

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, October 30, 1974

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

## PETITION: LAND TAX

Mr. VENNING presented a petition signed by 280 residents of South Australia stating that they were concerned at the continuance of land tax on rural land in this State, and praying that the House of Assembly would consider abolishing rural land tax, as it is not, and has not been for a long time, a taxing medium in other States.

Petition received and read.

## PETITION: SUCCESSION AND PROBATE DUTIES

Mr. VENNING presented a petition signed by 235 residents of South Australia stating that they were concerned at the continuance of succession and probate duties in this State, and praying that the House of Assembly would increase certain rebates, increase succession duties relief, increase the period before interest becomes payable, and amend the Act to allow property held in joint tenancy to be eligible to receive full primary-producer concessions.

Petition received and read.

## QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

## HOPE VALLEY TANK

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (October 17).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: All essential work other than the roof cladding has been completed, and a contract has been let for this work. Investigations are being made as to when this part of the project can commence.

## WEEDICIDES

In reply to Mr. McANANEY (October 10).

The Hon. L. J. KING: It is the poison regulations under the Food and Drugs Act and not the Dangerous Drugs Act that applies to the packaging and labelling of dangerous weedicides. The present regulations are up to date and adequately policed; the uniform schedules of the National Health and Medical Research Council were proclaimed in June of this year, and the revised poison regulations, which include the uniform standards for packaging and labelling, were gazetted on September 26, 1974. The resolutions of the Women's Agricultural Bureau safety school are being forwarded to the Poisons Schedules Subcommittee of the National Health and Medical Research Council for consideration. In the meantime, the following comments on the resolutions are made:

1. With the adoption of the uniform standards for packaging and labelling, these are now becoming standardised. Permanent labelling is being discussed with the National Packaging Association, but it must be appreciated that lithographed labels are more expensive than other types; this increased cost would be passed on to the primary producer.

2. The circumstances under which a substance could be fatal vary so widely, depending on age of the person, general health, and mode of poisoning, that it cannot generally be concisely stated.

3. Print size for safety directions has been examined but, because there is so much mandatory information to be given on labels, type size, particularly on smaller containers, has been a major problem. The design of

the poison bottle is now being reviewed to provide extra labelling space.

4. Visual warning symbols have generally been rejected in Australia, as they tend to give an incorrect impression of the relative toxicity of poisons bearing the same symbol. Reliance is placed more on safety directions to convey the appropriate warnings.

## TRAVELLERS AID HOSTEL

In reply to Mr. CUMBE (September 11).

The Hon. L. J. KING: The annual Government grant of \$2 500 for 1973-74 was forwarded to the society on August 26, 1974, in order to keep the society in funds while its application for an increase was being considered. This has removed the present urgency and, in the meantime, the matter of future funds is receiving consideration. It is expected that a report from the Community Welfare Grants Advisory Committee will be available in about one month's time.

## PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier say whether he made any progress yesterday in raising additional Commonwealth Government funds that would permit South Australia to meet its \$200 000 000 commitment for the infra-structure of the Redcliff project, and will he say how much of that sum is expected from the Commonwealth Government and when the amount will be determined? It is obvious from the figures that have been made available to the House from time to time that an ever-increasing sum of money is involved. I consider that it is impossible for the South Australian Government to meet the commitment of \$200 000 000 in from 3½ to 4 years, and it is obvious that, unless the Commonwealth Government makes available money for the infra-structure, the Achilles heel of the whole exercise will be the State Government's failure to deliver the goods. On this basis, I seek information from the Premier about whether any progress was made yesterday in this vital area.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Not by me. I did not go to Canberra to have discussions on this subject.

Dr. Eastick: Isn't it important?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is as absurd as he usually is with that kind of interjection.

Mr. Venning: You should speak respectfully.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I suggest that the honourable member encourage his Leader to deserve respect when he interjects.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: To suggest that I do not regard the Redcliff project as important is so childish a remark in this place as to deserve the retort that it got.

Dr. Eastick: You haven't replied to the question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have replied. I did not go to Canberra to have discussions on this topic. No such discussions were scheduled.

Mr. Mathwin: So you didn't mention it?

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members will suffer the consequences of Standing Orders immediately, if they persist in disregarding them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I went to Canberra to make a submission to the economic committee of the Labor Caucus, which was holding hearings on the Industries Assistance Commission's report on the car industry, and in making those submissions I had the thanks and support of the car industry of this State. The people of South

Australia ought to be thankful that the staff of my department had been able to prepare a report on the I.A.C. proposals that was far more detailed and far more soundly researched than any other submissions that had been made, and that, in consequence of that work, the motor car industry in this State and the jobs of the workers were being saved. I believe it was important to the State that I should undertake that. In suggesting that there is some fault on my part because no talks were scheduled on some other topic, where work is proceeding according to plan, the Opposition is, I suggest, only looking for some—

Mr. Coumbe: Can you give us details?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot give any more information on this score. I point out to the Leader that replies have already been given in the House regarding the submissions made to the Commonwealth Government for its support.

Mr. Goldsworthy: If you haven't had the Commonwealth—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In fact, the Commonwealth Government will indicate the level and nature of its support when a price has been agreed between the gas producers and the petro-chemical consortium, and we can expect that decision as soon as that conclusion has been reached.

#### UNIONISM

Mr. WELLS: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether, under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, assistance can be given to union representatives to discuss union membership, without being intimidated, and has he seen a report in this morning's *Advertiser* of statements made in the House? The report states:

Mr. Gunn (Liberal, Eyre) told the Assembly that the Minister of Labour and Industry (Mr. McKee) had said he supported the action of this particular union. Mr. Gunn described the president of the V.B.U. (Mr. P. W. Meehan) as "an imported stirrer".

Mr. Gunn: And so he is.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WELLS: The report continues:

He had come from another State and was being paid by an outside organisation.

Is the Minister aware that Mr. Meehan was born in Western Australia, came to South Australia 12 or 14 years ago, married a South Australian girl, and has a child living in South Australia with him and his wife? Mr. Meehan was a member of the merchant navy for 12 years. He has worked in the motor vehicle industry, since 1966, at Chrysler Australia Limited, Commercial Motor Vehicles Proprietary Limited, and Port Stanvac. He became a V.B.U. organiser about three years ago, and has been a member of the Australian Labor Party as long as he can remember. He belongs to no other organisation whatsoever. Does the Minister know that Mr. Meehan is the president of one of my sub-branches?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WELLS: I believe that my word on this matter is as good as the honourable member's slanderous statement.

Mr. Mathwin: Question!

The SPEAKER: "Question" has been called.

Mr. WELLS: That's about—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I assure the honourable member that there is authority and protection under the legislation to give union secretaries and organisers

an opportunity to address their members. I can appreciate the honourable member's concern regarding the remarks made yesterday by the member for Eyre against Mr. Meehan of the V.B.U. Of course, Government members are frequently subjected to criticism of the trade union movement from members opposite—

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: —particularly the member for Eyre.

Mr. McAnaney: What about the member for Elizabeth?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The member for Eyre often gets up and uses the protection of the House—

Mr. McAnaney: So does the member for Elizabeth.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: —to make statements that he knows are completely without foundation, purely for the purpose—

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Eyre. The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The honourable member made the statements purely for the purpose of degrading the trade union. Having heard the explanation given by the member for Florey, I can only suggest to the member for Eyre that he retract the statement he made yesterday about Mr. Meehan and, if he refuses to retract it, I suggest that he forsake his privilege in this House and repeat his remarks outside to enable Mr. Meehan to protect himself.

#### GAUGE STANDARDISATION

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Transport provide me with further information regarding rail standardisation and its effect on Adelaide and, more particularly, on North Adelaide, which is in my district? Last week I asked the Minister a question about one aspect of this matter but, since then, following statements that have been made by members of the public, by members of the Adelaide City Council, and by the Minister (as reported in today's *Advertiser*), there has been some controversy. As this matter vitally concerns an important part of my district, the complicated North Adelaide road system, and the future of certain park lands in the area, I should like the Minister to explain, if he can, just what he has in mind. I understand, from his comments in the press, that the Minister believes that Hindmarsh Boulevard, which was part of the original Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report, is likely to be proceeded with.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I thought this matter was proceeding on a proper basis until, regrettably, a report appeared in the daily paper of a debate that apparently took place at an Adelaide City Council meeting on Monday. I say "apparently" because I have not yet received a communication from the City Council about it. I am not criticising the Town Clerk for that, because, after all, it is only a couple of days since the meeting was held and we all know how long it takes for correspondence to travel from one place to another. However, I have to act on presumption. Reports, appearing subsequently in yesterday's *News* and in today's *Advertiser*, of what I said are fair and reasonable. I wish I could say the same about the editorial, however. Officers of my department yesterday spent considerable time and went to considerable trouble to provide a full report for the *Advertiser*, including access to the plans of the project. *Advertiser* representatives came to the department and photographed the plans but decided, for reasons best known to themselves, not to publish the photographs. Had the plans been published I believe there would have been a far better understanding

of the whole situation because, when one looks at the plans prepared by the consultants, Maunsell and Partners (who were appointed by the former Commonwealth Government), one finds that there is an area of land proposed to be used for the additional railway track to come into the city. As I have often said, the first point to be determined in considering a matter of this nature is whether or not a standard gauge line should come into Adelaide. This Government has always insisted that it should, but the former State Government (of which the honourable member was a senior Minister) in a telegram from the Premier, Steele Hall, agreed that it should not. We reversed that decision. If people want the terminus to be located at Dry Creek, then let them go ahead with their flag-waving exercise. We have said that we want standard gauge facilities available at the Adelaide railway station for passengers and at Mile End (and this is equally important) for freight. If these aims are to be achieved, the line must be put somewhere. On this basis, Maunsell and Partners was asked to prepare plans, but those plans have not been adopted. The Adelaide City Council has put forward certain matters. In fact, on September 17, 1974, I wrote to the council, stating in part:

The two matters raised in your letter were investigated during the preparation of the master plan but were not adopted by the consultants. However, the Chairman of the standardisation working committee assures me that they will be subject to re-examination during the final planning for the project.

So, the points debated by the council on Monday are the points that were put to the consultants but rejected. However, we have given an undertaking to re-examine them. In these circumstances, the criticism levelled has been a little unfair.

The matter of the crossing was not finalised by the consultants, who commented in their report that they could not settle it completely as several alternatives and unknowns were involved. So they simply included provision for a sum of \$300 000 for whatever might be decided later. In other words, they said that it was not imperative that the matter be finalised before the whole scheme was adopted. If the proposal in respect of road connections involves the connection of the north and south sections of Park Terrace, a section of roadway that currently follows the railway line and passes the North Adelaide railway station will no longer be required as a roadway and will be returned to park lands. These matters have not yet been resolved; they are still in the hands of the standardisation working committee, with no finality at all having been reached. No decision has yet been taken on the future of Hindmarsh Boulevard. I repeat what I said this morning: Hindmarsh Boulevard may at some stage be built, but that is as far as I am willing to forecast its future.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the North Adelaide over-pass or connector?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The whole of the North Adelaide connector and the Hindmarsh interchange plan is currently being reviewed, because serious doubts are now being raised whether these large tracts of land should simply be held out of production (if I can use that term) for about eight years or more. As the honourable member knows, in 1971 the Government made a definite pronouncement about its policy not to proceed with the Hindmarsh interchange, the Noarlunga Freeway, or the other major freeways proposed in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report. We said that we would not decide whether or not to proceed with those projects for at least 10 years. That time is still a long way off. Finally (and

this is most important), if people wish to wave a flag about the park lands issue, they will always grab a headline; however, I hope that, when they wave a flag, they will be fair dinkum. If we want the standard gauge railway to come to Adelaide, it must go through park lands. However, the method of going through park lands has not yet been finalised; more importantly, the matter is subject to an environmental impact statement. I do not know how much more than that we can do.

#### MONARTO

Mr. PAYNE: Can the Minister of Development and Mines assure the House that the Monarto concept plan will contain truly Australian features? My attention was drawn to this question by a short article by Venu Sarma which appeared in the October issue of the Australian Government Department of Urban and Regional Development publication *Community*. The article states:

At a recent public seminar on Monarto in Adelaide, a question was quite innocently asked, "What are the truly Australian features of the Monarto concept plan?" And would you believe, the planner literally ducked and grinned!

This matter concerns all members of Parliament as it does members of the community.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I have a statement from the Monarto Development Commission on this matter, which states:

The Monarto Development Commission intends to provide an environment at Monarto which reflects in many ways a typical Australian image. In order to do this in the planning studies, great consideration has been given to the natural landscape to preserve creek beds and provide adequate shaded areas for public use. In addition, a considerable number of trees are being planted to reinforce the existing Australian vegetation character of the site. The trees which are being planted are all local native Australian species and no exotic species are being introduced at this stage.

So far as the building form is concerned, it is the intention to carefully study all existing Australian traditionally built forms, particularly architectural styles and the environment as they can be seen in Adelaide. Traditionally Australian architecture has paid close attention to climatic conditions and in Monarto the same careful considerations will be given to climate: for example, the use of verandahs to provide external shaded areas, etc. Other traditionally physical forms will be recognised in roof and wall construction and other external shaded areas will be used. The orientation of built structures has also in the past been carefully considered in relation to the position of the sun and prevailing winds. In Monarto these external climatic influences will be carefully considered and clearly expressed in the architecture by orienting specific usages in specific ways.

In the past Australians have expressed a desire for privacy and individuality in living environments and this will be expressed in the residential development at Monarto: for example, acoustic and visual privacy between individual and residential use will be carefully considered and receive a great deal of consideration in order to ensure that each residential unit will have at least one private and enclosed courtyard area. On the Monarto site there are about 80 existing structures which can be seen and it is of interest to note the type of materials and colours that have traditionally been used in these buildings, some of which are 100 years old. It is the intention of the commission to interpret the feeling created by the use of those old materials in a contemporary way to create an atmosphere which would be in technological terms modern and different from the existing atmosphere, but in actual feeling would be very much the same as what has been traditionally created on the existing site: for example, the colour of walls of existing buildings which is very consistent throughout the site, and this will be reflected in new commercial, civic, cultural and residential developments. Other significant Australian traditions, such as the need for outdoor recreation and sporting facilities, will be recognised and provisions for these activities will be made at a very early stage.

## SWANPORT BRIDGE

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Transport report on the progress of the proposed new Swanport bridge? I understand that there have been problems about finding suitable footings for the Swanport bridge until the approach roads have been virtually completed. The completion of this project in the Murray Bridge area will have a big bearing on river crossings in the Berri area. Therefore, I ask the Minister what progress has been made on the bridge and when he expects the project to be completed.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will get the information for the honourable member.

