

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Wednesday, September 12, 1973

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

**MURRAY NEW TOWN (LAND ACQUISITION) ACT  
AMENDMENT BILL**

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

**MONARTO DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION BILL**

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

**PETITION: CASINO**

Mr. DEAN BROWN presented a petition signed by 204 citizens who expressed concern at the probable harmful impact of a casino on the community at large and prayed that the House of Assembly would not permit a casino to be established in South Australia.

Petition received.

**QUESTIONS****ESCAPED PRISONERS**

Dr. EASTICK: In the absence of the Premier, will the Minister of Works, as Deputy Premier, arrange for an immediate independent authoritative inquiry into the Government's prisoner rehabilitation programme, particularly into the aspects that allow public exposure of long-term prisoners? I indicated yesterday (and I do so again now) that I believed in an effective rehabilitation programme being undertaken by the department, and I do not accept or believe that people should be incarcerated forever or kept in cages like animals. However, the Deputy Premier will appreciate that there is grave concern and growing public disquiet at various aspects of the present occurrence, with the people moving away from the puppet show at the Royal Show. Letters to newspaper editors, telephone calls, letters to members of Parliament, and discussions on radio talk-back programmes all indicate the grave concern that the people of this State have, particularly when they relate the present situation to a knowledge of the activities of people like Darcy Dugan, in Sydney, who was released on parole and became the leader of a crime ring, and various other aspects that flow from the Attorney's acknowledgment that these persons were not under close surveillance while they were at Wayville showgrounds. Further, the failure of the escapees to give themselves up (that is, if they had undertaken this escape for the purpose of a gag or a dare) does require, I suggest, that there be the fullest and frankest inquiry into all aspects of this matter. I suggest to the Deputy Premier that it is only by taking action of this kind by an independent and authoritative body, rather than by a departmental inquiry (and I do not imply any incompetence by departmental persons who would undertake a departmental inquiry), that the public disquiet will be stood aside. I consider it essential that the Premier should indicate, at the earliest possible time, that he accepts the responsibility of the Government to accede to my request.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Gunn: You didn't go too well yesterday!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. L. J. KING: I rather infer from the fact that the question has been directed to someone else that the Leader of the Opposition does not agree with the member for Eyre about who fared best in the encounter yesterday.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Government does not intend to hold an inquiry into the rehabilitation system. Of course, there has been an inquiry into the whole of the penal method system in South Australia by the committee inquiring into penal methods and the revision of the criminal law, presided over by Justice Mitchell. Many valuable recommendations have been made. I explained yesterday that the classification system that the department used to determine the degree of security in which prisoners were to be held had been in operation for many years, under Governments of both political complexions. In the statement made in the House yesterday I indicated the identity of the persons who comprised that Classification Committee and how the committee operated. I consider that the system has operated satisfactorily for many years and has done much towards rehabilitating prisoners in South Australia. Doubtless, the system can be improved and much more can be done towards rehabilitating prisoners, and the recommendations of the Mitchell committee will assist greatly to that end. The proper authority in the Prisons Department will determine the facts of this case, and the Chief Secretary will obtain the precise facts in a report that he expects to receive, I understand, in a day or so. That will elucidate the precise facts surrounding this incident, but I do not believe that any lapse that may be indicated in security or any weakness in the classification in this case tells us anything about the validity of the overall system. It is quite clear (and this was indicated in the statement yesterday) that, in this case and using hindsight, the competent officers who did the job were wrong in thinking that these two prisoners could be entrusted with the responsibility that was entrusted to them. The facts raise questions about the degree of security that obtained at the showgrounds. Those facts must be investigated, but they are only facts relating to this case. Whatever defects may have occurred here (and that remains to be determined) do not warrant a full-scale inquiry into the whole system of rehabilitating prisoners, because that is precisely what the Mitchell committee has inquired into and is the subject on which it has reported. The Chief Secretary has indicated (and I indicated in the House yesterday) that he is concerned to ensure that the methods used in classifying prisoners to determine the degree of security required are being constantly examined, re-examined, and improved, and he said that he was concerned about the security aspects that existed at the Adelaide showgrounds in relation to the puppet show and was inquiring into them. The facts elucidated by that inquiry will be available to any member who is interested. I said yesterday that the system had operated for some years: it has been tried, tested, and proved by experience, and the fact that three prisoners in one case abused the trust placed in them, after proper procedures and processes had been gone through, does not involve, in my opinion, a criticism of the system itself.

Mr. COUMBE: Because of the Attorney's absolute refusal on behalf of the Government (and I presume he is speaking on behalf of the Government) to hold a public inquiry into this matter, which is causing grave public disquiet, will he at least assure the House that he will confer with his colleagues to ensure that the committee set up by the department will be more cautious

in future, and that the Classification Committee will consider more thoroughly the release of prisoners who are serving maximum sentences but who are given trustworthy positions before their release as part of their rehabilitation?

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on the honourable Attorney-General, I draw the attention of the honourable member for Torrens to the fact that, although his question may not be identical, it is certainly similar to a question asked yesterday. Although I will permit the honourable Attorney-General to answer this question, I shall have to rule further questions out of order if they are similar to questions previously asked.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes, I certainly give the honourable member that assurance. The Chief Secretary has indicated that he is most concerned to ensure that the system of assessment is perfected so far as possible and that the methods of assessment are improved wherever possible. There are certainly aspects which I believe the committee would do well to look at, and I believe the committee members will have learnt something as a result of this experience. No matter how competent and experienced officers are in making these judgments, they should learn, and no doubt will learn, from a specific experience. I think in this case they will ask themselves (certainly, it is a question I would ask myself in their position) whether it is wise to entrust this responsibility to men undergoing an indeterminate sentence or a life sentence when perhaps they do not have a sufficiently proximate release goal. There is no doubt that, where a prisoner is in that position, he is placed under stresses and temptations that would not apply to a prisoner who could see a definite date ahead on which he could expect release if he complied with what was expected of him.

That is the question which clearly arises from these facts, and it must be brought home to the members of the committee by the facts of this case. No doubt, they will learn from those facts the importance of looking very closely at a prisoner who does not have a definite release goal, in considering how far he should be placed in a position that must inevitably involve stress and the temptation to escape. Clearly, that is one aspect which presents itself from these facts and from which the committee will learn. I do not doubt that the Chief Secretary has conferred already with the Comptroller of Prisons (Mr. Gard) and indicated his concern about these matters. I can certainly give the assurance on behalf of the Government that the committee will be asked to re-examine its method of assessment and to give special attention to the lessons to be learnt from the experience in this case.

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Attorney-General give the House a summary of the present position relating to the current search for the escapees?

The Hon. L. J. KING: No, I have no information on the precise position regarding the search.

#### UNLEY INTERSECTION

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Transport a reply to my question about installing traffic lights at the intersection of Wattle Street and Unley Road and the suggestion to ensure that new buildings are not erected because this would prevent a "turn left with care" lane from being installed? We are pleased to have the Minister of Transport back, and this is the first question he has been asked since his return.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Highways Department plans to install traffic signals at the intersection of Unley Road and Wattle Street, but detailed design work has

not yet been carried out. It is expected that the signals will be installed during the 1974-75 financial year. The department has no current proposal to install a left-turn slip lane at this location.

#### LABOUR RELATIONS

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry send a letter of congratulation to the Commonwealth Minister for Labour regarding his stand and that of the Australian Government, first, for stopping the overseas labour recruitment drive of Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited; and, secondly, after certain assurances from that company, for allowing such recruitment to recommence? During the last week what I consider to be a most worthwhile agreement has been reached in Whyalla between B.H.P. Company and the trade union movement regarding increases and overaward payments made by that company. I believe that the role played by the Commonwealth Minister regarding overseas recruitment by the company was an important factor in the company's decision to change from its past policy of non-co-operation and to adopt a more realistic approach to solving its labour problems.

The Hon. D. H. MCKEE: It is pleasing to hear from the honourable member that people in Whyalla have benefited in some way from the statement by the Commonwealth Minister for Labour (Mr. Cameron). Although at the time the company was most critical of the Minister's statement, it caused the company to look at the problem and realize that the situation needed upgrading. I think it would be a good thing if other industries similarly placed regarding the labour force were to do likewise. This would facilitate the recruiting of labour not only for industries in isolated areas but also for industries to which it is difficult to attract labour. I shall have pleasure in conveying to the Commonwealth Minister the honourable member's remarks and congratulations.

#### GARBAGE DISPOSAL

Mr. HOPGOOD: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether the Government has been involved in investigating a process described in today's newspaper whereby garbage can be converted into building bricks? As I am aware that the Government is committed to a scheme of co-ordinating garbage disposal, I imagine that any scheme whereby this material could be put to productive use would commend itself to the Government.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am aware of the process to which the honourable member refers and which was reported on briefly in this morning's paper. The Government is interested in the process, and I understand that discussions on it have been held with the Industrial Development Branch of the Department of the Premier and of Development. My own department is also interested in the process, and I hope that, as a result of discussions being held, action can be taken in this State that will help solve our garbage disposal problems. I am sure that this sort of activity would be a useful undertaking.

#### PARKING OFFENCES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Local Government inquire of the Adelaide City Council about giving stickers to those believed to have committed parking offences and especially about one incident that I shall explain? Yesterday, I went to Channel 9 television studios to take part in a segment on *Newsbeat* and, while there, I saw the first segment of that programme which was subsequently shown last evening. It concerned an incident in Grenfell Street, city, yesterday in which it was alleged by a motorist,

who had been in touch with *Newsbeat* and who was shown on the film, that the car in question had been in a 15-minute parking or loading zone for about three hours and had not been booked, although cars on either side of it had been booked. To sum it up, the inference to be drawn from the segment was that this car had not been booked for reasons which were not given and which must give rise to suspicion. I shall say no more about it than that. However, because of the seriousness of the inference, because of the public interest that must be engendered as a result, and because no innocent explanation has yet been offered publicly or privately, so far as I am aware, for what happened, I ask the Minister, because, although I realize that he has no direct responsibility for this, he is the liaison between Parliament and local government, whether he will make the inquiry to which I have referred.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will direct the question to the Adelaide City Council, asking whether the council wishes to comment.

#### INGLE FARM ROADS

Mr. WELLS: Has the Minister of Transport a reply to my recent question concerning certain roads at Ingle Farm?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Sullivan Road and Nelson Road section of Montague Road should be completed this year. Work should be continued between Nelson Road and Kelly Road, west of Sullivan Road and east of Kelly Road in following years. Work on Nelson Road between Montague Road and Bridge Road is in progress and should continue until completed. One of the ultimate dual carriageways should be completed in 1976 and the other some three years later. No work on other sections of Nelson Road is programmed. Both the above programmes are subject to the availability of funds and no delays in preconstructional activities. The Highways Department has no present plans for installing school crossings on either road. The normal procedure is for local government to initiate such proposals and to seek Road Traffic Board approval.

#### MURRAY RIVER LEVELS

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked yesterday concerning expected levels of the Murray River?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This morning I asked the Engineer-in-Chief what would be the likely levels of the Murray River. Whilst away from Adelaide I heard several news items concerning Murray River levels. Some time ago I indicated that the expected flow of the Murray River would be about 25 000 cusecs. This estimate has now been increased to between 31 000 and 32 000 cusecs, the full weight of which is expected to be felt in our parts of the river during early November. It is not expected there will be anything other than a high river and this will probably last until about Christmas. There could be isolated pockets of flooding and the Engineer-in-Chief mentioned Mannum in this regard. Although the Loxton caravan park was also mentioned, I believe that this has been designed to cope with high river levels. There is no real concern so far as South Australia is concerned, but the situation is being watched closely, for there is confusion within the department because of the news items that are appearing in other States, especially in Victoria. The Engineer-in-Chief assures me that at present there is no cause for alarm and, if there is any change whereby people need to be warned or told about expected damage, that information will be given as quickly as possible.

#### LAND VALUES

Mr. CHAPMAN: In the absence of the Premier, can the Minister of Works explain how the Government can be consistent in supporting a proposal to control land prices up to a maximum increase of 7 per cent a year, while at the same time the Valuation Department is increasing land valuations in this State by 100 per cent, 200 per cent, and 300 per cent? A report in the *Advertiser* of July 25 quoted the Premier as saying in this House on July 24 that control of land prices would continue for an indefinite period in the metropolitan area. The Premier also said that the proposed legislation was intended to control the price of vacant allotments, and consequently no exemption of the application of the 7 per cent mark-up would be made in respect of land sold at auction. I take it the Premier was also referring there to land sold by other methods.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think that the honourable member will agree with me that the effect of the action of this Government in allowing only a 7 per cent increase in any year in the value of a block of land purchased after a certain period will be to reduce valuations placed on a block (and this is what the honourable member is concerned about), whether they be assessed on annual values or in accordance with the Land Tax Act. The effect of the move by the Government will be to keep down the increase in valuations. The very reason why the honourable member sees at this stage increases of 100 per cent or 200 per cent in valuations of land for taxation purposes is that there has been no control at all in this State of increases in the price of land. From past experience, the honourable member will know that officers of the Valuation Department work on prices from current sales of land in a given area. When selling a property, whether in the South-East, on Kangaroo Island, or in the metropolitan area of Adelaide, no-one seems to think that, if he makes 200 per cent, 300 per cent, or 400 per cent profit on that sale, it must have an effect on the valuation, for taxation purposes, of that land and surrounding land.

Mr. Gunn: That includes the Government!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I reiterate that, if the proposition put forward by the Government works (and I hope it does), the effect in future years on valuations by the Valuation Department will be that they should increase by only 7 per cent, not by 200 per cent. Surely that is clear. As the honourable member will know, with regard to land tax, quinquennial assessments are made. Although we have seen steep increases in this tax, they only reflect the increases in prices paid for land in a given area.

Mr. Chapman: The action of both parties is simultaneous?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I hope that it works out that way. Surely the honourable member can see that the Government's proposal will not only have the effect of keeping prices down and of stopping speculators from doing what they have been doing for years: it will also have a big effect on the valuations made for taxation purposes.

#### SOUTH ROAD CROSSING

Mr. WRIGHT: Has the Minister of Transport a reply to my question of August 23 about the St. Joseph's school crossing on South Road, near Kintore Avenue?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Highways Department has received a recent communication from St. Joseph's school pointing out the various difficulties associated with the school crossing in its present situation. Therefore, an

investigation is currently being carried out to establish the most suitable course of action, recognizing that the safety and welfare of the schoolchildren is of great importance.

#### HOSPITAL PATIENTS

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about the discharge of hospital patients?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Minister of Health states that, when patients are to be discharged either from the wards or from casualty in the Royal Adelaide Hospital, it is firm policy to take into consideration the social situation before making the final decision as to placement. However, in some cases it is difficult to obtain accurate information and there are occasions when information obtained is misleading. In all cases, patients who are discharged are provided with a letter to their local medical practitioner. In those cases where patients are sent to the Royal Adelaide Hospital with a letter from their local medical practitioner and it is judged that admission is not necessary, every effort is made to contact the local medical officer to discuss the decision with him. As a means of avoiding situations as described by the honourable member, consideration is being given to means by which accurate social information about patients may be obtained for the guidance of hospital staff.

#### PAY-ROLL TAX

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Premier consider amending the Pay-roll Tax Act, 1971, to exclude Centennial Park Cemetery Trust Incorporated and similar organizations from having to pay pay-roll tax? The trust board has approached me, contending that at present a discriminatory provision in the Act results in the fact that competitors of this trust, such as the Enfield General Cemetery Trust, the West Terrace cemetery, and the Dudley Park cemetery, benefit by not having to pay pay-roll tax. The board points out to me that there is an ever-increasing problem in keeping costs down, and it asks that the Act be examined with a view to having it amended along the lines suggested.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is most difficult for us to revise the Pay-roll Tax Act to provide for exemptions in South Australia that do not exist elsewhere. All questions of further exemptions would have to be referred to a meeting of State Treasurers, who would examine the general proposals for exemptions in any amendments. Although I cannot promise the honourable member that in the reasonably foreseeable future we can comply with his request, we will look at the matter he is talking about.

#### PORK PRICES

Mr. McANANEY: Yesterday the Premier informed me that he had a reply to my question on pork prices. Does he have it with him today?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs has supplied the following comparative figures relating to average pork prices at the abattoirs market and for retail sales for July from 1970 to 1973 inclusive:

	July prices in cents a pound				Increase since 1970
	1970	1971	1972	1973	
Average abattoirs price (including killing charges)	29.3	34.8	30.9	34.3	5.0
Average retail return.....	47.4	53.2	52.9	56.0	8.6

The increase of 5c a pound in the average abattoirs price includes increases in slaughtering fees of about 2c a pound. Following the introduction by the abattoirs of a minimum charge based on an economical run of 10 pigs at a time,

more butchers are now obtaining their supplies from wholesalers at higher than average abattoirs prices. In comparing the increase in the average retail return with the increase in the average abattoirs price, the following factors should also be taken into account: (1) A carcass yields about 80 per cent of saleable cuts; and (2) award wage rates for butchers have increased by approximately 40 per cent. On average, this alone is equivalent to a cost increase in excess of 2c a pound.

#### NORTH-EAST ROAD

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Transport a reply to the question I asked on August 28 regarding widening and reconstruction of North-East Road at Modbury?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Subject to the availability of funds, and the finalization of outstanding land acquisition, work on the North-East Road between Modbury and Hancock Road is expected to be completed by August, 1974. Work is being carried out in stages and, when sections are completed, they will be opened to traffic as soon as practicable.

#### GLADSTONE PRISON

Mr. VENNING: Yesterday the Attorney-General indicated that he had a reply from the Chief Secretary to a question I asked on June 20 regarding the future of Gladstone Prison, and I should be pleased if he would now give me the reply.

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague states that the report of the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee was tabled after the question asked by the honourable member had been answered, and before then no information was available regarding any recommendations to be made by the committee. It is not possible to forecast the future of Gladstone Prison in isolation, however, and the total recommendations of the committee must be examined in detail and decisions made on priorities of whatever new institutions are to be provided.

#### PORT LINCOLN HOSPITAL

Mr. GUNN: The Attorney-General informed me yesterday that he had a reply from the Minister of Health to the question I asked during the debate on the Loan Estimates regarding work at the Port Lincoln Hospital, and I should be pleased if he would give me that reply now.

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague states that preliminary investigations are in hand for the further development of Port Lincoln Hospital. It is contemplated that the new maternity section will be accommodated in a floor to be added to the main building, and the present maternity section, when vacated, will be devoted to accommodation of chronic and geriatric patients. Additional residential accommodation is also to be provided for nursing staff.

#### PATENTS

Mr. DUNCAN: Has the Minister of Transport a reply to the question I asked on August 23 regarding the patent rights to an electric motor car being developed at Flinders University?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Any patents that are developed as a result of the work being carried out on the electric car at Flinders University will be jointly and equally owned by the South Australian Government and Flinders University. The project is being administered through the Industrial Research Institute and funded by my department. The Industrial Research Institute was established particularly for bringing together research and development skills

available throughout South Australia so as to provide the best possible opportunity for development of industry within the State. The many discussions that the development team at Flinders University has had with South Australian industrialists augurs well for the possible production of any such vehicle in this State.

#### TOLDEROL POINT

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to the question I asked on August 2 regarding development of Tolderol Point?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: To date \$7,300 has been spent at the Tolderol Game Reserve, in addition to the development of the area as a game reserve, for the conservation of wild life and the management of game. It is proposed to develop the area as an experimental area for the growing of waterfowl food, including both plants and micro fauna. This latter development will concentrate on the growing of native food plants, including the salt-tolerant species of the genus *Scirpus*. Information gained from current experiments and further trials will be used elsewhere in the State.

#### RESIDENT MEDICAL OFFICERS

Mr. PAYNE: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Health to my question of August 16 regarding the duty periods of resident medical officers?

The Hon. L. I. KING: My colleague states that information received from the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital confirms that resident medical officers are not rostered for duty periods in excess of 340 hours over a four week cycle, which is the maximum level of duty hours suggested in the relevant award. In most instances the duty periods rostered are well below this maximum level. In certain areas of the hospitals, such as the casualty departments, medical staff rosters are based on 60 hours each week and it is possible to spread duty times relatively evenly from one week to the next. In other areas, when continuity of patient care is required for longer periods, rostered duties can be less evenly spread, with some weeks of duty times being higher than others. In no instance, however, do rostered duty times amount to 120 hours in any one week. Should medical staff be "called back" by the hospitals for additional work in the event of emergencies, separate, additional payments are made. Some resident doctors, however, prefer, of their own volition rather than of necessity, to call in to the wards even on days on which they are rostered off duty in order to maintain close contacts with their patients. It could be this last reason rather than the specified rostered hours of duty which led to the claim made over the radio of 120 hours a week being worked uninterruptedly over a six-month period.

#### AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to give an assurance to Parliament that primary producer organizations will be consulted before the head office of the Agriculture Department is relocated? I ask this question for two reasons. The first is that the Agriculture Department is primarily an advisory organization and, as such, should be available and readily accessible to most primary producers. Many farmers have occasion to visit Adelaide and usually avail themselves of the opportunity to confer with officers of the department but, if the department were to be relocated away from the city, it would be impracticable for farmers to avail themselves of this service. If the department were located at Monarto, it would be impracticable for primary producers to the north

and west of Adelaide to maintain a close association with departmental officers. My second reason for asking the question is that there is reported unrest amongst employees in the department, and a relocation could result in wholesale resignations.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to take up the matter with my colleague, asking him to consider the honourable member's comments. I should have thought that the most desirable thing to do so far as the honourable member's constituents were concerned would be to decentralize the department. In that case, the farmers would not have to come to the city to seek advice.

#### POLICE CADETS

Mr. DUNCAN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary whether it is the policy of the Police Department to reject applications for cadetships in the Police Department from persons who have appeared before the courts when juveniles and pleaded guilty to minor offences, even in cases where no conviction has been recorded? If this is the department's policy, will the Attorney ask his colleague to consider altering it to provide a more flexible approach and one more in line with modern juvenile sentencing practice? The son of one of my constituents was charged with shop-stealing at the age of 13 years. He pleaded guilty in the Juvenile Court and was placed on a 12-month good behaviour bond without a conviction being recorded. He kept to the terms of the bond and, when 14 years of age, he was discharged. On the information I have, he did not cause the Police Department any further difficulties and, more than four years after committing the offence, he has applied to join the Police Force. I am instructed that he has a good scholastic record but was rejected, without having his application considered properly, because of the juvenile offence. Will the Attorney ask his colleague to examine this matter and explain the position?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes, I certainly will. I will ask the Chief Secretary to consider the matter generally, and I shall be obliged if the honourable member will give particulars of the case to my colleague so that he will have that information when he is examining the matter.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE: MR. NANKIVELL

Mr. EVANS moved:

That one months leave of absence be granted to the member for Mallee (Mr. W. F. Nankivell) on account of absence overseas on Commonwealth Parliamentary Association business.

Motion carried.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE: MR. RODDA

Mr. EVANS moved:

That three months leave of absence be granted to the member for Victoria (Mr. W. A. Rodda) on account of absence overseas on Commonwealth Parliamentary Association business.

Motion carried.

#### WET-LANDS

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I move:

That in the opinion of this House all remaining available wet-lands in South Australia should be preserved for the conservation of wild life, and where possible former wet-lands should be rehabilitated.

South Australia is desperately short of wet-lands, and even the smallest areas should be preserved. Our wet-lands are an extremely important part of the environment, and the greatest hazard our water birds face today is the reduction

of their natural habitat. This far outweighs any other pressures by mankind. During the recent drought throughout Australia, the swamplands of the Murray River system abounded in bird life, as the area was used by thousands of wading birds and by most species of duck. Many would have died had these waterways not been available, and over the years many thousands of hectares of prime wet-lands has been destroyed for drainage and agricultural purposes.

I believe that the terms of reference under which bodies such as the River Murray Commission, the Engineering and Water Supply Department and other Government departments, and the South-Eastern Drainage Board operate should consider the effects of projects on wild life conservation and on environment. In the last fortnight I have travelled through the North of the State and, when flying over that area, have seen the vast wet-land areas. These areas are temporary, and when the country dries up permanent wet-lands will be needed to support the large increase in bird life that will have bred in these temporary wet-land areas. Much knowledge is available in the National Parks and Wildlife Service, in which competent officers operate, and in the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, and these officers have the ability and the knowledge to do the work required to safeguard the fauna, especially waterfowl.

Generally, Australia would be between 20 years and 30 years behind the United Kingdom and the United States of America in work concerning the habitat and protection of the environment of wild life. Probably, Victoria is leading Australia in this regard, because the Victorian Government for several years has recognized the problems and is doing much work. However, recognition of these problems is spreading throughout Australia. *Victorian Resources* is a magazine published in Victoria, and I quote from an article prepared by Mr. P. G. Brown. Mr. Brown is the President of the Victorian Field and Game Association and also the nominee on the Conservation Council of Victoria, and his article concerning the value of wet-lands states:

In the past, wet-lands were valued solely on their agricultural value and no attention was paid to their value for other purposes. When wet-lands areas are being valued for Government purchase even today the valuer must base his calculations on agricultural value, because no other yardstick has been provided, as yet, for him to use. This is an area which requires research. I believe that the agricultural value of these areas is insignificant when compared with the value of the areas to the community for other purposes.

Without research it is difficult to put a monetary value on wet-lands but these areas obviously have a value in each of the following ways: conservation of flora and fauna; production of fauna beneficial to man—for example, the ibis; hunting, fishing, tourism; passive recreation; and recharge of underground water aquifers.

Let us look at the value to the community of each of the above.

Conservation of flora and fauna: the list of both flora and fauna species which are dependent upon wet-lands habitat is extensive and, for this reason alone, wet-lands must play a big part in any conservation programme. The Australian Committee on Waterbirds set up by the fauna author ties of Australia lists 93 species of birds alone which are dependent upon wet-lands areas for the whole or a significant part of their habitat.

