempt to minimize any possible assistance that the Grants Commission should make available.

The Leader of the Opposition has great difficulty in appreciating any argument, particularly if it is a logical one. However, I point out to him, first, that the Commonwealth opposed South Australia's submission to the Grants Commission; and, secondly, that since the commission was established, I think in 1933, to hear submissions made by claimant States, its determinations have been taken by the Commonwealth Government of the day (no matter what political colour it may have been) as the final determination of the matter. In other words, its recommendations have always been accepted in every detail.

Mr. Hall: Has there ever been a case where the recommendations of the Grants Commission have not been accepted?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I would doubt it, but all I am pointing out is that the Prime Minister, when he told the South Australian Government to go to the Grants Commission, certainly did not expect the minimum figure (that is what it is at this stage) of \$5,000,000 to be awarded, and the Commonwealth actively intervened before the Grants Commission in an attempt to knock over some of the arguments presented by South Australia—in particular, the argument on education. It would do the member for Mitcham good to listen to this argument, because it is important. In South Australia 86 per cent of the children of school age attend Government schools. The Australian average is 75 per cent. Putting it another way and looking at the school population as a percentage of the total population, in South Australia one in five of our population attends a Government school; in the other States that average is one in six. That means that, if the other States on average spend, say, \$70 a head of population on education, they are spending \$420 for each student in Government schools. However, in South Australia, if we spend \$70 a head of population on education, because of the higher ratio of children in Government schools, that amounts to only \$350 for each student in Government schools, compared with \$420 for the Australian average. One of the main disadvantages we have and one of the main props to our case before the Commonwealth Grants Commission—

Mr. Coumbe: Isn't it the other way round?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The other States have a ratio of one in six, and six times \$70 gives us \$420; in South Australia the ratio is one in five, and five times \$70 is \$350. We can look at it in another way: in order to get the same expenditure on each student in

Government schools in South Australia as applies in the other States, we have to spend a higher amount per capita on education than they do in the other States, which represents a serious budgetary disadvantage.

There is a further aspect of our application to the Grants Commission that is relevant. Honourable members will know, I hope, that the standard this year is a deficit standard, because both New South Wales and Victoria are running very large deficits. In these circumstances, if we do not run a deficit, we cut back some of the grant that we would otherwise get from the Grants Commission. If a surplus standard was operating in New South Wales and Victoria, this argument would not apply but, because a deficit standard is operating, the implication is that we have to run a deficit in order to take full advantage of the case we have put before the Grants Commission. I refer now to the argument raised in part by the member for Kavel in relation to the \$3,000,000 replacement building programme because, as usual, he made a number of inaccurate statements.

Mr. Venning: He was right on the ball.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: He was not. I stated at the outset and repeated again and again that it was conditional on Commonwealth money being made available. The member for Rocky River should know that that has been stated any number of times. It is still possible, I believe, that we will receive assistance from the Commonwealth Government for the school-building programme. We have just been requested by the Commonwealth to make a submission classifying building projects over the five-year period of the survey into most urgent, urgent, and desirable, and I presume that the kind of submission we make on that matter may influence the Commonwealth Government's attitude. We are proceeding with all possible speed to prepare such a submission. However, I again make the point, particularly for those members who do not want to appreciate the true situation, that it is essential that we have prepared building plans that can go to tender immediately additional funds become available.

The development of the construction programme of many open-space units gives our building programme a much greater flexibility than it ever had previously. In order to build up our expenditure for the remainder of the year (if we need to, say, towards the end of November), we are not in a position of having to make a choice between one or two

large school projects and of wondering whether, if we adopt this project, we could end up with \$400,000 more than we want to spend, instead of with \$200,000 less. Having a large number of individual projects ready to go to tender means that we will have much more control over expenditure on school buildings than has been the case in the past, and this is most important.

The Public Buildings Department is proceeding to design open-space units at the rate of two a week, and we will, in effect, build up (as we will not be able at this stage to let all of the plans we will have designed) a stockpile of projects ready to go and available to call on immediately we can project available funds to finance this work. That is a most important position to be in, particularly when we are concerned to expand expenditure on school buildings. I know that the member for Torrens appreciates the problems that arise in the sphere of school buildings when an attempt is made to increase expenditure rapidly within a short space of time. Referring now to the percentage rise in expenditure on education proposed for this financial year, I point out to honourable members that the only valid basis for comparison is how this percentage increase of 14.7 per cent (almost 15 per cent) compares with projected increases.

Mr. Hall: Nonsense!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. Hall: The national figures—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am sorry; the Leader of the Opposition has a reputation for dimwittedness that is exceeded by few people in this State. I do not really expect he will appreciate it, but I point out for the benefit of others of greater wit and intelligence—

Mr. Hall: We don't mind insults; what about some facts!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: All right; let me give the facts. Let me give the budgetary provisions for increased expenditure on education over the last 10 years, that is, the projected percentage increase in each Budget over that period. In the Budget for the 1961-62 financial year, the projected increase was 11 per cent; for 1962-63, it was 11.1 per cent; for 1963-64, 7.8 per cent; for 1964-65, 9.6 per cent; for 1965-66, 9 per cent; for 1966-67, 12.9 per cent; for 1967-68, 9.6 per cent; for 1968-69, 8.4 per cent; and for 1969-70 it was 10.8 per cent.