## NORTH HAVEN HOUSING

Mr. OLSON: Will the Minister of Development and Mines, as Minister in charge of housing, say whether the South Australian Housing Trust intends to build cluster-type houses in the otherwise plush North Haven development area? Inquiries received from constituents have shown that they are expressing alarm at a statement attributed to the Mayor of Port Adelaide (Mr. H. C. R. Marten) in the *Messenger* of Wednesday, October 16, claiming that, as Port Adelaide was a completely safe Labor stronghold, the Government was trying to drag Port Adelaide down. The report also suggested that cluster-type houses were to be built in the North Haven area as part and parcel of the deal in settling Aboriginal families.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Mayor of Port Adelaide, in his wisdom, may choose to release a statement that would be interpreted in many areas as being racist, but I have no intention of underwriting the statement. I take issue with the implication that seems to be in the report that cluster-type housing would damage a plush environment. I point out, for the benefit of the House, that cluster-type houses may well add to, rather than detract from, the general standard of what people may regard as a plush environment. However, to deal with the specifics of the honourable member's question, first, the information that I have from the Housing Trust regarding its activities in the North Haven area is that planning now provides for a total of 142 single-unit houses, and a small area has also been set aside to build accommodation for aged people. This will be identical with the sort of accommodation for aged people that I have seen in other areas, including that in William Road at Christies Beach, in my district, and it harmonises well with the surrounding semi-detached bungalows. That is the kind of development that it is. The Mayor of Port Adelaide should know darned well that any sort of proposal for any building activity in his council area must be discussed between the trust and his council, and his council has certain powers at its disposal if, for any reason, it wishes to place a stumbling block in the way of a building proposition. True, from time to time there have been discussions between the trust and the council about medium-density development. There was one discussion recently and, following the trend of those negotiations, the proposition was withdrawn. The trust's present activities in the North Haven development are along the lines that I have explained, and it ill behoves the Mayor of any council to be spreading stories, for whatever reason, in his local newspaper.

Regarding the other matter raised by the honourable member about Aboriginal people in the area, I have been able to get information on that matter also. There are 347 houses throughout South Australia administered by the trust under the Aboriginal funded houses scheme, and 45 of those houses are in the Port Adelaide council area.

I have a dissection of the various parts of Port Adelaide in which those houses are located. I will not detain the House by reading that dissection, but I can give it to the honourable member and to any other member who would like it. The point I make is that the trust is merely acting as an agency.

Mr. Coumbe: Will you have the information inserted in *Hansard*?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Yes. I seek leave to have the information inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The SPEAKER: Is the information statistical?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Leave granted.

## ABORIGINAL HOUSING

District	No. of houses
Peterhead . . . . .	3
Osborne . . . . .	4
Taperoo . . . . .	7
Largs . . . . .	1
Semaphore . . . . .	4
Birkenhead . . . . .	7
Alberton . . . . .	6
Rosewater . . . . .	5
Ottoway . . . . .	6
Gillman . . . . .	1
Ethelton . . . . .	1
Total . . . . .	45

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The only remaining point that I should like to make is that the Government's attitude to the housing of any persons in a minority group in the community, whether Aborigines, various classes of migrant, or whomsoever else, is that our basic desire will be to satisfy the needs of that community. It so happens that people express a wish to live in certain areas because of nearness to either employment or to their friends and relatives, and the Government always will help them in this desire to live where they want to live. The desire of the people concerned is our only criterion. To suggest, as has been suggested in this scurrilous report, that the Government has any other motive in mind is to me completely irresponsible, and it is a derogation from whatever reputation local government has in this State. I think that other people involved in local government should be willing to make clear that they in no way identify themselves with that statement.

## HOUSING TRUST PROGRAMME

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Development and Mines, as Minister in charge of housing, say to what extent it is intended to increase the house construction rate of the South Australian Housing Trust in the financial year ending June 30, 1975? I heard a radio report today that the Minister had stated that he had an extra \$3 000 000, which the Commonwealth Government granted recently, and that he also had the opportunity to ask for more money next March. The report stated that he intended to upgrade the rate of new house construction by the Housing Trust. At present, the trust's building rate is less than 1 400 houses a year, which is about 1 600 fewer than the figure that the trust had for many years, and, if the Minister is to upgrade the house construction rate to 3 000 a year, he will require an additional \$21 000 000. I ask the Minister whether he intends to take the construction rate to 3 000 houses in this financial year or whether we are to face another dire shortage of houses for the low-income groups in this State.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It is important that, when people consider the present performance of the trust, they consider the number of commencements in this financial

year rather than the number of completions. Completions obviously reflect the level of activity last financial year rather than this financial year. That is the first point I make. The second point I make is simply that the additional money we requested at the recent conference was to maintain the rate of building we had set for ourselves for this financial year, and that was made known to the Commonwealth Government at our meeting in July. The history of this matter is as follows: Certain submissions were made to the Commonwealth Government in May for the meeting of Commonwealth-State Housing Ministers in June, but those submissions were not met entirely. However, the Commonwealth told us to proceed on the assumption that our targets had been met in a financial sense, and we were invited to come back later in the year in order to get additional sums so that we could maintain the target which had been set but for which not all the money had been made available.

South Australia over-spent by over \$3 000 000 last year, whereas some other States, particularly New South Wales and Victoria, drastically under-spent (I think New South Wales under-spent by \$30 000 000) and the Commonwealth Government sensibly said, "We won't give you money you can't spend. You must demonstrate your capacity to spend." We returned in October and told the Commonwealth Government what we believed we could spend, in view of the programme we had continued from the beginning of the year. However, we were not given all of that money, but we were urged to continue in the way we had been going and to return again in March, at the beginning of the final quarter of the year, when, we were told, the same kind of exercise would be proceeded with and we would be given money to enable us to hold that programme. Mr. Johnson indicated to the States that, although they were not getting all the money they had requested (I am talking now about the Housing Commission, not the Home Builders Account), they should nonetheless maintain their programmes. So, a clear indication was given that more money would be forthcoming. Regarding the actual number of houses, I will obtain all the detailed information I can for the honourable member.

#### STOCK WEIGHTS

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Minister of Education ask the Minister of Agriculture to ascertain the reason or reasons why producers who have sold stock on a dressed-weight basis through the facilities of the Government Produce Department, at Port Lincoln, have not been able to obtain details of the weights of those carcasses? On Monday evening, I attended a meeting of the Port Lincoln branch of the United Farmers and Graziers, at which this matter was raised, and several other producers present also reported similar experiences. When questions were asked, the reply given was that the weights were made available only to the buyer. Although there is a technicality regarding the legal ownership of stock when sold on this basis, the principle of not providing details of weights to the seller leaves room for dispute. If weights were made available both to the seller and to the buyer, greater confidence of all concerned would result and, ultimately, it would bring greater satisfaction to the Government Produce Department.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will refer the matter to my colleague and obtain a reply for the honourable member.

#### KING WILLIAM ROAD

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Transport say whether roadworks on that part of King William Road which

runs from Greenhill Road to Northgate Street will be carried out before King William Road becomes a clearway? Some time ago it was decided that King William Road would be declared a clearway but, apparently, certain roadworks had to be carried out. As the banking up of traffic is now causing concern along Unley Road and Goodwood Road, and if it is necessary that this road be declared a clearway, how long will it be before this takes place?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain a full report for the honourable member.

#### CENTRALISED GOVERNMENTAL CONTROL

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

That in the opinion of this House the Government stands condemned for its willing and active acceptance, despite public protestations to the contrary, of the Commonwealth Government's policy of promoting the concept of centralised governmental control with regional government by restricting general allocations of funds to the States, so limiting the scope of State Government activities and increasing State Government taxes, to the grave disadvantage of the people of South Australia.

Without doubt, one could attack the Government's record from many angles, and it will be attacked from many angles. The Government's willingness to accept direction imposed on its members by the Australian Labor Party Conference, at Surfers Paradise, in 1973, is just enough reason for the Government to be condemned. We have seen in so many of its actions since that time a willingness to accept direction from Canberra even though such direction is against the best interests of the State. This Government was willing to accept a "Yes" vote on the referendum subjects, the first of which were introduced in December, 1973, when this Government wanted to hand over its powers to the Commonwealth Government, without any clear indication that the Commonwealth Government would have to answer for or consider the sovereignty of the States and the responsibilities of the States, under their Constitutions, to the people of the States.

This was an acceptance by the Government to abdicate its responsibilities to the people and to allow the Commonwealth Government to take over control. We saw a backing-off from responsibilities which, on the one hand, the Government said it would not make available to the Commonwealth Government at the Commonwealth Constitution Convention in September, 1973, until suddenly, only a few months later, it said that it would make those responsibilities available to the Commonwealth Government. We have seen in the last 24 hours an acceptance by Government members of a Commonwealth direction to bring about the cancellation of the Commonwealth Constitution Convention that was to have been convened in South Australia next week, a situation which was politically motivated and which has not been helped by the attitude of the Prime Minister and some of his colleagues over a period. It is a situation which, in January, 1974, at a meeting of the Committee A in Canberra, the Prime Minister was asked to indicate guidelines for the activities of the financial subcommittee of that working party, but he has not yet brought forward such guidelines.

Since then, four more referendum subjects have been put before the people of the Commonwealth, and rightly defeated, whereby the Commonwealth Government was trying to ride roughshod over the interests of the States and of the Australian people by putting forward a story that was contrary to the facts and to the best interests of the Australian public. The State Government has continued

to try to manage this State's financial affairs in circumstances of continued rising inflation. This factor has been clear in every document the Treasurer has introduced in respect of Loan moneys. It has been obvious in respect of the Budget and, more recently, in his announcement of the increased taxes that he will foist on the people of South Australia. The Treasurer has no regard at all for a reassessment of priorities; no regard to the need to bring into perspective the wanton waste evident in so many aspects of Government spending; no preparedness to recognise the best interests of the South Australian community (indeed, this is a matter that goes beyond the South Australian border); and, in so far as it is influenced by the State Government, no preparedness to accept the best interests of the community of South Australia as served by a balanced progress of the private and public sectors of the community. The Government has consistently eroded the chance of the private sector to play its rightful part in the future development of this State. The acceptance by the Government of so many directions from the Commonwealth Government is restricting the State's chance for the general allocation of funds to areas in which no priorities exist.

More and more of the funds being made available to the State Government under section 96 of the Commonwealth Constitution are being tied so that action can only be taken in an area in which the Commonwealth Government determines the rate of development. I am one of the first to accept that several projects being funded under section 96 grants have been suggested by the State Government: we do not deny that situation. However, at that point the Commonwealth Government determines the priorities and the amounts to be allocated to the projects, and it is the Commonwealth Government that indicates to the State Government what the State's matching grant will be for the money the Commonwealth Government is making available. In considering the education system in the light of section 96 grants, one realises how many times science blocks have been provided at schools that have no immediate requirement for such a facility. Several examples can be given in which science projects have been constructed at schools at which few students will benefit, although areas of real education need are being denied. The Minister of Education has only to consider the situation at Oodnadatta. Recently, I visited that school, in which facilities have been provided that are far beyond the capacity of students to use, whereas other aspects that would meet the requirements of the students are being denied.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The school at Oodnadatta has nothing to do with the Australian Government. If you want to criticise that school, you should criticise the South Australian Education Department. It has no relation to funding.

Dr. EASTICK: I will return to that matter later. Many decisions are made outside the State in relation to the type of student population, and the effect of such decisions is against the best interests of the schools involved.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You had better find me an example other than Oodnadatta.

Dr. EASTICK: I will return to the subject of Aboriginal content of the school at another time, and will not refer to it now. We have situations in which funds, on behalf of the State, are committed to projects outside the priority order of the State, and I refer to this matter in relation to matching funds that are essential and are required in respect of section 96 grants. Recently, we saw an attack on the hospital system, and we have had no clear indication

yet that hospital facilities in South Australia will remain under the control of the South Australian Hospitals Department. However, one of my colleagues will have more to say about that matter. We have seen the scope of State Government activities, as referred to in the motion, consistently being interfered with by the intrusion of the Commonwealth Government saying what it will or will not support. It is all very well for the Premier to suggest several times that his many protests against the activities of the Commonwealth Government are sincere: they are patently insincere. A report in the *News* of Thursday, June 6, under the heading, "Dunstan will yell for more", states:

Sydney, Today: The Premier, Mr. Dunstan, back from a European tour today, said he would go to Canberra tonight, seeking a 15 or 16 per cent increase in the \$200 000 000 given to South Australia at last year's Premiers' Conference.

"I will yell if I don't get sufficient funds to carry on our programmes in South Australia," he told me today.

That report was under the by-line of Rex Jory. The *News* next day, under the heading "His shabbiest deal", contains the following report:

Irate South Australian Premier warns: State tax certain to go up. An angry Mr. Dunstan, who disregarded a prepared speech to criticise the Commonwealth Government's attitude, left no doubt that taxes and charges in South Australia would be increased on his return home from today's Premiers' Conference. South Australia was faced with an impossible budgetary position in the coming year because of the Commonwealth Government's refusal to increase finance to the States, Mr. Dunstan told the conference.

Then we had a series of statements on television, in the press, and in this House about what the State Government thought of the deal it had received. In the *Advertiser* of June 17, under the heading "Dunstan attacks Whitlam policies", a report, written by Bill Rust, states:

South Australia's Premier (Mr. Dunstan) last night accused the Prime Minister (Mr. Whitlam) of taking decisions on his own which conflicted with Federal A.L.P. policy. Mr. Dunstan said the Commonwealth Government's policy was forcing State Governments into regressive tax measures.

Then the Treasurer had the audacity to stand up in this House when the Budget was introduced and say that he was certain that the promises, which he had received from the Commonwealth and which would net us an increase of \$6 000 000 in order to keep down additional costs of taxation on the people of South Australia, would be honoured. Yet later, when the same Bill was introduced in another place, a new paragraph, inserted in the second reading explanation, clearly indicated that the Commonwealth Government had failed this State Government. In the interim we find that the Treasurer indicated in this House that Mr. Whitlam and he, although having some differences of opinion, were getting on very well. Of course they get on very well, because most of the activities that are reported are engineered to grab the headlines. In the *Advertiser* of June 18, under the heading "Extra money for South Australia 'a hopeless case'", a report states:

The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) said yesterday it would be "a hopeless case" to try to get more money from the Commonwealth Government this year. He had been asked whether he would raise the question of more money for South Australia when he met the Prime Minister (Mr. Whitlam) in Adelaide next week. The Premier and other Labor leaders will meet to discuss new taxes expected to be charged by the States.

We have seen a succession of meetings of A.L.P. leaders, as well as meetings of the Premiers, at which the South Australian Premier was going to lead the attack and present evidence to the Prime Minister that would give a financial

advantage to the States. Earlier this afternoon the Premier was unable to define clearly what part the Commonwealth is going to play in the vital industrial Redcliff complex if, in fact, it is going to provide any of the funds for the infra-structure at all. We have the situation where the Premier is unable to indicate whether he was able to glean any details at all while he was in Canberra yesterday that might give a glimmer of hope regarding that vital project.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Why should I do that? I didn't go there for that purpose: I didn't have an appointment to discuss that matter. What rubbish you talk!

Dr. EASTICK: It is not rubbish.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It is! It is absurd nonsense.

Dr. EASTICK: In whose mind?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Yours, and you know it! You're trying to draw me into this matter. You're trying to do a Mitcham; it's about his standard.

Dr. EASTICK: I would have thought the Premier could do better than that, but it is obvious that he cannot. It is obvious that the future of South Australia and, indeed, other States of the Commonwealth is being jeopardised by the activities of the Commonwealth Government through its disregard for normal Commonwealth-State relations, its attempts at centralism, its refusal to meet the States and to come to grips with the areas of difference that exist, its non-acceptance of the need to go before the people of Australia (an opportunity that has been offered to it by means of the Commonwealth Constitution Convention), and its failure to look at the areas of State and Commonwealth relations that need to be reassessed if Australia is to progress at both the State and Commonwealth levels. If I was speaking in another State Parliament I would be able to highlight the same sort of costs that apply in South Australia.

Last December, the maximum price of petrol anywhere in Australia was 58.1c a gallon, but, with changed circumstances and the refusal of the Commonwealth Government to accept the responsibility for the whole industry of trying to rationalise the price of petrol, it now costs at American River 64.5c, at Andamooka 67.8c, at Anna Creek 68.6c, at Arkaroola 69.2c, at Bollard Lagoon 80.3c, at Clifton Hills 79.9c, at Cordillo Downs 86.7c, at Everard Park 80.3c, at Koonibba 64.7c, and at Leigh Creek 64.5c.