Production of fauna beneficial to man: any valuation put on wet-lands must consider the part these areas play in breeding or sustaining species beneficial to man. The most notable of these species is the ibis, whose work has been recognized by man ever since it became sacred to the Egyptians in the days of the Pharaohs. Research has shown that 5 000 ibis will eat one ton of insects a day, and an inspection of the paddock after a flock of ibis has been over it will show how well they do their job. In 1971, when a locust plague was feared in northern Victoria near

Barmah Forest, landholders were issued with insecticide to spray the swarms but, due to the work of birds, particularly ibis, which came out of the forest to feed on the insects, this was not necessary.

In addition to reducing costs to the farmer there was the beneficial effect on the environment of less insecticide being used. Tragowel Swamp, a 700 acre (283.3 ha) area of wet-land south of Kerang, is a prime example of wet-land which can be used for breeding and sustaining fauna beneficial to man. After many years of strenuous efforts by the Field and Game Association and other interested groups, the Crown land section of the swamp has recently been declared a game refuge. When the water conditions are right this area supports a high ibis colony which has been estimated to breed up to 250 000 ibis in one season. If each ibis were valued at only \$1 it would make this swamp the most valuable land in the district for this one purpose alone.

This point is extremely important. To all intents and purposes this is biological control rather than chemical control, and chemical control has caused many of the agricultural problems. This development is an extremely valuable asset to the farmer. I refer also to a report from the House of Representatives Select Committee on Wildlife Conservation under the heading "Wet-lands and swamps", as follows:

94. Apart from fish, waterfowl constitutes the major game species in Australia.
95. Hunting game species can, in the committee's view, be regarded as a legitimate use of some species of wild-life, provided that the hunter is prepared to contribute towards the cost of conservation. All hunting organizations appearing before the committee indicated that they were prepared to contribute—in the form of licence fees. The committee believes that the sport should be properly controlled. Species taken should be from populations which are correctly managed to produce a continuous surplus. Numbers should be regularly monitored so that the effects of hunting can be evaluated.
96. It is generally agreed that waterfowl are declining in numbers as a result of the encroachment of agriculture and the resultant drainage of swamp land, the damming of rivers, flood mitigation programmes and the trampling by stock and feral animals of nesting cover on the edge of lagoons. The flow of most rivers has been reduced by water conservation and flood mitigation schemes. Many of the most productive (in wild life terms) swamps have been drained.
97. The value of waterfowl has rarely, if ever, been given consideration when water reclamation and conservation schemes have been implemented.
98. Australia is the poorest continent in relation to the number of species and the size of the populations of waterfowl that it supports.
99. There are 19 species which differ widely in habitat and ecology. Three broad groups are recognizable:
  - (a) Northern: this includes the magpie goose, "whistling" duck, Burdekin duck and pigmy goose. These birds are generally restricted to the coastal tropics and sub-tropics.
  - (b) Southern: this includes the Cape Barren goose, black swan, mountain duck, chestnut teal, freckled duck, shoveler, musk duck and blue-billed duck. The main distribution of these species is south of latitude 27°S.
  - (c) Continental: this includes the grey teal, pink-eared duck, black duck, hardhead and wood duck which are found throughout the continent. The species use different regions as breeding and refuge areas at different times according to rainfall conditions.
100. In the inland areas, many of the common game ducks have breeding seasons which are directly related to water level changes in the swamps and billabongs. Although some breeding occurs each year, extensive breeding takes place only when lagoons and billabongs are replenished or when water spreads across the plain. The whole trend of water conservation on the inland river system is to diminish or prevent this flooding. This restricts waterfowl breeding.

101. Methods should be developed to maintain coastal refuges and replenish adequate inland swamps and billabongs. This would go far towards ensuring the survival of all waterfowl.

This confirms my comments regarding the South-East. True, the South-Eastern Drainage Board has done an excellent job in following its terms of reference. It has effectively drained the South-East, but past areas of natural habitat of wild life are now used for agriculture, and natural breeding previously carried out in the South-East is no longer possible or exists. I believe that water should be used before being returned to the sea, and that it should be fed through a chain of man-made wet-lands and be then returned to the sea, but only after we have used the water. I believe that much of the water drained from the South-East could be fed (as was done in the past) into the south-eastern end of the Coorong. This would upgrade one of the rare areas in which natural fauna can breed and exist. By this means we can restore the Coorong to its natural state so that it can carry the wild life and waterfowl population that it used to carry. The report continues:

102. Many wild life conservationists regard protection as the main obligation to native fauna and cannot accept the idea of conserving for hunting.
103. The committee believes that waterfowl conservation is justified by its value as a game species and as a natural resource, and because of aesthetic values.
104. The committee recognizes that habitat destruction is by far the most important threat to wild life populations and believes effective waterfowl conservation depends on a recognition of the threat to these populations and an appreciation of their value as a natural resource.

The report concludes:

That when water reclamation and conservation schemes are being planned their effects on waterfowl and waterfowl breeding grounds be considered.

All bodies, organizations and Government departments whose activities affect the development of the State should consider the habitat of waterfowl and the natural environment in making provision for the projects on which they are working.

This problem was recognized in America many years ago. America went through the stage we are now going through where all the available land was developed for farming. Swamp lands and wet areas were dried up and used for farming. True, in North America the situation applying to the breeding of waterfowl is somewhat different from that taking place here. Waterfowl migrate south from Canada and back again for the breeding season. However, with the drying up of natural swamp lands and other wet areas that pattern was interrupted, because there was no place for the birds to migrate to and a great percentage of the waterfowl population perished, there being nowhere for them to stop over on their migratory pattern south.

I now refer to a voluntary organization existing in Canada and the United States called "Ducks Unlimited" and to an article by its national trustee (Mr. Martin Winton, of Fresno), as follows:

If you are not familiar with North American waterfowl we raise between 70 per cent and 80 per cent of all of the ducks on the North American flyways in Canada. Shortly after the First World War, farmers in trying to develop wheat land in Canada drained many of the large marshes. Other large areas needed extensive projects built so that water could be held on the prairie. So to protect the waterfowl Ducks Unlimited, Inc., of the United States of America, and Ducks Unlimited (Canada) were born. It became the duty of the Canadian group to supply the land and all necessary permits and to do the work. Ducks Unlimited U.S.A. was to raise the money, send it to Canada . . . Since the late 1930's Americans have sent over \$18,000,000 to our Canadian neighbours. We hope to be able to send \$20,000,000 more in the next 10 years. All

of us agree this is the amount the Canadians must have if we are going to develop the wet-lands and the open space necessary.

So it is not a cheap matter to return reclaimed land to its native state. The American Government, recognizing this, has adopted an attitude different from that adopted in Australia. I quote an amendment to an American Act, known as the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act, of 1937, as follows:

The first sentence of section 3 of the . . . Act of September, 1937 . . . is amended to read as follows: "An amount equal to all revenues accruing each fiscal year . . . from any tax imposed on specified articles by section 4181 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 . . . shall, subject to the exemptions in section 4182 of such Code, be covered into the Federal aid to wild life restoration fund in the Treasury . . . and is authorized to be appropriated and made available until expended to carry out the purposes of this Act."

Under that amendment, all moneys collected through licence fees and other charges on the relevant sporting organizations interested in waterfowl must go into a special fund for the development and protection of habitats and for restoring natural facilities. In relation to our own national parks, I believe that we should seriously consider using hunting organizations, under the supervision of departmental officers, for the purposes of controlling vermin. At present, large quantities of 1080 and lucijet are used to control vermin, but this is mostly a hit-and-miss process that destroys much of the bird life and animal life that we are trying to conserve. I believe that, under the direct supervision of departmental officers, greater use can be made of the people concerned in order to control vermin, and this would help remove undesirable elements from game reserves. If the department examines this matter, it should see the value of this suggestion in preference to using poisons such as 1080.

The wet-land areas of this State today are totally inadequate to carry the wild life population that will be evident within the next few months, and I believe that, if the activities of those departments concerned with our environment and especially with the wet-lands of this State include a consideration of the effects on wild life to which I have referred, this State will soon lead Australia in developing and conserving our native wild life, especially waterfowl. I commend the motion to the House and hope that it will receive the support of all members. This matter has not been raised in an effort to take a rise out of the Government: it involves a problem that has existed for many years and, as long as we recognize this problem and change our thinking, the present trend can be changed and we can revert to a stage where South Australia will be taking adequate care in developing our wild life species.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### PREMIERS' CONFERENCES

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of Opposition): I move:

That this House supports the practice of regular meetings of all State Premiers with the Prime Minister in consultation on mutual matters of interest to the States and Commonwealth.

I believe that this motion can be carried without undue delay, and I think all members will appreciate its import. A newspaper item of August 20, under the byline of Brett Bayly, states that the Prime Minister was considering discontinuing the system of holding Premiers' Conferences. In fact, one recalls that last February the normal procedure of holding these conferences was denied State Premiers, who were not called together until May, 1973, when inflation was starting to cause a considerable problem.

After that meeting, certain action was to be taken by various State departmental officers and reports were to be made at the Premiers' Conference to be held in June, although no clear indication has been given to the public of the nature of the officers' inquiry and no apparent action has been taken.

However, I believe that the Premier, through statements he has made in this House, is firmly convinced that Premiers' Conferences should be continued in order to discuss not only financial matters but also a wide range of subjects which will be of mutual advantage to all the States. The situation requiring consultation between a Premier and the Prime Minister will always arise, and I believe that specific projects of national importance should be discussed regularly by all Premiers and the Prime Minister. I cannot accept the situation that occurred in Sydney last week, where a rather unusual Premiers' Conference was held around the dinner table, and the Premiers were completely denied the opportunity of receiving the advice that would normally be available to them on such occasions. I fully agree with the attitude adopted on that occasion by the Premier of Queensland in refusing to attend the discussions because the full purpose of the discussions to be undertaken over the dinner table were not made known in advance to the participating Premiers.

I believe we need a Premiers' Conference which is purposeful, which has a definite agenda but where there is the opportunity to go beyond that agenda if necessary, where the necessary supporting staff is available for the Premiers, be it in the legal or economic field, and where adequate preparation has been possible. On August 21, in answer to questions by the member for Torrens and the member for Bragg, the Premier clearly indicated that the action to destroy the concept of the Premiers' Conference was not in line with current Labor Party policy. I hope the word "current" that he interposed into his reply does not suggest that there is a possibility of the Labor Party's changing its policy in the future and that there will be a move away from the acceptance of the Premiers' Conference format. I do not intend to speak further this afternoon, because I believe that the public announcement made by the Premier on August 21 means that we can expect the full support of this House for this motion and that it can go ahead without undue delay, certainly within the next few minutes.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I do not oppose this motion. However, I point out that the business of government in Australia requires constant consultation and communication between those at every representative level of government, and that communication and consultation must be not only formal but informal. In fact, in the process of consultation with the States we have had many times the amount of consultation from the present Commonwealth Government than has been the case with its predecessor. Time after time it proved, under the Liberal Party in Canberra, impossible to get consultation not only between Premiers and Prime Ministers but between Ministers in various disciplines, and the amount of steady refusal by previous Commonwealth Governments to consult with the States formally or informally was amazing.

I can cite numbers of instances of this to members opposite. In the housing area, for instance, it took us years to get a meeting with the Commonwealth Minister for Housing: Dame Annabelle Rankine refused over a two-year period to meet with State Housing Ministers, and it was not possible to get a meeting with her successor until after a new housing arrangement had been announced by

the Liberal Commonwealth Government without any consultation with the States. I went to Canberra for a subsequent meeting to find that Liberal Housing Ministers from other States had to say some things that made me feel quite at home. It was as if I was at a meeting where members of the Liberal Movement and the Liberal and Country League were present.

Mr. Coumbe: It reminded you of Surfers Paradise.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Certainly, the language was a little more colourful than the honourable member has used on occasions, but not much more. Since that time, at almost every level and area of government we have been able to have regular and constant consultation with Canberra, and much of this has been initiated by the present Commonwealth Government. I applaud this, and I believe it should continue on every possible occasion when we can talk to one another: I think that is essential. I signal my complete and utter disagreement with the Leader of the Opposition in his support of Mr. Bjelke-Petersen's utter stupidity last week, and I use those words advisedly. His Liberal colleagues in other States did not agree with Mr. Bjelke-Petersen's refusal to talk with the Prime Minister. I can imagine nothing more absurd than a refusal to talk with the Prime Minister.

Why was it necessary for us to have a formal agenda when it was known that certain specific things needed to be initiated? In fact, the initiation of that meeting came from the Liberal Premier of Victoria. This was completely agreed with by me, and agreed with by me at a time when Mr. Bjelke-Petersen was sitting beside me at that conference and agreed to by him. He only later raised this absurdity that he had to have a formal agenda and his officers beside him, before he could have talks with the Prime Minister about matters of mutual interest. A number of things of vital importance to the States were raised at the dinner without the co-operation of Queensland. I think that was a very ill advised position for the Premier of Queensland to take, and I hope it is a view that will not be taken in future by the Leader of the Opposition. I believe at every level of government there needs to be constant consultation and communication, and it is only in those circumstances that government in this country can work.

Mr. HALL (Goyder): I support this motion, which I believe is innocuous and has little teeth in it. It expresses a very wide opinion and no-one, as the Premier has said, will disagree with me, because there is little in it. The general opinion that it is a good thing for the Premiers to meet with the Prime Minister is really in the hands of the Premiers. I am sure the Prime Minister would always see a Premier, although there have been occasions when Sir Thomas Playford had difficulty in getting interviews in the past with Sir Robert Menzies. There was much publicity about that at the time, and one South Australian Senator was galvanized into action, which was a very rare occasion indeed.

As I see it, the Prime Minister of the day will see Premiers when they collectively want to see him. I have known one or two exceptions to that, but generally speaking the weight of the Premiers' collective opinion that they want a conference with the Prime Minister would be acceded to. Little more can be said to this motion, because it is not contentious. It does not attack the Government, and it is rather typical of the Opposition at the moment in other spheres of the Liberal and Country League. As it is a non-attacking, bland motion and as everyone agrees with it, I, too, agree with it.



Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): It has been suggested that the motion is bland and does not have much point to it. I suggest that it has much point to it, as the Premier has acknowledged. The motion is put forward from the national point of view, South Australia being a vital and integral part of this nation. The co-operation of the Premier of this State and of all the other State Premiers and the Prime Minister is essential. Conferences of this type should continue to be held: in fact, there should be more of them. I listened with interest to the Premier when he spoke about some difficulty in arranging meetings. When I was a Minister, I did not experience this difficulty, and at that time not all Governments in Australia were Liberal Governments. As this is a sensible motion, I am sure that all members will agree with it and with the important sentiments expressed in it.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I thank honourable members for the support they have given to the motion. I notice that the Premier has said that he seeks formal and informal meetings. I accept that, but I point out (and I think he will acknowledge this) that even when informal meetings are held it is necessary in due course to accept formally the decisions arrived at in informal meetings. Certainly that applies in relation to the informal meeting, about which we heard some comment, held at Kirribilli House last week. There is to be a meeting of Premiers in a week or two to formalize the decision made on that occasion. I look forward to a unanimous vote in support of this motion.

Motion carried.

#### PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Mr. HALL (Goyder): I move:

That in view of the confusion surrounding the proposal to build a petro-chemical plant at Redcliffs on Spencer Gulf and the possible conflict that may arise with the Commonwealth Government concerning the export of petroleum liquids, the Government should inform the House:

- (a) whether it has a legally binding letter of intent from every company required to participate in the construction;
- (b) whether it has the unqualified approval of the Commonwealth Government for the export of liquid petroleum from South Australia; and
- (c) whether it will give an absolute assurance that the environment and ecology of Spencer Gulf and its surroundings will be fully protected before any constructions commence.

The motion deals with the proposal (which, as far as we know, is in the publicity stage) to establish a petroleum industry, based on the products of South Australian gas and salt fields, at a place known as Redcliffs. This proposal, which was first referred to at the time of the last State election, has from time to time received some publicity through the South Australian media. In his usual way, the Premier introduced this proposal in a showy fashion to help his electoral chances. I believe it was a wise political move for him to bring up this \$300,000,000 petro-chemical plant to be established at Redcliffs. However, he did not have enough facts to substantiate his publicity at that time, and I believe he seriously and deliberately misled the South Australian public.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Rubbish!

Mr. HALL: The evidence we have gleaned from the media of this State and from other sources indicates that this is the position. The Minister says that this is rubbish. He knows that the Premier claimed that a proper investigation had been made into the environment and ecology and that it had been established that no damage would be done by this industry. Yet, in today's *Advertiser* the special

reporter details the investigations now in progress, with regard to the proposal at Redcliffs, to examine the ecology. These are the investigations that, during the last State election campaign, the Premier said had been done. The Minister of Education can read a book and conveniently ignore that fact, because he cannot successfully interject on the point. It is in black and white that the Premier said this at that time, and it is also in black and white that the investigation into this matter will now go ahead.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Give the exact reference, and don't quote him out of context.

Mr. HALL: I will give that. During the election campaign, I raised the following questions in relation to this project:

What will be the type of chemicals to be produced? Has there been a price arrived at concerning the supply of gas by the producers? Will the company receive a licence to export hydro-carbons? Who will provide the capital to build the pier to deep water, 2½ miles (4 km) out into the gulf? Will the manufacturing company have any Australian content in ownership? Will it have a 51 per cent Australian ownership; if not, what will be the Australian content? Has there been any report that the project is definitely feasible? Is it a fact that there is indeed no agreement, but a set of interdependent conditions which in no way constitute an agreement to proceed?

The Premier continued to state the importance of the project, saying that a United States firm was negotiating about it. It was then pointed out in the *Advertiser* of March 5, 1973, that the company concerned was the Dow Chemical Company, which would export to Japan, Korea, Taiwan, and other countries from the producing plant at Redcliffs. The Premier insisted that he had a letter of intent. I challenged him, saying that he did not have a legally binding letter of intent.

On a television programme with the Leader of the Opposition during the election campaign, he pointed to a paragraph, in a letter that he said was a letter of intent to proceed. That was all very interesting. My information was that, although he read a paragraph from that letter, it was not a legally binding letter that meant anything with regard to an agreement. The facts of the matter are now revealed, when we find months later that the scene has changed and publicity is no longer being given to the Dow company. A newspaper report on July 21, 1973, headed "Decision on Redcliffs 'in two months'", states:

The company or companies to develop the \$300,000,000 Redcliffs petro-chemical complex should be known in about two months.

At that time, the scene had changed to other companies. If that is the case, what is the position with regard to the first letter of intent? How important was it? How valid was it for the Premier to claim to the people of South Australia that he had a letter of intent to proceed at that time? That question is completely unanswered. I hope that, for his own standing in the community and, more important, for the well-being of the project, the Premier can explain himself.

Mr. Millhouse: The Minister of Education has gone quiet.

Mr. HALL: No doubt he will mouth some words, but whether they will have any meaning is another matter. I have referred to an important point. Was the Premier fooling the public during the election campaign when he claimed, with regard to this plant, that he had a letter of intent? Did he in fact switch from that company to another company or companies at a subsequent date? On August 3, 1973, under the heading "We'll build Redcliffs, say Japanese firms", a newspaper article states:

Two Japanese chemical companies announced today that they would build a plant at Redcliffs in South Australia.

Are these additional companies involved in taking from Redcliffs some further product somewhere else, or are they alternative companies to the company from which the Premier said he had a significant letter of intent? The scene has widened to the stage where it appears that the Premier and his Government are again hawking this proposal around the world to see whom they can get interested in it. The Premier has not disillusioned anyone with that viewpoint and he has not effectively dispelled the concern about his handling of the matter. The second part of my motion states that the Government should tell the House whether it has the unqualified approval of the Commonwealth Government for the export of liquid petroleum from South Australia. I understand one of the factors required to make this an economical plant is that it have an ability to export some of the petroleum fracture.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No.

Mr. HALL: It is that, or the product of petroleum. As I understand it—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Your understanding is very poor.

Mr. HALL: I understand that the petro-chemical plant will use gas or petroleum in liquid form. The Commonwealth Minister for Minerals and Energy (Mr. Connor) has spoken publicly about the export from Australia of materials produced from, or directly constituted of, petroleum. Several matters are attributed to the Minister in a reported statement of April 13 last. Part of the report states:

So a Labor Government says that exclusive control of Australia's fuel and energy resources is much too serious to be left to individual companies, whose present status flows from the absence of a true national fuel and energy policy. Mr. Connor said Labor policy as set down at its Launceston Federal Conference in 1971 provided for such an authority. In the field of petroleum search, production transport and refining there was an obvious need for a national petroleum and minerals authority.

The report contains further speculation as to whether these materials should be exported from Australia. There is in Australia a hardening view, which cuts across political viewpoints, that we should not export petroleum products from this country, because there is a world shortage of petroleum that is almost upon us in terms of planning. There is a hardening feeling that Australia should maintain its petroleum resources for its own use, not for export either in the form in which it is produced from the ground or in refined form.

Doubtless, whether that view is valid will be established by future study and decision, but my motion draws attention to the fact that the people do not know that the companies apparently interested in Redcliffs have permission to export their products, having regard to any future use of Australia's petroleum resources. The Premier also would be in doubt at this stage about what will be the final assessment by the Commonwealth Minister as to whether Australia's petroleum resources will be used to feed the economy of other nations with the product.

The last part of my motion deals with protection of the environment and ecology of Spencer Gulf and its surroundings, and this point raises the most serious aspect of the proposal presented by the Premier during the election campaign. At that time, there were criticisms that the ecology of Spencer Gulf would be threatened by such a chemical works, the basis of concern being that Dow Chemical Company, which then was the company being publicized as the one interested in the project, had a bad record internationally in relation to the pollution of waters adjacent to its plant and that the company was (and, I believe, still is) subject to law suits regarding damage to the environment around its plants, particularly in Canada.

The Premier commented on this concern by saying that the necessary investigations had been made. He used the name of the Fisheries Department in relation to these investigations and he dismissed any concern about the ecology, in the sense that his Government had found out that everything was all right and the plant could go ahead with the knowledge the Government had. However, when the Premier was challenged, we found that the Fisheries Department had no knowledge of the report that it was supposed to have produced for the Premier. When questioned earlier this session, the best the Premier could do was say that he had lost the page. That was the best answer he could bring to this House when he was questioned about the so-called report that the Fisheries Department and his Department of the Premier and of Development were supposed to have got on this issue.

I suppose that even the most dubious person may have been taken in by the statement about the loss of a page from a report. However, today's *Advertiser* contains a report headed "The \$300,000,000 Redcliffs project hangs on their work". Apparently, the position is not as the Premier stated it during the last election campaign when he said that the investigation had taken care of the ecology, because the research is being undertaken now and apparently the construction of the plant depends on this research. To illustrate my point, I shall quote from the report to which I have referred. It states:

They didn't look very important people—just two men and a girl in a boat . . . but this trio is fishing for the future. On their work hangs the future of the giant \$300,000,000 Redcliffs petro-chemical project. The South Australian Government and huge industrial consortiums wait on their report.

Apparently, they were not waiting on that report during the election campaign. I see that the Premier is getting a little agitated about this.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Irritated!

Mr. HALL: The Premier said that we could proceed and that these matters were not in question, having been taken care of. Suddenly, since that time the matters have arisen and a report that will cost \$80,000 is being prepared. We shall be able to read about that investigation. We could not read a report last March, because it had not been begun, although the Premier had said it had been. The newspaper report also states that these people were just easing themselves into their wetsuits in readiness for the first of the day's dives to the seabed to bring up samples of marine life for analysis and recording. Then the report states:

This preliminary study—

and I emphasize "preliminary"—

by the State Department of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation will take two weeks and is designed to prepare the groundwork and define the problems for the major investigation which will follow.

Either this reporter has been misled seriously or the Premier was deceitful during the election campaign: they cannot both be correct. There is no point in reading more of that newspaper report, as the position has been stated clearly. The Premier, if he likes, can say that the report is wrong and that these people are not out in Spencer Gulf doing the preliminary study. That is all he can say, unless he admits that he misled the South Australian public in March last. The whole question of Redcliffs becomes deeper when we consider the attitude of other countries to pollution. Those who have spent some time in Japan in recent years would know (and I have spoken to people who have returned from there recently) of the growing awareness in Japan of the need to take urgent action in their areas of

industrial production, which is one of the most polluted areas on earth. As seen by some Japanese, this action is to place the pollution-making plants outside Japan. A fairly widely held view in that country at present is that the best way to get pollution out of Japan is to place the dirty productive work in some other country: that is good sense from the Japanese point of view. I quote from an article in *News Week* of April 2 this year, in which there is a reference to the general pollutant effect on Japan. The paragraph, which is not out of context, states:

As public outrage over pollution has mounted, industry has been making belated efforts to control the damage caused by its waste materials. The Government has pushed through a series of laws designed to control air, water and soil contamination. Prime Minister Kakuei Tanaka has devised a multibillion-dollar scheme to "remodel" Japan by dispersing industry from polluted urban areas to the countryside. But so far the measures have been far from effective, and the Tanaka Government has set its sights on a continuing growth rate of 10 per cent a year—a rate that is incompatible with a serious effort to control pollution. "The only real answer," says one Japanese expert, "is to move our industries abroad, to countries where raw materials are available. Only then can we hope for an improvement in the quality of our life."

It is one thing for the Premier and his Government to begin now a belated inquiry into the ecology of Spencer Gulf concerning the Redcliffs project, but Parliament does not know how polluting will be the plant that is to be placed at Redcliffs. We need more than a verbal report from the Premier who has, in the past, been proved to be wrong by events subsequent to the March State election, and to have misled the State. We should not rely on his verbal assurance that the plant will not pollute Spencer Gulf. A substantive committee report on that situation is needed. It is too important a matter to be entrusted to the type of haphazard and *ad hoc* management that the Premier has brought to the scheme, which he revealed for election purposes earlier this year. My motion is framed in a way that will enable the Premier to reply to it.