Mr. Hall: What was the actual figure?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It was over 18 per cent: I am well aware of that. The projected increase at this stage last year was 10.8 per cent, whereas at this stage this year it is 14.7 per cent. As explained in the Treasurer's financial statement, last year there was a teachers' salaries award that caused expenditure on education to increase well and truly above the estimate. The final excess was \$4,421,000, of which nearly \$4,000,000 was the result of higher salary levels consequent upon the new award and the national wage case. So, \$4,000,000 of the excess expenditure last year was just a consequence of higher salary payments: it did not result in any real expansion. It was most important from the teachers' viewpoint that the Government last year made that increased expenditure, and I congratulate it on it. However, the amount of expansion envisaged for education this year in our projected increase of 14.7 per cent is greater than the amount of real expansion that occurred last financial year. If we ran into a similar award this financial year we would have to increase actual expenditure over and above what is projected now.

At this stage no award increases that are not already known are included in the Budget. This is a feature of the Budget every year, as every year some excesses occur in expenditure because of award changes. This is inevitable. At this stage of the year the projected increase in education expenditure is a record, and it is a record by far over any other provision that has been made in South Australia. That is the correct situation. In South Australia the resignation rate is running at 13 per cent—about 1,400 teachers a year. Many of these resignations are unavoidable because they arise from the high percentage of females in the teaching profession and the consequent resignations arising from pregnancy and because married women employed by the Education Department naturally move to another State or overseas if the husband is posted there. In addition, every year increasing numbers of teachers take advantage of the opportunity to travel overseas and teach there.

Mrs. Steele: You would not accept that last year.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The only things said last year were about how many teachers were going overseas.

Mrs. Steele: You did not accept this last year.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be surprised to find any remarks that I made that showed that I did not accept that. I think that in the best possible circumstances we could get the resignation rate down to about 10 per cent. However, if teachers become more mobile and travel more overseas—and it is hard to say to teachers either that they should not travel overseas and get that experience or that it is not in our long-run interests for them to get a more varied experience—I believe that in the long run we will get a regular flow-back of teachers from overseas, balancing out the teachers who resign to gain the experience of overseas travel.

Mr. Clark: And who are possibly all the better for that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes. One change we have made in an endeavour to ensure that any teacher who has gone overseas from any Australian State can be attracted back to South Australia is to provide that any teacher appointed up to the level of senior master (or below that level in future) will have overseas experience taken into account in determining the salary that is to be paid. The consequence of this is that no teacher who goes overseas and who teaches in England or Canada or elsewhere will be downgraded in salary as a result. I believe this is an important change, particularly for a smaller State like South Australia, when we recruit in Canada or in England mainly Australian teachers who have previously gone to those countries.

The main point I wish to make is that we have to appoint between 1,400 and 1,500 new teachers every year just to make up for the resignations. In addition, we have to appoint more teachers because we get increased numbers of students in our schools. Also, if we wish to lower student-teacher ratios we need to appoint more teachers again. I estimate that if we could find sufficient qualified teachers we would be wanting now to appoint more than 2,000 teachers every year to the South Australian Education Department, for all these reasons.

One of our big problems is that the current output of trained teachers from teachers colleges is about 1,000, and it will stay at 1,000 for both 1971 and 1972, partly as a consequence of the transition to three-year training in teachers colleges and partly as a consequence of the inability to expand sufficiently first-year intakes in previous years. We are faced with the fact that there will be no increase in the output of teachers from teachers colleges in

South Australia until 1973. Therefore, until 1973 we will be badly placed in appointing qualified teachers to the teaching service unless we are able to increase significantly our recruitment overseas and our re-employment of qualified teachers previously employed in the department or, alternatively, our recruitment from other States.

What we have done in the Budget this year is to provide the largest ever increase in the numbers in attendance at teachers colleges for next year. This will give us an increase in the output of teachers colleges in 1974, when we should have about 1,500 teachers coming out of our teachers colleges and available for appointment in schools. That number, together with the normal rate of re-employment, particularly of married women teachers who had previously been employed in the department, would enable by 1974 the appointment of sufficient qualified teachers from within our own resources to meet the need for replacements, to cope with expanding numbers and to get class sizes down. However, the situation will be very tight until then and, unfortunately, in order to get the kind of expansion that we want in the output of trained teachers, much of our increased expenditure must go to expanding teacher training. This is an expensive process and involves a considerable increase in the staff of teachers colleges. We expect in this financial year an increase of 74 in the lecturing staff at teachers colleges, which is a 20 per cent increase in the staff of teachers colleges, and that is expensive. We have the added expense of providing equipment and paying allowances to an additional 625 student teachers. These matters are important, and members should be aware of the details. If they want to make financial comparisons between years, members should make those comparisons on a proper basis and should not play around with statistics in the way the Leader of the Opposition is fond of dealing with them. I hope that further contributions to the debate that involve comparisons, particularly when we get to the lines, will be better than some contributions we have heard so far.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the first line. After the Treasurer delivered his Financial Statement last Thursday week, the House adjourned for the Royal Show and, whilst I was at the show many of the rural people, who had come down to exhibit their animals or to see the various displays, expressed disappointment about the Budget, and I could not tell them of anything significant in it that would help them.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Did you speak to them at the L.C.L. booth?