Mr. Gunn: What about Mount Davies in the corner of my district?

Dr. EASTICK: At Mount Davies, petrol costs 96.5c.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It's a matter of turnover in the number of gallons.

Dr. EASTICK: It is not a matter of how many gallons are sold; it is more a matter that, if we are going to claim that we have a responsibility to the total population, we should take steps to give everyone an equal right. If we do not, we will isolate people because of the type of action being condoned by the State Government in matters of this nature and make two entirely different classes of people. I could highlight other areas of this nature, but other members will undoubtedly do that. I believe that the motion should be supported by all members as being a motion that clearly indicates the dissatisfaction of the South Australian people with the Government it is at present forced to accept.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the motion, which refers to matters of grave significance to South Australians. Reference has been made to centralised governmental control. The beliefs of the Premier, expressed 18 months or two years ago, are well known

on this matter, because he, with his State and Commonwealth colleagues, is a firm believer in what is popularly called centralism in government. The Premier and some members of his Ministry have said that they believe State boundaries are illogical and that there should be some sort of regional grouping for government in this country. There are several press references to substantiate that point, but I will not dwell on the centralist tendencies of the Commonwealth Government.

I believe that every financial measure which the Commonwealth Government puts before the Parliament in Canberra indicates that that Government is seeking to take unto itself more and more control over State activities. The Commonwealth is seeking, in effect, to starve the States into submission. A recent example of this was the measure relating to road grants to the States when no allowance whatever was made for inflation; indeed, for roadworks South Australia was to receive from the Commonwealth the same grant as it received last year. What was probably equally as damaging was the Commonwealth's dictating to South Australia the precise way in which South Australia would spend not only the Commonwealth grant but also all the money raised in the State by way of road taxes. This would have led to a serious disadvantage in country areas in the first instance. Even the amendments that were finally accepted in the Senate only partly remedied the situation. The Government's record regarding centralist tendencies is well known. I believe the Australian public now has a proper appreciation of this, and it has had a taste of what a Commonwealth Labor Government implies.

The Commonwealth is trying to enhance its chances of implementing its policies by attempting to starve the States into submission by all sorts of means. The Premier and his Ministry, when there was a Liberal and Country Parties Government in Canberra, publicly took every opportunity to denigrate the activities of that Government by embarking on a political exercise often at the most inappropriate times. The Premier did it, as did the Minister of Education, and the Minister of Transport, from my own knowledge when attending a function at the Adelaide railway station to open a wine promotion display, also indulged in this cheap sort of politicking and took the opportunity to denigrate the then Commonwealth Government. This sort of cheap politicking was indulged in *ad nauseam* by present members of the Ministry when the Party in office in Canberra was of a different political complexion from their own.

Recently a disastrous Commonwealth decision was made to withhold \$6 000 000 from the revenue of this State after a firm undertaking had been given by the Prime Minister that the money would be available. In reply to a question, the Minister of Education said that he understood that this was a firm commitment. The sort of political exercise in which the Minister of Education engaged when there was a Commonwealth Liberal and Country Parties coalition Government was to announce in the newspapers of this State the fact that he had \$3 000 000 of Commonwealth money to spend on school projects, when in fact he had no such undertaking. Under questioning in the House, he acknowledged he had no such undertaking. Now that the Commonwealth Government is of a different political complexion, the attitude of the Ministry opposite has changed. Previously, Ministers acted most irresponsibly by announcing that they had money when no undertaking for such money had been given. Now, things have been reversed: they have undertakings, but their colleagues in Canberra have seen fit not to honour those commitments. To

indicate the change of approach that has taken place and the complete hypocrisy of the Ministry opposite, I will quote the following interesting exchange on September 16, 1969, between the Premier, who was then Leader of the Opposition, and the Hon. Glen Pearson, the then Treasurer (as reported at page 1505 of *Hansard* of that year):

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: . . . The Treasurer has endeavoured to do his best to hold the line and to do no more than that, because of the difficulties with which he has been faced by the Commonwealth Government's policies. However, what amazes me in these circumstances is that, in the present political situation, people in this State who say that they are concerned to maintain the rights of the States to be able to carry out their responsibilities are not, regardless of any sort of political consideration, out on the hustings to campaign for South Australia's getting its rights.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Can the honourable member give me any assurance that if we had a change of Government we would get better consideration?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I certainly can.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I'll be interested.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have been to meetings of the Labor Party in Australia over the last three years at which this particular subject has been No. 1 topic right throughout and, unlike the meetings (or the lack of them) and the public exchanges of people of the political persuasion of the Treasurer, ours have been amicable, because our Commonwealth leaders have seen the necessity for providing the States with the means to discharge their responsibilities.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I thought unification was the policy of your Party.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Obviously, the Treasurer has not been keeping up with the decisions of the recent Commonwealth Conference of the Labor Party.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: In any case, your meetings could be held without any likelihood of your having to make good the undertakings given or the promises made.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think the Treasurer has not been looking at the Gallup poll figures for this State. If he has not, I suggest he does, because they will give him some sleepless nights. While I do not want to disturb his slumbers too much, I suggest that for the benefit of the State he ought to face the facts.

That most significant exchange took place not long ago, just before the present Premier came into office. A couple of points emerge from that exchange. First, the Premier urged L.C.L. members, who were then in Government, to get out on the hustings and actively campaign against the then Commonwealth Government. When his Party came to office, its members certainly campaigned against the then Commonwealth Government, not only in this House but also at every opportunity on public occasions, whether or not it was the right time or the right place; in fact, most of what they said was in bad taste.

Therefore, I now urge the Premier to take his own advice. Enough of this sham about performing certain excretory functions from an aeroplane: let him get out on the hustings and campaign against his Commonwealth colleagues. Members opposite cannot have it both ways. At times they want to dissociate themselves from other members of their Party, but they are all members of the Australian Labor Party; members opposite are not members of a South Australian branch of the A.L.P. The Premier takes part with the Prime Minister in public marches down the main street. He appears on the hustings with various members of the A.L.P. Frequently, he travels to other States to campaign for his colleagues there. These people are comrades in arms. The Premier cannot urge us, when in Government, to go on the hustings and criticise our Commonwealth colleagues, yet be unwilling to criticise his own colleagues.

The second point that emerges from the exchange to which I have referred is the fact that the Premier, as Leader of the Opposition at that time, had no doubt that

South Australia would get better consideration when his colleagues came to office in Canberra. That was the central theme of the exchange. Although the Hon. Glen Pearson had some doubts, the Hon. D. A. Dunstan had no doubts in 1969 that things would be better if we had the A.L.P. occupying the Commonwealth Treasury benches. There had been these harmonious and amicable meetings of the Labor family, and the Premier had no doubt that a Commonwealth Labor Government would consider the needs of the States. He assured the House in 1969 that a Commonwealth Labor Government would mean a flow of money to South Australia. There was no hint of a suggestion that such a Government would not honour undertakings.

However, we find that, far from funds being forthcoming, the Premier cannot even trust his Commonwealth colleagues, who will not honour the undertakings they have given. This indicates either that the Premier was being completely irresponsible or hypocritical in what he previously said, or that his faith in his Commonwealth colleagues was ill founded. The Premier often goes to other States to campaign for the A.L.P. in those States. I shall not be surprised if he takes part in the Queensland election campaign; if he does not do so, he will not be running true to form. As members of this Government are also members of the A.L.P., they must take the blame for what is happening.

I also want to deal with the defence the Premier uses when he is attacked. In the past, there were statements about taxing tall poppies. As I have said before, the fact is that all major taxing programmes have to be levelled at the average, middle-class taxpayer. The A.L.P. is keen on talking about protecting the poor; it refers to the upper class, the middle class, the working class, and so on. This is the Australian nation, and I believe it is a classless nation. Nevertheless, taxation must be levied on the average citizen. Therefore, it falls more heavily on trade unionists and people on middle incomes than it does on the so-called wealthy people. Even if the so-called wealthy (because of their income, this would include the Premier and his Ministers) were bled white, there still would not be sufficient income to undertake the grandiose schemes launched by the Labor Party wherever it is in office.

The Premier has said that the Playford era was a disaster in relation to expenditure on health and education. I have obtained figures from the Bureau of Statistics to compare with the statements made by the Premier on these matters, which he knows are emotive electoral issues that will appeal, in the case of education, to the many parents of young schoolchildren. At the opening of the Modbury Hospital the Premier blasted the Playford Ministry because it had not done anything about matters affecting health. The opening of the hospital was a winner for the member for Tea Tree Gully.

The picture is not as black as the Premier tries to paint it. In South Australia we have more private hospitals and private hospital beds than has any other State on a population basis. The Premier did not mention this when he said there were fewer hospital beds in this State than elsewhere.

South Australia has not the lowest number of hospital beds when one takes into account private hospitals, nursing homes, mental hospitals and other institutions that care for the sick. His statement is not factually based: it may be if one talks only about public hospitals, but one must take into account the total number of hospital beds available. Is the Premier suggesting the work of hospitals such as St. Andrews, Calvary, Memorial and the 140-odd private hospitals operating in the State are not providing a service

for the public? Is he suggesting the balance is wrong? For Socialists, maybe it is, because they do not believe in private enterprise. The statement made by the Premier is misleading, as indeed are many of his statements.

In education, we find we are not at the bottom of the list concerning expenditure on each student. In fact, bearing the cost of living in mind, we find that the Playford Government did not do badly, particularly in a State with such a high intake of migrants in a period of industrial expansion. In 1958, the expenditure for each student (taken from the *Commonwealth Year Book*) was as follows: New South Wales £12 7s. 1d., Victoria £11 5s. 10d., Queensland £9 15s. 7d., South Australia £12 3s. 1d., Western Australia £13 4s. 2d., and Tasmania £14. We are about halfway down the list. When we examine the cost of living and the basic wage determined on a Commonwealth basis for the major cities between 1939 and 1959, we find that the Adelaide rate was 4 per cent to 6 per cent lower than that of the other cities. This was not because we paid lower wages; it is based on a determination by the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission, taking the cost of living into account.

For the Premier to say that this State lagged behind the other States in the provision of funds for education and health services is patently untrue. I do not believe all hospitals should be public. The Socialists believe that, but we do not. When we examine the statistics, we find how hollow is the nonsense churned out by the Premier about health and hospitals. Since the accession to power of this Government's Commonwealth colleagues, it has had access to more funds than ever a Liberal and Country League Government in South Australia had. The Government criticises its Commonwealth colleagues but then joins them on the hustings as comrades in arms. Since the present Commonwealth Government came into power, this country has been plunged into an inflationary spiral, the like of which has never been seen by most citizens.

I believe this Government has to take its share of the responsibility, along with its Commonwealth colleagues. I exhort the Premier to do exactly what he suggested to the Hon. Glen Pearson. If he is fair dinkum he will have to form his own Labor Party and get out of the Australian Labor Party, or desist from supporting his interstate colleagues at election time. He will have to denounce these people for the frauds they are and for not keeping their word, and he will have to admit that the Commonwealth Government is seeking to centralise power in Canberra and starving the States into submission through its policies on bounties, fuel subsidies, and now its action in relation to fuel tax. The Premier has to say those things if he is to have any credence at all. I support the motion, which I believe is well timed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): Until notice of this motion was given, I wondered how long it would be before members endeavoured to deflect public attention from their own inadequacies and divisions—

Mr. McAnaney: What are you doing now?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —and tried to do something for the public's benefit in order to tie me up with any decision that is made in Canberra by my colleagues, whether or not I disagree with it publicly. Members opposite are obviously discomfited by the fact that when I agree with what is being done in Canberra I say so and that when I disagree with what is being done in Canberra I say so as well.

Mr. Goldsworthy: With no effect.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We will see eventually whether or not members think there has been any effect.

Members opposite did not think I was willing to stand up in a Commonwealth conference and make headlines around Australia, attacking the Prime Minister because I disagreed with his treatment of the State, but I was. I never saw it from the Hon. Glen Pearson, and I did not see it from Mr. Hall in relation to his Party. I know that the people of South Australia are well aware that, when I believe that this State is being harmed or disadvantaged, or not being dealt with fairly, I will say so fearlessly.

Mr. Mathwin: All you do is say so.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Members opposite have been charging me with getting out on the hustings. The reason why the Opposition has moved this motion is that Opposition members do not like the fact that I have been getting out and saying what I believe to be right. They are frightened that people therefore will associate me with South Australia and the actions of this Government, and will not tie me all the time with decisions which are made elsewhere and with which I disagree. That is their fear, and it is what this debate is about. Let me deal with some of the matters that the Leader has raised. He has said, as an example of my supporting my Commonwealth colleagues (I did not quite work out how this happened, but it seemed to be the gravamen of his remarks) that the Constitution Convention next week was cancelled and that we agreed to the cancellation. The reason for cancelling the Constitution Convention was twofold. The first reason was the inability of the anti-Labor forces, particularly in this State, to agree. There would not be any Commonwealth Parliament delegates at the convention because the Liberals would not have the Liberal Movement represented there. That is the only reason why the motion was not carried in the Commonwealth Parliament. The Liberal Party would not have at the convention people from their side of politics who are affecting them on the hustings.

*Members interjecting:*

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Members opposite do not like it, but we know what it is all about. Members opposite know that the purpose of the Constitution Convention is to have all shades of Parliamentary opinion represented at the convention.

Mr. Evans: Was there a Commonwealth Parliament D.L.P. representative there last year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member may make his own speech. What I have said was the position that obtained in this House when members opposite tried to prevent the member for Mitcham from going to the convention.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I wasn't even in South Australia; you sacked me while I was overseas.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is right. We did it perfectly properly, too.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It was a bit of politicking if ever I saw it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If members opposite continue with the kind of division in policies and organisations that has been a feature of their activity in this State for some years, they cannot complain of the result, and the result is that, because they would not agree to a full representation of political views from the Commonwealth Parliament, the Commonwealth Parliament would have no delegation at the convention. The second reason is that Mr. Bjelke-Petersen has decided to go to an election now because he hopes that he will be able to take an electoral flood in his favour at this time. That is what he believes. Consequently, he does not want to come to a Constitution Convention: he wants to go on the hustings.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Will you be there?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I hope so. I usually use my best endeavours to support my friend, Mr. Perce Tucker, who I believe is the proper person to be Premier of Queensland.

*Members interjecting:*

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Tucker supports entirely my efforts on behalf of State organisations. Then the Leader referred to the science block legislation. What he seems to have forgotten about two of the matters on which he has complained most is that the legislation and the provision of funds to which he has referred were introduced by Liberal Governments in Canberra. The Leader is complaining bitterly, as I have complained, about the continuing formula for amounts provided to the States. Only two Premiers (Sir Henry Bolte and I) did not accept that formula from the Liberal Government. Sir Henry Bolte took the extra money that Mr. Gorton gave him and I did not get any, but Sir Henry Bolte did not accept the formula.

I protested bitterly about the formula, but I did not get any support from the Liberal Party. I did not have the Liberal Party in this State saying that South Australia had been dealt with in a lousy way by the Commonwealth Government under this formula. I have said ever since that the formula is inadequate, and it is the formula of a Liberal Government for the provision of money to the States that is the basis of the present dispute. If the Leader is accusing me of being part of a Commonwealth Party, I think the same applies to him. In these days his Party is not the Liberal and Country League in South Australia, as it used to be known: it is the Liberal Party of Australia, South Australian Branch.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It always has been.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It has not always been. Now it is officially known as the Liberal Party of Australia, South Australian Branch, not as the L.C.L., which used to be the local appellation in this State. I did not get from members of the South Australian Branch of the Liberal Party any protest against the Gorton formula when it was adopted, and it was adopted so as to operate until 1975.