I hope that he will reply, not in the public relation sense of smoothing out or giving an assurance, but that he will give proof on every point. If he can prove the points to the satisfaction of this side I shall be pleased, but I am greatly displeased with his statements about this matter during the past few months. It is not worthy of the proper leadership of industrial development in this State to have this matter misused for political purposes, to have it misrepresented, and to misuse Government departments in the way in which the Premier has attributed to them reports that he answers by saying, "I did not know that, because I lost the page." That behaviour will not impress companies involved in negotiations, will not enhance public regard for industrial development in this State, and will not attract benefits from other States to South Australia. I have moved a three-pointed motion, hoping that the Premier will have his department report on it, and that he will be able to prove the points which, no doubt, he will verbally maintain.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I oppose the motion. The honourable member has moved it in a manner that I think is consistent with his public performances in this State: I think it has been a disgraceful one. I am reminded, when listening to the honourable member, of the time when the natural gas pipelines Bill was originally before the House. The honourable member was then the Leader of the Opposition, and he consulted with people who were subsequently consultants to the Government and who told the Government

of what had transpired. They advised the honourable member that the Bill was a proper one and that only one or two minor aspects could be criticized. The honourable member said, "That is no use to me. I wanted you to tell me that this Bill was no good so that I could give Frank Walsh the works." That is the basis on which the honourable member has proceeded in public life in this State and the way he has proceeded with this motion. It is not a matter of benefit to the people of this State or of a great project that could provide an additional basis of stable employment in the northern area of this State: he has used this project merely as a matter of political abuse and nothing more. At no stage has the honourable member suggested that anything done by this Government has been of any benefit to this State whatever.

Mr. Millhouse: That's very true, of course.

Mr. Hall: You've lost Dartmouth for us.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Let us look back at the way the honourable member has proceeded in responsible politics within the State. The honourable member well knows that many matters he introduced as Premier I supported as Leader of the Opposition, even when they were unpopular, because I believed them to be right. I gave him full credit, and that is the attitude that has always been taken by members on this side and by members of the Liberal Party in this State. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has taken the same attitude, and I believe that that is right, responsible, and proper, but never has the member for Goyder taken such an attitude, because to him politics in this State is merely a matter of egocentricity and nothing more, and that has been his attitude in respect of this project. The honourable member wants to know whether the Government has legally binding letters of intent from every company required to participate in the construction of this project. Well, we have two legally binding letters of intent. They would be legally binding if we had accepted them, but they are legally binding offers. What is the situation here? I detailed this to the House previously. The member for Goyder originally said that I had not any letters of intent.

Mr. Hall: Legally binding?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No; the honourable member did not say that originally. He said that I had lied to the public, that I had no letter of intent at all. I tabled the letter of intent and, if the honourable member had been man enough to stand up for what he had said publicly, he would have apologized; but he did not have the guts to do so. What he said to the public of the State in abuse of me and this Party was a disgrace to his position publicly. He could not stand up and admit that he had been wrong, so he then added the question whether it was legally binding. I cited in this House at the time that he raised this matter a whole series of announcements made by him on projects in this State for which he had no contract whatever. He had announced to the State that the projects would proceed, although he had no contracts at all until some months afterwards. That apparently was proper but, when I told the people of this State, as I was in bounden duty to do, that a major project was developing in the North of this State, in which we could have had, and still have, every reason for the utmost confidence as to its development, the honourable member said that it was a dereliction of public duty, that I should not have announced it. If I had not announced it, however, the honourable member would have said that I was guilty of secretive government.

Mr. Millhouse: It happened to be a good time to make the announcement.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member had had the ability to read and absorb what had been said publicly, he would have appreciated that that is what I tried to get over to the public; but I doubt whether the honourable member's degree of comprehension of what he reads is sufficient. However, if he had bothered to read it, he would have known that in fact there were two major consortia negotiating with the producers and the Government for the development of Redcliffs. One is a consortium consisting of Dow Chemical Company and the Furukawa group of companies in Japan; the other is a consortium consisting of Alcoa, Imperial Chemical Industries, Mitsubishi, Showa Oil Company Limited, and the Okura group of companies in Japan.

The project is for the development of a major caustic soda plant for this country, as it is necessary to produce caustic soda in Australia for the processing of alumina. That will produce as a by-product ethylene dichloride, which cannot be used in this country and for which the major market is in Japan. The two consortia have between them the whole of the Japanese market for ethylene dichloride. It is vital, if the honourable member has taken any note at all of the present situation in petro-chemical developments, that Japan get additional supplies of ethylene dichloride because without such supplies it simply cannot proceed to supply the demand for plastic products.

Both of these consortia have delivered to the Government letters of intent to proceed to put a petro-chemical works of world dimensions and world scale, one of the biggest in the world, at Redcliffs. Each is competing for the development. The Government has said that it will not decide between these two competitors until it is clearly shown where the State's interest lies in either development, in providing for the maximizing of employment in the area and the maximum return to the Government, and ensuring that there is no interference with the essential ecology of the area; and on that basis and that basis alone shall we proceed. That has been made public many times. I do not know whether the honourable member has bothered to read it, but it has been said. We could, if the honourable member wished and if that was the only criterion involved, sign a contract tomorrow for the petro-chemical works; the legally binding offers are in my office. Neither has so far been accepted.

Mr. Millhouse: Are these the offers in the documents you tabled?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No; they are subsequent documents.

Mr. Millhouse: Will you table them?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In due season.

Mr. Millhouse: When will that be?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When we have come to an agreement with one or the other, the indenture that is signed as a result will be a matter of inquiry by a Select Committee of this House, and all the documents relating to the negotiations will be tabled.

Mr. Millhouse: But you will not table them now?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I will not, because the companies concerned do not want me to.

Mr. Millhouse: What have you tabled?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member had better go to the table and find out. I assume he is as capable of reading as is his colleague, and I rather think he has probably better comprehension. The member for Goyder then asked me to notify the House that I had the unqualified approval of the Commonwealth Government for

the export of liquid petroleum from South Australia. Of course, I have not got it: that is not part of the contract, and about that the honourable member is wrong. It is not intended to export liquid petroleum to Japan. In fact, a condition of the whole project is that a petroleum refinery be established at Redcliffs and that liquid petroleum gas be converted to gasoline. Both of the consortia have undertaken that that will be the case in either of their developments, and it is provided for already by legislation of the Commonwealth Parliament, of which legislation the honourable member is apparently unaware. His suggestion that we should pass a motion in this House on this basis only reveals his complete ignorance of the project. It has nothing to do with it. It is not intended to export liquid petroleum gas.

As to an absolute assurance that the environment and ecology of Spencer Gulf and the surrounding district will be fully protected, I have given that undertaking on many occasions. Now let me deal with a specific matter raised in the honourable member's speech. At the outset of negotiations with the consortia, they were told that the ecology of northern Spencer Gulf was to be completely protected: there must be no interference with anything affecting the fisheries and there must be no pollution of the area or of the general environment. The consortia gave complete undertakings that that would be the case. It was clear from the outset that there would be no discharge of effluent into the sea; there would be no polluting of the atmosphere from the discharge of fumes. The only question that arose in relation to the difficulty as regards the fisheries was the use of cooling water from the gulf and the return of that cooling water to the gulf. I had a report at the time of the last election that the extraction of cooling water from the gulf and its return to the gulf at the same temperature would in no way interfere with the fisheries. That was the only matter that could conceivably affect fisheries, other than the loading facilities, which were fully covered in the arrangements made. What is now happening is that there is, as required and as was stated to be required at the time of the last election, an environmental impact study under way. In looking at the use of cooling water from the gulf, we need to know exactly what is happening biologically in that area of the gulf to ensure that the process in no way interferes with it. That is proceeding at the moment at the expense of one of the companies in one of the consortia.

Whichever company gets the contract will have to pay for the work that is being undertaken under the supervision of the Environment and Conservation Department and the Fisheries Department; this is to lay down the criteria for the construction of the works to ensure that the microbiology in that area of the gulf is not in any way interfered with in the process to be developed at Redcliffs. It does not mean that this study is to see whether or not Redcliffs can go ahead: it is laying down the conditions under which it can go ahead, so that there is, in accordance with the undertakings given, no interference with the ecology. In relation to the report that the honourable member has read, I do not know what representations he has made to the reporter responsible for it. The honourable member says that somehow or other the reporter has been misled, but he cannot cite anything from my department that would mislead him. I was asked one question yesterday: whether, if the report said that the Redcliffs project would interfere impossibly with the ecology, the project would stop. I said that that was not a

conceivable hypothesis, because that is not what the study is about. We already know that the Redcliffs project will not so interfere with the ecology.

The report is to establish the conditions that will ensure that the proper parameters are looked at in the development of the project to ensure that the ecology is not interfered with; that is what the study is about. Because newspaper reporters at times want to get the dramatic into their reports, I have no doubt that this was the basis on which a reporter could write, "Redcliffs hangs on the investigations of two men in a boat in Spencer Gulf." That is hyperbole, and I am sure that the honourable member can understand it, because he is very used to using it. The whole of this is the sort of thing that the honourable member has made his "Hall mark" in South Australian politics, and I can only say that it is no wonder that, as a result of that and the kind of display we have had in the House this afternoon, he has announced his transmogrification to other areas.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### MINISTRY OF SPORT AND RECREATION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Becker:

That in the opinion of this House a Ministry of Sport and Recreation should be established in this State.

(Continued from August 29. Page 580.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I quite appreciate the motive of the member for Hanson in moving this motion. True, in South Australia at present the administration in the area of sport and recreation is fragmented and unsatisfactory. In 1965 we endeavoured to alter the general set-up in relation to recreation and bring the whole area of sport and recreation under the Ministry of Social Welfare. However, that did not work out satisfactorily: it was not possible to get a complete co-ordination of all the work under the new Public Service administrative arrangements which derived from the creation of the Social Welfare Department. In fact, since that time the situation has deteriorated rather than improved. At present this matter is the subject of a study by the Public Service Board in an endeavour to see to it that we have a co-ordinated administration in this area. I am by no means certain that the result of the investigation will be a recommendation that we have a separate Ministry, but we may well have a separate department for which there will be separate Ministerial responsibility. The investigation is currently under way, and I hope I will have something more to tell the honourable member next week. In those circumstances, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 29. Page 581.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I congratulate the member for Tea Tree Gully on introducing this Bill, which I support. The honourable member has shown much interest in animal welfare and has had many consultations with officers of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. During those discussions she has shown a sincere interest in ensuring that all animals, particularly those affected by this Bill, are treated humanely. The provisions of the Bill are fairly simple. The increased fines provided for are more appropriate in today's world, particularly since the previous increases were made in 1960. Some of the increased fines are five times greater than those

that operated previously; some are 21 times greater; and some are double those that operated previously.

I do not believe that any person who considers the legislation will cavil at the increased fines for actions that can be described only as callous and unmindful of the welfare of animals. The Bill provides for the adequate exercise of animals, perhaps a dog that may normally be chained up or kept in a confined space. Having had the opportunity to discuss these matters with the member for Tea Tree Gully and with the Secretary of the R.S.P.C.A. and other members of the general committee of that organization, I am certain that each provision is at least a step in the right direction in the interests of general animal welfare.

We will always have the situation whereby the provisions of the Act and the regulations under it are inadequate to cope with every conceivable question that will arise, but I believe that the new provisions now overcome many of the difficulties which have previously existed and that they will work to the advantage of the R.S.P.C.A.; for example, the need to eliminate questionable actions that have been on the borderline of the provisions of the existing Act. In the past, while officers of the R.S.P.C.A. have taken legal action against persons who have contravened the Act, they can now adopt a more consistent attitude of education regarding the protection of animals, this having been a major part of the society's past activities. The society has seen difficulties that have arisen and has been able to direct people's attention to minor transgressions, giving them the benefit of the doubt and also giving instructions and advice on animal care and welfare. No-one believes that the R.S.P.C.A. should ever back away from prosecuting people who hang animals or who leave animals consistently without food and water, batter them, kick them or take any other actions which have been reported to the society and which have been successfully prosecuted by it in the courts.

It is incomprehensible that people inflict such acts of gross violence and gross negligence on animals. Unfortunately, the records show that this occurs and, in lauding the fact that officers of the R.S.P.C.A. have adopted this educational approach in conjunction with taking the necessary legal action and other action, I acknowledge that members of the legal profession in South Australia have offered their services in actions taken to court. I give proper recognition to the profession for the services rendered freely by its members in the interests of animal welfare and the society generally.

I refer now to the section of the Bill dealing with the abandonment of animals, because a decision must be taken by some person on what constitutes abandonment. It is recognized that many animals are abandoned in their own best interests, for example, birds, possums and other wild life trapped or caught in an alien environment. Where possums are caught in house roofs and in similar situations, unless the provisions of the Bill were not as wide as they are it would not be possible to return them to their natural habitat, but there is real sense in the provision whereby those animals which are out of their natural habitat can be returned to it by a person without his being subject to prosecution. At the same time, any person placing a domestic animal in a hazardous situation, by releasing it in an unnatural environment or in a situation where it will fail to receive adequate attention, will, under the Bill, find himself subject to investigation and, if the need arises, prosecution.

Without any qualms, I commend all of the provisions of this Bill to the House. True, representations have been made by the Bird Protection League of South Australia,

especially regarding the size of cages and the type of bird to be contained in them, but I believe this matter can be covered adequately by regulation. Indeed, how the use of cages after sale is to be policed is not an easy problem to solve, because many cages will be used in private homes and will not normally be subject to the surveillance of society inspectors or the public generally. With the member for Fisher, who will highlight the situation regarding the chaining of birds, especially cockatoos, I accept that in many instances it is to an animal's advantage if it is chained and given adequate food and water and is protected from the elements, rather than being cooped up in a small cage.

However, any person who allows a chain to cause injury, especially to the leg of a bird or dog, is subject to certain action under the legislation. This adequately covers the situation that the Bird Protection League has sought to have covered in the Bill. I commend the provisions of this Bill and ask members to look closely at them when the Bill passes through the Committee stages.

Mr. JENNINGS (Ross Smith): In supporting the Bill with much pleasure, I congratulate the member for Tea Tree Gully on her initiative in introducing this long overdue amendment. I believe it should pass through this House and in another place with great expedition. As I stated, this Bill is long overdue, and I have been informed by the former Chief Secretary (Hon. A. J. Shard) that it was always his intention to introduce this legislation as Government business but, because of the pressure of other urgent business, it was always crowded out. This in itself is one method of showing how private members' time can be effectively and beneficially used. As the Leader pointed out, there is little new in the Bill apart from the matters that long experience has taught the R.S.P.C.A. are necessary to the comprehensive legislation. My only regret, if it can be so regarded, is that the measure does not go far enough and does not intrude into other forms of cruelty not covered by the general law at the moment. I considered whether I should seek to amend the Bill, but the mover, the R.S.P.C.A. and, I think, the Leader are of the opinion that if we chose any novel departure at this stage the Bill, which has been so long delayed, might be further delayed or even put in some jeopardy.

I do not think this fear is justified. However, out of respect for the mover I have desisted from doing anything further at the moment. There will be opportunities later and perhaps we will consider extending the provisions of the Bill at that time. Many examples of cruelty existing in the community are not covered by this legislation. The Leader mentioned them, and we all know of them. However, I do not want to do anything to jeopardize the passage of the Bill; if something is done in Committee, that is a different matter. The Leader has expressed his support for the measure and I hope that presages a speedy passage through this House and another place. I repeat my congratulations to the member for Tea Tree Gully on her motives, and I give my support to the Bill.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill, although I should like to see it amended in one or two respects. However, I was not of the opinion that it would pass through the House this afternoon and I do not wish in any way to slow down its progress. If it is possible to have amendments drafted in time I should like the opportunity to move them in Committee. I congratulate the member for Tea Tree Gully on introducing this Bill, which in the main offers greater protection to birds or animals kept as pets, but that is not its whole intention. I accept the comment of my Leader that officers of the R.S.P.C.A.

carry out an educational role as well as a policing role in protecting birds and animals. One important provision puts the obligation on the owner of a bird to provide a cage of sufficient size to allow the bird freedom of movement, and this obligation is usually on the householder whose family has a pet.

There is no obligation on the person selling the cages to inform the purchaser that restrictions have been placed on the size of the cage in which a bird is to be kept. This is a small failing in the Bill; at least we could make it obligatory for the person selling cages to display in a prominent position in his shop the regulations covering the size of the cages. I have no doubt that the officers of the R.S.P.C.A. and the Government will bring down satisfactory regulations, but it is very difficult to get the message across to every person who intends to keep a pet. We should go as far as is humanly possible to make people aware of the law; therefore, there should be an obligation on the person selling the cage to display the regulations governing its size. I do not think that would in any way detract from the Bill, and it would help to ensure that birds are kept in suitable cages.

Mr. Wells: Surely that is impractical.

Mr. EVANS: To say it is not practicable to have displayed in a prominent position in a shop the regulations relating to the size of cages shows that that person has never been in any practical situation. The only other aspect concerning me was mentioned by the Leader, who said that, where a bird or animal is chained or tethered in any way, inspectors must advise the person concerned of the regulations and have the power to prosecute if the offence is sufficiently serious. I accept that as a fair argument, but I think it should be illegal to chain a bird. I know there could be problems in trying to define what is meant by "chain" but we could make it illegal to chain or tether a bird if we found a suitable definition.

Very few birds are tethered and it would affect few people, who would have to give away a chain and buy a cage. We may be responsible for a great increase in that activity later, because the increases in the size of cages will make them more expensive, resulting not only in a tendency to tether more birds, but also in more cruelty. We all know what could happen to a chained bird: if the chain were to become ensnared on an obstruction near the perch the leg or ligaments could be badly strained, and the leg could be cut. This undesirable practice should be discontinued. I should like to move amendments along the lines I have mentioned when we are in Committee, but I have no objection to the Bill as far as it goes, although I believe it should go further.

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): I thank the members who have spoken in this debate for the support they have given the Bill. [ note that the member for Fisher intends to move some amendments. As he has not foreshadowed his proposed amendments in detail, and as I should like some time to consider them, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### DARTMOUTH DAM

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Hall:

That the Prime Minister be informed that it is the opinion of this House that Dartmouth dam should proceed as planned because:

- (a) the urgency of its construction has not diminished since the signing of the agreement;
- (b) its priority of claim on Commonwealth funds is at least equal to many other items included in the Commonwealth Budget; and

- (c) South Australia's extra water entitlement which is part of the Dartmouth agreement will not be available to this State until Dartmouth dam is declared operational.

(Continued from August 29. Page 582.)

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

To strike out ail the words after "that" second occurring and insert:

this House supports the views expressed in the letter of the Premier to the Prime Minister refusing discussions for postponement of the construction of Dartmouth dam. I would have thought the sensible stand for people in this State to take was a united one, saying that we have the contract for the construction of Dartmouth dam; that we do not intend to consider any alteration to the contract; that the contract is the minimum we could have to conserve the river waters and provision of additional guaranteed waters to us in dry years; and that we are not, in these circumstances, going to do anything other than insist on the letter of the contract. That was clearly expressed to the Prime Minister in my letter to him. The motion, as originally expressed by the honourable member, was another of his political exercises. What he did was try to rehash the political history of the State by endeavouring to use this matter to swing public opinion to him on a certain issue at election time, and he failed.

The honourable member proceeded, as usual in matter of this kind, to pass a number of remarks to my discredit. If one went through the history of the inconsistencies in public presentation of undertakings on this matter, the honourable member's name would be about the colour of Murray River mud. Quite frankly, I think that we have done all that exercise in the past, and I see no purpose whatever in pursuing—

Mr. Millhouse: It's better for you not to, isn't it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I could do it if the honourable member would find some masochistic enjoyment in it, I suppose, but I do not see that it is necessary for me to go into that sort of perverted satisfaction for him. I am interested in getting on with the job.

Mr. Hall: That's a change.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have been trying—

Mr. Millhouse: It's better for you to forget the past on this issue and hope for the best in the future.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has exercised his energies, as well as those of his colleague, in doing very much other than getting on with the job of achieving things for people in South Australia in the past year or so. Admittedly, I appreciate his activities because it has been possible for the Government to get on with the job while he has been indulging himself in carving up his former colleagues.

Mr. Millhouse: Why don't you get back to the motion and say something about that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I already have. I said that what we ought to do is to unite in our presentation to the Commonwealth Government of the case which I put to this House and for which I received the Leader's support, which I appreciate.

Dr. Eastick: It's still there.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I appreciate that. I believe that all the citizens of the State ought to convey the attitude to the Commonwealth Government that the minimum for this State immediately is the construction of Dartmouth dam and the provision of the extra water entitlement following from its completion.

Mr. Millhouse: Pity you didn't say that in 1970!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I wanted more and I tried to get it; unfortunately, I was unable to get more, but I did my best.

Mr. Hall: You wanted Government.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know what the honourable member wants now. No doubt he wants Government, but obviously, from his own recent actions, the honourable member has not the faintest scintilla of a hope of getting it.

Mr. Millhouse: You seem to be obsessed by all this. You've been coming back to it all the afternoon.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member wants to put his own obsessions on other people, I suppose that is his privilege. To repeat for the honourable member's benefit, because he is trying to interject to keep me away from what I want to say, I believe that the proper course for the people of the State to take is to unite in the presentation of a case to the Commonwealth Government. I hope that the honourable member is listening this time. The minimum that the people of the State will accept is the present contract for the construction of Dartmouth dam, and we will not shift from that. I believe that we ought unanimously to express our view that way, namely, in terms of the amendment I have moved.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### COMMONWEALTH POWERS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That this House, while acknowledging that the Commonwealth Constitution should be reviewed and amended to suit contemporary conditions, supports the federal system of Government and opposes any action to clothe the Commonwealth Parliament with unlimited powers, to invest the High Court of Australia with final jurisdiction by abolition of appeals to the Privy Council and in particular action by the Commonwealth Government or Parliament to weaken the sovereignty of the States,

which the Attorney-General has moved to amend by leaving out all words after the word "That", first occurring, and inserting in lieu thereof the following words:

this House acknowledges that the Commonwealth Constitution should be reviewed and amended to suit contemporary conditions, affirms that the distribution of legislative powers between the Commonwealth and the State should be that which is most conducive to the Government and welfare of the Australian people and supports the abolition of appeals to the Privy Council and the clothing of the High Court of Australia with final appellate jurisdiction and with jurisdiction to give advisory opinions.

(Continued from August 29. Page 585.)

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I support the motion and oppose the Attorney-General's amendment. On this occasion I find myself in agreement with most of the matters that were canvassed by the member for Mitcham, but there are one or two minor areas in which I disagree. I make our attitude clear to the Attorney-General, who tried to humiliate Opposition members, and me in particular. I do not think that there is one issue which divides non-Socialist Parties in this country from the Socialists or from the Australian Labor Party more clearly than the argument of federalism as against centralism. As one who believes in State Parliaments, local government, and a federal system, [ make clear that, in no circumstances, could I support the attitude of the Commonwealth A.L.P. Government, particularly the Prime Minister's attitude.

The Attorney-General's challenge, during the course of his remarks, prompted me to research this matter. Before quoting a number of references that I have been able to obtain in the course of my research, I want to

deal with one or two comments that the Attorney-General made in his speech in this debate. He said that the Australian Labor Party delegates to the recent Commonwealth Constitution Convention would go there with an open mind. He said (page 583 of *Hansard*):

If this convention is approached by certain delegates from an *a priori* or fixed centralist point of view, having a desire simply to have more power transferred to the Commonwealth Parliament simply for the sake of having more power transferred to it and, if it is approached by others on the basis that they want to retain all the existing powers of the States and increase such powers simply because they are States' powers, and an *a priori* expression of States' rights, then the convention is doomed to fail. There is no way that we can produce the sort of change needed if delegates are so attached to narrow points of view and, therefore, cannot deal with the real questions of constitutional reform.

That is the exact attitude that the Attorney-General's colleague, the Prime Minister, adopted. It was clear from newspaper statements issued from the convention that the Prime Minister was using the occasion purely to promote the line adopted at the A.L.P. conference at Surfers Paradise recently, that there was only one type of Government best suited to Australia and that was the centralist type of Government. This means the eventual abolition of State Parliaments and of all the safeguards for the people of the States in the present federal system. That is a completely different policy from that of the Liberal and Country League and the Liberal Party of Australia. I wish to quote from the Victorian Liberal Party platform, as I think this adequately expresses the views of members on this side.

Mr. Hopgood: Can I have a copy of that?

Mr. GUNN: Although I do not wish to transgress Standing Orders by answering interjections, if the honourable member would like to examine this document I shall be pleased to lend it to him. It states:

The Liberal Party is dedicated to the development of a society in which the individual can achieve fulfilment. As a liberal Party, it believes that this will be achieved when the individual has maximum freedom of choice in his own life, and a due respect and concern for the freedom and well-being of his fellows. The great challenge of public policy is to balance freedom and concern, for without both there can be no dignity.

That adequately expresses the point of view held by members on this side.

Mr. Keneally: Held but never practised.

Mr. GUNN: We certainly practise it. Obviously the member for Stuart is intent on side-tracking members on this side; he rarely, if ever, takes part in these debates. I do not intend to reply to his interjections. I think the following passage from the platform of the Victorian Liberal Party is pertinent to the matter we are discussing:

The greatest challenges to the fulfilment of the individual today are from centralized power, the narrowing of choice, and the destruction of an environment which makes possible humane and worthwhile life. The Liberal Party recognizes that all the facets of education, social welfare, health, conservation, transport, housing and town planning must be directed to securing a fuller and more rewarding life for each citizen. It seeks the enrichment of living conditions, physical and mental, city and country, as the major task of modern government.

I entirely agree with those comments. It is no wonder that the people of Victoria completely rejected the policies advanced by the Socialist Left A.L.P. in that State and returned the Victorian Liberal Government with an increased majority.

Mr. Hopgood: We got an increased number of votes.

Mr. GUNN: In future a similar result will be achieved in this State when, at the first opportunity, the people will remove from power the centralist A.L.P. Government.