Mr. VENNING: Yes, and elsewhere, during the enjoyable time I spent at the show. Many rural people are looking forward to being able to change the Government at the next election. The incomes of primary producers have fallen almost overnight, much more quickly than anyone thought possible. Generally speaking, primary producers were willing to meet the cost of their industry when they were able. They paid their rates and taxes and took out insurance policies to try to cover succession duties. They have also placed their sons on the farms so that the industry could continue as we would wish. Let us not be carried away with the present mineral situation. The rural income of the Commonwealth is still important: it is 40 per cent of our net income and comprises a large percentage of this country's exports. It is necessary for farmers today to ensure the future of the industry, and the best way to do that is to have their sons continue on the properties. The decreased income of primary producers is of great concern, and this matter is frequently discussed at meetings of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated.

A few weeks ago farmers marched in King William Street and eventually were met by the Treasurer. When he met this confrontation of producers from South Australia he said things that he had referred to in his policy speech before the last election. Speaking about land tax he said he would do something about reducing it for primary producers. Recently, I asked him a question concerning what reductions would be made in land tax for primary producers, because land values had increased in the early part of the quinquennial year whereas in the final year of that assessment they had dropped considerably and, overall, it could be said that they had dropped 30 to 40 per cent. Although the Treasurer has said that some degree of relief would be given I am not sure now that he knows how much he can reduce land tax for primary producers.

Succession duty is also worrying the primary producer. Every 15 years the Government takes a wad out of a farm estate. When a person commences farming in his own right he has to consider what will happen to his property and how it will affect his family. Farmers have to pay fairly high insurance premiums in order to protect their estate. During the recent farmers' march, as we

walked down King William Street, a farmer would say "I helped to build that insurance building" and another would say, "Yes, and I helped to build that one." Obviously, they are aware of the fact that through insurance policies they are helping to protect their estates from heavy succession duty imposts.

If our rural communities and our family units are to continue it is imperative that succession duties be wiped out entirely. At the farmers' meeting the Treasurer said that he would set up a committee to consider wheat quotas. I do not think that this action will help this rural industry solve its present problems. Growers have their appeals committee, which has been set up to consider appeals. I do not think that what the Treasurer has said about the setting up of this special committee will do very much to help the industry. The quota problem has already been attended to by the appeals committee, which consists of three gentlemen competent in handling appeals in respect of quotas. When talking of the rural industry, which I represent mainly in my area, I am concerned that the Government has decided to increase the charges at our ports in South Australia. I am also concerned that only a short time ago the Government decided to lift the 2½c a bushel surcharge at Port Giles, about which I have said much in this Chamber. The Government was prepared to forgo about \$70,000 a year, and the total expenditure on the facilities at Port Giles, which cost \$2,500,000, the Government has decided to wipe off altogether. This was the cost to the Labor Party of its effort in Goyder prior to the last election. I do not know why the Labor Party did this: it did not have to. It could have promised the farmers the world and it still could not have won the seat, so I find it hard to understand why the Government lifted the surcharge at Port Giles.

Let us consider the history of the situation there. The growers met at meetings and passed resolutions favouring the loading on Port Giles. They knew it was an issue whether it would be financially sound for the Government but, to help their case, the growers in that area unanimously agreed that a loading of 2½c a bushel be imposed at Port Giles. Before the port really got under way, the Government lifted the surcharge on grain delivered at that terminal, the total amount involved being \$2,500,000. Now, as a result of this Budget, harbour charges are to be increased throughout the State. There had been a decrease in respect of wheat handling charges at other outports

because of the quantity handled at our ports, yet the Government is now increasing its charges. I remind members opposite of the importance of bulk handling for the growers, who have financed this scheme from their own pockets by way of interest-free loans to the bulk handling co-operative.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: How do you justify the surcharge you had at Port Giles?

Mr. VENNING: There was every reason to put a surcharge on there.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Do you agree there should be a surcharge there?

Mr. VENNING: Yes; otherwise, growers on Eyre Peninsula would be entitled to have three or four additional ports built on Eyre Peninsula if an additional port at Port Giles was justified. The alternative was that grain could have been shipped through Ardrossan. Indeed, there are now three shipping terminals within 50 miles of that area. I do not believe that, if the Government at that time had known that the growers in that area were not going to honour this agreement, the port would have been built today.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Are you saying these growers are dishonourable?

Mr. VENNING: No. I am blaming the Government for not standing up to its responsibilities. It made a shocking deal in the district prior to the last election. Getting back to this important industry, we find that the cartage of grain by the South Australian Railways has been responsible for earning much revenue, and it is expected that the movement of grain in this State in the coming season will play another significant part in augmenting revenue. However, we are concerned about the suggestions being made that the Government intends to increase rail freights. We remember that, when it came into power in 1965, it increased rail freights and it belted the unfortunate people living in the distant parts of our State who had to pay increases in rail freights of up to 33½ per cent on long hauls.

In contrast to this, it was the policy of the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, when he was the Leader of this Party, to consider growers in these areas and to reduce freights, thereby encouraging people to take up a vocation in country areas. However, today we find that the primary producer is being belted in various ways through increased freights, and he is being compelled to use the railways. It is an unfortunate aspect of the bulk handling

situation that where a silo is on railway property, even though grain is not moved by rail, there is an impost on the movement of that grain of about 80c a ton. These silos were built by the growers with their own tolls and with interest-free loans.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And on their own land.