Mr. Kenelly: That's because they had to toe the line.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Where were they? I protested about it, I have protested at its continuance, and I will continue to do so. I should have thought that, if the Leader was dinkum in this matter, he would support me and say that it was right for the Premier of this State, regardless of political views, to protest when he believed that the continuance of a formula set by the Commonwealth Government was wrong. However, the Leader does not do that, and he tries to play politics about the matter.

The science block legislation about which he has protested, saying that it distorted the priorities in schools expenditure, was a creature of the Liberal Government, and all its assistance to secondary schools was given on a sectional and political basis. It was never designed to ensure that the money went to the areas of need, and the Leader carefully overlooks the fact that, even though the States have been disadvantaged by a continuance of the formula regarding general assistance grants, this State has had a reversal of the situation that has existed under every Liberal Government concerning the education matters to which he referred.

At Premiers' Conference after Premiers' Conference, I was asked by parent and teacher organisations in this country to put on the agenda for the

conference the question of carrying out the recommendations of the national inquiry into education. Time and time again I was told by Liberal Premiers in Canberra, "We have assessed the priorities, and the money you get under the formula is what you will have to use in this area." It was plainly and grossly inadequate. What has happened under a Labor Government in Canberra is that in this vital area of State administration we have had the most massive infusion of funds in the history of Australia. Never has Australia had such an enormous increase in funds for education. In fact, the proposals of the national inquiry into education are being carried out, and the pleas of the States at that time for a better deal on education have been met. How was that centralising? One would think, from the way in which the Opposition talks, that we should have followed the lead of Sir Robert Askin and Mr. Bjelke-Petersen by refusing Commonwealth funds being granted for the benefit of their constituents.

Regarding the suggestions made by the member for Kavel, I did not know that he was going to talk off the topic to the extent that he did this afternoon, so I did not come with the statistics involved. However, I suggest that he look at the comparative expenditures shown in the lists in the Grants Commission reports, because they accurately reflect the social services expenditures for all States over the years reviewed. He will see that, in the remarks I have made on this topic, I was entirely right. The plain position is that, on matters of disagreement with the Commonwealth Government, no-one can suggest that this Government has been supine.

Mr. Goldsworthy: "Ineffective" would be better, wouldn't it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I may not be able to say that I always have a win politically, but what I can say is that I try, and South Australians know that I do and they pay it.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You hope!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows perfectly well that they do. That is what he is upset about, and that is what the motion is all about. Opposition members carefully neglect to refer to the enormous assistance this State has had from the Commonwealth Government in a whole series of areas since it came to power, without any diminution in our ability to exercise our own responsibility in those areas. I recall Opposition members proposing at one stage of the proceedings that we filter the water in South Australia, but we did not have the money. I know that the Leader has suggested that we should not go on doing it, and refuse the Commonwealth money in order, by some sleight of hand, to relieve the Budget. The fact is that, when the Commonwealth Government came to power, it acted on the protests that had been made by the States over a long time.

No Premiers' Conference went by without Sir Robert Askin protesting about the sewerage situation in Sydney. He received money for sewerage, and so did every other capital city. However, we received less money than the other States received because Adelaide was better sewered than they were. I was able to urge (and this is the degree of "ineffectiveness" the honourable member talks about) immediately on the Commonwealth that, although we had done a good job in respect of sewerage, we had a different situation from the other States regarding the quality of our water supply and that, therefore, we should be able to come in under the same scheme to get money for improving our water quality, and we got it. That is how "ineffective" that was.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What about brandy?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member cannot change the subject. We got the money for water filtration, without any diminution of responsibility in the way in which it was to be spent; that is, we could exercise our options on how we went about water filtration. How is that centralising? Opposition members must remember that, over the last three years, this State has received above the formula sum more in extra grants from the Commonwealth than ever before in its history.

Dr. Tonkin: We know.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I should hope so. Would Opposition members suggest that somehow or other that was harmful to the State?

Dr. Tonkin: Yes.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am glad to hear the honourable member say it. We will tell the parents of the State that he thinks it harmful that we got the extra money for education.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. Tonkin: In some ways it is.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The fact is that Opposition members have no case, or have as little a case as the Leader started out with in his remarks earlier this afternoon.

Dr. Tonkin: We have a much better one than yours.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader inquired whether I had received any information from the Commonwealth Government yesterday concerning the Redcliff project, and I said "No". He then turned that quite untruthfully into a statement that I had said that I had been unable to glean any information from the Commonwealth Government. I said nothing of the kind: I did not try.

Dr. Eastick: Where did "glean" come in?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader said that I had been unable to glean any information from the Commonwealth Government. I did not try to do so. I knew perfectly well that the time for the Cabinet's submission on this project would be on the completion of the arrangements between the gas producers and the consortium as to price, so that the final arrangements could be before the Commonwealth Cabinet. They must be before the Commonwealth Cabinet, because the price the Commonwealth Government will support in relation to the liquids is part of the deal. How can I possibly go around the corridors and say, "Can you give me any information?", when I know that no decision will be taken until that action has been completed? So, having said that I did not go there to get information on this score, the Leader said that I had been unable to glean it, with the clear implication that I had tried and had been unable to find out anything. That is untruthful and improper, but it is a good example of the case that the Opposition is trying to build around this silly motion.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support the motion. There is something wrong with the Premier today, because he was lacking in his performance; he was not at his best, and he gave one of the most ineffective performances I have ever seen him give. For a start, he did not even speak to the motion. I invite members to study the actual wording of the motion and try to recall where the Premier actually referred to some of the specifics in it. He slipped away from it adroitly, as he is a past master at doing, and indulged in criticism, as we are all entitled to do. All he did was try hard, but rather vainly, to hide the divisions in his own State and Commonwealth Parties by drawing red herrings across the trail. One of the phrases contained in the motion deals with centralised Government.

We know that we are receiving some section 96 grants in this State, but there can be no doubt that centralised Government is the official policy of the Australian Labor Party in this and every other State as well as in Canberra, in order to do away with State Parliaments. Part of the motion states:

... of the Commonwealth Government's policy of promoting the concept of centralised governmental control with regional government by restricting general allocations of funds to the States, so limiting the scope of State Government activities and increasing State Government taxes . . .

State taxation has been increased, as we have seen to our cost. The Premier suggested that the position in his Party and relations between him and his Commonwealth colleagues were all apple pie and that they were buddies.

Mr. Crimes: He didn't.

Mr. COUMBE: Although he said that they had their differences at times, he gave the general impression that he as State Premier and Mr. Whitlam as Prime Minister were united on broad concepts. Following a famous conference recently held in Adelaide, a report in the *Advertiser* of June 27 states:

The Prime Minister (Mr. Whitlam) yesterday agreed to a reappraisal of Commonwealth-State relations.

After a 5½-hour conference with six dissatisfied State Labor leaders in Adelaide he conceded the need for closer co-operation and mutual understanding on Labor policy and objectives.

Mr. Whitlam emerged from the conference room stern and flushed. He refused to stop for reporters and television crews waiting to interview him. The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) said he was "very, very happy."

"There has been a great deal of agreement," he said. "All financial matters are being looked at. We have established a working party to look at the overall situation. The Prime Minister has been extremely helpful."

Then the Premier is reported as saying that he was delighted that there would be a reassessment of the State's roads agreement (this was just another broken promise), that there had been no major changes in policy, but there had been a great deal of understanding. To emphasise my point I quote the following report in the *Advertiser* of June 28:

South Australia and other States almost certainly will receive special Commonwealth grants to overcome their financial difficulties.

We saw what happened in the Budget in this regard, and I draw the attention of members to the \$6 000 000 which was promised but which did not eventuate. As a result of this loss of \$6 000 000, we have had to impose extra taxation. The report continues:

The Prime Minister (Mr. Whitlam) has guaranteed sympathetic consideration for any request for help. Mr. Dunstan briefed Treasury officials yesterday morning and ordered that a submission for help be drawn up immediately. "We have gained an undertaking that we will get sympathetic consideration for proposals for Commonwealth assistance in a number of crucial areas of Labor priority," he said.

The Treasurer introduced his Budget (and it was a fair old slug) but, at the end of his speech, he said that he would get the \$6 000 000 extra from the Commonwealth Government. That amount has not arrived, and a statement was published by the Minister of Education, in the absence of the Treasurer, explaining that the Government would have to levy extra taxes. However, the Minister did not explain what happened to the \$6 000 000 and why we did not receive it. Obviously, there was a disagreement between two sections of the Labor Party in this regard. This State and its people are being gravely disadvantaged as a result of decisions made by this Government and the Government in Canberra.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): My colleagues have indicated that the Premier sought to take the heat out of this motion, and that he refused to face the reality of the major allegations made against him concerning the unquestioned acceptance by the A.L.P. in South Australia of directions of and manipulation by the Australian Labor Party in Canberra. Recently, many directions have been given by that organisation concerning councils, hospitals, transport, and roads: it seems that, in any area of Government activity, the Labor Party here has accepted these directions. The Premier suggested last week that I had said that action should be taken to prevent expenditure on projects that were being funded by the Commonwealth Government, but I point out that I had much more to say about the urgent matter of financing this State. I make the point that one thing I have said (and I stand by this) is that I believe that, in the present economic climate, it is essential for a responsible Government to assess and reassess the commitments it has made with the Commonwealth Government, and to ask the Commonwealth Government to reassess priorities within the State in order to redirect funds so that they can be spent for the benefit of the State. In referring to the perilous financial situation, I have suggested that a responsible Government would seek to reassess the total expenditure of Commonwealth and State funds. It is all very well for the Premier and the Minister of Education to try to suggest that the Liberal Party, under my leadership, is refusing Commonwealth funds. We will accept Commonwealth funds so long as their expenditure will benefit the South Australians that we represent. So that this motion can be put to a vote and receive the full accord it deserves, I submit it to the House.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, and Venning.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Crimes, Duncan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson (teller), Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. McAnaney and Wardle. Noes—Messrs. Corcoran and Dunstan.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

#### ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (LITTER)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 11. Page 878.)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): I should have liked a little more time to collect my thoughts on the matter; however, I appreciate the difficulties—

Mr. Goldsworthy: You wouldn't push on with it last week.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am ready to push on with the matter of road maintenance contributions now, but the Opposition Whip will not allow it to be debated.

The SPEAKER: Order! We are debating the Road Traffic Act Amendment Bill.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Fisher has introduced a Bill that makes the carrying of a receptacle for litter compulsory in a motor car. It is interesting to read some of the points he made in his second reading explanation. Although I agree with the basic principle, I am afraid it does not necessarily follow that the introduction of compulsion on motorists does anything at all to solve the problem of littering highways. All of us want

to see the litter problem reduced; we want to ensure that people do not drive along the roads, throwing out empty cans and bottles as some people do. Equally, I do not believe that we ought to over-react and place a burden on the 95 per cent of decent Australians who, simply because of the misbehaviour of the other 5 per cent, would be affected.

I believe there is far too much of this sort of reaction to the problem; however, I appreciate the motivation behind the move. I believe everyone agrees with the idea, but when one looks at the measure one is at a loss to understand how it would operate. What worries me is the abuse that could occur. For instance, the Bill makes it an offence not to have an adequate litter receptacle with a capacity of not less than 1½ litres. What is a "litter receptacle"? That is the first matter that comes to mind. Is a car boot a receptacle under the definition of "adequate litter receptacle"? It seems to me that no-one would have to carry a litter bag in those circumstances, and the aim of the member for Fisher would be defeated. It does not necessarily stop with the boot because, in many cases, a car glove box could be of sufficient capacity. In many cases, too, cars are fitted with expandable door pockets. Could they be used as litter receptacles, too? Many cars have a shelf under the dashboard. I wonder whether that would qualify under the definition. I use the shelf in my car to store a tremendous quantity of litter.

Dr. Tonkin: I didn't know it was big enough to take all your rubbish.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Insulting remarks, such as that just uttered by the member for Bragg, are typical of him and of his mentality. I thought we were dealing with the serious subject of litter.

Mr. Mathwin: Don't get so hurt.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If Baldy Bill seeks it, he will get it. The Bill also provides an exemption for a vehicle of a class for the time being the subject of a notice published pursuant to section 138c of the Act. Why should we exempt any vehicle? Just who is it that the member for Fisher wishes to exempt under the provisions of the Bill? In his second reading explanation the honourable member referred to passenger buses. He said:

There will be some areas where it will be necessary to offer an exemption at first, and later we can reconsider the position and perhaps remove the exemption. Perhaps some passenger buses or even other commercial vehicles may be exempt to start with . . .

The honourable member wants to exempt vehicles which carry goods and which travel for between eight and 12 hours a day, yet he would compel ordinary motorists, who travel to and from work and spend only about 20 minutes a day in their car, to carry litter bags. The wording of the honourable member's Bill is extremely loose. I acknowledge that there is a problem in this area. However, I hope I have made clear that I do not believe we should tackle it in the way that is provided for in the Bill. Many unfortunate and undesirable circumstances could result from the wording of the Bill.

Some time ago, when the member for Eyre brought a matter into the House, I told him that I thought we could deal with litter in a general way. I believe that he accepted that we would solve the problem in the right way. If buses were exempt, private motorists would be required to have a litter bag, but passengers in buses could open windows and throw out their empty cigarette packets and other rubbish. There is no equality in that situation. Because of the deficiencies in the honourable member's Bill,

I believe it should be defeated. However, if it is any consolation to the member for Fisher, I assure him (as I previously indicated to the member for Eyre) that we will certainly consider this matter.

Mr. MATHWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### HILTON PROPERTY

Consideration of the following resolution received from the Legislative Council:

That, in the opinion of this Council, the Ombudsman should be requested to investigate as a matter of public interest all matters in relation to the acquisition by the Highways Department of allotment 4 containing 480 square metres or thereabouts of subdivision of portion of block 24 and other land of section 49 laid out as Hilton from George Sydney Elston and Kathleen Annie Elston, his wife, and the subsequent use of the above land and to report to Parliament on any matters which he considers to be of public interest.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That the resolution of the Legislative Council be agreed to.

This most important matter deserves close scrutiny not only by this House but also by the Ombudsman, because it has attracted great public interest. If it is good enough for the Ombudsman to be asked to investigate whether or not a schoolgirl should be suspended (and in that case it was only a matter of the Minister of Education's failing to have the courage of his convictions to back up a headmaster), it is good enough for the Government to take proper action and give the Ombudsman the powers of a Royal Commission to investigate this serious situation before us. We must look closely at all the circumstances surrounding the matter. People in the community are most dissatisfied about the way the matter has been handled, as many people whom I will name later have suffered greatly financially as a result of the exercise.

The history of the matter is that Mr. and Mrs. Elston owned a property for several years. Good citizens of this country, they worked hard to acquire this property and looked forward to obtaining rent from it so that they could live a reasonably simple life, but that was not to be the case. I will quote the words of my colleague in another place who introduced the matter there.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may not quote remarks from another place in that way.