Mr. Hopgood: You've told us that for three years, and what's happened?

Mr. GUNN: One or two matters took place that perhaps made it a little easier for the A.L.P. to be returned to Government at the last election, but I assure members opposite that those matters will have no effect in future. If one studies the Labor Party's platforms, one inevitably comes to the conclusion (and I said this last evening and I say it again)—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The bigger the untruth, the more you have to repeat it.

Mr. GUNN: —that its policy is to abolish all State Parliaments and all offices of the State Government, and this policy can lead only to a one-Party State.

Mr. Crimes: How on earth do you work that out?

Mr. GUNN: The A.L.P.'s platform (and this was recently altered at the Surfers Paradise conference), under the heading "Constitutional Matters", in section 2 states:

Amendment of the Australian Constitution:

(a) (1) To clothe the Parliament of Australia with such plenary powers as are necessary and desirable to achieve international co-operation, national planning and the Party's economic and social objectives.

A little research discloses the late Dr. Evatt's involvement in endeavouring to change the Constitution of the country. We should examine what he had in mind.

Mr. Hopgood: It's a pity it wasn't carried.

Mr. GUNN: I entirely disagree with that, because the whole object of Dr. Evatt's exercise was to destroy the Constitution of the country so that we would have a complete centralist Government. His aim was to force on the people of the country the Socialist type of Government which would deny to individual citizens any local involvement in their own affairs. That was his sole desire, and Senator Murphy follows a similar line.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You do tell the most dreadful stories.

Mr. Crimes: He has a vivid imagination.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Poor old Dr. Evatt has been dead for some years and you haven't any charity for him.

Mr. GUNN: I do not want to reply to the Minister's interjections. I have done a little research into this matter. It is interesting to consider what Dr. Evatt had in mind when he endeavoured to have a referendum held in 1944. When he was campaigning towards this end, I understand he issued a confidential document in which he made 14 points, and the A.L.P. platform follows along these lines. It was his aim to get the Australian Parliament to accept obligations under the United Nations, such as those with regard to the International Labor Organization, and in other areas, so that there would be an excuse to by-pass the Australian Constitution. Once this precedent had been established, the Constitution could be amended and other necessary steps taken eventually to abolish the Senate (which exists to safeguard the States' rights) and eventually to abolish State Parliaments.

If we read this obnoxious document containing the Labor Party's policies, we can see that the A.L.P. clearly intends to abolish the Senate, the office of State Governor, and also Legislative Councils. Once they have been abolished, it will start its attack on Lower Houses. I understand that the Premier has made a speech along these lines in this House. Apparently, a stage will be reached where there is one central authority in Canberra and a few regional centres. One can visualize what sort of democracy would exist then; a few bureaucrats in Canberra would run Australia.

I think that five or six valid reasons (there may be more) readily come to mind why we should have a federal system



in this country. The first is that Australia is far too large a country to be run by one centralist Government. The second is that a centralist Government is necessarily remote from the people. Of course, this would suit the Socialist line of thought, because those concerned would not have to answer to the public; this would be right down their alley. I strongly support the line taken by the member for Mitcham on this matter. I would never vote to transfer powers to the Commonwealth, because that would not be in the best interests of the country.

Mr. Keneally. What about prices and income?

Mr. GUNN: I would agree to that for only a limited period.

Mr. Keneally: Isn't that a contradiction?

Mr. GUNN: No. The member for Stuart did not give me time to finish my remarks. I would agree to that only if adequate safeguards existed.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the member for Eyre is not the principal speaker in opposition to this motion, which was moved by the member for Mitcham: the principal speaker in opposition to it was the Attorney-General. Therefore, the member for Eyre is subject to the normal time limit of, I think, 45 minutes that applies to speeches on motions before the House. My colleagues suggest that some unofficial timing has taken place and that the honourable member has probably already taken up about 14 minutes of the time to which he is entitled.

The SPEAKER: The Minister of Education has raised a point of order, which I must uphold. True, the member for Eyre has been unofficially timed. Having commenced his remarks on the motion at 4.49 p.m., it can be seen that the honourable member has spoken for about 14 minutes. He is being timed on a limited basis.

Mr. GUNN: Thank you, Sir, for your clarification of the matter. I will now take my full time.

Mr. Langley: That won't worry us.

Mr. GUNN: I was about to conclude my remarks, but I do not intend to be gagged by the Minister of Education.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I don't think you could speak for the full time allowed without being pulled up by the Speaker for being out of order.

Mr. GUNN: I was canvassing my attitude regarding this Parliament's surrendering its powers to any Commonwealth Government, and I said I opposed this. I would vote against any motion involving this Parliament's surrendering its powers to the Commonwealth Government. I would, however, make one exception: I would be willing on certain occasions to give the Commonwealth power in some areas on a limited basis and for a limited time. Although one could not trust the present Commonwealth Government in any circumstances, one could trust a Liberal and Country Party Commonwealth Government, which would be far more realistic and which would in no way wish to centralize control in Canberra.

Mr. Langley: Do you believe in one vote one value?

Mr. GUNN: That matter is not being discussed now. Although I have certain views on it I would be out of order if I canvassed them now. With those few comments, I conclude my remarks.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That this House disapproves of the intention of the Commonwealth Government to reduce or cut out altogether grants to certain independent schools and is of opinion that the State Government should, by additional grants, make up to those independent schools so affected what they will lose from the Commonwealth,

which the Minister of Education had moved to amend by leaving out all words after "That" and inserting in lieu thereof the following words:

this House recognizing that the recommendations of the Interim Committee of the Australian Schools Commission—

(1) represent a charter for improved educational standards for the vast majority of Australian schools, both government and non-government; and

(2) that as a consequence for the first time in Australia, all school students can expect in future years to receive an education which will develop their particular talents to the fullest possible extent;

approves the action of the Australian Government in accepting those recommendations.

(Continued from August 29. Page 591).

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): This motion was moved by the member for Mitcham to illustrate his disapproval of certain actions taken by the Commonwealth Government in relation to independent schools. The main complaint is that, following the release of the Karmel report, the Commonwealth Government has either drastically reduced or discontinued grants to certain independent schools. The Minister of Education has moved an amendment that can only be described as a slick way of icing the cake. He is obviously most embarrassed, as some of the recommendations contained in the Karmel report conflict with those in the report of the Cook committee, which was set up by the Minister and which is operating here in South Australia. Some of the recommendations of these committees seem to conflict with one another. The Minister therefore finds himself in the invidious position of having to defend his own committee and uphold its decisions, and at the same time defend and uphold different recommendations of a committee that has reported to his colleagues in Canberra on the same matter. There is no doubt that there is much conflict between the two committees' reports.

In his amendment the Minister refers to the educational standards for the vast majority of independent and non-Government Australian schools. He is therefore referring to only a part of the overall scheme. He does not say that certain grants to many independent schools are either being reduced or withheld completely. Undoubtedly, in the independent school system in this State there is a wide variety of standards, financial resources and support, irrespective of whether the schools are religious or non-religious bodies.

It has often been said since the committee made its report that many independent schools would be hard pushed to continue their operations. We must examine the educational standards of these schools, not necessarily just their structures, because many independent schools that have for years gone without certain structural items are being penalized. These schools have concentrated on reducing their teacher-pupil ratio, with the result that a far better academic and educational standard is provided for their students. However they are being penalized, because one of the criteria of the Karmel report was the pupil-teacher ratio, and the schools that concentrated on this aspect (to their credit, as their students got a better education as a result) seem to be leading in the list of schools that will be penalized. Therefore, the Minister in his amendment is referring to some schools.

Undoubtedly, when we take the whole of the Karmel committee's recommendations, involving schools as a whole and students as a whole (and, after all, we should be considering the students), we see that much more money has been recommended for the education system as a whole, and most of the students in Australia will receive a better education as a result. However, this does not get away

from the fact that some schools that in the past have received Government assistance will be denied it in future, and this is the whole purport of the motion.

I do not argue about the second aspect of the Minister's amendment, namely, that in future most students will be able to get a better standard of education. We all hope that this occurs, and we are not cavilling about that aspect. The whole purpose of the motion as moved by the member for Mitcham was simply that certain schools that, by their efforts, had improved their facilities would now be denied assistance. Comments have been made in various newspapers in Australia about this matter: there has been talk about various types of independent school being denied the grants that they received previously, and some ecclesiastics have spoken on the matter.

I understand that about a week ago a meeting of Catholic Archbishops in Melbourne made a pronouncement, and I saw on television the Anglican Archbishop of Adelaide speaking on the same subject. I hope that this matter does not ever lead to sectarianism coming back into our schools. I fear this, and I hope that it never occurs. I say that most sincerely.

Mr. Keneally: What was the view of the Archbishop of Adelaide?

Mr. COUMBE: I read the comment made by the Anglican Archbishop in Synod and I saw him on television. His views were not entirely in accord with the reported views, as I understood, of the Catholic Archbishops. Certain schools in Australia, because of the work they have done, are being denied Government grants. We are in an area of great complication here: I am the first to admit that. Many small parish schools need all the help that they can get. Some so-called "wealthy" (that word is not mine but it has been used previously) schools have been able to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio by their efforts and, in many cases, the sacrifices made by parents, and a higher standard of education has been achieved for the children.

I was most incensed and disturbed in this House recently to hear an interjection by the member for Elizabeth in which he referred to those parents who had sacrificed many things to allow their children to go to some of these schools as "two bob snobs". If that is so, I am a two bob snob, and so is the Premier because just after that interjection, I heard, "What are you talking about? Boys from St. Peters?" The Premier, the member for Mitcham, the member for Chaffey, and I went to St. Peters. We have sent our children there and have made sacrifices. I am not a two bob snob.

Mr. Keneally: I couldn't afford to send my children to St. Peters.

Mr. COUMBE: Neither could I now. I make this comment in passing, because I think the remark was typical of the member for Elizabeth and that it was made in extremely bad taste. There is no doubt that many parents, whether of children at a religious school or those at an independent school, have made sacrifices to send their children to those schools, and they are being penalized. The point made by the member for Mitcham in this regard is completely valid.

We are saying that there is a conflict between the report of the Cook committee, which the Minister of Education in South Australia appointed and whose report he is upholding, and the interim findings of the Karmel committee, which was made to the Minister's Commonwealth colleague and which the Minister is trying to justify. The Minister is in a dilemma, because the two reports are conflicting. I suggest that every member of this House must support

strongly the principle that we should have the two systems of education in this country so that parents who desire to do so can send their children to the school of their choice. I suggest that no-one would argue against that point of view. We should consider the matter of cost, which the member for Mitcham brought out vividly.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You're trying to win him back, are you?

Mr. COUMBE: We are not talking about the old school tie. The most recent Auditor-General's Report, which was issued yesterday, discloses that the cost of educating a State secondary school student is \$507, which is an increase of \$90 on the cost of \$417 last year. The figures are supplied by the Education Department and, whilst they include payments for administration, they exclude the debt charges on Loan funds; that is, the cost of providing the building.

Let us imagine the amount of grants provided by the State and Commonwealth Governments and what a farcical position there would be if the independent school system as we know it collapsed tomorrow, with all the children now attending independent schools having to go to a State school. What would the capital cost and the running cost be if that happened? The Minister of Education will be the first to admit that it is good business to provide grants to independent schools.

The motion deplores the fact that some schools that have been receiving grants will have the grants reduced or cut out. Who will suffer? No doubt students at the schools will suffer, and also parents who send their children to those schools. It seems to me that this is part of the socialistic idea, that instead of bringing everyone up to a level some are being brought down. Instead of everyone coming up, some are coming up and some are going down, and that is an old ploy of socialists. Following the speech by the member for Mitcham, the member for Davenport made a valuable contribution. At this stage, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: No!

The SPEAKER: There being a dissentient voice, the honourable member for Torrens must continue.

Mr. COUMBE: I appreciate the great courtesy the Minister has extended to me, and this is an example—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Come on, you have had plenty of time.

Mr. COUMBE: —of his co-operation.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You don't want a vote on this, that is your trouble. The L.C.L. is trying to delay it, and the L.M. knows that that is the case.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Torrens.

Mr. COUMBE: Once again the Minister is presuming; but he will keep! It is many years since I have heard a member call "No" in that way.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You have had weeks to prepare for it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Torrens is debating the motion moved by the honourable member for Mitcham. The honourable member for Torrens.

Mr. COUMBE: I have covered the points referred to by the member for Mitcham, and I support the contention he put forward, which was supported by the member for Davenport. The amendment introduced by the Minister of Education will not achieve what he wants it to achieve. It will be carried by the numbers, and it will be the icing on the cake. Having made those few comments, and having been prevented by the Minister's calling "No"—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You have had weeks to prepare.

Mr. COUMBE: —I oppose the amendment and support the motion.

Mr. HOPGOOD (Mawson): I vigorously oppose the motion and support the amendment. The debate we have heard so far carried my mind back a couple of years in this House when, as I recall it, the former member for Alexandra introduced a private member's motion that sought to continue the per capita system, which had been introduced by the Hall Government, and opposed the needs basis that had been introduced by this Labor Government. I vividly remember that debate, because it fell to me to introduce one of those amendments that strike out all words after "That" and introduce words that had the effect of supporting the Government's policy. The House carried that amendment, and the Government continued its policy of introducing a needs basis for assistance to non-government schools in this State: the fruit of that policy was the Cook committee. I remember that debate, because at that time the issue, as clearly drawn, was between the Opposition's policy of a per capita form of assistance and the Government's attitude, which favoured a needs basis.

What I find remarkable about the Opposition's reaction to the Karmel committee report is that suddenly Cook seems to be O.K. Suddenly, the form of needs basis, which this State Government introduced and which was bitterly opposed by members opposite at that time, is now acceptable. So far as we can see (because there has been no overt criticism by the Opposition in this debate of the basis on which State aid is granted) they now support what is happening and support the form of needs basis that operates in this State. If that is so (and we have yet to hear a voice from the other side denying it) it seems that the wisdom that we put forward at that time as a Government has prevailed, to the extent that the Opposition now seems to be willing to accept it.

Mr. Mathwin: Why call it a needs test; why not a means test?

Mr. HOPGOOD: I would be pleased to call it that, as I see no problem in what it is called, but that would not get to the core as well as a needs basis does. We think we should distribute the available finance between schools according to needs as they are seen to exist. That summarizes in a kernel what we are trying to do. I suggest to the Opposition that it should consider this matter. Has it drastically altered its Party policy? Have its members now abandoned the concept of per capita grants, and are they willing to adopt some modified form of needs basis? If that is so, we are quibbling about details and not principles, and I would be interested to see the reaction of Opposition members and hear their opinions.

It seems to me that much humbug has been spoken about this matter, not only here but also in the community. For example, many people are conveniently ignoring that capital grants to non-government schools will continue, that some schools in category A in the Karmel committee report are to receive grants for capital facilities, and that all non-government schools are eligible to compete on their merits for a share of the capital grants under the Karmel committee programme. There has been no interference with that on-going programme.

In 1974 and 1975 capital grants to non-government schools will rise to \$57,000,000, and Government schools will receive \$264,000,000. I believe there has been a deliberate campaign to undermine the massive assistance that will be given to the needy by the Australian Labor

Government. The Karmel committee analysed Australian schools and established a base unit of 100 for an average State school's recurrent resources. Measured against this index, non-government schools in the categories listed varied from 40 to 270. The committee's aim is to bring all schools, Government and non-government, up to a base level of 140 within six years. This will cost at least \$2,000,000,000. Class A schools have the top level of recurrent resources, but H class schools have resources far below the level of the average State school, and these will receive the most aid, as is just. A report by the Commonwealth Minister for Education (Mr. Beazley) states:

The Government's role in education is now directly related to the child and the young person.

We have had the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and all sorts of things quoted to us in this debate. Let me make clear that, when we talk about freedom of choice and when the Universal Declaration of Human Rights talks about this, what it is talking about is absence of legal disabilities as to where one should send one's child to school. Surely we would all agree that no-one would want to produce legal disabilities as to where a person should send his child to school. That is what the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is all about: it is nothing to do with economic arrangements whereby people send their children to school—it deals with the legal and not the economic situation.

My own attitude is that no-one has the right to claim State aid *per se*, any more than a person has the right to claim Government assistance in the financing of his motor car because he prefers that to using the public transport system that the Government provides. No-one has the right to that, but what the Government must do is ensure that no child has a standard of education significantly below the general standard of education provided by the Government in the community. This provides the norm because, after all, most children have this form of education. I do not say it is satisfactory; I do not pretend that the things we are doing in education now are a Utopia and that we cannot go much further in providing basic facilities in schools. Of course we can, and this Government is committed to trying to improve those conditions, as is the Australian Government. We shall continue to try to improve the level of education facilities and staffing in schools in the Government system but, where there are private schools that have standards significantly below this level, the Government has a responsibility to step in and raise them, not because anyone has a right to claim something from the Government as a result of his decision to send his child to a certain school but because the Government has a responsibility to that child, not to the parent. The parent has taken the decision, but the Government has a responsibility to that child to ensure that it does not have to suffer a second-class education.

When we are talking about private schools, we are talking about a vast range of standards. The member for Glenelg reminded the House in an earlier part of this debate that I had been involved in the private school system in a very good private school in an Adelaide suburb—Westminster School. I was a teacher there for some time after having taught in the Education Department, so perhaps I am in a position to be able to comment on the relative merits of both systems. The only limitation I would make on my judgment is that I have taught only in a limited number of Government schools and in only one private school. As I have said previously, there is a wide

range of standards with private schools. I remind the member for Glenelg, if we want to talk about Westminster School, that that is a fairly well set up school. It has a good range of facilities; it has a magnificent chapel, after having been in existence as a school for only a little more than 10 years. I believe that Prince Alfred College had to wait for about 90 years before it got its chapel. Westminster School appeared to be fairly hard up against it a year or so ago as a result of the rural crisis, but we know that more money is now available in the country areas, which has certainly eased the whole situation. Furthermore, this school which, as I say, is not hard up against it at present and which has facilities that in many ways are superior to those of many Government schools, has in fact been placed in category C; it is not a category A school. It is not a school that will lose all Government assistance. It is not a category B school—it is in category C.

What does this mean to this school, which has well set up laboratories, a magnificent chapel, an animal room for the study of animal husbandry, and these sorts of things? It means, so far as I can see from a study of a document entitled *Schools in Australia: Report of the Interim Committee of the Australian Schools Commission*, that there will be a moderate reduction in grants, from \$104 to \$90 regarding the secondary part of the school and from \$62 to \$60 regarding the primary section. I do not think that those people who are sending their children to category C schools that are as well set up as Westminster School really have much cause for complaint. If Westminster School was the sort of school that was to have all its grants cut out, I think the sorts of points made by members opposite would be more valid; but that is not so: it will continue to get a substantial amount of assistance from the Australian Government. This very much cuts the ground from under the feet of those members opposite who suggest that it is not only the extremely exclusive schools that will suffer as a result of the policy brought in by the Australian Government. I support the amendment.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### COMMONWEALTH GRANTS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That this House deplore the action of the Commonwealth Government in making available to this State for the financial year 1973-74 \$20,000,000 less than requested by the Premier at the Premiers' Conference and Loan Council, and is of opinion that the South Australian Government should make fresh and vigorous representations to the Commonwealth to increase the moneys to be paid to South Australia to the amount originally requested.

(Continued from August 15. Page 345.)

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): Obviously, in moving this motion, the member for Mitcham is whistling in the dark, as he usually does, in the hope that he may embarrass not only the Treasurer (for he loves to do that when he can, although he does not always do it effectively) but also the Government. It is well known that the State Premiers at the Premiers' Conferences desire to obtain even more than they probably ask for, in the hope that it will ease their own Budgets. The member for Mitcham knows how successful our State Treasurer was in gaining additional Loan funds for this State, and the honourable member appreciates just how important they are to the State's progress. I can assure the honourable member that the Treasurer did an excellent job, as I know from having accompanied him to the conference. Because the Treasurer is now in the Chamber, he can speak for himself, and I will let him do just that.

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

To strike out all words after "That" and insert "this House applaud the case for financial assistance to the State presented by the South Australian Government at the Premiers' Conference in June of this year."

I shall now modestly explain why the amendment should be carried. The only purpose of the motion is to stir. For what other purpose was it put on the Notice Paper? What does the member for Mitcham think he is achieving by moving a motion that the Commonwealth Government should be condemned because South Australia did not get all the money which it sought and which I believed was necessary for the conduct of the business of the State? As a result of representations made since that time, the Prime Minister has suggested other courses by which in due season this State may have a subvention to its revenue in the growth tax area that will cover the gap between the present formula and the recurrent revenue needs of the State for the continuing services of the State.

The reason the honourable member moved the motion is the same as the reason that applies to Opposition members in any similar circumstances; Opposition members take the following attitude: "We will try a little bit of mischief to drive a public wedge between the State Government and the Commonwealth Government of a similar political complexion." When Sir Thomas Playford went to Canberra and did not get what he wanted, or when the member for Goyder was Premier and went to Canberra and returned saying that he had got a lousy deal (as he had), the appropriate thing (for the benefit of the people of the State!) would have been for the Opposition to move a motion stating that this House condemned the Commonwealth Government for not providing everything requested by the Premier of the day. The motive in such circumstances would have been a little public mischief: no-one would have had any illusions about the purpose. This House has better things to do than considering such a motion. The proper thing is to carry the amendment.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I cannot support the amendment, for reasons that are as obvious as the reasons why the Premier believes it should be supported. I do not believe that the member for Mitcham is simply stirring: he has raised a very important point which should be ventilated. After all, the Premier returned from the Premiers' Conference wailing and gnashing his teeth. We know that he is an expert Thespian; he is still a member of Actors Equity. I am never quite sure to what extent he is acting and to what extent he is being serious. However, this matter is serious. I do not believe that the Premier was acting all that much when he returned from the Premiers' Conference; he was reported seriously by the press, and he was on record as saying that he was desperately disappointed that the Commonwealth Government had not done him right. He now says that there are other courses that may possibly be followed in due season, and he talks about growth taxes to cover the gap. There is a gap and, in his emotional speech, the Premier has admitted there is a gap. He plays it down, but he cannot deny there is a gap. This State is being denied the money to which it is entitled and which it needs to maintain its services; I could quote many statements of the Premier to back up my claim. The Premier says that the motion is a means of driving a public wedge between Governments of a similar political complexion; certainly the Governments are of a similar political complexion. I have said before and I will say again that I believe that the withholding of funds is a deliberate attempt to bring the State more and more

under the financial dominance of the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Keneally: You are not very good at finance, you know.

Dr. TONKIN: I am a pretty good judge of political moves being made financially. That, of course, is the major reason why the money is being held back. We have already seen examples of special grants. The system of special grants, with more and more strings attached, is simply being used to let the Commonwealth Government intrude further and further into State affairs, and the Commonwealth Government is doing it by using financial duress and financial dependence. It is a part of an overall plan—

Mr. Keneally: A conspiracy!

Dr. TONKIN: I am grateful to the honourable member for suggesting the word: I agree that it is a conspiracy designed to further the aims of the Australian Labor Party in forming a centralist Socialist Government. The State Governments will become agents, and nothing more, for the Commonwealth Government, and after a relatively short time the following rationalization will be made: "Why are State Governments and State Parliaments necessary, anyway? Let us do away with them." That is what the Commonwealth Socialist Government wants and it appals me that we have a Government of South Australians who are willing to throw away the State's powers and responsibilities in so many spheres, because that is exactly what is being done. I hope members of the community will wake up to the dangers facing our current way of life, and I hope it is not too late. I support the motion, and I strongly oppose the amendment, which is arrogant and bumptious.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I support the motion and totally reject the amendment. I would have expected that this motion would receive the wholehearted support of the Premier and other Government members. After all, the member for Mitcham tried to support the Premier who, on his return from the Premiers' Conference and Loan Council meeting, complained vigorously about the shoddy treatment he had received at the hands of his own colleagues. Obviously, despite the so-called marriage, *entente*, or however one might describe the existing arrangements between the South Australian Government and its counterparts in Canberra, the facts of life have suddenly dawned on the South Australian Government, which now realizes that the Prime Minister's promises made during last year's Commonwealth election campaign were nothing but a facade to hoodwink the people of the country so that Labor could assume the Treasury benches and put into operation its obnoxious centralist policies aimed at destroying the people of Australia, and at moulding them into one solid cast, so that they could not express their own points of view and be a part of the Government of this country.

Mr. Payne: We're one country and one people.

Mr. GUNN: That is the very point which the member for Bragg, other Opposition members, and I have made. We believe in Australia as one nation, whereas the Commonwealth Government believes differently, and there is a big difference between these points of view.

Mr. Payne: You believe in one nation in six separate lots. Don't dodge the issue.

Mr. GUNN: The member for Mitchell either does not understand or does not want to understand. He is a victim of his own propaganda; that is his problem. I suggest that he reconsider his attitude because it is illogical. It is obvious to anyone who understands the situation that the Premier has failed to receive the funds he expected

to receive, because the Commonwealth Government had embarked on such a spending extravaganza the likes of which has never before been seen in this country. The Commonwealth Government did not have the funds to give to the States so that they could supply the essential services so badly needed by the Australian people. That is the reason. In many areas the Commonwealth Government embarked on schemes that were already adequately covered by State Governments. The Commonwealth wished to override the States as a result of its centralist policies. One has only to consider the number of new departments that have been created and the massive increase that is taking place every week in the Commonwealth Public Service. Obviously, the Commonwealth Government did not have the funds or, if it did, it did not want to make them available to the States. However, the funds it did make available had strings attached to them that made it difficult for the States.