Mr. VENNING: We pay the rent, too, and it is \$20 a year where we have a weighbridge on railway property. We pay all the time, but road transport is moving grain at half the cost.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Another anti-railway man!

Mr. VENNING: No, but I am concerned that the Government is not being fair to primary producers and that it is increasing rail freights. I want to see the Government reduce rail freights to the level of road transport charges.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You put them up.

Mr. VENNING: The Government did that. It increased rail freights on long hauls in 1965 by up to 33½ per cent.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What has your Government been doing since 1968?

Mr. VENNING: We have not altered rail freights.

Mr. McKee: What was it doing for 30 years?

Mr. VENNING: I will refer to the member for Pirie in a moment, because I think he can help primary industry, particularly in the northern part of the State. I saw what he was able to do only about a fortnight ago in regard to parking in Port Pirie, and I am hopeful that through him we will be able to get some additional land at Port Pirie for more silos. Particularly if the honourable member makes the front bench, I think he will be able to give us much support in building those additional silos. However, for the benefit of the Minister of Roads and Transport, I point out that I am a railway man and that I am happy to ride in the train from Adelaide to Merriton.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's only because you have a free ticket.

Mr. VENNING: That is all right; I can relax and at the same time do much work. Primary producers should not be made to carry the State's economy. Some primary producers are using road transport to carry their grain at about half the price they have to pay

on the railway system. I hope the Government will seriously consider this matter. Later this week I have to introduce to the Minister of Roads and Transport a deputation from the Northern Transport Association.

Mr. McKee: The member for Heysen recommended an increase in rail freights.

Mr. VENNING: The honourable member must have misunderstood the member for Heysen. The importance of the railway system has been stressed, and I agree that we must make the best possible use of it. However, I do not think the primary producer should be taken for a ride and expected to carry the State's economy. I will be interested to see how slow the progress is on the next phase of gauge standardization.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That will depend on the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. VENNING: The Minister cannot blame the Commonwealth Government entirely.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It hasn't had time! It has only had since 1949!

Mr. VENNING: We will see what the Minister does about it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Give us 21 years!

Mr. VENNING: What has the Government done about the Dartmouth dam? I am talking about the Government's progress—or lack of progress. The previous Government agreed with the Commonwealth Government to ask Maunsell & Partners to investigate the next phase of the standardization plans. After Maunsell & Partners had produced their report, the South Australian Railways Commissioner (Mr. Fitch) commented on it, and at present both the Maunsell report and the Fitch report are in the hands of the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport. I hope that real progress will be made very soon. I am not ramming for one report or the other: if there is merit in both reports, let us put them together and decide to build a line that involves the best features of both reports.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Don't you think the Fitch report serves the farmers in the North better?

Mr. VENNING: Yes. However, farmers in the North are not getting satisfactory service at present. So, let us hope they will get a better service in the future.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I would like to see a better service for the farmers in the North. You will get nothing for the farmers from the Maunsell report.

Mr. VENNING: If there is any merit in the Maunsell report as against the Fitch report, let us put them together and get the best possible scheme out of both of them. If the Fitch report favours the southern part and the Maunsell report the northern part, let us put the two schemes together.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And have a double line from Adelaide to Port Pirie!

Mr. VENNING: Rubbish! It does not mean that at all. A large amount of money has to be spent on this project, and the sooner we make a start the better, particularly now when the economy of this State, particularly in our rural areas, is at such a low ebb. It is rather significant that when we have a Labor Government we seem to have many problems in the rural areas. In 1968—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What about 1961, when we had the credit squeeze?

Mr. VENNING: In 1967, when the Labor Government was in office, we had one of the worst droughts we had ever seen. Things were running pretty close this year, too, until we received some rain recently. I hope that these rains continue.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There are too many members addressing the Committee. The Committee will make better progress if the member for Rocky River can speak without being interrupted.

Mr. VENNING: I hope that the late spring rains continue and that the people in these northern areas will get some return. I warn the Government that there are some problems looming for us in these areas if the late spring rains do not continue. Assistance will be required, and possibly some areas will have to be declared drought areas. Therefore, I hope the Government will not be backward in coming forward to assist the primary producers in those areas should the need arise.

About 18 months ago the Treasurer went to Queensland and delivered to the university in that State an address which was headlined in the press "Farewell to the rustics". He stated in that address that primary producers, through various circumstances, would have to leave the land and go to the bigger cities. He went on to say that the rural population would diminish and that its effectiveness in the community would diminish. It concerns me to know that the Treasurer delivered such an address, for it indicates that he is not over-sympathetic to the primary producers of

this State. I would have thought, following the farmers' march, that he would get the message and try to do something about the present situation. The Treasurer is well aware of the problems, because in his policy speech he said:

Wool prices have deteriorated to an alarmingly low level; in fact, the lowest for 20 years.

Perhaps his Deputy, who represents a rural area, prepared that part of the Treasurer's policy speech.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Private conversation between members across the Chamber is out of order.

Mr. McKee: The divine right!