Mr. GUNN: Very well, Sir. Some time after this area had been rezoned as an industrial area, Mr. and Mrs. Elston decided that they would have to increase the rent on the property so that they could meet council rates and other charges and obtain a reasonable return. They informed the tenant at that time (Mr. John Edmund, who is and was involved in Theatre 62) that they would have to increase the rent. Mr. Edmund was a very bad tenant: he had always been behind in his rent payments. When they informed him that they would have to increase the rent, he objected, saying that he would see the Premier about the matter and would stop Mr. and Mrs. Elston from increasing the rent. Mr. Edmund was leasing the property so that he could run a restaurant in connection with Theatre 62.

He told Mr. and Mrs. Elston (and to this stage this has not been denied) that he would approach the Premier and would stop them from increasing the rent. How right he was; he certainly dealt with the Elstons! One should remember that this is the same Mr. Edmund who runs Theatre 62 and who has received over the last few years \$154 000 from the South Australian Government in grants for that theatre. The Auditor General's report shows that, in 1972-73, Theatre 62 received an allocation of

\$19 000; in 1973-74, it received \$50 000; and in 1974-75, it will receive \$85 000. That is an interesting set of circumstances. As I have said, when the Elstons told this gentleman that they would increase the rent, he said that he would see the Premier and stop them. Having had great trouble with this tenant, they decided to sell the property, as was their right.

They advised a suitable agent to act on their behalf. About 1½ hours before the property was to be auctioned, the agent received a telephone call from the Assistant Secretary of the Minister of Transport informing him that the Highways Department intended to acquire this property compulsorily. This is a serious matter because I believe the compulsory acquisition of private property should be one of the last resorts.

Mr. Langley: What about compulsory acquisition for schools?

Mr. GUNN: I am not going to be sidetracked by the member for Unley. If he wants to support this type of activity he may speak later in this debate. We know that certain steps are laid down in the Land Acquisition Act in relation to the compulsory acquisition of land. Section 10 (1) provides:

Where the Authority proposes to acquire land for the purposes of an authorised undertaking, it shall serve upon each person who has an interest in the land, or such of those persons as, after diligent inquiry, become known to the Authority, a notice in the prescribed form, of intention to acquire the land.

Subsection (2) provides:

The Authority shall not acquire any land for the purposes of the undertaking (by agreement or otherwise) unless the requirements of subsection (1) of this section have been satisfied.

After one has read that part of the Act, it is clear that this was an illegal acquisition; no other interpretation can be put on it, no matter how anyone argues. It is a completely illegal acquisition in favour of friends of the Government, and the reputations of both the Premier and Minister of Transport are under the gravest scrutiny on this occasion. After this matter had been discussed in public, I placed some questions on the Notice Paper so that I would know exactly what took place. On September 10, 1974, I asked:

1. Whose decision was it compulsorily to acquire Mr. and Mrs. G. S. Elston's property on Burbridge Road?
2. Did any instructions come from the Premier's Department in relation to acquisition of this property?

I received the following replies:

1. Minister of Transport.
2. As the property was about to be sold, the Premier discussed with me (Minister of Transport) the desirability of the Highways Department's acquiring the property and, as a result, I requested the Commissioner of Highways to purchase it.

I also asked the Minister whether all the documents relating to the acquisition would be tabled in the House and the answer I received was "No". One of the most revealing answers is that the Premier involved himself in discussions in relation to this acquisition, because we must remember that Mr. and Mrs. Elston said that Mr. Edmund had implied that he would request the Premier to stop the sale, and the Premier certainly did so, because he discussed the matter with the Minister of Transport, whose Assistant Secretary phoned the auctioneer and said the Highways Department intended to acquire the property compulsorily. In the report of the Ombudsman, the Commissioner of Highways is stated to have said that he was unaware that the Government intended to acquire that property compulsorily. A letter from the Ombudsman to Mr. and Mrs. Elston, dated August 14, 1973, states:

On looking at the information forwarded to me by the department I am satisfied that the first notice of acquisition that you received was, as you have stated, by means of a telephone communication conveyed to the auctioneer on the morning of the auction. On looking at various departmental records it would appear that the persons responsible were severely criticised for approaching you in this way . . .

The Minister should table in this House all the documents because the Ombudsman, who had the opportunity of examining some of the documents, has stated clearly that there is a grave doubt about the validity of the acquisition. On October 2, 1973, the Ombudsman wrote again to Mr. and Mrs. Elston, as follows:

Thank you for your letter of September 22. I agree that as events now stand it would appear that the situation has basically resolved itself in favour of Mr. Edmund and a continuation of his business on the property.

That is another damaging statement in relation to the compulsory acquisition of this property and reveals a set of circumstances that must be made the subject of a full inquiry.

Mr. Dean Brown: Do you think all the documents would still be available?

Mr. GUNN: I would hope so. It would be a scandalous situation if any of the documents had been altered, but I think they would all be available at the Highways Department. On page 2 of his report the Ombudsman states:

The Commissioner of Highways reported to me that the Assistant Secretary to the Minister of Roads and Transport did advise the agents on the day of the proposed auction that "the Highways Department would commence acquisition 'in the near future'." The Commissioner had no knowledge of any direction to the auctioneer not to sell the property at that time.

That is a very serious accusation to make. The report continues:

The actual notation of the Assistant Secretary on the file was "Rang Mr. . . . (Land Agents, Woodville). Advised that Minister would be arranging for Highways Department to commence acquisition in the very near future. 9.15 a.m. 15/7/70." The Commissioner reported to me that no specific indication had been given to the owners by the department prior to this time of requirements for road purposes, but proposals under the Metropolitan Road Widening Scheme and the M.A.T.S. report did show that this property was affected.

At that stage these people had not been given any notice according to the Land Acquisition Act, so it is clear that this was an illegal acquisition, and the Minister of Transport and the Premier have much to answer for in relation to the matter. Whether or not there was collusion, it is a serious situation when Ministerial authority is used to acquire private property on behalf of a Government department when the Commissioner of Highways is not aware of the circumstances.

Mr. Coumbe: Do you think the Minister should resign?

Mr. GUNN: I would not make that charge until the Ombudsman has had the opportunity to investigate the situation, because the Minister's name will appear again when the member for Davenport relates the activities of other people involved in this acquisition.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Is he your friend now? I thought you were campaigning against him for the front bench.

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

Mr. GUNN: This was a scandalous situation, the sort of situation that does nothing for open government, the credibility of this Government, its honesty and integrity, or its right to use public funds. The Government's name and

the names of the Premier and of the Minister of Transport can be cleared only by a full, frank and open inquiry, with the Minister tabling in this House all the documents, after proper scrutiny by the Ombudsman.

Let us consider what happened to this property after the Elstons were compulsorily moved. I have said that many people are dissatisfied. A Mr. John Paul-Jones went to much expense to renovate and improve the property to conduct a licensed restaurant, and the member for Davenport will speak about the unfortunate situation in which Mr. Paul-Jones was involved and how he was virtually fleeced out of the property by one John Ceruto.

After that gentleman had occupied the place, another person approached me, stating that he was totally dissatisfied with the treatment he had received. A Mr. Edwards and his wife occupied the Peanuts Restaurant, which I think Mr. Ceruto renamed the Red Garter. Mr. and Mrs. Edwards would like to give evidence about how they were treated. Why did the Highways Department and the Crown Law Department try to increase the rent while those people were occupying the property? Why were those people not properly informed, when they purchased the property, about articles that did not belong to the lessee?

This matter has attracted much press publicity over a period of a few months. Allegations have been made in this House and in another place. In the name of good government, this Government should agree to an inquiry. As I have said, the precedent has been set already in relation to a public investigation. People are concerned because another restaurant has been mentioned. I do not intend to deal with that matter today, but I could make several charges regarding it. During the time that I have been inquiring, I have been amazed at the number of people who have given me information, and already I have obtained \$3 000 compensation for one person. When one engages in this kind of activity in the House, one can mention names, but I do not wish to give names and I do not want to do any harm to a person who is in business.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You didn't think much about that yesterday when you attacked Paddy Meehan.

Mr. GUNN: I do not intend to be sidetracked. There are several questions here. Whether the Premier's decision to quit his law firm had anything to do with this is also a matter that should be investigated, because there are several matters relating to that decision. If this Government is honest and believes in open government and wishes to properly discharge its functions as the authority responsible for spending taxpayers' money in this State, it will allow this matter to be referred to the Ombudsman to conduct a full and open inquiry. I urge all members to support the motion, particularly when they hear what the member for Davenport has to say.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I second the motion, because I consider that this is the most serious case that has come before the House since I have been a member. Some grave accusations have been levelled, first at certain employees of the State Government, and particularly at two Ministers in this State, namely, the Premier and the Minister of Transport. I support the holding of a full inquiry to find out whether those two Ministers were involved. If they were, it is up to this House and the people of South Australia to decide what action should be taken, but at least we should know the circumstances and to what extent they were involved.

I will deal with the matter chronologically from where the member for Eyre left off, and I take the case up from the middle of 1971. At that stage, the property at 59

Rowland Road, Hilton, was owned by the Highways Department and was leased to Theatre 62 or, as the name appears on other documents, the Management of Theatre 62 Enterprises. As at the middle of 1971, Theatre 62 applied to sublease the said property to John Paul-Jones, Flat 1, 21-23 Noble Street, Ovingham, and I have a copy of the sublease agreement. I think it states clearly the conditions under which the sublease took place. I should refer first to the agreement between Theatre 62 and the Highways Department, because clause 5 of the lease indicates clearly that no part of the property should be sublet without the written permission of the Highways Department. That clause states:

The tenant will not without the previous consent in writing of the Commissioner or such person or persons duly authorised by him pursuant to paragraph 1 of this agreement first had and obtained . . .

(b) Underlet or part with possession of the said premises or any part thereof.

I have it on excellent authority that no written permission was obtained from the Commissioner of Highways or his nominee. That is the first point. The fact that no written permission was obtained was a complete irregularity. However, I should point out that under the conditions of this lease between Theatre 62 and the Highways Department, the lease was on a one-month agreement, with the right to renew. However, it was sublet to John Paul-Jones on the implied basis that the lease was a long-term lease. Part of clause 2 of the sublease agreement states:

. . . continuance of the landlords lease from the property owners, and that the tenant with full right renewal will pay the landlord the set figure of thirty dollars per week payable on a monthly basis.

That certainly implies a long-term basis, but the lease was on only a one-month basis, with a right to renew, so it was strange that the property should have been sublet, when it was let initially on only a one-month basis. That is the second irregular point about the property. Further, I should say that the directors of Theatre 62 at that stage were (and I have this information from the Companies Office register) John Edmund Gregory Shuttleworth, commonly known as John Edmund, and Hugh Angus Williamson. Williamson resigned on October 1, 1972, which was after the relevant date. So, I make clear the three points up to this stage. First, the form containing the agreement with the Highways Department does not list the company on the top of it. It simply lists "Theatre 62", although I understand that its full business name is the Management of Theatre 62 Enterprises. So, it tends to be an irregular agreement between the department and Theatre 62. Secondly, the property was sublet without, I believe, the Commissioner's written permission, which was against the conditions of the original lease. Thirdly, it was sublet, even though the original lease was only on a monthly basis with the right of renewal.

I will now read evidence given by John Edmund in the Licensing Court on, I understand, March 1, 1972. The following is John Edmund's evidence to the court, and this can be verified by the court:

The premises on which J.P.-J's—  
standing for John Paul-Jones—

is situated and the premises next door which is a studio for the theatre are owned by the Highways Department and were owned until two years ago by Mr. Elston. Two years ago Mr. Elston wanted to sell and we—

I am not sure whom he means by "we"; possibly he means Theatre 62 Enterprises—

couldn't afford to buy so the Highways Department bought because they thought there might be a freeway going through there. They subsequently leased the premises to us.

I think that that is significant evidence to back up the statements made by the member for Eyre. The evidence continues:

John Paul-Jones came to me to say something could be better than the coffee lounge. He wanted to turn it into a much more attractive building and to have something so people could have meals before the show. We then decided to have a licence. I think it would be very good for the theatre. People who have rung to book for the theatre inquire with us to see if there is food and wine before they come to the show.

I make the point that that document clearly outlines the fact that, in Mr. Edmund's eyes, apparently the Highways Department was willing to purchase the property, because he did not have sufficient funds, and the department was then willing to lease the property to Mr. Edmund. I will now go on from the middle of 1971, when John Paul-Jones initially sublet the property from Theatre 62. Obviously, he was dissatisfied with the arrangement and could not obtain a licence under the agreement. So, it was necessary for him to lease the premises from the Highways Department itself. On November 29, 1971, John Paul-Jones sublet the property from the department, and I have in my possession a copy of that lease between John Paul-Jones and the department.

Later, the lease was transferred from John Paul-Jones to Peanuts Proprietary Limited, and I have a copy of the Highways Department's letter dated July 27, 1972, granting approval for the transfer of the lease from John Paul-Jones to the department. John Paul-Jones was the owner of the company Peanuts Proprietary Limited. Therefore, although the lease still stood in his name, it was paid by Peanuts Proprietary Limited. The licence was eventually granted to John Paul-Jones on March 6, 1972. From November 29, 1971, until the end of December, 1972, John Paul-Jones and the company he owned (Peanuts Proprietary Limited) spent \$17 176·36 on improving the property. The evidence that this money was spent can also be obtained, because it was given in a subsequent case in the Bankruptcy Court. I have quoted that evidence to bring the matter up to date, and now the interesting part begins. I will now take up the matter from the end of 1972 until the beginning of 1973. On December 19, 1972, the restaurant was closed. The reason for its closing was that a doctor advised John Paul-Jones that, for health reasons, he should stop managing the property and take a rest. So, over Christmas, he decided to take that rest, and he closed the restaurant. Then, at the end of January, 1973 (and I will call this day No. 1, because I do not know the exact date), John Ceruto telephoned John Paul-Jones at Bernie Van Elsen's studio at Kent Town and said that he wanted to buy the Peanuts company. They met in Wakefield Street and went down to inspect that property.

John Ceruto, whose name has been used previously, was a former employee of the Premier's Department. Initially, he was a temporary clerical assistant in the Hospitals Department. On January 18, 1971 (this information is contained in *Hansard* of September 10, 1974, at pages 800-1) he was granted leave without pay to gain overseas experience in catering. On April 28, 1971, he was appointed to the Premier's Department as Catering Projects Officer, Ministerial Staff, on a salary of \$3 555, or \$68·50 a week, which was increased to \$80 a week on August 6, 1971. Mr. Ceruto resigned from the Premier's Department on June 23, 1972. I make the point that he was a former employee but, at the stage to which I am referring, he had

resigned from the Premier's Department. Undoubtedly, he was a close friend of the Premier, and he had been photographed with him on several social occasions. On day No. 2, John Ceruto wanted to borrow the keys to the property so that he could inspect it. He borrowed the keys from John Paul-Jones at the Hilton Motel, Parkside, and promised to return them three days later. That same afternoon, John Ceruto obtained details of the property and the company records of Peanuts Proprietary Limited (the property at Hilton Road) from John Paul-Jones's solicitor by personally visiting the solicitor. He told the solicitor that he was going to purchase the property from John Paul-Jones.

I now turn to day No. 5: John Paul-Jones went to the restaurant and was told by a person there that the place had been bought by someone else. I understand that this person immediately telephoned John Ceruto and told him that John Paul-Jones had called. John Ceruto contacted John Paul-Jones to say that he had the lease, that the locks on the place had been changed, and that if he tried to enter he would be arrested. Also Ceruto told Jones that the name was to be changed to the Chop House. On day No. 6, John Paul-Jones telephoned the Highways Department and spoke to one of the leasing officers. I shall read how Mr. John Paul-Jones relates the telephone conversation: these are the exact words he wrote down:

It was he who expressed interest when I rang concerning John Ceruto locking me out at Peanut's. The leasing officer said: It is a surprise to hear from you. I was told you had left the country by a Mr. Ceruto who has just been given the lease of 59 Rowland Road. While he was in my office the Minister (Mr. Virgo) rang with instructions from the Premier's Department to cancel your lease.