As I said earlier, obviously, because of the size of the policy statement which the Prime Minister made on November 13 and which he tried to put into effect, the States will starve. That is a deplorable set of circumstances, because it is obvious to anyone who understands the problems of the people of South Australia and of Australia that State Governments are best able to provide the services the people require. As State Governments are closer to the people, they can the better appreciate the problems of the people. Fortunately for my district, certain projects approved by the previous Government are to proceed. The previous Commonwealth Government had committed the Commonwealth to provide funds for the Poldo-Kimba main; otherwise, I am sure that the Coombs committee would have put a red line through the project and the people in my district would have had to wait many years for it because the State Government could not provide the necessary funds. One has only to read the document to know the reason why. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### OFFSHORE RIGHTS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That this House call on all South Australian members of the Commonwealth Parliament, and particularly the Senators irrespective of their Party allegiance, to oppose by every means in their power the Seas and Submerged Lands Bill and the Seas and Submerged Lands (Royalty on Minerals) Bill now before that Parliament.

(Continued from August 29. Page 591.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

To strike out "the Seas and Submerged Lands Bill and". I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

#### SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

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

That I have leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to apply out of the general revenue a further sum of \$50,000,000 to the Public Service for the financial year ending on the thirtieth day of June, 1974.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The Premier and his Government should face the reality that the community is demanding a far more comprehensive explanation of the circumstances surrounding the escape of the prisoners from the puppet group at the Wayville show-grounds last Saturday. I have said many times that I accept, and indeed applaud, the provision of rehabilitative

facilities for persons in gaol, and I will continue to do so. However, I stress on behalf of the people of South Australia that there are many disturbing aspects in the situation that has unfolded since last weekend which have not been answered by the Chief Secretary or the Attorney-General. The lack of information which has been sought but which has not been given to the members of this House, and therefore to the public, is causing grave concern throughout the community.

The number of telephone calls that have been made, the letters that have been written, and the amount of discussion that has taken place on this matter on talk-back programmes in the last three days show clearly that the people of South Australia are concerned about the Government's failure to give them adequate information on this matter. This information, I believe, can now be obtained only by the appointment of an independent inquiry which would announce its findings to this House and therefore to the public, which will clearly set out all the facts surrounding the escape of these prisoners, and which, more importantly, will take heed of the situation that has been frequently reported to members of the Opposition: that the prisoners who escaped from the puppet group had, during the course of the show, the opportunity to move around the showground, without supervision, for a distance far greater than the stalls immediately adjacent to the puppet show. I again take this opportunity of voicing to the Government the disquiet of the people of this State on this matter, and I again ask the Government urgently to institute a proper, independent inquiry on this matter.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I wish to raise a subject associated with that raised by the Leader, and I refer to the failure of the Attorney-General this afternoon to give members a progress report on the police search for these escapees. Everyone in the community has been concerned about these escapees. Indeed, the people in the Hills area were most concerned last night when it was thought that the escaped prisoners could be in the area. I should have thought that the Chief Secretary would keep the Attorney-General, who is his representative in this House, fully informed regarding the progress of the search being made and, indeed, that the Attorney-General would be able to make himself well aware of what was happening.

I have the greatest respect for the Police Force, the members of which have done everything possible in this matter and whose activities over the last few days have been a great reassurance to the people of South Australia. However, I should have thought the Attorney-General could tell this House exactly what those activities had been and how they had progressed. It seems that the Government is dodging the issue again; apparently it does not want to think about it. I echo the Leader's remarks: if the system which has been adopted for rehabilitation, and with which I agree, is satisfactory, the Government has nothing to fear from an independent inquiry, because the Government would be vindicated if this was so, and I believe it would be vindicated. Why, therefore, should it refuse to have an inquiry?

There has been much concern, unrest and fear in the community regarding these escapees, and the Attorney-General should have been able to tell the House what steps had been taken and what conclusions had been reached. I sincerely hope that tomorrow we may hear statements from him, in addition to any other news, regarding the exact position.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I support fully what has been said by my two colleagues. I was amazed to hear yesterday that 15 prisoners were being guarded by only

two guards and that there was apparently no liaison between those guards and the police regarding their working together in case anything happened. According to a report, the Assistant Comptroller of Prisons, having been informed of the escape, went immediately to the showgrounds. As he probably was nowhere near the showgrounds at that time, it would have taken him a considerable time to get there. The Superintendent of Yatala Labour Prison, having been told of the escape, came from his home, after which the police were called. Surely the guards looking after these prisoners should have had some liaison with the police, so that every policeman at the showgrounds could have been told immediately of the escape and so that there may have been a chance of capturing the prisoners before they left the showgrounds. This aspect illustrates the breakdown in administrative control and, indeed, the complete lack of a sensible relationship between the police and the prison officers. I would certainly like to hear from the Government on this aspect, because it illustrates great carelessness.

Motion carried.

Bill introduced and read a first time.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It has been customary for the Government to present two Supply Bills to Parliament each year, one prior to the commencement of the financial year and the second during August. Members will remember from previous explanations that supply is necessary to enable the Public Service of the State to be carried on between the beginning of the financial year and the date upon which the Appropriation Bill receives assent. The Supply Act approved by Parliament in June last authorized expenditure up to \$110,000,000. This is a higher amount than would have been provided in the normal course but, because of unusual circumstances that the Government thought may have arisen to delay the consideration by Parliament of the second Supply Bill, it was considered prudent to provide this sum.

This Bill provides a further \$50,000,000 which, together with the \$110,000,000 previously authorized, is expected to be sufficient to carry on the continuing operations of the Public Service until the debate on the Appropriation Bill is completed and the Bill becomes law. Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of \$50,000,000. Clause 3 prevents the Government and individual departments from spending moneys for purposes other than those examined and previously approved by Parliament. Until the Appropriation Bill, currently under debate, receives assent, the Government must use the amounts made available by Supply Acts within the limits of individual lines set out in the Estimates and Supplementary Estimates for 1972-73 and other appropriation authorities granted by Parliament.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill. I was surprised when I was told earlier this afternoon that it was intended to introduce a Bill covering this sum, seeing that \$110,000,000 was appropriated as recently as late in June. However, having divided the total amount to be spent in this State during the next 12 months (about \$612,000,000) by 12 to get an average amount for each month, I accept that we must almost be at the stage where the public servants would not be paid unless the additional appropriation was made available. The information given is in accordance with that normally given and I see no reason why the Bill should not pass immediately.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

**CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT ACT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**GIFT DUTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**AGENT-GENERAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**HOUSING AGREEMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**STATE LOTTERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**REGISTRATION OF DEEDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment.

**UNDERGROUND WATERS PRESERVATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Underground Waters Preservation Act, 1969-1970. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It makes several formal amendments to the principal Act, the Underground Waters Preservation Act, 1969-1970. The purpose of these amendments is to give effect to a decision to transfer substantially the administration of the principal Act from the Mines Department to the Engineering and Water Supply Department. When this transfer is effected the main areas of the principal Act that will still come within the jurisdiction of the Mines Department will be those connected with technical aspects of well sinking.

This transfer of responsibility is in keeping with the overall plan of, eventually, placing responsibility for the preservation and development of all water resources in this State in the hands of a single authority. It is hardly necessary for me to remind honourable members that the economic future of this State is, to a considerable extent, bound up with the manner in which our water resources are developed and husbanded, and the Government is mindful of the steps that must be taken to achieve proper conservation and protection of the water supplies.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends the interpretation section of the principal Act. This section contains a reference to the Director of Mines, and the amendments will provide that a reference in the Act to the Director can be read as a reference to the appropriate officer of the Mines Department or the Engineering and Water Supply

Department, as the case requires. Clause 4 similarly amends section 44 of the principal Act, removing the specific reference to the Mines Department and substituting therefor a reference to "a department of the Public Service of the State that is concerned in the administration of this Act". This will cover both the departments concerned in that administration.

Clause 5 amends section 50 of the principal Act by deleting a specific reference to the Minister of Mines. Clause 6 amends section 57 of the principal Act by providing that an authorized person, as defined, can also provide a certificate as to certain matters that may be admitted as evidence. Clause 7, by enacting a new section 57a in the principal Act, provides a power for the Minister to delegate his powers and functions under the Act, except this power of delegation. Such a delegation, it is considered, will make for better and more convenient administration of the principal Act.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

**APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 11. Page 694.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): Believing it is a formality for members to support the Appropriation Bill, I at least take that action verbally by saying that I support it. I do not say that the Bill pleases me entirely. Most of the slugs that have been imposed were announced before any legislation was introduced, and most members who have spoken on this side have referred to many of the slugs that have been imposed. One has been in an area with which I have been concerned for some time—water rates. We have seen an increase this year of 13 per cent in water rates plus the escalation in property values, thus making the overall increase in water rates much higher to the individual than the 13 per cent announced by the Government. I now refer to two letters. I will read them in full, because they have some significance in relation to water rates applying in this State. The first letter states:

I acknowledge receipt of your further correspondence of December 14, regarding water rates in your area in reply to mine of November 12, and advise that Labor policy provides for water conservation for irrigation and all purposes of settlement. It is my firm belief that the industrious person who improves his property should not be penalized by inflated valuations on that improved property. I also believe that it is possible to introduce a system of charging for water so that one charge is made for the capital expenses associated with water supply together with a charge related to the quantity of water used and this should, to a degree, cater for the producer that does not want a supply of reticulated water. On taking office, a Labor Government would instruct officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department to investigate this contention. The answer to your final question, of course, is that it is the prerogative of the Government in power to introduce measures for any form of taxation revenue, and therefore it is only a Labor Party in government that would be able to help you in your problem of water rates.

We know how much the Labor Party has helped with water rates whilst it has been in office! It has increased them by more than 20 per cent in 3½ years, without the increased value of property being considered.

Mr. Venning: And it is still running.

Mr. EVANS: Yes, particularly with the increase in property valuations. That letter was written some time ago when the Australian Labor Party was flying the flag to win Government. That Party would say anything to win, without accepting any responsibility. The letter I have read was signed by the then Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Frank Walsh). What happened subsequently? On March 25, 1966, 12 months after the A.L.P. had been in Government,

this constituent, having voted for the A.L.P., believed that that Party would be certain to change its policy and help him and other citizens concerning water rates by using a system that would enable the ratepayer to pay for the water he used. This system I have advocated, although I have been told by some of my Party colleagues and our Minister of Works that it could not operate successfully. It is ridiculous to say that it cannot operate: I realize that some people will pay more and some will pay less for water, but the responsibility for using water will fall on the individual, and there will be a responsible approach to the use of water in the driest State in the driest continent in the world.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He will finish up with a toothache with his tongue in his cheek like that!

Mr. EVANS: The Minister can be sure that I will fight for that system to be introduced, because that is my policy whichever side of the House I am on. A letter from the Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh) dated March 25, 1966, states:

In reply to your letter dated February 23, 1966, I advise that there has been no alteration to the policy outlined in my letter dated December 15, 1964. However, before any variation is made to a method of charging which has been in operation for over 80 years, a very careful system study must be made to design an alternative and to study the effect which this will have upon the various types of consumers and the finances of the State. Almost 350,000 consumers are involved in South Australia and up-to-date mechanical processes are necessary to deal with a problem of this magnitude. A computer has recently been purchased by the Government, and it is proposed that it will be used initially to render water and sewer rate accounts on a quarterly basis—

in other words, people get slugged more often, but not quite so much—

and to accumulate statistical data for revision of the rating system. Once all the necessary information is available, it will then be used to design an alternative system of charging. Until such time as this occurs and the necessary legislative alterations are made, rates must continue to be payable in accordance with current legislation.

The same system applies today. The Labor Government was in power for about two years, from March 25, 1966, until March 2, 1968, and again from May, 1970, until today. That is about 51 years of Labor Government, but the promise made at that time to at least one citizen has not been honoured. The Minister of Works knows that a report was made by a committee that gave some lead as to the actions to be taken. Having read the report, I agree that it is not a comprehensive one. However, the time has come when we should change the system, and I believe that many people would agree with that statement.

The Hon. I. D. Corcoran: That report cost 80 000 bucks, and the committee was set up by your Party.

Mr. EVANS: I agree with the Minister that the Liberal and Country League Government of 1968-70 appointed the committee to investigate the system, but that, at least, is more than the A.L.P. has done since it has been in power. At least we got something out of it.

The Hon. I. D. Corcoran: It cost \$80,000.

Mr. EVANS: The Minister could make the change if he wished.

The Hon. I. D. Corcoran: If you became Minister of Works would you make the change?

Mr. EVANS: I would advocate it but I cannot make the change, as the Minister knows full well. I make this point strongly: that we do not have to have the system the Minister suggests, that everyone is to have the same rate, whether an industrial, a domestic or a commercial user of water. The argument has always been that, if we lay down the rate for water use, the home owner will pay more, the big stores in Rundle Street will pay

less, and some industrialists will pay less. That need not be the case as we can have an industrial rate, a domestic rate and a commercial rate, and we can still charge people for the quantity of water they use, so much as a thousand gallons (4 546 l), according to their sphere of activity. That can be done and it can be justified, and the average person in the average house will not be penalized to a great extent, whereas the person who wastes water and places a burden on the rest of the State, as well as natural and financial resources used in supplying facilities for water, will be disadvantaged.

Mr. Keneally: Do you—

Mr. EVANS: The member for Stuart, who is interjecting, should refer to *Hansard* to find out how many speeches his colleagues have made over the last three or four years and he will find that the number is very small. Indeed, extra expense will be imposed on the people of this State in relation to the cost of renewing the seat covers on the seats his colleagues are now sitting in, because they never seem to move. Another area in which the A.L.P. has acted falls within the province of the Minister of Works—power, an 11 per cent slug in one hit. The Minister of Transport has been interjecting this evening. I refer him to *Hansard* of September 26, 1968, where, at page 1486, the present Minister of Transport (the then member for Edwardstown) said:

At whom is the Government kicking? It is kicking at the people who can least afford to pay. It is kicking at the ordinary people—the kids who want to buy cool drinks and who will be slugged 1c more.

I recall the then member for Edwardstown standing over here and ranting and raving about charging an extra cent for a bottle of cool drink.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. EVANS: He went on to say:

It is a tragedy that the kids are being hit, yet the Attorney-General can laugh; he may think he has that ring of confidence. I assure him that there will be a ring of confidence in the voice of the electors when the Government next goes to the people. I hope members opposite will give some consideration to the people who cannot afford these charges.

Then Mr. Ferguson interjected:

Where's your handkerchief?

The member for Edwardstown continued:

The member for Yorke Peninsula probably does not have many working class families in his area. I can remember that, when I spent three weeks on Yorke Peninsula a few years ago, I did not find too many farmers waiting to walk off their farms. All members should remember working men who have large families and they should remember what the extra charges on cool drinks and ice cream will mean to them. No sooner were beer prices decontrolled than those prices were increased. I hope there will be enough people within the Liberal and Country League who will take steps to see that working men with large families are protected.

I admit that the prediction of the present Minister of Transport about the future of that L.C.L. Government was accurate, but I also say in relation to his own Party that he will face some problems within 21 years. To refresh the Minister's memory a little (because he has been overseas and has not been here to know just what has been happening in his own Party and the slugs it is imposing on the "poor kids") I give him these facts. Under the A.L.P. Government, on May 30, 1970, there were 26oz. (737 g) bottles of cool drinks; the contents only were worth 17c and on August 9, 1971, the price went up by 1c to 18c for the "poor kids". On May 15, 1972, it went up another cent—still for the "poor kids".



The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Who puts it up? Who gets the profit?

Mr. EVANS: In late 1968, when the L.C.L. Government took cool drinks out of price control, the A.L.P. said, "Keep them under control because we can keep the price down." Now, within 31 years, a 26oz. (737 g) bottle has increased in price from 17c to 23c under price control, whereas the price most probably would be nearer 21c without price control. The Minister of Transport is the person who knows that the A.L.P. Government is really hitting at the working class the hardest.

Mr. Langley: How about the difference in the prices of pies and pasties in New South Wales and South Australia?

Mr. EVANS: I am not going to talk about that. I now come to the *News* of August 17, 1973, where the headline states, in a report from Canberra:

South Australia tops food prices jump.

Of all the States in Australia, South Australia has the highest increase in food prices! The article states:

Food prices have risen faster in Adelaide than in any other State capital in the past 12 months. Prices spiralled by 17.3 per cent to July.

How can anyone say that we have price control in South Australia, the only State in Australia, when we get the highest increases in food prices except Canberra, and in all other cases there was a lesser increase than in South Australia? Just to help the member for Unley so that he will understand the position, in the *Advertiser* of July 6, 1973, the following appears:

Pies will be 2c dearer and pasties 1c from Monday. Pies will cost 18c and pasties 17c. The last increase for pies and pasties was on April 9, when they rose 1c each. That is, two increases in one year. The article continues:

This means the total increases this year will be 20 per cent for pies and about 13 per cent for pasties.

If we project that to the end of the Government's term (when it will be defeated at the next election), we find that pies and pasties will cost about 30c each.

Mr. Langley: They cost 24c in New South Wales.

Mr. EVANS: Is the honourable member suggesting that we should import pies and pasties from New South Wales? Liberal and Country League Governments were able to keep the costs of food and other commodities at lower levels than those of other States, but the present Government is allowing those costs to increase in comparison with those of other States. Members opposite say that it does not matter if our cost structure increases to the level of the other States; they say that that is acceptable. Indeed, I do not think they would mind if our cost structure exceeded that of other States. Actually, we should try to keep all costs down to the lowest possible level, but that is not happening, and members opposite know it. If members opposite speak to the man in the street they will be told that he is concerned about the cost of articles he has to buy. Some people have said that the Budget is excellent; it provides for expenditure of \$612,890,000, an increase of \$90,000,000, or 13 per cent. However, the inflationary trend is running at greater than 13 per cent.

So, in terms of purchasing power, there is no real increase: we are still where we were 12 months ago. In fact, with the inflationary spiral as it is, we could be worse off by the end of another 12 months. So, the amount of money that the Government intends to raise will not really help at all. If members opposite want me to say where I would make changes, I say that changes could be made in connection with proposals to build restaurants. I do not really believe that it is necessary, in a society like ours, for a Government to venture into projects to build

eating houses when it is urgent that more money should be spent on protecting the health of the community and furthering the education of our young people. Further, our Public Service is increasing at the rate of 7.8 per cent per annum in terms of personnel, not in financial terms. When one takes into account the inflationary trend, the increase in the personnel of the Public Service is undoubtedly becoming too great, and the cost involved must be borne by the man who is producing things. The Commonwealth colleagues of members opposite are starting to realize that this is the case, and they are talking about using the axe on several hundred Commonwealth public servants.

Mr. Payne: What about the man building a house in Highland Drive in your district?

Mr. EVANS: The honourable member has raised the matter of a substantial, beautiful house being built in Highland Drive, Bellevue Heights, but I know that the man who is building that house is cursing the Government because of the huge increase in building costs that he has to meet. That man is paying 15 per cent more to have his house constructed than he would have had to pay if the Government had kept inflation in check. The Treasurer recently admitted in this House that the cost of building materials and labour in this State had increased in nine months by 18 per cent. If an increase of, say, 20 per cent is projected into the future, we can realize that in five years time a house now costing \$12,000 to build will cost \$24,000. Members opposite are mistaken if they think that the man in Highland Drive is happy with the Government.

Mr. Langley: What caused the building trade to go bad? No-one would employ apprentices.

Mr. EVANS: I appreciate that interjection. The Builders Licensing Act has been operating in this State for only a short period, and it has imposed restrictions on sub-contractors; more people are changing to day labour. If the honourable member reads a speech I made about two years ago he will find that I predicted that within two years the inflationary trend (over normal inflation) would be 10 per cent or more as a result of the Builders Licensing Act. The honourable member has admitted tonight that my prediction has proved to be accurate. The average person wishing to build a house nowadays does not know from one month to the next how much he will have to pay when he arranges a building contract. Most building contracts have a rise-and-fall clause, because builders know that they cannot afford to enter into a contract without such a clause. It is so long since a fall occurred that no-one worries about the fall aspect. The average young couple today is undoubtedly afraid of the inflationary trend. The Leader said earlier today that, because of the Commonwealth Government's recent monetary measures, the authorities estimate that a young couple will have to pay an additional \$4 a week in connection with a 30-year loan of \$12,500. When we take into consideration increasing costs at the rate of 18 per cent per annum and the additional \$4 a week, we realize how difficult it will be for a young couple to make up the leeway.

Mr. Langley: Young couples seem to be finding the money.

Mr. EVANS: If the honourable member speaks to builders today, they will tell him that young couples are saying, "Is there any way in which we can cut down in order to get a house which is within the range of our borrowing and which meets our requirements?"

Mr. Langley: Houses are sold very quickly nowadays.

Mr. EVANS: The honourable member's comment relates to the situation of six months ago, but it has changed recently.

Mr. Langley: I am talking about this week.

Mr. EVANS: The other matter to which I wish to refer is the South Australian Film Corporation, which could have effective results in the State. About a year ago I wrote to the Treasurer to ask whether the corporation could help in producing a film to assist Speld, the authority that assists children who have specific learning difficulties. However, the Treasurer said that the corporation was not equipped to make a film for Speld so that it could instruct teachers on how to help these handicapped children. Now that the Treasurer has said that the corporation has the facilities and the capacity to produce films, I hope that the Government will see its way clear to negotiate with the corporation to produce a couple of films, or at least one for Speld, because all the films used today for lecturing are produced in the United States of America, Canada or Europe. It is difficult enough for these children to understand English without their having to worry about the accents or different terminology used in other countries.

I know that the member for Bragg would support my view that this organization is concerned because it is unable to obtain an Australian produced film. If South Australia were to take this action it could perhaps make the films available to the Eastern States, Western Australia and Tasmania and show a profit on them. I put this proposition to the Treasurer, because the film corporation is included in the Estimates. One other area to which I wish to refer briefly (the member for Mitcham covered it to some degree) is the idea that in Australia today it is becoming more difficult to govern and that we must liaise and have dialogue with the people in the other States more than we have had in the past, and change the Commonwealth Constitution. However, I am not one who would trifle with changing the Constitution.

If I could give a word of advice (even though it might not be acceptable to the Australian people) it would be, in effect, that we should not give politicians any more power than they already have, whether they are Liberal, Labor or any other kind, because I do not think that they need any more power. I would not centralize power any more, because the greatest protection the Australian people have is the diversity of power. We should not push it in any one direction. To illustrate what could happen, the Prime Minister, at the recent Constitution Convention in Sydney, said that he had changed his Party's view on centralism. He himself no longer believed in complete centralism, nor did his Party. He changed that philosophy and said, "Here I stand as the Prime Minister of Australia, and I alone got my Party to change its policy on centralism. Give us more power. You can trust me and my colleagues."

The Australian people respect politicians, but I ask them not to give more power to anybody or to entrust any group of politicians, whether Liberal or Labor, with any greater power in Canberra. The Prime Minister gave an example of what could happen. A good leader can lead his group in any direction, although he may not be good for the country. If all the power ends up in one little group of hands in Canberra, and if there is an influential Leader, whether Liberal or Labor, he could change Australia to the detriment of the country, unbeknown to the people. It might not be intentional, but he could do harm. The greatest protection Australia can have is by keeping the power spread as evenly as possible, especially throughout the smaller States, such as South Australia, Western

Australia, Queensland, Tasmania, and the Northern Territory, which will become a State in time.

When this State has a population of 2 500 000, the combined total population of New South Wales and Victoria will be about 20 000 000, and the voting power of the minor States in a central Government will be virtually nil. What we should be doing is asking for more power for the States, not for Canberra. It is important that we should get the message across to the people that we do not want a centralist octopus that reaches out with a tentacle and grabs everything at once. We do not want a system of Government that is removed totally from the people. I will tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the method by which I think the Australian Labor Party will try to achieve its objective: it will offer the hand of the good Samaritan to local government. I accept that local government needs help, but it should go through the State Government for it. A central Government will say to local government, "Your areas are not suitable. We want you to make areas and call them regions." I instance the report in the press this week about Whyalla, which it is suggested should take in Iron Knob and other areas and form one large area.

If the Labor Party has its way and has control in Canberra long enough it will give more and more power to the regions so that there will be no need for State Governments. The Governments will say, "You don't need State Governments. We will have regions and pay officers of the regions. We will have all the power in Canberra and the States will not matter. We will look after you in Canberra." That will not work. We may get one or two steps along the track but it will collapse, and Australia will have problems.

I do not disagree with the amalgamation of some of the smaller councils or changing boundaries to make some councils easier to operate than they operate at present. The ulterior motive behind the A.L.P. is to have regions and replace the State Government with regions, but that is a long-term view. The member for Mitcham made the point quite well that the A.L.P. was caucused at the Constitution Convention and each knew what the other was doing, except that there were some niggers in the wood pile. The member for Mitcham may not have noticed it, but I invite members to read the report of the convention when it is available, to pick out from the A.L.P. team who hedged a little, and to speak to those people privately.

Some of the A.L.P. members in Tasmania and Western Australia, which are no more minor than South Australia, should be selected. I believe that the Treasurer also is concerned about power going to the central Government and is worried about the central octopus. I believe that the whole of Australia should be worried about it. I hope that the traditional attitude of Australians will prevail in this case and that they will say, "We do not trust the politicians enough to give them any more power. You have a Constitution. Operate the country under that Constitution and, if you cannot agree among the States, make use of the money that is available. You are not fit to govern our country."

Mr. Keneally: That's inconsistent.

Mr. EVANS: It is not inconsistent. I do not want to give away any of our power or rights to the central Government. I believe in the long term that, if taxing powers are not given back to the States, a set share of the tax collected each year should go to them, without their having to go cap in hand to the Commonwealth Government saying, "We want more." If the Treasurer wants an example

of this State being penalized because of its good house-keeping in the past under Liberal and Labor Governments (I give credit to both), this year is a typical example. Money was given for the leeway to be made up on sewerage works, Victoria and New South Wales, the States that had fallen behind with services, receiving the most. New South Wales received \$11,000,000, Victoria \$9,000,000, and Western Australia and Queensland \$3,000,000 each, and Tasmania received \$1,000,000. But what did we get? South Australia received only \$1,600,000, solely because the Governments of this State have been good and thrifty housekeepers, providing greater sewerage facilities. This is the sort of thing that happens as a result. Being a minor State, South Australia cannot trust a central Government, which is concerned only about the votes it can receive in the major States. That is where its members are elected to give a majority, and it therefore considers those major States only.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: At least you have admitted that we have a good State Labor Government, anyway. That is gracious of you.