The CHAIRMAN: Never mind about the divine right, either. The honourable member for Rocky River.

Mr. VENNING: The Treasurer is well aware of the rural problems. About a month ago I invited him to go to the Gepps Cross abattoirs to see the low returns that primary producers were receiving for their commodity. Although I have received from him a note saying that he has a reply to my question, unfortunately the debate this afternoon prevented me from asking for the reply, and I look forward to his statement tomorrow about conditions there. I hope that he has examined thoroughly the unfortunate position of primary producers. This is the spring, when stock and lambs are ready to be brought to the abattoirs for slaughter, but there are restrictions on deliveries of stock, and the animals are getting past their prime and bloom. I wonder who is receiving the benefit?

Much has been said about South Australia's being a mendicant State, and I remind members opposite that when Sir Thomas Playford used to go to the Grants Commission he was told that he would have to increase water rates and rail freights, and do all sorts of things if he was to share in these grants, but that did not affect him. He carried on the State as he desired, and it seems that, when the present Treasurer announced that he would go to the Commonwealth, on behalf of South Australia, as a claimant State, he was only conditioning the people to the increased taxes that he intended to impose.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Gorton told him to apply, as a mendicant State, as a result of two years of Hall Government. Answer that!

Mr. VENNING: That is all right. That applied to Sir Thomas, too. As these Budget proposals unfold, we will see that they will be detrimental to the rural community. I do not know how the Treasurer intends to get blood out of a stone, but I think that is what he will try to do. Tourism has been mentioned in this debate. Many holiday shacks have been built at Port Broughton, in my district, and I am pleased that the council will provide a new caravan park. However, these attractions, whilst bringing much new money to the area, also bring problems. Hospital facilities at Port Broughton are totally inadequate for the large population there at holiday time, particularly during the Christmas season. Something should be done to make these facilities available at this time of the year. Rural areas have not been given any significant relief by this Budget but I shall be interested to see how the Treasurer gives effect to this Budget through the legislation that he intends to introduce.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the first line. If I used the words that the present Minister of Roads and Transport would have used if he were on this side, I would describe it as a lousy Budget, and that is proved by the fact that so many Government members are seat warmers and have been told by their Party to say nothing. They are the words that the Minister used when he spoke about a previous Budget, but the Budgets in the last two years have been much better than the present one. I shall quote what the Minister of Roads and Transport said last year when speaking about the acquisition of property and of a Highways Department proposal to purchase a particular property. The Minister, when referring to a person who wanted to dispose of his house, said:

He has had his house on the market, but he cannot sell it, naturally enough. Who would want to buy a house that is in the path of the M.A.T.S. plan?

He continued, and I quote the *Hansard* report, as follows:

The people affected by the M.A.T.S. plan should be given some consideration, and they are the people I am pleading for. The person who has fought and striven all his life to purchase a house is forced by this Government's dictatorial attitude and its incompetence—

Mr. Broomhill: They are unnecessarily forced.

Mr. Virgo: Quite unnecessarily, yet a person who has purchased a house is having his greatest asset frozen by this Government, which could not care less about it. This is the tragedy of it.

I had asked a question of the Minister and when replying on August 5 he said that his department was to acquire a part of a property at Blackwood. I point out to the Minister that until last Friday, at least, his department had made no contact with this person. Last year the Minister had been so concerned about the rights of the individual and said he had been put in a difficult position by a Government department, but now his department is not putting the wheels into motion to pay compensation and acquire this property so that the person can sell the balance of his land and receive enough money to buy another property.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Is this property on the M.A.T.S. plan?

Mr. EVANS: This is a property that the Highways Department requires in order to widen a road. Whether it is on the M.A.T.S. plan or not does not matter. Is the Minister saying there is a difference between people living on property that is on the M.A.T.S. plan and people living in the path of an arterial road and whose property is to be acquired? Why ask whether the property is on the M.A.T.S. plan? The Minister knows that it is the action of his department that is freezing this person's asset.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That is not so: that is deliberately untrue, and you know it.

Mr. EVANS: The department is slow in putting a valuation on this property and acquiring it, thereby giving this person the opportunity to use the money obtained from it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That is quite untrue and you know it.

Mr. EVANS: It is not untrue. Also, the Highways Department has carried out, and still has to carry out, work on two run-offs on the Mount Barker Road. It is difficult in this Chamber by question to get over a statement explaining all the facets of any particular matter, so I take the opportunity now, as money will be spent from this Budget to complete the run-offs, to explain to the Minister that it is not true to say that the little bit of rock protruding will not inconvenience a fast-moving semi-trailer.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You say that you know more than the engineers of the Highways Department do?

Mr. EVANS: I am saying, regardless of what the Minister tells me, that I have driven heavy vehicles and I believe it is much easier to

drive a vehicle in practically a straight line than it is to take a curve around a piece of rock jutting out from a hillside. If the Minister doubts this, I invite him to do it himself with one of his departmental vehicles. The point I am raising has not been settled: the Highways Department has excavated behind and in front of this rock. All it has to do is to remove that piece of rock, which is about 4ft. deep and 12ft. high, and a perfect run-off would be there for the driver of a heavy vehicle who had to leave that freeway from the extreme lefthand carriageway. I urge the Minister and his departmental officers to have another look at this and make sure that, if we are to have a run-off, it will be 100 per cent and not 95 per cent effective. The approach to the other run-off has been widened. I congratulate the department on this. Now that a sign is there prohibiting people parking there, that run-off will be fully effective, when the material to be used as a buffer is placed there.