That reported conversation is extremely important. The leasing officer went on to say:

The lease is at Mr. Fox's office at the Crown Law Office. I suggest you take the matter up with him.

After some more conversation, the leasing officer said to Mr. John Paul-Jones:

No, I couldn't repeat this in a court or to anybody; in fact, I would deny it.

I think that is an extremely important piece of information. On March 12, 1973, John Paul-Jones had a conversation with the Premier at 59 Rowland Road, Hilton: the Premier was at the property. Again I quote what has been written down by Mr. John Paul-Jones of what the Premier said:

I know all about your discussion with Arnold: he came straight to me with your story about what had happened with Peanuts. I know also about your association with the Liberal Movement and that you've made a tape recording of the whole affair to Hall. It is in my interest and the Government's interest to keep this restaurant open for the benefit of Theatre 62 and the theatre complex.

Also on day No. 6, when the previous conversation took place between John Paul-Jones and the leasing officer of the Highways Department, Mr. Jones went to the Crown Law Office with his accountant. At this stage the solicitor acting for John Ceruto was Mr. Lee, of Dunstan Lee Taylor and Lynch. The "Dunstan" referred to is the Premier of this State. I have details, which I cannot quote because of lack of time, of letters from Mr. Rogers, of Williamson and Company, to John Ceruto. Mr. Rogers, acting on behalf of John Paul-Jones, was a member of the legal firm of Williamson and Company. A letter dated March 12, 1973, discusses the whole situation under which the premises were taken over by John Ceruto, and points out that fittings and improvements had been placed there by John Paul-Jones under the terms of the lease, part of which reads as follows:

That the lessees shall have the right at any time during the said term or upon the expiration or earlier termination

of this agreement to remove any or all of the buildings structures erections fencing and other improvements placed on the said premises by the lessees . . .

That would mean that John Paul-Jones, being the person who held the lease, had the right to remove his belongings and possessions from the premises, but we know that the right had been removed, because locks were changed. I move now from day No. 6 to May 31, 1973, when John Paul-Jones went to the restaurant now called the Chop House to remove fittings, and took with him three gentlemen friends. John Ceruto was there at the time and refused Jones entry. John Ceruto rang the Premier's office and, later, Mr. Bertram of the Premier's Department arrived at the premises. John Paul-Jones telephoned the police, because he wished to enter the premises in order to remove his possessions, as it was his right to do so under the lease, but the police officer advised him that he would need a Supreme Court writ. That day he went to take out such a writ. I have a copy of it, but it was never finalised because, at this stage, someone had sued John Paul-Jones for bankruptcy. He had not been declared a bankrupt but the application had been filed before the court. I understand that a chance was given within the month to try to negotiate an agreement between John Ceruto and John Paul-Jones, but no agreement was reached, because John Ceruto refused to agree, knowing that John Paul-Jones had been summonsed to appear at the Bankruptcy Court, and that when he was before that court it would be too late to proceed with an agreement.

I emphasise the fact that the Premier's Department was involved when Mr. Bertram came from that department and backed up the action of John Ceruto. From the events in the first half of 1973, we can come to the following conclusions: first, there is circumstantial evidence that John Ceruto had gained the lease on the property under false pretences. That is obvious when one considers the agreement between the Highways Department and John Paul-Jones because, under the heading "Notices ii" on page 6 of that agreement, the lease cannot be cancelled without written notice from the Commissioner of Highways by registered letter. John Paul-Jones is willing to state that at no stage has he received any written communication from the Highways Department. Certainly, he has not seen a registered letter or a postal article relating to this matter. Therefore, the lease agreement was broken in favour of John Ceruto, because he was the person who then took over the lease. That in itself is a serious allegation. It is even more serious when one hears that it was done on the instructions of the Premier and the Minister of Transport.

That is the worst sort of allegation that could ever be made about any Government. John Paul-Jones received no financial reward for the money he had invested in Theatre 62 and in the restaurant attached thereto which had various names, despite his having invested \$17 000 in the undertaking. Furthermore, there is direct evidence which I have presented and which suggests that at least one person from the Premier's Department was actively involved in taking over this lease on behalf of Mr. Ceruto, and that that person acted to ensure that John Ceruto had the lease plus the fittings and any improvements made by John Paul-Jones, without Ceruto's losing any money.

Mr. Evans: Are you saying that the creditors of John Paul-Jones missed out on the benefit of the fittings?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: That is so. I could read some interesting material containing information given to the Bankruptcy Court. I refer to the evidence given by John Paul-Jones, when being cross-examined by a solicitor. I

do not know whether I would be permitted to table this document.

The SPEAKER: Order! Can the honourable member for Davenport assure the House that this matter is not still before the court?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I can, Sir, as the case is now closed. However, I will read the appropriate paragraph. The solicitor asked John Paul-Jones whether John Ceruto had paid him any consideration for his property, in reply to which Jones said:

None at all. He tried to bribe me at the beginning. When he knew I was going bankrupt he said, "You are going bankrupt. We will pay \$5 000." I said, "I don't want to go bankrupt."

This casts serious doubts on the type of deal that took place. I could also read evidence, again from the Bankruptcy Court (and, no doubt, people can see this evidence), which suggests that Ceruto paid nothing whatsoever to John Paul-Jones and that, to say the least, he had obtained the lease from the Highways Department under suspicious circumstances. I recommend that people read that evidence. They are the allegations which have been made and on which I have presented evidence. What conclusions can be drawn from this? First, there is most certainly prima facie evidence that an injustice has been done in this State and that both the Premier and the Minister of Transport have been closely associated with, and possibly involved in, that injustice. Secondly, there is prima facie evidence that a former employee of the Premier's Department received favourable deals because of his close association with the Premier and the Highways Department. There is also evidence that present employees of the Premier's Department were willing to help him. This clearly illustrates a most serious allegation against the Premier and the Minister of Transport.

There must therefore be an open inquiry to enable the public to hear the facts and, if the facts are shown to be correct (as I suspect they will be), the Premier and the Minister of Transport must resign and stand to account to the public of this State for abusing, in the worst possible way, the positions of office and honour that they hold.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If the facts are not true, obviously their reputation will have been entirely cleared and they will be free to—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable Minister of Transport.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): I will start where the member for Davenport just stopped. If the allegations, and not facts, as he claims them to be, are true, he said that the Premier and I should resign. I recall several members saying "Hear, hear" when he said that. Equally, if the wild allegations that have been made by the members for Davenport and Eyre are untrue, they should resign. If they read the Ombudsman's report, they would see that what they have said today is a pack of lies and, if either of them had the guts, he would resign immediately. However, they are using this place to try to get over their own Party's problems and to get on to the front bench, and they do not care whom they malign in order to achieve that end. It was the Vehicle Builders Union yesterday and it is the Premier and me today.

Members should read what the Ombudsman had to say and all the relevant material in connection with this matter. The member for Davenport used at least 50 per cent, and probably 75 per cent, of his time talking about some sort of mystery that he was hatching up. When he

is beaten for preselection, he will certainly have plenty of ammunition if he turns to writing mystery books. However, I do not think anyone will understand them or even try to read them. For those members to say that the Premier and I have been involved in some untoward dealings in this House proves that they are not capable of reading the Queen's English. Heavens above, on August 27 (not many weeks ago) all members received a copy of the Ombudsman's report. I do not ask them to read all of that report if they are too tired or too disinterested to do so, or if it will spoil their stirring stories. However, let them just read the last sentence or two. The Ombudsman said:

However, stripped to its essentials, it was a negotiated settlement—

not the sort of standover one that the member for Davenport has talked about—

and not a compulsory acquisition, and so my complainants entered voluntarily into an agreement about which they subsequently complained to me.

They voluntarily entered into that agreement, yet the member for Davenport is trying to conjure up an improper act. He should read the last sentence of the Ombudsman's report before he interjects and makes an even bigger fool of himself. The Ombudsman concluded:

After investigation, and for the reasons outlined above, I felt constrained to find that their complaint was not justified.

Despite that, the members for Eyre and Davenport still want to come into this Chamber and make allegations. They are moving votes of no confidence not in the Premier and me but in the Ombudsman. They are calling him a liar.

Mr. Mathwin: Don't be ridiculous.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not being ridiculous. That is what is happening. The member for Northern, who has been prompting the member for Eyre all the way through, is, together with his colleagues in another place, expressing dissatisfaction with the Ombudsman. That is what he and his colleagues are saying, as the Ombudsman has stated that nothing untoward has happened. There is no substance in the allegation that the members for Davenport and Eyre have made; nor is there any substance in the allegation made by Messrs. Whyte, Potter and Hill in another place. One of those gentlemen knows a little bit about land acquisition. Indeed, we had experience of this during the 1968-70 term of office of the Liberal and Country League Government. I want to take members through this report. If they are too tired to read it themselves, I will refer relevant parts to them. The Ombudsman reported to this House in a special report that has now been supplemented by his normal report, which I think members will have received recently. He was prompted to make an advance report to Parliament because of the motion moved by the Hon. Mr. Whyte, which is substantially what we are now being asked to support.

Dr. Tonkin: Why don't you—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think that the member for Bragg will have too much sense to buy into this debate, which he will probably studiously avoid. The Ombudsman told this Parliament and the public (his reports are open) that he had conducted an investigation because of the motion of the Hon. Mr. Whyte. The situation is that we are now being asked to go back to the Ombudsman, telling him that we are dissatisfied with his investigation and that we want him to carry it out again. We are saying that we want a different result, as the member for Davenport is dissatisfied with the original result.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transport has made certain accusations about the information I gave in support of my case regarding the Ombudsman's report. In his report, the Ombudsman does not deal with any of the matters to which I have referred; he is referring to an entirely different purchase. This should be pointed out.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order. I listened intently to the remarks of the honourable member for Davenport. The honourable Minister is replying on the basis of what is contained in the report.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am concerned about the matter before the House. What interpretation the member for Davenport may put on the matter is his business. The resolution from the Legislative Council seeks to have the Ombudsman investigate, as a matter of public interest, all matters in relation to an acquisition by the Highways Department.

Mr. Dean Brown: Read the rest of it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am sorry if the honourable member is getting up-tight. If he wants me to read all of it, I shall be happy to do so, and I hope he will read the Ombudsman's report.

Mr. Dean Brown: I've read it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member had read it, he would not have made the allegations he made in this place today. If he has read it and has still made the allegations, he is a complete fool. The position is that the House is being asked to require the Ombudsman to investigate, as a matter of public interest, all matters in relation to the acquisition by the Highways Department of a certain property. Surely the honourable member does not want me to give details of the property as they are set out in the resolution.

Mr. Dean Brown: Go on reading the resolution, particularly the last two lines!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The resolution concludes as follows:

. . . and to report to Parliament on any matters which he considers to be of public interest.

He has already reported to Parliament; that is what the honourable member does not seem to be able to get into his head.

Mr. Dean Brown: Read the last two lines!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know what the honourable member is talking about. In his speech, he referred to letters by various people. I do not think any member, even members on his side, could follow what he was saying. In fact, the member for Hanson was asleep then (as he still is), and I did not blame him. Because the Ombudsman's first report on this matter did not satisfy the member for Davenport, we are being asked to have the Ombudsman investigate it again.

Dr. Tonkin: Get back—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not think the member for Bragg is satisfied, either, although earlier I thought he would be smart enough to stay out of this matter. The member for Eyre is not satisfied about the report. These members are intent on doing some public stirring: they use this Parliament as a place in which to defame people, saying things about them that they would not have the guts to say outside.

Mr. Dean Brown: That's completely untrue.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I challenge members to go outside and say the same things about people that they say in here; they would have writs wrapped around their ears, and they know it.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Not one member opposite has been willing to say that this property was not required by the Government.

Mr. Becker: You twist it to suit yourself.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If any member is willing to say in this House or anywhere else that this property was not required for road purposes, let him say so. This property was required by the department.

Mr. Becker: That's weak.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member had better go back to sleep: he looks better that way. The fact is that the property was required and still is required for these purposes. If members want to deprive the Government of being able to buy properties for road purposes—

Mr. Gunn: You should be—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre has already spoken in this debate, and he will not be allowed to speak a second time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Where properties are required for road purposes, it is only right and proper that the Government should be able to acquire them. We do this all the time, as Governments have always done. This is part and parcel of normal Government operations, yet members are trying to suggest that some ulterior motive is involved. Do members oppose the activities of the Highways Department? They have tried to make out a case by saying that the auction of this property was called off fairly late. If they think this is the only auction that has been called off, they must still have their napkins on.

Only today, I signed a docket authorising the sale of a house to the Education Department. This is a classic example. I know that the members for Torrens and Victoria will appreciate what I am saying, because they have had experience in this area. When we intend to dispose of a property, our policy is first to offer it to all Government departments. If they do not want it, it is then offered to councils, and then to the public. I am now talking about a property that at first was not wanted by any Government department. We then told councils about it, but they did not want it. Subsequently, we began negotiating a private sale. The Education Department, on reviewing the matter, subsequently said that it could use the house for departmental purposes. That property was then withdrawn from public sale. Is that a sin?

That is a typical case, and the same sort of thing happened in relation to the Hilton Road property. Negotiations were commenced by private owners. When our attention was drawn to the matter, we ordered the auction to be stopped and private negotiations were entered into. One fact must not be lost sight of in this matter: the sale price was negotiated with me. That means that it was accepted by the owners. In fact, if one reads the report, one finds a statement there that is very often used, to the effect that the negotiated price was full but not unreasonable. In other words, it was a higher price than that which the Land Board believed was correct, but it was not unreasonable. To say, as some members have said, that we deprived the original owners of justice is completely contrary to the facts, and the Ombudsman has stated as much in his report. I challenge any member to read the report and then support the motion. No person, in clear conscience, could read the report, accept the Ombudsman's decision, and still vote for the motion. Members must do

one thing or the other: either accept the Ombudsman's decision or vote for the motion. If members vote for the motion, they are expressing no confidence in the Ombudsman's investigation, which has already been conducted in accordance with the requirements of the motion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The original motion in the Legislative Council dealt with the matter to which the Minister of Transport has just replied: that was the subject of an investigation quite properly on complaint to the Ombudsman, who has reported on it. The Ombudsman's report completely clears the Government of any impropriety in negotiations for the acquisition of the property.

Mr. Dean Brown: What about subsequent use?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will turn to that matter, bearing in mind that certain matters concerning subsequent use seem to have been settled. What has happened is that the honourable member has raised a new allegation which apparently is based on alleged injustice to an individual named John Paul-Jones. I am surprised that the honourable member should apparently know so much about Mr. John Paul-Jones from what he has read: apparently Mr. John Paul-Jones has been making statements to him, and the honourable member has relied on any statements whatever. I suggest that the honourable member's researches did not take him far enough. For a period, Mr. John Paul-Jones was the lessee of the property, and he borrowed a very substantial sum of money, some of which was spent on the property. But the builders were not paid for much of the work actually carried out on the property. Mr. John Paul-Jones sought to sell what interest he had in the property, and he approached a number of people in the course of endeavouring to negotiate for more finance. He approached Mr. Ceruto.

Mr. Dean Brown: Did he approach Mr. Ceruto, or did Mr. Ceruto approach him?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He approached Mr. Ceruto.