Mr. EVANS: I said that Liberal and Labor Governments have been good housekeepers in relation to the services they have provided.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That is what you admitted. Don't worry: it is in *Hansard*. Are you correcting it?

Mr. EVANS: No, I do not wish to do so. I included both Parties deliberately. I say this, even though in my area the people are concerned about the lack of sewerage facilities, and I will, therefore, be attending a public meeting soon. However, I do not denigrate the good work that has been done. I support the Bill and will refer to specific issues later.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I, too, support the Bill, and take this opportunity of complimenting those responsible for the Auditor-General's Report, which we received very late in the piece. We should have received it when the Budget was presented, but this year members did not get it until after the show adjournment. They have, therefore, had little time to study it. Those who compiled this valuable document, which is probably the best document that is presented to a Parliament, were faced with a difficult problem. The compilation of the Budget is a difficult task at the best of times, but this year those responsible had to ascertain exactly what the Commonwealth Government was going to do.

If one refers to page 102 of the report, one sees the sum spent on freeways. I am pleased that the Minister of Transport is back with us again so that he can see the dreaded and taboo word "freeway" being referred to freely in the Auditor-General's Report. One can see from the report that last year \$4,210,000 was spent on freeways under the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan. Despite our having supposedly finished with M.A.T.S., which is taboo, we spent over \$4,000,000 in this respect last year, \$2,000,000 the year before and \$3,000,000 the year before that. It can be seen, therefore, that more was spent on freeways last year than was spent in any previous year. I am pleased the Minister received this report now and not before he went away, as it may have upset his trip, the principal purpose of which was to study this type of thing abroad. I hope he did study it, that he has brought back information, and that he has not forgotten all he saw while he was away.

I am particularly concerned about the proposed fly-over at the Oaklands crossing, work on which was originally expected to commence in 1977 and be completed perhaps in

three years. Morphett Road, which leads up to this crossing, is in a bad condition, and no relief, not even temporary relief, is being given to the people who live in this area. I hope that the Minister will take note of this matter and that, if any assistance can be given under the "Miscellaneous" line, he will do his best to assist the people in this area.

I draw the Government's attention to the line dealing with the Fire Brigades Board on page 246 of the report. One sees there that the State Government contributed \$410,388 to the board, while local government contributed \$676,831—far more than the State Government's contribution. Of course, the insurance companies contributed much more (\$1,779,726). I draw this matter to the attention of the Minister of Local Government, because he would realize the hardships being imposed on local government in having to pay for these facilities. In his Financial Statement, the Treasurer said:

Three weeks ago, when the Loan Estimates were presented, it seemed that the deficit could be about \$13,000,000 and I thought it might be prudent to close that gap a little by seeking additional revenues from such measures. Since then, all major sources of receipts have been reviewed again, and it seems that the buoyancy of late 1972-73 is being sustained in some areas. The estimates of receipts have been reviewed upwards and the Budget gap is now estimated at \$11,254,000.

In only three weeks the Treasurer finds a difference of \$1,750,000. He continued:

We propose, in consequence, to refrain from introducing any more tax measures at this stage, to keep a careful watch on Budget trends, and to take such action as seems appropriate from time to time.

He said we would not have any more taxes to pay. I should think not, because we are already saddled with many taxes. Hospital fees have increased by \$4 a day, harbor charges have been increased, pay-roll tax has been increased and, when we convert to the metric system, everyone who uses water will have to pay more. Despite all this, the Treasurer says that he will not impose any more taxes. That is a fantastic statement for him to make.

Electricity charges, which Opposition members predicted would increase by 10 per cent as a result of the Government's action, have actually increased by 11 per cent. That increase will apply to everyone, including pensioners and others who can ill afford the extra cost but who must use electricity. The Government is thumping the aged and everyone in the community who cannot afford this type of increase. Of course, the Government is following well in the footsteps of its Commonwealth bosses, who have imposed increases in the interest rates on loans, affecting everyone in Australia, particularly young people, who will have to pay up to \$4 a week extra in interest on money that they have borrowed to purchase and establish houses.

What has happened to the plan that the Treasurer announced some time ago about cheap housing? The Government said that it would put 55 units on a transport corridor in the Smithfield area comprising 7½ acres (3.24 ha). If that is not high-density living, I will go he! Building societies, private developers, or anyone else in the private sector would not be allowed to do that and I should like to know what the Director of Planning thought about the Government's plan. The Director is responsible to some extent for the administration of the Planning and Development Act, but even Chief Justice Bray said he could not understand the provisions of the Act, yet they were forced on councils without those councils being allowed to amend them in any way.

Dr. Tonkin: I think the Government depends on that and does not want anyone to understand.

Mr. MATHWIN: I think that is the method the Government has used. On page 7 of the Financial Statement, the Treasurer states that receipts from taxation will increase by \$22,147,000, or 19 per cent, to \$137,716,000. Receipts from public works and services will increase by \$46,780,000, or 22 per cent, to \$248,015,000. Commonwealth grants will increase by \$21,666,000, or 10 per cent.

The Treasurer states, under the heading "Public works and services", that \$30,000,000 will be transferred to the Railways Department. That is a staggering amount that the taxpayer must face. It is the equivalent of \$576,923 a week, \$82,191.78 a day, \$3,424.66 an hour, or \$57.08 a minute! That is what it is costing the taxpayers to keep the railways in operation. The Minister of Transport went on a study tour to get information which I had given him last year and the year before but which he did not believe: Now he is saying publicly, "This is a good idea". He has read the reports of my speeches in *Hansard*, gone away and had a good time, and then has dealt with what I said last year.

Yesterday the Minister stated that transport in this State will possibly be free. Although the people are paying \$57.08 a minute now to the railways, the Minister is suggesting that we carry railway and other public transport passengers free of charge. This has been tried in other countries, including Italy, and when I was in Rome last year I was fortunate enough to have some interesting free trips. What will be the cost to the taxpayer when travel in South Australia is completely free?

Mr. Coumbe: It will be priceless!

Mr. MATHWIN: It will indeed. The Treasurer also states on page 7 of his Financial Statement:

Revenue from stamp duties is most difficult to estimate this year, especially in the area of conveyance of property, where such a high level of activity took place in 1972-73. The Treasurer is going to put a stop to that! He also states:

Apart from the normal problem of attempting to project into the future from a base that seems to be in no way typical, there is the further complication of trying to assess the likely effects of the Government's proposals to restrain the increase in price of building allotments.

This is interesting. We all know that the Treasurer has stated that the Government will prevent people from making a profit of more than 7 per cent on any land or property transaction. However, what has happened regarding the sale of land that the Government owned? The Minister of Transport, in reply to a Question on Notice, gave me information yesterday about sales of Government-owned property.

The Government sold an allotment in Marleston, which it purchased for \$38,400, for \$91,200, or 137 per cent more than the purchase price. It sold another property, at Lucas Street, Richmond, for \$6,875, having purchased it for \$3,000, making a profit of 129 per cent. Further, it sold for \$7,800 an allotment in Torrensville that it had purchased for \$3,470, a profit of 125 per cent. Again, this good Labor Socialist Government, which thinks everyone is naughty and must not make a profit of more than 7 per cent on land transactions, sold a property at Nunyah Avenue, Parkholme, for \$9,500, although it had purchased it for \$2,800. That was a profit of 239 per cent.

It purchased a property in Nickels Avenue, Parkholme, for \$3,300 and sold it for \$8,625. A block purchased at Plympton Park for \$3,731 was sold for \$10,100, a profit of 170 per cent. This was sold in February, 1973. That is a shocking profit, but this Socialist Government says that it is shocking for people to make more than 7 per cent profit. A block purchased at Anzac Highway,

Plympton, for \$11,850 was sold for \$45,000, a profit of 280 per cent. Yet this is the Government that tells people they are naughty if they gain more than 7 per cent and that legislation will be introduced to prevent more than a gain of 7 per cent. That block was sold in May this year. The Government has indicated that any land sold after May 5 will be subject to a profit of 7 per cent.

Yet another property in Grange Road, Findon, was purchased for \$12,700 and sold for \$15,300, a mere 20 per cent profit. Here is an example that will make the member for Unley's mouth water: he would make more at this job than he would make by overcharging on electrical repairs. It costs more to obtain an electrician than it does to get the family doctor. In Hayward Avenue, Torrensville, a block was purchased for \$12,200 and sold for \$63,500, and that is a profit of 420 per cent. These are instances of sales by a Capitalist Socialist Government that proclaims that people must not do this. In Novar Gardens a block was purchase for \$63,200 and sold for \$132,500, a profit of 110 per cent. Is that not shocking! If the railways could operate like this we would all be able to have free rides. I should like to give one more example from my magic paper. A block in Norman Terrace, Everard Park, was purchased for \$38,800 and sold for \$60,000, a profit of 54.6 per cent. It was sold in June, 1973, immediately after the Government had put on the brakes and told people they must not do this sort of thing. If honourable members would like me to read through these details again—

Mr. Langley: Tell us when they were bought.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the member for Glenelg has given enough illustrations, and I hope he will not repeat them. I suggest that he gets on to the subject under discussion, and that is the State Budget. The member for Glenelg.

Mr. MATHWIN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for drawing my attention to this matter, but the details I have given relate to the Budget. I turn now to another section of the Budget, and in his statement the Treasurer said:

The operation of the financial assistance grant formula gave South Australia a grant of \$470,000 below estimate. Wage increases were very much as expected but, with a decline in the migrant intake, the percentage increase in population did not reach the expected level and this was automatically reflected in the grant.

It seems that the decrease in the intake of migrants has been reflected in the Commonwealth grant, but the Treasurer suggests that we do not increase the number of migrants to this State. Although we have a problem in the building industry with a shortage of labour, the Premier suggested that we should build a casino, because that would be more important and would help us to receive money from the Commonwealth. The Premier as Minister in charge of immigration, should realize that we have a problem in this State and that the building trade requires skilled and unskilled workers, but he has not seen fit to adopt any scheme to attract migrants to this country. I asked him during the Loan Estimates debate whether it was difficult to obtain migrants: he told me that it was, and that if I had addresses he would be pleased to receive them.

From my inquiries I know that many people wish to migrate to Australia, but it seems that the Treasurer is not interested in introducing an advertising campaign in Europe and the United Kingdom to attract migrants to this State. The member for Whyalla seems to be pleased that the Commonwealth Minister for Immigration had prevented unskilled migrants from coming to Broken Hill Proprietary

Company Limited at Whyalla, the unions there having been successful in obtaining over-award payments. We have a problem in this country, because we have to obtain tradesmen quickly, particularly in the building trades.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: When are you going home?

Mr. MATHWIN: I will go home any time the Minister likes if he will pay my fare, but I will be back. In fact, if he supplies the money I will go with him as adviser, because he needs some advice. The member for Unley is way off beam when he talks about subcontract work in the building trade; he does not know what he is talking about. He is in a protected trade. He can send his men out and charge a service fee of about \$8.50; the man goes out with a screwdriver, and within three minutes he can hold out his hand for \$8.50. A doctor cannot do that. Subcontract work was a most successful scheme for building houses within the building trade, but the Government pursues its policy of forcing out subcontractors. It stops anyone with incentive. The idea of a Socialist Government is to cut out people who have an incentive to go on their own and work hard. The Government does not like bonus schemes because it is hard for the less diligent worker to keep up. The Government says, "We will control what you have and how you will work". I cannot really understand the thinking of the member for Unley.

Mr. Langley: How many subcontractors have apprentices?

Mr. MATHWIN: If the honourable member had an apprentice, he would be a sorcerer's apprentice!

Mr. Langley: Why don't you stop being personal and get on with your speech?

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable member has been personal towards me all night.

Mr. Langley: I have not said anything against you.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg.

Mr. MATHWIN: I thank you, Sir, for your protection. I refer now to the Estimates of Expenditure. I note that for tourism last year the amount that was allocated was underspent by \$3,000—on the local scene. That is a great pity. I am again surprised at the Treasurer, who of course is the Minister responsible for tourism and who states at every given opportunity his favourite line: "We have a Mediterranean climate and should take every advantage of it". Yet he underspends in tourism \$3,000, which is amazing. If we look at the line "Overseas visits of Premier and officers" under "Office of Premier", we see that last year the cost was \$3,738; this year it is expected to be \$16,000—five times as much. So it looks as though the Treasurer is expecting to make a few grand tours around the world.

In passing, I refer to a few odd matters about education. I am disappointed that the Minister of Education, under "Miscellaneous", should have allocated the Surf Life Saving Association of Australia only another \$11,000; it has been consistently that for the last three years. I imagine the Minister of Education, who knows much about the surf life saving service and is sympathetic, as all members are, to the Surf Life Saving Association, knows what a good job it does; but it is getting more responsibility with the increasing population and with daylight saving. I think the Government could have provided more than \$11,000 for this association.

I see that the Boy Scouts Association is to get only the same amount as it got previously, and it has Woodhouse and many more places to look after. One would have thought that the Government would be a little more sympathetic to that association than granting it a meagre

\$2,500. In closing my few remarks, let me say that the Treasurer was angry about the effect on the brandy industry of the actions of his Commonwealth colleagues. He stands by just watching and doing nothing while this great spiralling of prices and wages goes on. The Commonwealth Government has done practically nothing in this regard about what is probably the biggest thing facing us in this country—inflation.

Mr. Keneally: Have you any ideas?

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes; there are plenty of ideas. With prices and incomes rising, why does the Commonwealth Treasurer not tackle the problem, really get into it and do something about it? No doubt, the State Government would agree to any effective action, but merely putting the brake on prices is sheer madness. The only proper method of combating inflation is to peg wages and prices; we cannot do the one without the other. That is obvious to anyone. The only alternative, if we do not want to peg wages and prices, is to curb Government spending.

Mr. Keneally: You have been pegging wages for 50 years but you have not been pegging prices.

Mr. MATHWIN: The member for Stuart has been in this life long enough to know that the minimum is pegged. The member for Whyalla said today in this Chamber that the Commonwealth Minister for Immigration was not allowing immigrants to come to Whyalla so that his unions there could get over-award payments.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. MATHWIN: Honourable members know as well as I do that that is a fact.

*Members interjecting:*

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg.

Mr. MATHWIN: [ know that members opposite are a little upset, as I have touched them on a raw spot, so let us see what the *Advertiser* of September 11 said about statements made by the Commonwealth Treasurer, as follows:

Decisions "first in inflation fight". "This is the beginning," Mr. Crean said. "We will take such measures as we can at the right and proper time".

The next part is terrific:

Mr. Crean said it may be some time before the housewife sees the effects of revaluation in lower prices for food in shops.

I am sure it will take some time for that to happen. In fact, I will be amazed if housewives living today live long enough to see the prices of food come down under the present Government. If there is a change of Government, of course, there will be an opportunity for prices to come down.

Mr. Langley: Did your Government peg food prices?

Mr. MATHWIN: The Liberal Government never had the galloping inflation that is facing the country now. The Treasurer said last night that revaluation was a necessary move in view of the growth of overseas reserves, the increase in the amount of money available, and the extraordinary consumer demand being generated in the country. One does not have to be a genius to know what is happening. People are buying articles now because they know that if they leave their purchases until later the articles will cost more. In today's *Advertiser* there is a special plea from the Commonwealth Treasurer: "Don't sell your shares!" What a terrific thing to say! In effect, the Commonwealth Treasurer is saying, "We have ripped the guts out of the share market, but don't sell your shares: Australia's future is good, and the shares will appreciate in value." The Commonwealth Socialist Government wants the working man's dollar in its pocket; it has a policy of

high taxation. I believe that it is the theory of members opposite to soak, the rich, but they must realize that it is not a bottomless pit, and there is an end to what the people can stand. Many people who supported the Government are beginning to receive salaries that are in the brackets where they will be thrashed by taxation. With the Commonwealth Government's policy of high taxation, it will be a sorry state for South Australia and Australia generally. I support the Bill.

Mr. HOPGOOD (Mawson): I, like other members, from time to time conduct schoolchildren around the precincts of the Chamber, and one of the points I habitually make is that this is a public place: all statements made here are available to all citizens through *Hansard*, through the press, and also through the public galleries. I would rather imagine that members of the public availing themselves of this knowledge of the debate so far would really wonder what the dickens we were discussing, because so far we have heard about practically everything in this debate. We waited for nearly 45 minutes for the member for Glenelg, who talked about reducing Government expenditure, to suggest areas in which the reduction might take place. We thought that perhaps he would use the last four minutes of his time to put forward specific prescriptions. Unfortunately, however, we heard nothing.

We have heard the debate largely turn into a parade of Liberal shibboleths, and we have heard it largely centre around the concept of inflation and what should be done to cure it but, again, without any real specific prescriptions such as might be useful to this Government or, indeed, to the Australian Government, which seems to be increasingly the subject of attack from the gentlemen opposite, rather than the Government that sits in this place. In view of the line that the debate has taken, I think that I, too, should have one or two remarks to make about inflation, because it is part of the conventional economic wisdom of our society that Budgets have a part to play in the control of economic disturbances in the community. What members opposite have said is that neither the Commonwealth Budget nor the State Budget has really gone anywhere towards meeting the problem of inflation in this country. I am awfully glad that neither of those documents addressed itself to this problem. I believe that we are now growing out of the phase where people thought that, by some means of fiscal policy through a Budget, it was possible to control inflation.

Let us see what was the result of heavy-handed Liberal attempts to use these means to control inflation. The member for Glenelg, who has a very short memory (or maybe he was not even in the country at the time), told us that there had never been an inflation in Australia such as that which we are now experiencing. Of course, he may not have been in the country at the time, but in 1951 inflation was considerably more severe under the Menzies Government, which promised to put value back into the pound. At that time the result was a horror Budget, which led to considerable inflation. A similar thing happened in 1961 in the credit squeeze, and a lesser effect arose from a McMahon Budget only a couple of years ago.

If Governments want to control inflation, there is a very simple means whereby that can be achieved, but it is also extremely undesirable: all one has to do is create a pool of unemployed. If we wanted to stop inflation in Australia tomorrow, I imagine it would be possible to stop it, using this socially undesirable form of control. But do we really want to go back to that and to follow the prescription of the member for Alexandra, who brought out

some most extraordinary statements in this debate? He wants to slash wages, retrench all over the place, and bring in a system of, I guess, piece-work in Government departments. We are well aware of the socially undesirable consequences that would follow in the train of such policies.

Liberal spokesmen have been talking for a long time and implying that the workers of this country are bludgers and worse and that they should be whipped into line, and that we need far more productivity than we have at present, yet Liberal administrations are rarely willing to carry out the logic of what they say. Premier Butler the younger advocated piece-work at the 1927 State election. He was in power for only three years, and then a Labor Government was elected but, following the Labor Government, the Liberals had many years in which they could have tried out these systems that might have brought in greater productivity. I am not aware that any of these harsh schemes, as I would call them, were introduced. As far as I am aware, the workers were not whipped harshly by these Governments' introducing schemes of piece-work, payment by results and trying to weed out the "bludgers"; none of these things seems to have happened.

Mr. Coumbe: But industrial development—

Mr. HOPGOOD: I would not deny that the industrial development of this State, such as we know it, began in the early 1930's when Butler the younger was Premier. However, I am not discussing that point but replying to a point raised by the member for Alexandra, who in effect said, "Look, we need greater productivity, and we can do it by getting tougher." If previous Liberal Government Administrations got tougher (and I am not aware that they did) it has not led to increased productivity. As far as I am aware, they have not got tougher because, when it comes to administration, other facts must be taken into consideration. We want more than sloganeering and tough talk from the Opposition in these matters, because inflation is a difficult problem to tackle. I remember reading years ago in the *New Statesman* that the Western economies, as we know them, were finished unless some effective and socially desirable counter to inflation could be adopted. As far as I am aware, this counter has not as yet been adopted.

My own viewpoint is that the only socially desirable kinds of control that could be introduced are those which would involve fairly large-scale Government intervention in the market economy, but I know that that advice would be rejected largely by Opposition members. I simply say to them that the only alternative to that form of control on inflation is the heavy bludgeon of artificially introduced employment.

Mr. Coumbe: Will you expand your proposition a little?

Mr. HOPGOOD: I have only 37 minutes, and there are other areas in which I want to become involved. Perhaps the member for Torrens can draw me out on that point later. There are all kinds of ways in which I believe Government controls can be instituted. I believe, for instance, that we have to do more in the way of trust-busting legislation. I am well aware that State Labor Governments had problems with their Upper Houses in the past so far as the reference of these powers is concerned. I support the reference of control over prices (and wages are a form of price) to the Australian Government, because that is the only level at which real controls can be exercised. This has been shown by the failure of State Governments to continue pricing policies after the defeat of the Chifley referendum on prices in 1948, I think it was. I support the reference of this power, which would also

involve control on wages over and above the fairly Draconian controls we have in the wage sector.

I am not too sure that the Party opposite is dinkuni about this point of view. I am well aware that the member for Heysen is not happy about the reference of such powers or, indeed, about the efficacy of controls on prices or wages. When by way of disorderly interjection earlier in another debate certain Government members tried to pin down the member for Eyre on the same point, we got a most equivocal answer. Some sort of a temporary reference of powers to the Australian Government, such as was hinted at by the member for Eyre, is simply not good enough, because we did not know what kind of time sequence he was talking about. Inflation is something that cannot be wished out of the window by a brief period of controls on prices and wages. Inflation will come back, and will come back again, so we need something more than simply a temporary transfer. One of the reasons why inflation will come back and come back again is that the problem is not solely a national problem but an international problem. Last week I read some very interesting (and, I suggest, salutary) comments in the *Melbourne Age*, which quoted Professor Galbraith, the wellknown and, indeed, celebrated American economist. He is by no means a red: he was the economic adviser to the Kennedy Administration. This is what he said (and I do not know whether he was similarly reported in the South Australian press at the time) under the heading "Economic seer issues a pessimistic prophesy on inflation":

John Kenneth Galbraith, brilliant economist and best-selling author, is pessimistic about Australia's chances of controlling inflation. Professor Galbraith, who arrived in Melbourne yesterday, said he doubted that any action taken in Australia alone would control inflation. The decisive question is that it be brought under control in my own country—the United States, Professor Galbraith said at an airport press conference. Inflation is a world-wide problem, and it's going to be serious as long as it isn't tackled in the metropolitan economy. As long as inflation is out of control in the U.S., it is likely to be out of control in those countries that do a lot of trade with the U.S.—like Australia.

In other words, when the American economy coughs, the rest of us sneeze. I think that is true. The article continues:

Just two things are necessary to control inflation.

He was talking about the metropolitan economy of the United States of America as opposed to backwoods areas such as Australia. The article continues:

We must have tax increases—because the primary cause of inflation is the excess amount of money in the hands of consumers—and we need to get serious about controls on prices and wages.

So there it is. I think that any Government that allows itself to be stampeded into precipitate action on inflation as a result of misinformed, in part pernicious, criticism by any part of the political world or, indeed, by the population in general is to be condemned. In view of what has been said by so famous an economist as Professor Galbraith, I think it is wrong that we should over-react to this situation. After all, what is important is not so much that inflation is taking place but that it is taking place at a level which is not dangerously out of line with what is happening in other economies, particularly those with which we trade. Members should know enough about economics for me not to have to develop why it is important whether we are inflating much more quickly than other economies are. Apart from that, the only other problem about inflation is the differential effect it has on various groups in the community.

I remind members that deflation also has a differential effect, largely on other groups within the community. If one wishes to talk about the way in which a certain group is disadvantaged, groups are being disadvantaged all the time, whether we have inflation, deflation, or for want of a better word what I might call a steady state economy. What a Government must determine is what is the least of the various evils available to it, and who we allow to be most greatly affected by whatever prevailing economic circumstances we are faced with at that time.

If as a result of inflation certain needy groups need extra assistance, that can be handled within the economy. That is something that can be handled as a result of political decisions by the Government of the day. It is not necessarily a danger signal that precipitate action should be taken by the Government of the day which would have all kinds of undesirable social consequence. For these reasons, I hope that no Government will be panicked into taking measures that may have these undesirable consequences. I rather hope that we will examine the whole problem and do what we can to extend the apparatus of control, not just for control's sake (sometimes a more sophisticated rather than a more Draconian control is what we want) but in order to do what we need to do: try to achieve the extremely difficult goal of controlling inflation while maintaining employment at a high level within a world economy that has inflation as a problem.

Many other points have been raised in this debate. The member for Glenelg entertained us hugely with what he said about land prices. Again by way of disorderly interjection, Government members attempted to obtain from him the dates on which the various parcels of land had been purchased, but either he did not have that information or he wilfully sought to conceal it from us, because under the legislation now before the House, to which I am not permitted to refer at length, these sorts of profits could still be obtained.

The legislation refers to resale after a certain date, not to the first sale. The member for Glenelg has not told us whether he was talking about resale (which is unlikely) or whether he was talking about the first sale, which would not be controlled in the legislation contemplated by the Government. I have a more serious criticism of the honourable member: that he was not dinkum in what he had to say. From what he has said it is obvious that he does not want control of land prices. He was taxing the Government with an alleged inconsistency. He was not putting forward a mature and considered point of view from his side of politics about what should be done in an area that is one of the prime causes of inflation such as we are now experiencing. That is an example of the general tendency of Opposition members to have a general shot at what is going on without in any way attempting to advance prescriptions that might in some way assist. My suggestion, unkind as it probably is, is that members opposite do not have these prescriptions available to them.

As it is more productive for one to refer to the various lines in Committee, I will not do so now. However, I wanted to say a few things about what I think we must do regarding inflation and the types of attitude we should adopt, and again to tax the general constructiveness and sincerity of the Opposition. So far as I can see, the constructiveness that one might have expected has not eventuated.