I now turn to something over which the Minister has at times been hostile, differently from when he was on this side of the Chamber, when he used to take us to task about the M.A.T.S. plan; but he does not like us talking about it now.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I still think it was the worst thing ever introduced, and Steele Hall can take the blame for it.

Mr. EVANS: Let us go back a little. Although we have been over the argument often enough, it is important to mention that \$12,000 out of this Budget is still to be paid to Dr. Breuning, who is in America still trying to write a report. I may be wrong there: the report may have arrived here and we have not heard of it but, to the best of my knowledge, it is still somewhere between Australia and Dr. Breuning's hands.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You do not have much knowledge.

Mr. EVANS: I do not have much knowledge of this, because the Government is not generous in giving us any information. It merely says it has set down the terms of reference and has told the expert what its policy is and what it wants planned, under those conditions. So I must admit I do not have much knowledge of the report; but the Minister condemns this M.A.T.S. plan and says it is rotten. Yet for three years, when the previous Labor Government was in office, this plan was being prepared by our own State experts, whose advice

the Minister a moment ago asked us to accept. I now ask him to accept that advice. Also engaged in compiling this report were experts from other countries, and practically \$700,000 of the State's money was spent on it. However, in 1970 the Labor Government brings to this State an expert and his assistant, the qualifications of the latter person, we are told, being those of a lawyer and a humanist. Personally, I did not think it possible for one person to have both these qualifications. We have a Government spending \$12,000 to bring to South Australia an expert who will look at our State's transport system and who, the Government will probably say, will solve its problems, yet nearly \$700,000 has been spent on a plan that was compiled in the term of a Labor Government.

Mr. Ferguson: That's quietened them down a little.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It has not. The terms of reference were written by the Playford Government, and you know it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. EVANS: When the Walsh Government came into office in 1965, it could have changed the terms of reference if it wished; it could have been as dictatorial to the people concerned as this Government has been to us, and it could have made other arrangements. The Minister knows that it is as ridiculous to use this argument as it is to adopt the attitudes that he adopts on other subjects.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You know that you cannot repudiate negotiations made and contracts signed. Wake up to yourself!

Mr. Hall: You—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Oh, shut up.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. EVANS: The Minister of Roads and Transport knows that money had been spent on the scheme, and he knows also that just before the 1968 election his Government did everything in its power to have the report submitted to the people so that it could use it as electioneering propaganda. It was not a lousy plan, and he knows it full well. I am glad that the Minister of Education is advising him to do what he tells us to do: to shut up!

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Fisher.

Mr. EVANS: We are expecting a report from an expert who is now back in America

and who has had a wonderful trip over here for 14 days to have a look at our transport system.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Don't talk rot.

Mr. EVANS: He had a look at a report that was supposedly lousy and rotten.

Mr. Hall: The product of a poverty-stricken imagination!

Mr. EVANS: I do not know about that, but the Government is now going to hedge and dodge and end up by falling back on many of the proposals contained in the M.A.T.S. plan, and the Minister knows that full well.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Does he?

Mr. EVANS: Yes. One of the things on which the Government will fall back and on which it will undertake expenditure, as provided for in this Budget, will be the widening of arterial roads in the metropolitan area, and that is part of what is contained in the M.A.T.S. plan. The Government will continue to widen main arterial roads.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Of course we will. We have never said we would not.

Mr. EVANS: The Minister said it would never implement any part of the report, yet now he is saying, "Of course we will." I believe that the Minister has a hatred for masses of concrete freeway.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's right.

Mr. EVANS: I wonder what he will use to build the new one near West Lakes. What will that be built of?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What new one at West Lakes?

Mr. EVANS: I believe that the railway line will be closed; that is what the Minister tells me.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You've been playing around.

Mr. EVANS: What moneys will the Minister use for that project? That will be interesting to see. How can we justify either a Labor Government or a Liberal Government spending \$700,000 on a plan and then saying that it is useless and that not much of it will be used? How can we justify employing another expert at a cost of \$12,000? The Government had a stated policy, and it had to find a let-out.

The M.A.T.S. plan looked ahead to 1986. It may be 1971 before we start talking about Dr. Breuning's report, and it may be 1972 before we get any action. So, there

will be only 14 years left between then and 1986. I can take no action other than to say that I believe there has been a waste of the State's money and a waste of valuable time in not going on with the major part of the M.A.T.S. plan. The Minister of Roads and Transport should realize that people are still concerned about where freeways and expressways will go and whether their homes are in danger. When the Minister was in Opposition he condemned the then Government for not buying properties and for not saying where the freeways would be. The position is still the same today. If the Minister has a conscience he should think about this matter. Was he guilty of a sham to win a few votes in his own district, where he stirred every council to object? The member for Mawson, in referring to an Opposition member, said:

I remind him that young people are increasingly finding that the political freedoms of which older people boast seem to be there until they are tested, and when that happens they magically disappear.