Mr. Dean Brown: That is completely contrary to the evidence.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is the honourable member's view, but I am informing the honourable member of my instructions. Regardless of who approached whom, it is quite irrelevant to this matter. They had a conversation in which Mr. John Paul-Jones offered to sell the business for \$5 000, including the fixtures and fittings and the lease. Mr. Ceruto was a former employee of our department, and he came to see me and asked for my advice on the subject. I said, "Before you go purchasing anything, I should point out to you, and you ought to know this from your working in this department, that you had better check what it is that is being sold to you." He then made inquiries about the lease and he was informed by the Highways Department that, in fact, Mr. John Paul-Jones did not have a lease to sell, because he was greatly in default of it. The Licensing Court was about to cancel the licence because the premises had been closed and the licence was not being operated. It was in these circumstances that Mr. Ceruto was nominated by the Highways Department to carry on the licence until a new lease could be effectuated.

Mr. Mathwin: Was this before he went to America?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. So, as to the question of Mr. John Paul-Jones being done out of something, actually he was in default of his lease. At no time did

he tender the money owing to the Highways Department to carry on the lease, and it was properly cancelled. To maintain the licence, the Highways Department had to have a nominee in the place, and Mr. Ceruto became the nominee. In fact, the fittings and fixtures were under a bill of sale and, if the honourable member had bothered to do his research properly, he would have known that Mr. Ceruto was a bailee of the fixtures and fittings which Mr. John Paul-Jones was proposing to remove. Having been put into the premises as the nominee of the Highways Department, Mr. Ceruto was therefore a bailee of those goods. If he had allowed them to be taken out, he would have been sued by the holder of the bill of sale, the Repatriation Department. In fact, Mr. Ceruto then had to pay money to the Repatriation Department and finally compounded to the department for the money owed by Mr. John Paul-Jones in respect of this property, of which the honourable member says Mr. Ceruto had, somehow or other, deprived Mr. John Paul-Jones.

Mr. Dean Brown: That was only \$600.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member can point to other things not in the bill of sale which Mr. John Paul-Jones could have removed from that restaurant, I would be glad to know what they are. In fact, Mr. John Paul-Jones put into the bill of sale to the Repatriation Department landlord's fixtures that were in the place before he went into it. I know about this because I discussed the terms of the bill of sale with the Commonwealth Minister for Repatriation. True, I went to the restaurant for lunch one day, and Mr. John Paul-Jones turned up and abused me. He said he was determined to maintain his interest in the place to protect Mr. Edmund, who had lent him many thousands of dollars.

That was the conversation we had—not what he told the honourable member in one of his usual inventions. I have had some experience of Mr. John Paul-Jones by now. In fact, at the time I was there, Mr. Edmund arrived, and it was a very difficult scene for Mr. John Paul-Jones, because Mr. Edmund took to him and said what he thought about any prospect of Mr. John Paul-Jones protecting Mr. Edmund. It was an interesting scene. In fact, Mr. Edmund has never been paid by Mr. John Paul-Jones, just as most of Mr. John Paul-Jones's other creditors have not been paid. If Mr. John Paul-Jones had a right in law in respect of property in this restaurant or in respect of the lease, I point out to the honourable member that the Official Receiver was in a position to prosecute that right. Why did he not prosecute it? The honourable member has relied upon a most unreliable character to try to lend verisimilitude to an otherwise unconvincing narrative, and there is no more in that than there was in the other.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I have not been aware before this afternoon of any of the details of this matter. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks made by the honourable member for Eyre, the honourable member for Davenport, and also to the remarks of the Premier. I rather discounted the remarks of the Minister of Transport, because I felt his hyper-reaction or over-reaction to the allegations made was not really what was necessary on a serious occasion such as this. The Minister was not willing to deal with the specific allegations the member for Davenport had raised, but it may be that the Minister did not know the answers to those allegations. It simply seemed to me that he was sheltering behind the Ombudsman's report on one aspect of that matter, an aspect that was old, stale, and done. It seemed to me he

was deliberately ignoring the fact that the Ombudsman had not considered those matters the member for Davenport had raised. In addition, I believe he was totally wrong in refusing to read the motion in full, the motion which includes the words and may be read as follows:

. . . be requested to investigate as a matter of public interest all matters in relation to the acquisition . . . and the subsequent use of the above land . . .

I believe that is the important feature of this entire motion. It is not limited to the acquisition of the land, the subject the Ombudsman dealt with, but it must surely also deal with the subsequent use of the land. Serious allegations have been made.

I at least give the Premier credit for dealing with the allegations in a responsible way. He has treated the subject quite seriously, he has answered the allegations as he sees them, and I think he has given what could be a reasonable explanation of the matters outlined. However, the whole point is that I do not know whether this is in fact the case. I do not think members of the general public know, and certainly members in this House do not know. I do not believe we are in a position to know the facts. When a matter such as this is raised, as it was on another occasion in relation to another allegation of possible impropriety, the Government had no hesitation in appointing a Royal Commission. In this case, I cannot for the life of me see why the Government should not take the lesser step of asking the Ombudsman to inquire into the whole matter, to follow on the investigations he has made into the acquisition, and to follow on into the areas of the subsequent use of the land.

There is most certainly an alleged injustice to Mr. John Paul-Jones. That injustice has been alleged to have occurred in the transfer of the property. The facts as related by the Premier may be the complete and absolute answer. However, I am not in a position to judge, nor is any other member of this House. The alleged investigations of Mr. John Ceruto and the part played by officers of the Government could also have been explained this way, but once again I believe that once such allegations have been raised they must be investigated. They have not been raised primarily in this House by the member for Davenport and the member for Eyre, but they have been raised by other members in the other place as part of their duties in representing their constituents in this State, and to put forward their concern and their desire that justice should be done.

That is the only reason why honourable members have acted in this way. To make a political thing of the matter will not do it justice. I paid the Premier the compliment of saying that at least he treated it seriously and did not try to make politics out of it. That does him great credit, but it would do him even greater credit if he were to allow justice not only to be done but to be seen to be done by allowing the Ombudsman to follow through. I firmly believe that, if there is no truth in the allegations put forward, the community should know that there is no truth in them. On the other hand, if there is any truth in the allegations, made quite openly, it seems to me, in the community (and there have been very severe doubts and fears expressed throughout the community) that truth must be brought forward. I do not think anyone in this House could possibly object to such a course of action. I sincerely hope the House will endorse such a course of action by passing the motion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### WHEAT DELIVERY QUOTAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### ADMINISTRATION AND PROBATE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (SECRET BALLOTS)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 18. Page 1025.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I congratulate my colleague, the member for Glenelg, on bringing this most important subject to the attention of the House.

Mr. Keneally: Did you put forward this subject to a Federal conference of your Party?

Dr. EASTICK: That is rather interesting. I shall come back to that one. This is not the first time since many of us have been in this place that this subject has been before the House. It is a matter that concerns many people in the community and an ever-increasing number of members of the union movement. It is of considerable importance to the future well-being of persons conscripted into union organisations and of many people who accept the responsibility when employed to voluntarily enter into those organisations. They are concerned because of the growing difficulty they have of identifying themselves and the actions being taken by the hierarchy of the organisations. They are concerned because of the real difficulty that they have in understanding why on so many occasions they are denied the opportunity to work. One has only to refer to the record of lost man-hours in this and other States during the current financial year to realise how difficult it is for a person with a wife and family to be certain that he will be permitted to work tomorrow, on the next day, or on the day after. Many people have been pulled out and prevented from working. That has been done through no desire of their own and without any reference to them about the validity of the argument put forward by their union hierarchy to take them out of work.

The member for Stuart asked whether I was responsible for putting a certain motion to the meeting of the Federal Council of my Party. I was not responsible for that, nor was I responsible for voting for the motion put forward, which would have tied the opportunity of a court or any other responsible organisation about conducting a meaningful ballot to determine the wishes of people about whether they would go on strike or about the election of officers of industrial organisations.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable Leader that we are dealing with a particular Bill. The subject matter deals with secret ballots either for or against a strike. The reason why I call the Leader's attention to the subject matter is that he is now developing a matter that is dealt with in another Bill still being considered by the House. Any discussion of that other Bill is out of order in debating the measure now before the House.

Dr. EASTICK: The position becomes difficult, in that the motion about which I was asked to comment was closely related to strike action, and alongside the component involving strike action was involvement in other spheres. However, I accept your ruling and will not refer to the matter further. I refer now to a report on secret ballots in the *Engineer* of March, 1971. It is the South Australian edition of the publication, and it is an official

organ. On page 4, under the heading, "It's not good enough, Clyde," there is a comment that is of considerable interest. Dealing with ballots, the report states:

The trade union movement has always supported the principle of secret ballots in elections to trade union positions and to public office.

That is outside the immediate parameters of this debate. The report continues:

But the more progressive unions, in which we include our own, have always set their face against secret ballots on matters of union policy or action.

Certainly, the matter of going into a strike situation is a matter of policy or of action. The report also states:

In the main, the extension of the principle of secret ballots to union action has been advocated by the employers and the press and other anti-trade-union agencies.

There the writers are saying with one voice that they appreciate that there should be support for the principle, but immediately they turn around and say that they do not want any part of it. That is similar to another statement to which I refer members. In 1971, the New South Wales Government had recently introduced legislation to provide for secret ballots in unions, and Mr. Jack Munday, of the Builders Labourers Federation in Sydney, made a statement that was typical of the left-wing reaction. In August, 1971, he stated:

I do not mind a bit if they put the question of secret ballots to a vote, so long as it is done by a show of hands. In other words, he was saying that the employees should be put in a position where they could be thumped if they did not vote the right way. That is the only inference that can be drawn from a statement of that kind.

Mr. Duncan: To be consistent, you'll have to support having secret ballots in this House, won't you?

Dr. EASTICK: I cannot see the point the member is making. The other situation that should be recognised is that undoubtedly there would be tremendous public outcry if we asked citizens to reveal how they voted at Parliamentary elections.

The SPEAKER: Order! Once again I call the honourable Leader's attention to the fact that he should study the Bill. It deals with strikes, and secret ballots pertaining thereto. That does not necessarily mean that there can be an open debate. I again point out that there is before the House a Bill dealing with secret ballots generally in unions. That prevents any member from discussing that Bill. The only Bill that the House can consider now is that dealing with strikes, and secret ballots relating thereto.

Dr. EASTICK: It is clear that we are discussing secret ballots and, in upholding the situation relating to those ballots, it is necessary to determine the alternative to a secret ballot situation. In the Parliamentary field, it is completely foreign to all members that people should have to state how they have voted at elections, unless the people say so of their own volition. Government members and members on this side indicate clearly the way they will vote, because of the Party they represent, but they do not expect, nor can they expect, that everyone in the community will have to identify himself about how he has voted.

In relation to secret ballots in the case of strikes, there is a need to make sure that there is provision in this country for those connected with industry to express an opinion free of intimidation and accept the fact that the opinion they expressed may have far-reaching consequences for them and for the rest of the community. They have the right to expect to be able to vote, with all the consequences associated with that vote, in a way that protects

themselves and their families. I do not suggest that every union, in considering strike action, will arrange a voting pattern that will bring about intimidation of the persons called on to vote. However, there is sufficient evidence that such has been the case in the past and will, I suspect, continue to be the case in the future until there is a provision allowing individuals the right to decide, without fear, how they want to approach this matter.

The whole purpose of this Bill is to give a public airing of that situation, to give the opportunity not only in this Chamber but in another place of examining ways and means of implementing these provisions. As regards impending strike action in a certain metal industry group, intimidation was used against a person who had the temerity (let us be quite frank and factual about it) and the guts to arrange a petition amongst his fellow workers. That person was intimidated not only verbally, in the sense of being confronted in his place of work by shop stewards, but also by physical abuse of his property when he went to his car after work and found that all the tyres had been deflated. Honourable members may say that that is not a very significant or difficult situation in which to find himself, but it indicates the lengths to which many people will go in abusing an individual prepared to stand up and express himself, although his views may be contrary to those of his colleagues. This person did not want to take time off, which would cost him a day's wages, when in fact it was a matter of simple negotiation between the parties to resolve the situation, the details of which had been given to members on the shop floor some 10 days earlier by the shop stewards coming back with the details of the negotiations undertaken.

It was an irresponsible action that had been taken by members in the union hierarchy at the shop steward level that caused that person some concern and grave concern to those people who had signed that petition. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 5.56 to 7.30 p.m.]

#### STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, 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.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 24. Page 1690.)

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I oppose the Bill, because I believe that the Government is bleeding the public of the State white with its taxation measures, of which this Bill is only one. Early in his second reading explanation, the Minister of Education, on behalf of the Treasurer, acknowledged that these measures had become necessary for the simple reason that the Prime Minister's undertaking to the Treasurer that \$6 000 000 would be forthcoming was not forthcoming. The Minister said:

First, the additional special grant that we expected to receive from the Australian Government, following discussions with the Prime Minister, was not in fact forthcoming.

That, I take it, is a reference to the \$6 000 000 referred to in the Treasurer's earlier financial statement given to the House, in which he confidently predicted that this money would be available. It contrasts with the kind of statement the Minister of Education made when he announced the spending of \$3 000 000 of Commonwealth Government money at the time of a Liberal and Country Party Coalition Government, when there had been no undertaking from

the Commonwealth that the money would be forthcoming. Be that as it may, this savage taxation measure is being levied on the public because the \$6 000 000 has not been made available. The Minister said this in his second reading explanation.

Earlier today I quoted in connection with another matter from an interchange during the debate on this kind of legislation that the Treasurer had with Sir Glen Pearson, during which he referred to the Commonwealth-State relationship. I will now quote more than I did this afternoon, because it reinforces a point that is most important in my argument, namely, where we stand in relation to Commonwealth grants to this State. The record of the debate is as follows:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is quite true. As far as this State is concerned it is true, on both a Commonwealth and State basis, that any time there is an election the result will redound considerably to the credit of this side of politics. We will contribute something to the Commonwealth situation. I do not know how much the Treasurer has been going to other States recently, but I assure him that I have been doing so, and the position that I see in this State politically is not a matter concerning this State alone. If the Treasurer thinks there is not going to be a considerable change in Canberra after October 25, then in that case he is not facing the facts.

The Treasurer asked me whether I could give him an assurance that there would be a better deal for the States as a result of a change of Government in Canberra. I can give him that assurance. The Labor Party believes that the services which are the responsibility of the States must be given sufficient means so that they can operate effectively. The people that we represent politically are the people who rely on those services, and we are going to see that we get them.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I don't think you have any exclusive representation of those people.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Perhaps not, but they are the people who vote for us, and they are the people whom we came in here to represent—the ordinary people of this community.

Mr. Virgo: And they are worth representing, too.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Every one of us on this side represents an area where the lower and middle income groups predominate.

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

The present Treasurer could never more clearly have indicated that he believed that a change of Government was about to occur; indeed, it did occur, and the Australian Labor Party won office in Canberra. He also made clear that he believed that there would be a change of attitude on the part of that Government towards the States. In fact, he said that they were committed to it. The word he used in the passage I have just quoted was "assurance". That is the very word the Treasurer has used from time to time when referring to the Commonwealth. So, clearly this measure has been introduced to increase stamp duties, because the Commonwealth has not done what the Treasurer confidently predicted in 1969 that it would do, namely, make funds available to the State.