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): I could not let this opportunity pass without expressing my views on several aspects of this Budget. The way in which the Budget was presented proves that it is only a matter of time before this Government

disposes of Budgets altogether. This would be a pity, as a Budget gives members an opportunity to express their views on matters pertaining to their districts, although until recently it appeared that no Government member was willing to get up and express his views. However, the member for Mawson is the only Government member who has supported the Treasurer.

I am afraid I cannot get very enthusiastic about this Budget, which is one of the most unenthusiastic Budgets I have heard in the six years I have been a member of this House. I have been trying to find a name for it, but I cannot do so. I liken it to a dentist who is about to do some extractions but, when he opens the patient's mouth, finds that the teeth have already been extracted. That is how I find this Budget: the teeth have already been extracted. In other words, the taxation measures have been introduced prior to the presentation of the Budget. Apparently, the Government is putting into operation the old saying that a little and often is more acceptable than all at once, although in this case the taxation increases are large, not small. This method has been successful in hoodwinking the public and the press, because the day after the Budget was presented a report in the *Advertiser* under the heading "No tax rises, big spending in South Australian Budget" states:

South Australians were blessed yesterday with a State Budget free from taxation increases.

That statement was correct, because all the taxation increases had been introduced prior to the presentation of the Budget. Many busy people read newspaper headlines only, and anyone doing that would be misled because they would think that no taxation increases had been introduced. The article continues:

In a 55-minute speech to Parliament, Mr. Dunstan said buoyant conditions and a review of major income had eased an expected record \$13,000,000 deficit to \$11,254,000 and made possible an easier Budget than expected. This was a startling reversal of the thinking three weeks ago when the Premier expected taxation increases to raise another \$5,000,000 to \$6,000,000 at least.

Having just returned from a less than generous Premiers' Conference, he then announced increases in water and electricity charges, hospital fees and harbor charges as well as a 1 per cent increase in pay-roll tax. And he indicated then that the worst was yet to come.

Yesterday's Budget did not cancel his options to raise extra taxes later, but the threat of unpopular reaction was effectively dampened by introducing the four major increases on July 4. An 11 per cent increase in electricity prices from today will mean all four are now gathering revenue. Mr. Dunstan indicated he would play the current economy by ear and introduce additional taxation measures if they seemed necessary.

This bears out what I said earlier, that we can expect additional taxation from time to time with an eventual phasing-out of the Budget. The editorial in the *Advertiser* of August 31 under the heading "Mr. Dunstan's Budget" states:

Despite its \$11,000,000 deficit, the State Government Budget is unspectacular.

I said I could not find a word to describe the Budget, but the press has described it as unspectacular, and I think the press has aptly named it. The editorial continues:

The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) has been careful to ensure that in part by announcing most of its unpalatable features well in advance. The most substantial increases in spending are, both predictably and necessarily, for what are loosely called "quality of life" programmes, and for education in particular. Although there is always room for carping on detail or on the precise magnitude of departmental spending, the overall character of the Government proposals is unexceptionable. Even so, it is impossible to escape from the fact that the way in which revenue is raised can be almost as important as the way in which it is spent.

In this respect Mr. Dunstan's Budget is as unwelcome as the long line of its forerunners in the way it has had to resort to regressive taxes and increased charges for basic utilities to finance its new spending.

So much for the editorial. It seems that the press is no more impressed than the public, and I assure the Government that the public are not impressed with this State Budget or with the Commonwealth Budget. On page 51 of the Estimates of Expenditure there is an item under the Engineering and Water Supply Department line regarding electricity for pumping. Last year \$800,000 was allowed for this item and actual payments were \$715,000. This year \$1,237,000 is proposed, an increase of about 34 per cent on the amount voted last year. At present the reservoirs are holding more water than they were at this time last year, so the increase in estimated pumping costs must be attributed to increases in electricity charges.

The recent announcement of an increase of about 11 per cent in electricity charges in this State, brought about by the loading imposed on the Electricity Trust by the Government, has added a further burden on industry in this State. If the Government accedes to the recommendation in the Coombs report, there will be further steep increases in the price of electricity in South Australia. That report recommends a renegotiation of the freight rates charged on the transport of coal from Leigh Creek to Port Augusta. The last adjustment of freight rates, which was an increase to \$1.15 a ton (1.016 t), took place in 1956 under an arrangement between the State and the Commonwealth Governments. The agreement was that this rate would operate in perpetuity, unless an alteration took place with the consent of both parties.

At that time the standard freight rate for coal was \$3.30 a ton, so it seems that the increase was set at about one-third of the standard rate. The Coombs report pointed out that an additional 20c a ton would increase the revenue of the Commonwealth Railways by \$320,000 a year. The last analysis of cost was made in 1960 and, for a return of 41 per cent on the capital outlay, an additional 50c a ton, or \$800,000 a year, would be needed.

We know that there have been many cost increases since 1960, as well as increases in interest rates. If another agreement is negotiated, the increase in freight costs could well involve more than \$1,000,000 a year, resulting in increased electricity charges again next year. The present standard rate on the transport of coal from Leigh Creek to Port Augusta (a distance of 258 km or about 160 miles) is \$4.08 a ton. If the concession rate is abolished and South Australia is required to pay the standard rate, the additional cost to the State will be \$4,500,000 a year. Probably, this would make it more economical to use natural gas, but that would have disastrous effects on the township of Leigh Creek. The Coombs report concludes by stating:

It is clear that the present arrangements are a relic of historical circumstances and should be reconsidered. Possibilities: any increase in this freight rate will require negotiations with the South Australian Government. Legislation: not required but amendment of the present agreement with South Australia would be necessary.

It seems that, if the Commonwealth Government takes action on this report and approaches the State Government with a view to having negotiations, the State Government must stand firm. Otherwise, we will have another increase in electricity charges next year. I appeal to the Government to consider the township of Leigh Creek and the public of South Australia before agreeing to any increase in the rate. I support the second reading.



Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I have pleasure in supporting the Bill. The Budget is a supplementary measure to follow the Commonwealth Budget. It is apparent from speeches made by other honourable members that the sector that is hit most comprises the individual who is trying to achieve something himself. Almost all speeches have been in defence of the individual, the consumer, and the private enterprise person or family unit trying to achieve something.

The biggest problem has stemmed from the lack of effectiveness in controlling inflation. In December last we had a revaluation. We have since had, on a Commonwealth level, the lifting of tariffs, another revaluation, and an increase in interest rates. On a State basis, we have had increases in electricity and water charges, pay-roll tax, and harbor dues, and all of those increases affect the person who is trying to build something for himself, trying to create something and to look after his family unit.

All the industries affected are primarily export industries, and these are the industries that are, in the main, affected in my district. I refer to the fishing, grain and wool industries. They all rely heavily on an export market to achieve their ends. Figures show that the most recent Commonwealth revaluations have taken \$181,000,000 from the primary producer. It is all very nice to read reports that the primary producer can afford this. He is going through the stage now where he has a high income. He is receiving record prices, not by world standards but record prices compared to the last 10 years. It seems that he faces a record production level for the coming year. I consider that this will have serious and adverse effects, because the Government is riding on a wave of borrowed time and borrowed money. We cannot expect to receive these high prices in the future or to have the prospects of such a high production year. This will catch up.

At present the Commonwealth Government is aiming most of its means of raising revenue at the sections of the community that are benefiting from the good season. However, what will happen when the good season runs out? I think that then the Government will have to come back and say to the man in the street, "Last year we got \$181,000,000 from the primary producing sector. We took \$143,000,000 from him by way of reduced export incentives, and so on. We have had a record production year, but now it has gone. Where are we going to collect the money?" It will all come back on the people, but I believe the real impact will be felt in two or three years. An editorial in the *News* is significant in that it suggests that house buyers will be hardest hit. The editorial states:

The Government had to do something about inflation. It decided on a credit squeeze. Now, ironically, the people hardest hit will be those who helped put Labor in office. Mortgages will be more expensive, bank loan and hire-purchase interest rates higher, and the economy generally is in for a shake-up.

Young middle-class families, during the coming months, stand to lose more than any other section of the community. In housing alone, almost everyone with a mortgage faces either higher payments or mortgage extensions. This is a further setback to young people trying to save for a house—those people the Government was so concerned about helping in its pre-election speeches.

Mr. Venning: Do you think they will vote for Labor again?

Mr. BLACKER: Time will tell whether the Government will be able to regain the confidence of these people. When I refer to country people I mean all people living

in the country, not just farmers. The Budget has struck a savage blow at farmers but they are by no means alone in receiving these wild punches. The country dweller, be he farmer, businessman, teacher, miner, manufacturer, public servant, or whatever he is, finds himself paying more to live in the country. He must pay higher water rates; his electricity charges have been increased; he has to pay more for newspapers; and he is being taxed to live outside the metropolitan area. We are seeing a massive programme involving a redirection of resources away from country areas, mining industries, and the manufacturing sector towards the consuming sector. This approach has many dangers, and it has a disturbing emphasis when the consumer is considered at the expense of the productive sector. The economic strength and wide-ranging welfare programmes are built not on consumption but on production and the resources that production makes available to the nation.

Little evidence is available to suggest that the Labor Party understands this point of view, and this lack of understanding of the basic nature of sound economic management will bring great trouble to this country. We depend on primary industry. The latest figures available indicate that 77 per cent of our export earnings was derived from primary production: 57 per cent exported in the raw state and an extra 20 per cent exported as processed material. If we allow the primary-producing sector of the community to be pushed aside, what becomes of country towns? These towns would be of no further use scattered round and people would drift into the city and create a centralized effect; food would have to be found for them and the whole country would fall apart. Who would become responsible for production?

One of the greatest problems today is a world food shortage. The Australian farmer is the most efficient farmer in the world, and an article in today's *Advertiser* states:

Each farm worker in South Australia now provides food for 66 people, compared to 45 in 1948.

That is an interesting comparison, because the present production record for the American primary producer is 45, compared to our 66. I believe this indicates that great credit is due to the Australian primary producer, because he has achieved this standard through adversity. This adversity has created an efficient primary producer, who is unequalled in the world. A newspaper report of an address by the Director of Agriculture (Mr. M. R. Irving) to the Women's Agricultural Bureau last Monday states:

Mr. Irving said the number of farm workers in South Australia had dropped from 41 500 to 28 900 in 25 years. This represented a fall from 6.6 per cent to 2.4 per cent of the working population. But the value of production per farm worker had increased from \$4,800 to \$7,800 a year. Cattle numbers had trebled and the sheep population had more than doubled since 1948.

"Wool exports still account for more than 50 per cent of the total national export", Mr. Irving said. "Farmers have shown more skill and ingenuity. Every technical advance made by farmers which increases economic production finds its way to the consumer's plate."

Mr. Irving said the welfare of the community would depend on the success of agriculture just as much in the future as it had in the past.

I believe that we must protect this section of the industry because, although we are small in numbers, we play an important part in the economic life of the State, and this factor has to be considered. When we look further to see what has happened to the primary-producing sector, we find that new-ground farmers are being pushed out. I am

concerned that the discontinuance of taxation incentives on a Commonwealth basis (and those counteracted on a State basis) has made it impossible to continue land development as an economic proposition. These conditions have ruled out the man trying to build up a farm, to develop a property, and to create something for his young family. I do not believe that this is in the best interests of the country, because the man who is willing to use his hard labour in developing a property has now had the carpet swept from under his feet, and the way has been left open for high-finance syndicates to come in and develop the property. This, to me, is a step in the wrong direction.

Mr. Keneally: That's the ultimate result of the capitalist system: we advocate Socialism.

Mr. BLACKER: I believe that both Labor Budgets have resulted in a windfall for financial institutions. Although this matter has not been referred to in the debate, it is something that should be brought to members' attention. Probably one of the greatest problems and single factors influencing the high inflation rate has been the value of money to make money. The rise in interest rates, whilst affecting the consumer and dampening his spirits, will enable high-finance institutions to have a wow of a time, because they can raise their interest rates and go ahead merrily in a capitalist situation, but in the end a situation will be created in which high-finance institutions will be in control. The whole process tends to knock the private sector. The Government does not intend to cut Government spending in its efforts to dampen inflation. It has chosen other methods and, whilst I do not go along entirely with statements that we must reduce the number of public servants, I believe it is necessary for the situation to be reappraised. I see in today's *Australian* the headline "Job switch orders for 10 000 public servants". No-one will be put out of a job, but it is evident that the Government has recognized that an element of efficiency has been missing and it is necessary to create this efficiency in order to save millions of dollars. Further down the page we see that this move will lead to the saving of millions of dollars for the Commonwealth Government. I am pleased that at least one part of the problem has been recognized and an attempt made to rectify the situation.

Mr. Keneally: The rationalization of primary industry is equally as important; it should be equally as efficient as you would like the Public Service to be.

Mr. BLACKER: That the Public Service should be equally as efficient as primary industry?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: An inquiry is proceeding now into the Public Service of South Australia.

Mr. BLACKER: I am concerned about where we are going, because I believe the country is riding on the crest of a financial wave and experiencing a level of insecurity, inasmuch as the Commonwealth Government has budgeted by taxing the primary-producing sector of the community very hard in the hope of gaining extra taxation as a result of its budgeting measures and the recent revaluation. There is also the fact that we are looking forward to a record season and the tax available from the primary producers will be at a record level, never exceeded previously; but it will be very short-term, and that is what concerns me.

Mr. Venning: What will happen next year if it is an average year?

Mr. BLACKER: That will be so even in an average year. This year, we are working on record prices for wheat. The world price at present is \$3.64, almost 300

per cent higher than it was last year. The price of barley is at least double the price it was last year.

Mr. Keneally: What about beef?

Mr. BLACKER: We are getting high prices for wool, beef, and mutton. Pig meat prices are not so high, but they are rising. The whole movement is creating an artificial level in the State's economy.

I comment further on the price of beef, as the member for Stuart has brought it to my notice. The Australian housewife is fortunate that she benefits by purchasing the cheapest meat available in the world. This is partly because of our marketing systems and partly because of the primary producers, who have been able to put meat on the consumer market in the butcher shops in the metropolitan area more cheaply than it can be sold anywhere else in the world. Now that world parity is rising, we are trying to capitalize on the export market, and the Australian housewife is becoming perturbed because she has to pay a little more than she used to. At present she is well able to pay these prices, as she has paid them previously. I do not have the exact figures with me at present, but to buy 3lb. (1 361 g) of mutton chops takes 22 minutes of an average worker's time whereas in some European countries it takes as much as 340 minutes of labour to pay for the same amount of mutton chops. When we work on parity like that, we must be thankful that the Australian consumer can buy meat at a reasonable price.

I believe we are riding on the crest of a wave, but we have some very hard times ahead of us, particularly if we have a drought or even only an average year. It may not be for the first two years but by the third year we could well be in the grip of hard times. It sounds cruel and hard, but today's circumstances can be compared closely with the days prior to the depression of the 1930's, and no-one wants to see such conditions again. I was interested to note in last weekend's *Sunday Mail* that the cost to the average Australian taxpayer to support the Public Service is \$10 a week. Every Australian is paying this to support the Public Service—and we members of Parliament really come into that category. There are many industries I should like to comment on later, in particular the fishing industry in respect of whose grant there has been a sizeable increase. There are a few other items I will comment on when the lines are reached.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): With the flags flying at half-mast for rural industry and private enterprise, I rise to make a few comments on the Budget. I do not intend to elaborate on its broad terms or to embark on the complexities, probabilities or possibilities of its fruition in detail, but I shall mention a few salient facts as to its effects, not only on the rural community but also on the people of South Australia as a whole. One thing that has been mentioned so often by Government members is their aim to improve the quality of life for all South Australians. I think I can say that there is not a member on this side of the House who would not support such an aim, but the incredible inconsistency of the Treasurer and his yes-men makes one wonder when and how this ideal philosophy is likely to become reality. Tension is rising among thousands of South Australians at the Government's intention to pass legislation for the building of a casino in South Australia for the sole purpose of augmenting the State's revenue. It is a proposed revenue winner for the Government at the expense of social welfare in South Australia.

Mrs. Byrne: You don't have to vote for it.

Mr. VENNING: But we shall have to pay for it in the long term. The taxpayers of Australia will pay, and pay

dearly, through their contributions to social services to assist those people affected by a casino operating in this State. It has become evident that the casino operating in Tasmania, built to attract tourists, derives about 75 per cent to 80 per cent of its revenue from local people. You, Mr. Speaker, were there yourself recently to see it. It is clear that the taxpayers will be called on, through social services, to assist families whose breadwinner has lost money at the casino. Yesterday the member for Gilles presented a petition signed by many people expressing their concern at the Government's forecast of its intention to establish a casino in South Australia. I wonder how many more Government members will have the courage to present petitions expressing views contrary to those of the Government.

Mr. Hall: Do L.C.L. members oppose the establishment of a casino?

Mr. VENNING: My friend and colleague the member for Gouger is concerned that a casino will be dumped in his district. I wonder what the ex-member for Wallaroo (Mr. Lloyd Hughes) is thinking about this serious situation. Perhaps he is dumbfounded or perhaps he is still under the spell of a pledge that he signed when he became a Labor candidate for the Wallaroo District and later a member of this House. At any rate, he has been silent on the issue of a casino for South Australia. I was interested to hear yesterday that the member for Murray left the fresh waters of the Murray River to holiday near the salt waters along the shores of Yorke Peninsula, at Port Hughes. I do not know whether he occupied a pulpit in the area or whether he had an occasion to speak to the ex-member for Wallaroo about casinos. I guess that the reaction of the ex-member for Wallaroo would be froth and bubble, without any real substance. I was reminded tonight of the occasion when the ex-member for Wallaroo spoke in this House for three hours and, in effect, said nothing. As a result of that episode we now have a restriction on the time for which members may speak; that is the memorial in this Parliament to the ex-member for Wallaroo.

The SPEAKER: Is the honourable member reading from copious notes?

Mr. VENNING: No, Mr. Speaker, I am reading from a few brief notes; I refer to them occasionally, and I am sure that I will be able to link all my remarks to the Budget within the 39 minutes that I still have at my disposal. The Government claims that it aims to improve the quality of life. What a nightmare it is

becoming for industrial enterprises to operate under the present Government. It is obvious that there is not a member opposite who has been in business in his own right.

Mr. Payne: That's not true.

Mr. VENNING: I now realize that one member opposite, the member for Unley, has been in business in his own right. Possibly something may be learnt from the honourable member's campaign tactics. I believe that when he knocks on doors he has a screwdriver in his pocket; he tightens

the screws on the door while he is waiting for it to be opened.

Mr. Keneally: What about using similar tactics in your next campaign?

Mr. VENNING: I have a couple of screwdrivers ready for the next campaign.

Mr. Langley: Your story about me is another untruth.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Rocky River should link his remarks to the Budget.

Mr. VENNING: Many of your colleagues, Mr. Speaker, have been in the business not of private enterprise but of cracking the big whip; they know nothing about making ends meet. The interjections that I hear from time to time from members opposite confirm my belief. Is it any wonder that manufactured goods are in short supply in this State? Normally, when demand exceeds supply the problem is solved through a natural development, but this is not the case nowadays. No encouragement is given to industry to meet the growing demand. The Government has decided to milk private enterprise by increasing pay-roll tax by 1 per cent, from 3½ per cent to 4½ per cent. The Treasurer has said that pay-roll tax, in total, is expected to boost his revenue to \$49,000,000 this financial year, an increase of \$14,000,000 over the corresponding figure for the previous year. This is a most iniquitous tax on private enterprise, which gives employment to many thousands of people. The only responsible, progressive means of development in this State is private enterprise, whether it be in building, administration, consultant firms, road development, or the business that the member for Torrens is engaged in; yet it is private enterprise that the Treasurer sees fit to belt through pay-roll tax. This is just a part of the master plan of Socialism for South Australia, and it is part of a plan for control by the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Langley: What would you know?

Mr. VENNING: The Treasurer is a very shrewd operator; I guess that you, Mr. Speaker, have found that out before now. The Budget has been brought down in a modest way; the member for Frome said this tonight, and I believe he put it mildly. He referred to the intrigue of the Treasurer in this connection. Knowing the Treasurer and knowing his training as a solicitor, one would expect this sort of thing to happen. Those of us who have been brought up the hard way know that it is not possible to pull the wool over the eyes of people who have to think for themselves, work hard, and achieve worthwhile aims.

Representing a rural district, I am concerned at the way things are developing under the Labor Government. About two years ago the Premier's comments were reported in the Queensland press as a result of a lecture he gave there. The lecture in the press was headed "Farewell to the rustics". One can see that it has been the long-term plan and thinking of the Labor Party that the policies it brings down would be detrimental to rural interests as long ago as 1971, when the Premier was away from home but not so far away that those at home did not get to know what he spoke about on that occasion. I have copies of the lecture he gave. The lecture indicates what the Premier forecast would be the future for the primary producers and other country people of this State under the Labor Party policy that is slowly but surely unfolding before us.

Obviously the Government has no interest in the man on the land but for one thing: to rob him. There has not been even one move by the Government in the Budget to encourage the man on the land to stay on the land. What concessions there were (and there were not many) have been removed. I cite the concession for country water rates that was removed about 18 months ago and the increase in electricity charges. The landholder is already paying a standing charge that he undertook to pay to have electricity connected in the first place. The increase in the levy from 3 per cent to 5 per cent is another blow to an industry that has not yet emerged from the effects of low prices and continually increasing overhead costs.

Mr. Keneally: What would you—

Mr. VENNING: I was interested in a pamphlet that came to me in the post yesterday. The pamphlet is headed "How are they really doing down on the farm?" The pamphlet was sent to me by New Holland farm machinery manufacturers. The details on the pamphlet were developed from research undertaken by Philip Shrapnel and Company Proprietary Limited, economic research consultants, who were retained by New Holland for this purpose.

Mr. Keneally: How about—

Mr. VENNING: The pamphlet is an interesting one. I have several copies of it, and if any member wishes to have a copy I will let him have it later in the evening. It is a pocket digest of facts and figures that set the record straight on farm economy in the light of the current economic situation, especially the food price scale. The pamphlet illustrates a lass shopping and saying:

Food is so expensive these days. The farmers must be really living it up. They must all be buying Rolls Royces. The pamphlet illustrates another lass shopping and saying:

We can only afford meat two or three times a week now. And with the way prices are going, we may end up without even the Sunday roast.

The pamphlet continues:

This is a common conversation you hear while shopping these days. Is it true: are farmers really rolling in money?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Was the pamphlet issued by farm machinery manufacturers?

Mr. VENNING: I will let the Minister have a copy of the pamphlet later. It continues:

Is the farmer to blame for rising food prices? The farmer is an inflation fighter, not a promoter of inflation. Prices received by farmers for their produce have risen much slower over the last 10 years than, prices for final food products as measured in the consumer price index. Prices received by farmers for all food products rose by an average of 1.5 per cent a year. By contrast, the food group on the consumer price index rose by 3.2 per cent a year on average, or over double the rate of prices received by farmers. And the gap between the two is widening. A lot happens to the raw product between the time it leaves the farmer's gate and appears on the consumer's table. Food is transported, processed, packaged, stored, promoted and distributed. All this adds to the cost. All of these items are out of the farmers' control.

Mr. Langley: What about—

Mr. GUNN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The members for Stuart and Unley are deliberately contravening Standing Order 159, which provides:

No member shall interrupt another member whilst speaking, unless (1) to request that his words be taken down; (2) to call attention to a point of order; (3) to call attention to the want of a quorum; or (4) to move a motion in pursuance of Standing Order 61 or 156.

Members on this side are exercising their democratic right in putting before the House facts that are of concern to their constituents, and the members to whom I have referred are continually interjecting.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order because, if I did, the honourable member for Eyre would be the first one to feel the effect of my ruling, and I think it would interfere with the quality of the debate in the House of Assembly.

Mr. VENNING: The pamphlet continues:

Is the farmer really rolling in money? Farmers' incomes are failing well behind the rest of the community. Despite the 1972-73 rural boom, the farming community is still relatively financially depressed. Incomes of unincorporated farms, when expressed on a per farmer basis, have grown only at an average rate of 3.4 yearly between 1961-62 and 1972-73, compared with the annual 7.2 per cent growth rate in average weekly earnings—the best indicator of individual wage levels in the economy as a whole. But this 3.4 per cent included the abnormally high level of farm income in

1972-73 produced by the wool boom. Without it, the average increase in farm income between 1961-62 and 1971-72 was only 1 per cent yearly, compared with a 6.8 per cent annual growth in average weekly earnings over the same period. Aggregate farmers' income fluctuates considerably due to pressures of overseas and local markets, and because of variable climatic conditions. By contrast, total wages, salaries and supplements have grown steadily every year by an average in excess of 10 per cent.

Is the farmer really an inflation fighter? Over the last decade the farmer has actually kept down the rate of inflation in food prices by absorbing inflationary pressures from other sectors of the economy. Prices received by farmers have grown at a relatively slow rate. Prices they pay for items necessary to produce farm products have risen much faster. In the years from 1961-62 to 1972-73 prices paid by farmers for such things as seed, fodder, freight, building materials, machinery, rates and insurance rose by an average of 3.3 per cent yearly, over double the trend in prices received which rose by only 1.3 per cent.

Another heading is as follows: "Is the farmer doing anything to lower his food costs?"

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member is going to read the whole pamphlet, he could seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without his reading it.

Mr. VENNING: Thank you, Sir. Under the heading to which I have referred, the pamphlet states:

One of the least known facts in modern Australian agriculture is that farmers for years have sought their profits from increased production and efficiency rather than in higher prices. Faced with the ever increasing level of costs, the farmer has had to increase his productivity to cope. He has had to increase the productivity of his resources—his labour, management skills, land, machinery, fertiliser, livestock, etc.

In a comparison of gross farm product with gross non-farm product, at 1966-67 (or constant) prices, the average annual growth in real output per farm worker between 1963-64 and 1971-72 was 41 per cent yearly, compared with a 31 per cent growth per worker for the rest of the economy.