I believe in freedoms, although we lost one in this place today. I believe we must protect as many freedoms as possible. I have no objection if people wish to protest in a quiet and orderly manner. If one group is allowed to make a profit by selling an article on the steps of Parliament House and another group is not allowed to do it, that is unjust. Our freedoms exist only if they do not interfere with other people's freedoms. When any of our freedoms interferes with someone else's freedom, we lose the right to our freedom and we must accept the responsibility. This is where we fall down today. I have no objection to people having a different political view from mine as long as they do not interfere with my freedom to hold my political view.

Mr. Hoggood: Which freedoms are being infringed by the people on the front steps?

Mr. EVANS: If the member for Mawson likes to go outside now he will find that there are two groups there and that one of those groups is not allowed on the front steps whereas the other group is allowed to be there. I believe that is an example of interference with the freedoms of the individual. This is the problem that we face. We have the rights to freedoms only while they do not interfere with other people's freedoms.

I now want to refer to taxes, particularly water rates payable by people who live in the catchment area of the Adelaide Hills. Now that we have regulations and con-

trols in the catchment area, some of the properties there are rated very highly. Those properties were at one time considered potential subdivisational properties, but today they can no longer be considered in that light. In fact, they are now regarded as agricultural or semi-agricultural properties. Some of them have reticulated water past their door, and the owners pay a water rate. However, the rates they have to pay are extremely high as a result of the high value that has been put on the properties because of their original potential as subdivisational land. I mention this in the hope that the Minister of Works will read my remarks and will look into the matter and consider doing something about it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: They speculated and they lost.

Mr. EVANS: I remind the Minister of Roads and Transport, who is interjecting with his usual sarcasm and jealous approach to people who own land, that not all those people are speculators, for some of those properties have been in the hands of the same people for many years, and they have struggled to gain a fair existence. In the last 10 or 15 years, instead of their having a superannuation fund or something else to provide for their old age, they could see that they might gain the benefit of their labours through price escalation from subdivision. It was not their intention when they first bought the properties—in fact, it never entered their heads that they might be subdividable in the future. I want the Minister to get it into his head that many of these people are not the type of people that he is accusing them of being. I agree that some people bought land on speculation, and if those people dip out it does not worry me. In fact, I say it serves them right, because they are the people who have brought some of the problems to the small farmers in the Hills. They are the people who pushed up prices and therefore rates and made it difficult for the small farmer to exist. If the Minister can find a way of separating these people and of giving benefit to one and not the other, I shall be quite happy. However, he will have a difficult task trying to isolate them.

Mr. Keneally: Surely that is free enterprise.

Mr. EVANS: I do not deny that, but in some cases it is at the expense of others. If the Minister can differentiate between them, I will raise no objection. However, some people there are suffering badly through the actions of the previous Government in introducing a regulation regarding water pollution, and the present

Government is continuing the same action. Another matter that I wish to refer to was raised before but must be repeated, and that is our system of water rating which is unjust, and I hope that the committee that the previous Government appointed to investigate water rating systems will recommend a change that will take us, if not completely, partly towards the system of paying for water used.

At present the average water user is buying water at the rate of about 8½¢ a ton. That is cheap water, considering that we live in the driest State in the driest continent, and we should pay more for our water so that the Engineering and Water Supply Department will not require to be subsidized by about \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 a year. I see that the Minister of Education wants me to conclude my remarks. If I wanted to speak for as long as he has spoken sometimes he would have something to worry about. However, to satisfy him, I will not deal with education and I will simply say that I support the first line.

First line (Legislative Council, \$48,969)—passed.

The CHAIRMAN: If it is the wish of members, I shall put the lines *seriatim*.

House of Assembly, \$102,938; Parliamentary Library, \$29,212; Joint House Committee, \$49,858—passed.

Electoral Department, \$349,140.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I ask the Attorney-General for an explanation of the increase from \$61,783, the actual payment last year, to the amount of \$227,140 being provided for salaries and wages and related payments. I take it that payment of the costs of the last State election may have been laid over until this financial year. However, it does not seem that the expense of the election on May 30 last could be included in the \$61,783, and I think that expense must be included in the additional amount of about \$165,000 proposed for this year.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): The increase is accounted for largely by the costs of the general election, which have carried over to this year, and provision is made in these Estimates for the costs of the Midland by-election last Saturday and of the referendum next Saturday.

Mr. Millhouse: Would you be kind enough to dissect those figures?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not know that I can give a precise dissection now. A substantial sum for salaries and wages for the general election was brought to debit in the last financial year, but it left a substantial carry-over to the present financial year. However, I will obtain the precise figures for the Leader.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the time I administered this department the present Minister of Roads and Transport constantly raised the question of the salary of the Returning Officer for the State. He said (and I would not, nor do I, deny) that Norman Douglass (Returning Officer for the State) was on a low salary compared with similar officers in other States. I notice that only a modest increase in his salary has been provided, which probably is attributed to the 3 per cent salary increase some time ago. In view of the wellknown opinion of the Attorney's colleague about the worth of the Returning Officer and the opinion that has been expressed by many of us, can the Attorney say whether the Government plans to raise the standing of the Returning Officer for the State and, if it does, why this is not reflected in these figures?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I agree wholeheartedly with the honourable member about the qualities of the Returning Officer for the State: he is held in the highest regard by all Government members. Since the Government has taken office the question of his status and salary has been considered. A few days ago I received the comparative figures from other States that I shall use as a basis for a recommendation to the Public Service Board on this matter. Although the Estimates are prepared on the basis of the existing situation, that does not preclude a Cabinet decision following investigation by the board, and that matter is to be decided.

Mr. McANANEY: As people have the right to enrol for the Legislative Council, there does not seem to be any need for the State to incur additional expense by providing extra staff to send out enrolment application forms. Can the Attorney say how many extra staff have had to be employed for this job, and how much it will cost?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I cannot tell the honourable member the exact number involved, but this item includes an estimate of \$25,000 for this purpose. Of all the items in the Budget this one probably has the greatest significance for the future political development

of this State. I can think of nothing more important for a Government than to endeavour to ensure that all the people who are possessed by law of rights are given the maximum opportunity to enrol and exercise those rights. So far as I am concerned, the \$25,000 that it is estimated will be the cost of giving people the maximum opportunity of enrolling for the Legislative Council is money well spent. I make no apology for the inclusion of that item.

Mr. Millhouse: What is the \$25,000 for, exactly?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The \$25,000 is the cost of giving people the opportunity of enrolling for the Legislative Council. That is the item under discussion and I hope the member for Mitcham will regard that as money well spent.

Mr. HALL: I have no quarrel with the basic idea that the voluntary enrolment system should be made available to those people entitled to enrol. However, we on this side have bitter memories of a recent occasion when the Government used, unfairly, the electoral system of this State to try to institute, at the recent by-election, a one-sided practically compulsory vote in those areas that the Government thought would favour it. Therefore, the Government has recently demonstrated that it has motives that I believe are less than honourable. Having said that, I do not reject the idea of people who are entitled to enrol having their attention drawn to that fact.

In view of the recent blatant electioneering attempted under the guise of a referendum, can we be given an undertaking that, if attempts are made to enrol new voters for the Legislative Council roll, those attempts will be completely unbiased and will be made throughout the whole State without regard to variations of district or efforts to favour those areas that the Labor Party believes may favour it at an election?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am surprised at that question, because I have previously explained to the Committee that this whole operation will be completely under the control of the Returning Officer for the State and will be handled entirely through the Electoral Department; but, having heard the comments made by the member for Mitcham in praise of the Returning Officer for the State, suggesting that consideration be given to increasing his salary and upgrading his status, it is surprising to hear the Leader's comments. Of course, the matter will be in the hands of the Electoral

Department, and the electoral office of the Returning Officer for the State will act in accordance with the high standards it has always observed and will be completely free from political bias.

The method to be followed, as a result of instructions to give people the maximum opportunity to enrol, will have the effect of removing a bias that has existed previously where we have had the extraordinary situation of a person acquiring property by purchase being supplied with an application form for enrolment for the Legislative Council whereas, if a person acquired the qualifications for enrolment for the Legislative Council by some other means, such as acquiring the occupancy of a property, he was not given any such opportunity.

Mr. McANANEY: I refer to a new line "Fees for elections and referenda", on which \$3,400 was spent last year and \$136,200 is proposed for this year. Yet below there is a line "Periodical and general elections and by-elections and referenda—Printing and stationery, hire of booths and other expenses" on which \$13,082 was spent last year. As the Auditor-General says that the sum relates to fees and expenses of returning officers, etc., it would seem that the sum outstanding on the last election would be spent on that line. Will the Attorney-General say what is the specific purpose for the new item, for which \$136,200 is allocated?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The line "Fees for elections and referenda" relates to the payment to officers for the conduct of those elections and the referendum, to salaries and wages, and, of course, to provision in 1970-71 for a poll in the Midland District and for the referendum vote. As I have said, to that must be added the sums spent from advance account, which will be brought to debit in the current financial year, this being the balance of salaries and wages at the last election. The other line relates to printing and stationery, hire of booths and other expenses in relation to the by-election and the referendum. Regrettably this has arisen, because of the unfortunate decision made elsewhere that the Midland by-election and the referendum should not be held on the same day. The Estimates were prepared on the reasonable assumption that the two polls would be held on the same day.

Mr. McANANEY: I should like to have an explanation to substantiate the additional line rather than hear a discussion of generalities.

Will the Attorney-General explain the reason for the increase?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have already explained the reason for both lines, and I said in reply to the Leader of the Opposition that I would obtain the actual figures and supply them to him. I do not think there is any point in taking the matter further.

Mr. McANANEY: I accept that, but until now the Attorney-General has not said that he would do that. The Leader did not ask this specific question. He asked about the general increase on the three items concerned, whereas I am asking for specific information on two items, and the Minister has not been able to give that information. However, I should like to have it as soon as possible.

Line passed.

Government Reporting Department,
\$240,410; Parliamentary Standing Committee
on Public Works, \$11,167; Parliamentary Com-

mittee on Land Settlement, \$3,940; Miscellaneous, \$211,500—passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

GOODWOOD TO WILLUNGA RAILWAY (ALTERATION OF TERMINUS) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council
without amendment.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council
without amendment.

MUSEUM EXTENSIONS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on South Australian Museum Extensions.

Ordered that report be printed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.22 p.m. the House adjourned until
Thursday, September 17, at 2 p.m.