Summarizing, the article states:

The farmer is a fighter. He has to withstand the vagaries of the weather. He has to absorb cost increases on many of his input items. He is subject to violent price fluctuations caused by world trading situations. Despite all these adversities, he is still an efficient contributor to the national economy; one who is often not adequately rewarded for his efforts.

That article, set out by New Holland, is an important document.

Mr. Langley: Don't they make farm machinery?

Mr. VENNING: Yes, but that is beside the point. It clearly sets out the situation as it exists, and it was necessary for someone to undertake such a survey in order to highlight some of the incorrect statements being made today regarding farm prices and the situation of farmers in Australia. That this Government and the Commonwealth Labor Government are unwilling to accept the situation as highlighted in the economic research conducted by the consultants Philip Shrapnel and Company Proprietary Limited can be further sustained. My colleagues, particularly those representing the rural areas, have referred in detail to the effect the Commonwealth Budget will have on primary producers not only in South Australia but throughout Australia.

Probably the most serious aspect of the Commonwealth Budget has been taxation changes in respect of capital expenditure, investment allowance and the depreciation allowance on farm machinery. At a time when primary producers are recovering from low prices, high costs and irregular seasons, they are confronted with this irresponsible and unsympathetic action of the colleagues of members opposite in the Commonwealth sphere.

In the speech made by His Excellency the Governor, the Honourable Sir Mark Laurence Elwin Oliphant, K.B.E., when he opened the second session of the Forty-first Parliament, he said legislation on bulk handling would be introduced this session. It is well known, Mr. Speaker, that grower organizations in this State have been far from satisfied with the Local Government Act and its application to the rating of wheat silos. An approach was made many months ago to the Minister of Local Government, seeking his support for the introduction of amendments to the Local Government Act to make it possible to rate silos in this State similar to the way in which silos in Western Australia are rated. In that State the bulk handling authority has to pay about \$30 for each 100 000 bushels (3 640 m<sup>3</sup>) stored. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister appears not to have acceded to that request in its entirety but to be putting up a package deal comprising the rating and zoning of silos, two matters that bear no relation to each other.

Mr. KENEALLY: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the fact that the member for Rocky River keeps referring to you as Mr. Speaker. I suggest that, if he were to look around the Chamber instead of reading his notes so assiduously, he would realize that the Speaker had left the Chamber.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will not rule on the point of order. I merely draw the attention of the member for Rocky River to the fact that the Deputy Speaker is now in the Chair.

Mr. VENNING: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am pleased that I erred in the way I did, because at least I erred in the right direction. Rather than call the Speaker the Deputy Speaker, I gave you the higher honour, about which I am pleased. The Minister of Local Government was trying to put forward a package deal involving the rating and zoning of silos.

In his Financial Statement the Treasurer said that he expected grain freights to increase railway revenue by \$1,876,000 to a total of \$9,200,000. This could happen, provided that the Railways Department could provide a service, particularly during the harvest period, and without the undesirable and unworkable action of zoning grain deliveries. It appears that if the season continues in its present trend, there will be much grain about. Indeed, I know that a record shipping programme is expected at harvest time. I also believe that the silo system in this State has developed because the growers have wanted this. Any trend away from country storages has resulted from the inability of the railways during peak periods to keep silo space available at all times.

It is well known that wheat freights have in the past subsidized passenger services in this State. If the Railways Department or its Minister was dinkum about providing a rail service for the rural people, something would have been done to make rail freights competitive with those of road transport, and freights from certain areas (and I refer particularly to places such as Quorn and Andrews) would have to be based on the distance as the crow flies. However, no attempt has been made to rectify this anomaly; nor is it intended to alter rail freights, except to increase them across the board. I could speak for a week on this issue, but I do not intend to do so or to abuse my position as a director of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling for political advancement. I wish merely to say that the growers of this State do not, and indeed will not in future, accept any form of zoning in this State.

It is interesting to note the situation that has recently developed in relation to grain prices. The wheatgrowers

of Australia are again subsidizing the Australian people by providing wheat for home consumption at about half the overseas price. The member for Flinders said this evening that the overseas price had increased considerably. It is interesting to read in today's *News* that the Australian Wheat Board has sold wheat to New Zealand for \$4.18 a bushel (.04 m<sup>3</sup>), when the home consumption price of wheat is \$1.86 a bushel. Once again, the primary producers are subsidizing the home market as far as bread is concerned. There is even a move afoot to take action on beef, so the Australian consumer can have cheaper meat. Members opposite may say, "What of it?" My comment on it is that the primary producer should not be expected further to carry the community by being compelled to support an uneconomic railway system and a transport system lacking in a progressive outlook and having in many ways an inability to co-ordinate.

In promoting this Government's aims to improve the quality of life, the Treasurer still has done nothing to protect families that are seriously affected to the extent of having to sell portions of their properties to pay death duties. Small businesses are in similar difficulties. As indicated in the Financial Statement, it is expected that revenue from succession duties will be \$12,500,000 in this financial year. Stamp duty, which is a silent tax on the community, has increased from \$8,636,000 in 1964-65 to an estimated \$35,800,000 in 1973-74. In 10 years, revenue from stamp duty has increased by 400 per cent, so the people of this State are continuing to have the wool pulled over their eyes by this Socialist Labor Government.

This Government is playing its part as the suicide squad in this State towards centralism, and its loyalty to South Australia is non-existent. The appointment of the Royal Commission on council boundaries is only another scheme in the master plan of centralism. I refer to the clever tactics of the Government in appointing highly-paid committees to bring down reports, loaded before the start, on matters of vital concern to this Socialist Government. I think we must now have more than 50 of these committees operating in this State. I have heard it said that the Government has run out of competent people qualified for the never-ending number of committees being established. For the various reasons that I have given, I see no reason why I should follow the tradition in support of this Socialist document, and I reserve my support.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): Although I intended to refer to the pamphlet to which the member for Rocky River has referred, I think all I can do now is seek to have the illustrations inserted in *Hansard*. Because what is printed in the pamphlet will be in *Hansard*, I leave that aspect of what I intended to say. I have gathered that on the Government side there is no sense of practicability in regard to many of the statements that have been directed purely to the rural sector. Of course, many of the outstanding speakers that we have heard this evening have directed their remarks to that sector.

There has been only one other speech made, and that was made by the member for Mawson. It also lacked practicability and was not directed entirely to the rural sector, as speeches from this side have been. I thought the honourable member's speech was interesting. Whenever he speaks, he has something to contribute to the debate, but when it comes to the need to have a close association with earthy and practical things, his speeches do not have that approach.

I was interested to read part of the speech that the Minister of Education made about the Budget in 1968 and

I recalled the truth of the saying, "When things are different they are not the same." The Minister, who was then the member for Glenelg, spoke on September 24, 1968, on hospital fees, and his speech is reported at page 1341 of *Hansard* for that year. He said then that he hoped that the Government would not increase hospital fees to the extent that Victoria had increased them and he made much about South Australia's keeping prices down in comparison with Victoria.

One of the tragic things about the present Government's administration, particularly its encouragement of increased wages and prices, is that it is getting closer to the other States in several matters. This has caused South Australia to lose the advantage that it has always had. Over the years Sir Thomas Playford managed the State in such a way that it was a distinct advantage to have slightly lower wages in this State, because that was more than offset by the fact that the cost of living was lower still. At present we are quickly losing that advantage. Further, many members opposite do not appreciate the difficulties that country people face. They have little understanding of situations similar to that to which the member for Heysen referred yesterday. I had an example last Friday, when a gentleman brought to my office correspondence from the Electricity Trust. He had virtually to pay about \$400 a year for 10 years to get power connected to his premises, yet the power was not very far away.

This is the type of case that country people must face. The member for Heysen told the House that it cost him \$1,000 to put down a bore to get water to his property. People in the towns and in the metropolitan area do not understand these problems, and they have no idea of the cost to the country people of obtaining many of the conveniences that these people in cities or large country towns enjoy. The Government has placed impositions on country people. Admittedly, the Government does not get a large percentage of its votes from country people, but it has applied its heaviest taxation pressure to them. This is completely unfair, because for many years country people have been struggling to remain even solvent.

Fortunately, it sees that people in the country who have had overdrafts may be able to eliminate them this year, but much could happen before the credits were placed in their bank accounts. Details of taxation increases imposed on country persons have been given by other members and will be clearly illustrated in the records of this debate, but I must protest at the charges that have been imposed. I know that everyone will pay more for petrol: to some extent this is partly a luxury to the person who does not have to use it, but to the person who must use it as part of his business it is an imposition. This situation is also true for people who use power to irrigate, and many of my constituents are high consumers of electric power. In addition, all of my dairy farmers will have to pay the additional \$5 an acre (.4 ha) for pumping water for high land irrigation, the first time in the history of irrigation on the river flats that this imposition has been applied.

One could continue quoting the increases in fees that were not so much included in the Budget but were given to the State piecemeal and necessarily left out of the Budget. This is a very drab document, virtually showing all increases in expenditure in proportion to the increases that the Government will receive in income. It has nothing exciting about it, because many of its details were revealed to the public before it was introduced. This is in keeping with details of the Commonwealth Budget, because before and after that Budget was introduced many details were given and are still being given to the people of

Australia. I support the Budget begrudgingly in the knowledge that it will bring hardship to so many people I represent.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): This is an era of records, and it is everyone's ambition in sport or in other activities to break records. The Budget indicates a record in the amount of revenue to be raised; it is a record expenditure; and we are to see a record deficit during a time of record inflation in the State. Much has been said about the details of this Budget, but I refer to one or two specific matters. The estimate of receipts for 1972-73 was about \$108,000,000, compared to the estimate for 1973-74 of about \$138,000,000, an increase of about 28 per cent. However, last year's actual receipts were higher than the estimate, and if we compare the actual receipts with the estimated receipts, we find an increase of about 16 per cent. If last year's experience is repeated (and it well could be) taxation receipts for this year could be about \$145,000,000. The Treasurer, in his statement, said:

From our policy statements at election time, from our record over the past three years, and from our achievements in the previous period of three years in office, it would be clear that this Government's primary aim is to improve the quality of life for all South Australians and, at the same time, to ensure that each person has the greatest possible opportunity as an individual to determine how he or she will seek that improvement and what life style he or she will pursue.

I refer to the suggested deficit of about \$11,250,000, but the Budget provides that there will be sufficient Loan money to meet any deficit. However, using Loan money for this purpose denies money being available for capital expenditure or construction work. The Treasurer also stated that various increases in taxation had been announced before the Budget had been introduced. I refer now to the increase in water rates. In July, 1971, water rates were increased from 35c to 40c a thousand gallons (4 546 l), and the excess water charge remained at 35c a thousand gallons. In July, 1972, the excess water rate was increased from 35c to 40c a thousand gallons, bringing it into line with the rebate water charge. This year both rebate water and excess water charges have been increased to 45.46c a thousand gallons, or by 10c a kilolitre. In two years the cost of water in this State has increased by 28.5 per cent, but in the last financial year the receipts from water charges surpassed the estimated amount by \$2,000,000. The Treasurer has suggested that this was the result of a long dry summer, because *Hansard* of June 19, 1973, reports as follows:

The long summer season contributed to significant excess water consumption, and rate revenues now seem likely to be about \$2,000,000 higher than the estimate I presented previously.

In the district that I represent (and I speak specifically of the areas around Wallaroo, Moonta, and Kadina) the quality of water on many occasions leaves much to be desired. I appreciate the introduction of a chlorination plant, which is a precautionary measure against a certain type of meningitis occurring in the area over the past few years. However, the water is of such a quality at times that it is rejected by stock. I ask that consideration be given to this matter, because, with the increase in water rates, something should be done to improve the quality of water in that area.

Because of the tourist potential and the ever-increasing tourism in the Wallaroo, Moonta and Port Hughes area, particularly during the summer months, a greater volume of water and greater pressure are needed. Because of the demand for water during the tourist season, many areas around those towns and Moonta Mines, and adjacent areas,

are at certain periods of the day out of water. I turn now to electricity. The increase in the price of electricity will hit across the board, and especially in the domestic field in the household budget. It will affect the budget of many people who use this source of power for heating, cooking, hot water systems, etc. It will add to production costs in industrial areas. The levy on the sale of electricity has been increased from 3 per cent to 5 per cent, the effect of this on the average consumer being about an 11 per cent increase in price.

I notice in the Estimates of Expenditure that the increase in electricity revenue is from \$2,250,000 to \$3,700,000, representing an increase in revenue from the consumption of electricity in South Australia of 64 per cent. I say again that this will affect every household, every industrial or commercial undertaking and every institution that supplies essential services in this State: they will all be affected by this 64 per cent increase in revenue from electricity supplies. At page 9 of Parliamentary Paper 18, we find:

Receipts by the Hospitals Department from patients' fees are estimated to increase by \$1,421,000 to \$12,600,000 in 1973-74, mainly as a result of the increase from September 1 of \$4 a day in charges to inpatients. This increase is expected to yield about \$1,200,000 in 1973-74 and about \$1,800,000 in a full year.

That is another charge to the less fortunate people who need hospitalization. I now turn to a sectional tax, a growth tax, and I admit that this is a Commonwealth-wide tax. Irrespective of the State Government, there has been an agreement, I understand, with all State Governments that took the responsibility of this tax from the Commonwealth Government. South Australia did so in September, 1971. At that time the pay-roll tax was 2.5 per cent. Immediately the States took over administrative control of that tax it was raised to 3.5 per cent. Now, it has been increased to 4.5 per cent. For South Australia it will bring in an additional \$14,000,000 in taxation. I stated recently, and I say again, that this tax is an imposition on industry, and particularly on the smaller industrial organizations.

The District of Gouger, which I represent, has a big interest in primary industry. The effects of the Commonwealth Budget will be felt keenly in primary industry. How fortunate is the Commonwealth Government that primary industry is so much better off today than it was two or three years ago! However, many adverse taxation measures have been applied to this industry in the Commonwealth Budget, and that must be felt by this State. In 1948 the sheep population of South Australia was about 9 000 000; in 1973 it is about 19 000 000. I now refer to an article that appeared in the country edition of today's *Advertiser*. It is headed "Each farm worker feeds 66 people", and states:

Each South Australian farm worker now provides food for 66 people, compared with 45 in 1948. These figures were given by the Director of Agriculture (Mr. M. R. Irving) in an address to the annual congress of the Women's Agriculture Bureau on Monday. Mr. Irving said the number of farm workers in South Australia had dropped from 41 500 to 28 900 in 25 years. This represented a fall from 6.6 per cent to 2.4 per cent of the working population. But the value of production per farm worker had increased from \$4,800 to \$7,800 a year. Cattle numbers had trebled and the sheep population had more than doubled since 1948. "Wool exports still account for more than 50 per cent of the total national export", Mr. Irving said. "Farmers have shown more skill and ingenuity. Every technical advance made by farmers which increases economic production finds its way to the consumer's plate". Mr. Irving said the welfare of the community would depend on the success of agriculture just as much in the future as it had in the past.

Even though fewer people are now involved in primary industry, because of the increased technological methods that are used and because of the intense interest in the work performed by those people in the industry we now have more production. In 1948 there were many thousands that fed 1 867 500 people, whereas in 1973 the reduced number of people in primary industry are feeding 1 907 400 people. I would say, therefore, that primary industry is essential not only for the Commonwealth as a whole but particularly for this State, and it provides much taxation revenue for Governments.

This evening the member for Mawson in a very plausible way tried to explain away the inflationary situation. However, every business, whether large or small, applies the principle that it can spend no more money than the amount it receives. Managements in commerce and industry must administer their affairs to maintain a buoyant standard. How often we hear the State and Commonwealth Governments warning against passing on increased costs to the consumer, yet in the Budget the Government has made no effort to prune costs; instead, it has called upon the average man to provide the increased amount of money necessary. I shall make more detailed comments about items of expenditure when we are dealing with the lines. I support the Bill, but I am not happy about many aspects of the Budget, particularly the means by which the Government is demanding from John Citizen the increased taxation that will be necessary this financial year.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): In his speech the Treasurer placed great emphasis on the fact that the South Australian Government was trying to improve the quality of life of all South Australians. Like the member for Bragg, I believe that that is taking a pure piece of Liberal philosophy and, indeed, the Treasurer paid no further regard to it in the Budget. When we look at the quality of life in Australia, particularly in South Australia, we see that the most important aspects are inflation and the economic state of the country. While other speakers have dwelt on some aspects of inflation, I should like to cover other aspects, because it is the major economic problem facing the State Government and the Commonwealth Government, and it is the greatest worry of all citizens. Inflation affects the wage earner because it erodes his savings and his real income. Further, it particularly affects the superannuant and the pensioner, because the small amount that they have put aside is quickly eroded as inflation grows worse. The causes of inflation are two-fold: inflation occurs because demand is currently exceeding supply and because of the wage-price push.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the Socialist Government?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: No; inflation is caused only by the two factors I have referred to. The Socialist Government, however, is failing to control those factors. It is necessary for everyone in Australia to take a responsible, mature attitude to inflation and for certain people to put aside preconceived ideas as to what they would like to achieve. Private enterprise, the Commonwealth Government, State Governments, and private citizens must all take an active role in curbing inflation. The disturbing aspect of the Budget is that there has been no attempt whatever to take a responsible attitude towards inflation. I fully appreciate that economic control within Australia is basically a matter for the Commonwealth Government, but State Governments can play their role, too, because they are by far the biggest enterprises and spenders, apart from the Commonwealth Government. The first and most appropriate action that State Governments can take

is to reduce Government expenditure or at least maintain it at its current level. Such action would be supported by most Australians. An article, headed "Federal spending should be cut", quotes the results of a Gallup poll. The point made in the article applies to State Governments, too. The article, published in the *Advertiser* of July 26, states:

Most Australians want a cut in spending on the Federal Labor Government's programmes. An Australia-wide cross-section of 2 163 people aged 16 years and over were asked the following questions this month.

They were asked which of the following alternatives they would like: a postponement or dropping of proposed expenditure by the Commonwealth Government; a reduction or dropping of some of the previous L.C.P. Government's proposals; or an increase in taxes. Of the people interviewed, 61 per cent favoured the first alternative. Therefore, a clear majority of Australians favours a reduction or at least a holding in Government expenditure at this time, because they appreciate that this is a fundamental step in controlling inflation. Because we appreciate that Government expenditure is an important aspect of controlling inflation, let us look at the measures taken by the Commonwealth Government to control it. It revalued the dollar, but anyone with the smallest amount of common sense knows that revaluation is nothing but an interim measure to control inflation. In the short term it will bring down the relative cost of items in Australia, but that can apply for only one or two months.

While inflation exists overseas at a rate similar to that in Australia (although the rate is really somewhat less in most cases), if we use revaluation as the main means of trying to control inflation it will not work, because Australia's inflation will still continue at a rate at least equal to that of the major international powers. The Australian Government has revalued the dollar for the second time in 12 months and, having realized that the measure will fail again, it has taken the second step in controlling inflation by increasing interest rates.

I believe that we in South Australia are just beginning to realize the full impact that these increased interest rates will have on the average citizen. The Reserve Bank has already pushed the price of the long-term Commonwealth bond rate up by 11 per cent to 2 per cent on the open market; that means that the ultimate rate, or the ruling rate at present, is between 8.5 per cent and 9 per cent for long-term Commonwealth bonds. If Commonwealth bond rates increase by an actual 2 per cent, all other interest rates in Australia will increase by at least that proportion, or by a greater proportion. It is for this reason that I predict that either later this week or early next week we will see an entirely new interest rate applied throughout the financial circles in Australia. The rate for long-term Commonwealth bonds has not been more than 7 per cent since the 1920's, whereas currently the rate is at least between 8 1/2 per cent and 9 per cent, and it will probably go even higher.

What other interest rates are we likely to see and what are the likely effects on the average Australian and South Australian? The Savings Bank house loan interest rate will rise, I believe to 8 per cent within the next 10 days, trading bank house loans will increase to 10 per cent, and the rate applied by building societies for house building will increase to 11 per cent. It is not difficult to see what the implication of this will be on the average house builder or house owner, because most Australians still have massive loans or mortgages on their houses, so the implications on those poor persons are devastating. It can be estimated that, if these interest rates are applied, the

mortgage repayment of the average couple living in a typical metropolitan house will increase by between \$5 and \$10 a week: they will have to pay out this extra sum simply in interest. This will also have the effect of making money for house building more expensive. Interest rates are so high that it will be more difficult for people to borrow money to build a house.

We have heard so much from Government members on previous Bills about their great concern for the large number of people in the State who are without houses—those who are currently looking for a house or wanting to build a house. One would have thought that, if the Government was sincere and genuine in its beliefs and desires, it would take every action possible to hold down inflation and interest rates. It is the very high interest rates now being imposed on these people that will have the greatest impact on reducing the rate of house building in the State. I believe that the member for Unley is being unrealistic about the economy of the country. He should go out and try to borrow money to build a house. It is well known that building societies and banks have cut back on the sum they are currently lending on houses, as well as increasing the interest rate.

A friend of mine recently wanted to buy a house. When he first approached the bank he was told he could borrow \$14,000, but by the time he had bought the house about three months later the upper limit of borrowing had been reduced to \$11,500. I believe that that clearly indicates that finance is tightening up and that it is becoming increasingly difficult to borrow money to build a house. The Commonwealth Government has applied two measures to try to control inflation, namely, revaluation and an increase in interest charges throughout the nation, but it has failed to attack the real means whereby it could control inflation. I agree that a revaluation or an increase in interest rates may be needed, but it cannot be achieved simply through those means. One must consider income and price control. By this, I mean the incomes of companies, the individual, interest rates, and dividends paid to shareholders—in other words, a complete freeze on all incomes, including wages. Until this is applied the Government will not be effective in controlling inflation.

We hear much about the effects of this in the United States of America and the United Kingdom, where most people recognize that it has been partly successful. I advocate it as only one means of controlling inflation and, if applied with the other means, I believe it will be successful in controlling it. The other obvious means of controlling inflation is by controlling Government expenditure. The Commonwealth Government has been more irresponsible than almost any other Government any member can recall. One has only to consider some of the expected growths in the Public Service to realize the implications. An inquiry carried out by the *Melbourne Age* indicated that the possible growth rate in the Public Service in the current year could be up to 20 per cent; this is quite staggering when considered against a growth rate in the private sector of between 3 per cent and 31 per cent and a national growth rate of about 31 per cent.

Obviously, the Government is simply diverting funds away from the so-called productive sector of the economy to the more non-productive and service areas. We are studying a State Budget and we should appreciate what action the State Government should take to uphold this quality of life it so blandly advertised in the Financial Statement. The first thing is to reduce Government expenditure, or at least hold it at a level that takes full account of wage rises, without employing new persons in the Public Service.



The second measure the Government should take is to ensure maximum productivity from public servants. I believe it is high time that the Government examined the efficiency and productivity of the Public Service. I am pleased to see that Professor Corbett has been engaged by the Government to carry out an inquiry into the Public Service. I believe that this has great merit, and I compliment the Government on taking that step.

Mr. Keneally: You're going well now.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I will hand out compliments when I think they should be handed out. I believe this is one area to which this applies.

Dr. Tonkin: Will the Government take any notice of it?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The member for Bragg has made a valid point: having conducted an inquiry into the Public Service, will the Government take notice of its findings? The indications from this Budget are that it will not. It is about time that we started to make the Public Service more flexible. Unfortunately, the Government structure, with the massive proportions of our current bureaucracies, becomes inefficient and inflexible, and Government departments fail to adapt as technology changes: therefore, people are sitting idle in certain pockets, forgotten by the efficiency experts, if there are any.

Mr. Payne: Tell us one area where you recommend cuts?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It is not my job to do that. As I said, Professor Corbett, who has far greater access to the Public Service than I do, has been appointed to do this. He is an expert and I will leave it to his judgment. The Government should also try to encourage South Australia's private sector, which is the productive sector of our economy. If productivity increases at a greater rate, it will help to lessen the devastating effects of inflation. It is difficult for one to work out what the real growth factor is for the Public Service sector, because one has to allow for increases in wages.

From a superficial examination of the Budget, it certainly appears that the public sector is well above the State average growth rate of between 3 per cent and 31 per cent a year. I do not wish to go right through the Budget explaining where growth has occurred. However, I refer to the Department of the Premier and of Development, and the Mines Department. It is intended to increase the allocation in this area to about \$9,600,000, whereas actual expenditure last year amounted to about \$6,500,000. That

is an increase of about 45 per cent within 12 months. This is done by a Government which claims to be responsible and which has been crying out to the former Commonwealth Liberal Government and the people that inflation must be controlled, even though it was then 6 per cent or less. It is unfortunate that most of the increased expenditure for the department to which I have referred involves the employment of service staff and not areas that could increase South Australia's productivity.

I refer particularly to the Mines Department. I again compliment the Government on adopting a policy of carrying out wide seismic surveys in this State. Oil is indeed a valuable commodity, and I hope we quickly find more in this State. I was disturbed to see in the explanation that nothing was said about how much would be spent on mineral exploration, which is an important area.

When analysing the figures for that department, I see that expenditure for the South Australian Film Corporation, basically a non-productive sector of the community, is being increased by 350 per cent. The corporation's total expenditure last year was \$222,520, and its allocation this year has been increased to \$781,275. Although it is difficult to determine this exactly from the Budget, because one must look at every page thereof to pick out the various allocations to the corporation, I found that the Budget contains nine separate allocations to the South Australian Film Corporation. I am not decrying the corporation, because I believe it will be a great asset to this State and that it is the sort of industry we should be developing here. However, it is an industry of which we cannot now afford the luxury when considering the current inflationary rate. The Budget purports to strive to improve the quality of life of all South Australians. However, it fails in this primary objective referred to by the Treasurer because it fails to adopt a responsible attitude towards inflation. I therefore reluctantly support this inflationary Budget.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Schedule.

Legislative Council, \$83,794.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 11.39 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 13, at 2 p.m.