The Treasurer also had much to say, when Leader of the Opposition, when measures such as the one now before us were introduced in the House. Two stamp duty measures were introduced in the House when the present Treasurer was Leader of the Opposition, and this is what he said on November 7, 1968, at page 2332 of *Hansard*:

I oppose this Bill. While in itself this impost does not form one of the greater imposts outlined by the Treasurer in his Budget speech, nevertheless it creates a real additional burden to many people.

On that occasion, he was supported by his Party, including Mr. Hudson (now the Minister of Education), who last evening sought to absolve himself from the charge I made that financial legislation was frequently opposed by his Party when in Opposition.

Mr. Coumbe: When things are different, they are not the same.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In the same year, another Stamp Duties Act Amendment Bill was debated, and the Hon. D. A. Dunstan, then the Leader of the Opposition, said:

I have no objection to the form of this Bill so far as the form carries out the principles contained in the Bill, which I think the Bill effectively does. However, I do not support the Bill. I do not believe the expansion of the 1½ per cent duty to all areas of credit sales transactions is justified.

Another speaker on that occasion was Mr. Hudson (then member for Glenelg), who said, "I oppose the Bill." However, he went on last evening and called me a liar from across the Chamber. The Government now in office frequently opposed taxation measures when in Opposition, and it has little right to accuse us when we assert that the savage imposts the Government is levying on the public are unjustified. What I have quoted indicates clearly what the Treasurer's attitude was when he was seeking to get elected federally a Labor Party Government. He knows now what the results of those efforts have been: he has been completely let down by his Commonwealth colleagues. In fact, he has indicated to the House and publicly that they cannot be trusted. Reference is made in the second reading explanation to the new areas of taxation and to the increase in existing areas of taxation.

I believe that, in view of the Treasurer's Budget speech and the public statements he has made to the effect that there would be no new taxes, the announcement prior to the Budget statement of new taxes, and his recent announcement within weeks of the Budget of savage new taxes make a complete farce of this year's Budget. On the one hand the Treasurer is masquerading as the saviour of this State, making loud noises and saying, "I am battling on behalf of this State," but, in fact, he is getting nowhere.

Mr. Langley: What utter rubbish!

Mr. Duncan: You must go round in blinkers.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: What has happened to the \$6 000 000 that was promised, and why has this Bill been introduced? What impact has the Treasurer had with his representations? I have referred to the interchange between the then Leader of the Opposition (now the Treasurer) and the then Treasurer (Mr. Pearson). The *Hansard* report shows what Mr. Dunstan confidently expected would happen and the undertaking that he gave that things would be different when a Labor Government came into office in Canberra. Things are certainly different, but they are a darn sight worse. The Treasurer has acknowledged the fact that if he were handing out accolades for a Prime Minister in Canberra in the Liberal and Country Party Government, he would give the prize to Mr. Gorton as the toughest, but now he says that the present Prime Minister is tougher than Gorton was: he has said that publicly.

For the Treasurer to say that he is the saviour of this State at a time when his colleagues in the same Party are bungling the finances of this country is crass hypocrisy. We cannot support this legislation, because it does all the things that the Treasurer, when in Opposition, said should not be done. The Treasurer says that we must not tax poor people, but one of the taxes levied in this Bill is on the sale and transfer of motor vehicles. We all recall the song and dance performance by the Treasurer during the life of the Gorton Government when there was a whisper of an increase in sales tax on motor vehicles. All hell broke loose, because

the Treasurer said that this move was a blow at the life-line of the motor vehicle industry in this State. However, the increased tax did not eventuate, but I well remember the Treasurer's outcry. This Bill effectively increases the cost of a new or secondhand motor vehicle because of the steep increases in stamp duty. I quote what the present Treasurer said concerning this measure—

Mr. Duncan: It wasn't this measure; that was an increase in sales tax that was much greater than the increase now proposed for stamp duty.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: —during the Budget debate in 1964, when he was in full flight: he is reported at page 812 of *Hansard* as having said:

On this occasion the Budget proposes to increase charges upon a certain section of the South Australian people. It does so in a number of ways, the first of which is an increase in stamp duty of certain kinds. That stamp duty increase will for the most part fall heavily upon the poorer sections of the population.

The Labor Party is keen to inflame the idea of class distinction in the community, and throws these phrases around for purely emotive reasons. Members of that Party speak about poorer and wealthier sections of the community, wealthy graziers, and city people, as though, in some way, they are different. I thought that we were all Australians and belonged to the same nation, but the Labor Party seeks to create these divisions.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I believe that the Commonwealth Labor Government has been singularly successful in creating these divisions in the community. I quote from the Treasurer's Budget speech in 1964—

Mr. Langley: You weren't here then!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The fact that I was not a member then does not mean that the Treasurer did not make the statement or that I am not entitled to read what he said in that debate. What the member for Unley is saying is that the Government was not responsible for anything before the 1970 election.

Mr. Langley: No I'm not.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is the height of absurdity. In that debate, the present Treasurer referred to a tax on the poorer section of the community, as follows:

Quite clearly, the increase in charges in respect of mortgages will most heavily affect those people who need to borrow to erect houses. The proposed new impost upon motor vehicles, not only new but also second-hand, will fall most heavily upon the working section of the people.

These are the factors that we are referring to in this Bill, because these people buy secondhand and new motor vehicles and constitute a large proportion of those who purchase motor vehicles. Yet, this is what the Treasurer said.

Mr. Langley: In 1964!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Is it suggested that in 1964 poorer people of the community were involved in mortgage payments, conveyancing of houses, and purchasing new and secondhand cars, and that a different class of people now engage in those activities? That is complete nonsense. These imposts are precisely those that the Treasurer criticised so trenchantly in 1964, and has criticised since then. Every time there has been a suggestion by a Liberal Government to do anything to the motor vehicle industry, the Treasurer has objected. He has been seeking much publicity recently and, I may say, rightly trying to counter the effects of the Industries Assistance Commission's report. I suggest that, if we did not have a shiny new Labor Government in Canberra, the exercise would not be necessary.

These new taxation measures will hit those in the community whom the Treasurer has chosen to call poorer people, but I believe they will hit all people. This is a regressive measure, which the Treasurer professes to abhor so much. The fact that this sort of measure has been forced on the Treasurer by the Prime Minister, a man with whom he cheerfully marches down the street in support of Labor Day marches, appears with on the hustings, and travels to other States to support, is apparently irrelevant. Let us consider the increases proposed in and the impact of this legislation. The increase in stamp duty on the registration or transfer of a motor vehicle means that on a \$3 000 motor vehicle the duty will be \$60: on a \$4 000 vehicle (about the average price of vehicles today, such as Holden, Ford, and Valiant) the duty will be \$100. I think that poorer people, as the Treasurer classes them, aspire to own a new vehicle once or twice in their lives, but this Bill will affect them seriously. Conveyancing is the other matter to which the Minister refers at some length in his second reading explanation. There has been a down-turn in conveyancing and, when one considers the economic climate in this country, that is not surprising. I believe that this Government has an appalling record concerning housing, both public and otherwise.

The impact of inflation on the housing and building industries is probably as marked as in any other industry, and figures indicate there has been a sharp down-turn in conveyancing. In the first nine months of this year, compared to the same period last year, there has been an overall down-turn of 14 per cent. If we consider the figures for September (for a month since the introduction of the Budget) and compare them to the average figures for the previous nine months, the down-turn is much sharper at about 42 per cent. No doubt the Treasurer panicked when he saw the down-turn in conveyances. As a result, within weeks of the introduction of the Budget, he decided to increase stamp duties. The rates have been juggled, particularly for values between \$12 000 and \$18 000. Let us take the case of a house now worth \$30 000: one does not buy a mansion for that sum. Two or three years ago it would have been worth only about \$20 000. The Government's tax on such a house will be \$660. That is a fair slug in anyone's language.

The Minister of Development and Mines has said on a radio programme that he wonders whether we will be able to realise the great Australian dream of every couple owning their own house. The Minister knows the answer very well: the dream has fast evaporated as a result of the depredations of his Commonwealth colleagues, who have inflated the rate of inflation to such an extent that it is virtually impossible for a young couple to embark on the desirable project of owning their own house. This Bill makes that project even harder.

The rate of inflation in this country is a national disgrace, and it redounds directly upon the Commonwealth Government. It is all right for the Minister of Education to say, as he did yesterday, "Look at Japan." Let us also take into account Japan's import bill, its balance of trade, the tariff barriers that we put up against Japanese goods, and Japan's oil imports compared to Australia's oil reserves. For the Minister of Education and the Treasurer to suggest that there is a real basis of comparison between the two countries is nonsensical.

The effect of inflation is one of the major reasons for the introduction of this Bill. Not only the prices of houses but also the prices of all other items are soaring. We have heard much about the Government's so-called wonderful record in health and education. I quoted some figures

earlier today indicating that the Treasurer's defence in that respect is shaky. The Minister of Education would acknowledge that within two years it will cost twice as much to build a school as it costs now. So, what is the good of this massive infusion of funds? The Minister of Education chided the Liberal and Country Parties for suggesting that the No. 1 priority was controlling inflation, so that we could get value for money in education. If he disagrees with that, let him say so.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Your Party was to blame, when in Government, for not having policies to control inflation.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Commonwealth Government is thrashing around and chopping from one course of action to another. Finally, it is adopting some of the very policies enunciated by the Leader of the Opposition. However, one of the major points of our policy is that Government spending should be cut, but that is something that the Commonwealth Government and this Government have refused to do, although it would be in the interests of the nation for them to do it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What would you do?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Government members should consult the special page in the Auditor-General's Report referring to departments where the Auditor-General suggests economies could be effected. Government members should look at the growth of the Public Service. Perhaps we could reduce the number of people being put on the pay-roll; it would not be necessary to sack anyone at present on the pay-roll. In the last four years, according to the Auditor-General's Report, there has been a 20 per cent increase in the number of people employed by the Government.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Since this Government came to office?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It is all very well to talk about giving service to the public, but people in business have to see that they can pay their employees and make a profit; if they cannot do that, they go broke. Unfortunately, these simple business principles have not yet seeped through to the Treasurer. The Treasurer frequently says that he is a conservative Treasurer; conservatism has suddenly taken on a respectability that it has not had for some time in this State. However, if we look at the expansion in the Public Service, particularly in the Premier's Department, we do not see much evidence of conservatism. I was challenged to quote the figures, so I point out that page 16 of the Auditor-General's Report states that in the year ended June 30, 1970 (the year when the Labor Government came to office), 58 600 people were employed by Government departments, whereas in the year ended June 30, 1974, 74 500 people were employed by Government departments. It does not take a mathematical genius to work out that that is a 20 per cent increase in the number of people on the pay-roll.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: But that includes an increase in the number of schoolteachers and hospital employees. Are you against that?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We know that the only thing the Government has to fall back on is its much vaunted record in health and education. We know that the Minister of Education has been happy to support claims for pay increases submitted by the South Australian Institute of Teachers. The Government has always been happy to approve four weeks annual leave. The Government has been the pace-setter. It has always been happy to increase benefits to the public sector.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I challenge you to give me one instance where teachers' salaries here have not followed teachers' salaries in New South Wales.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister cannot make a second reading speech.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Last evening the Minister of Education sought your protection, Mr. Speaker, because there were interjections from this side of the House. He sought from you a ruling indicating that interjections were out of order, yet he now turns on his microphone to make sure that his interjections are heard. If the Minister believes that interjections are out of order, he should desist. The Government leans heavily on its health and education record. Last week the Treasurer, in reply to criticism, said that we had the best record in the country. This afternoon I have quoted figures indicating that that claim is completely false. If one takes the Commonwealth basic wage in this State and compares it with the Sydney figure and if one takes the amount spent per capita in 1953 and compares it with the corresponding amount in other States, one finds that we are in the middle. However, if we allow for lower costs and a lower basic wage, we are near the top. The Government makes this claim: the more money spent, the better the service provided. Unfortunately, that is not true. Just because more money is channelled into such fields as health and education for emotive reasons, that does not necessarily mean that the public is better off in the long term. The Minister of Education should look at his department to see that the money is being spent wisely. The fact that more money is flowing does not necessarily mean that the service to the public is improved.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You are being repetitive.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister of Labour and Industry cannot put two or three sentences together coherently, so it ill behoves him to chide me for wasting the time of the House.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Sit down.

The SPEAKER: When the Speaker is in the Chair, Standing Orders provide that all members will give obedience to the Chair, and that includes Ministers.

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the Minister is being unduly repetitive in his interjections.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. I have called the House to order, and that applies to all members.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: What would you do—

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Obviously, the Minister has not been listening; all I have done in the last minute or two has been to reply to interjections from his side of the House. These taxation measures are aimed fairly and squarely at the people whom the Government purports to represent in this place. Where will these measures fall? There is to be a steep increase in stamp duty on cheques. The Treasurer, perhaps, would suggest that the average person pays his bills in cash and that it is only the wealthy who can afford to pay their accounts by cheque. However, most business transactions are conducted by cheque.

Mr. Coumbe: Many housewives use cheques, too.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Many people conduct their business by cheque. Any impost on the business community inevitably means, in the long term, a charge on the

community. It is all very well for the Treasurer to say he will lean on the Electricity Trust and the Gas Company because they make a profit. Perhaps he is kidding himself or deluding the public into thinking he is hitting the big organisations, but these charges must add to the running costs of those organisations and such increases will be passed on to the public. That is precisely what will happen with increased duty on cheques. Business operations will become more expensive and, in the long term, this measure will fall precisely where all these other taxation measures will fall: on the average, ordinary bloke, the poorer section, as the Treasurer likes to call them, of the community.

Mr. Duncan: The less well-to-do.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is more respectable, is it? I think more and more people are becoming less and less well-to-do. If the member for Elizabeth can point to anyone in the community who has become more well-to-do since the Labor Government attained office in Canberra, I shall be interested to know. I have yet to see it, except perhaps for themselves and one or two of their henchmen. The community at large, the poorer sections, middle class or upper middle class, rural or urban, are all worse off.

Mr. Langley: What about the pensioners?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Perhaps the member for Unley should talk to the pensioners.

Mr. Langley: How many pensioners have you in your district? I have about 33½ per cent of pensioners in mine.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Kavel.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In the first remarks I addressed to the Bill, I quoted the Treasurer as saying the people the Government represented in this State were the ordinary average citizens. Does the member for Elizabeth think the people in the aged people's homes in my district are basically different from those in his district?

Mr. Duncan: They are better off under this Commonwealth Labor Government than under a Commonwealth Liberal Government.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: When one considers the charges for medical care and rents for houses as a result of inflation—

Mr. Duncan: They are certainly better off now.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Not in real terms. They get more money, but it does not go nearly as far as it did previously.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You're a real banana.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It ill behoves the Minister to get personal.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You try it all the time.

The SPEAKER: Order! Under Standing Orders, only one member may address the House at the one time.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have made no personal references to members opposite. The Minister chides me and says I am a banana, or something of the sort, because I made a few remarks that got under the skin of Government members. I have yet to hear the Minister string together half a dozen coherent sentences in this House. That is a personal remark, but it is the sort of thing he is asking for. The Treasurer says one must take a conservative rather than an optimistic view. The comparison used to be between conservatism and progressivism, but now it is apparently between conservatism and optimism.

Mr. Duncan: You can't even pronounce it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Perhaps I have not had the benefit of the background of the member for Elizabeth, who seems to be adopting a fairly superior stance at the present moment. The impost on cheques will return \$1 000 000 in a full year, while the impost on insurance policies will net \$1 400 000. The impost on motor vehicles, including third party insurance (and this is one which we were not going to touch previously, because it was aimed at the poorer people) will net \$1 900 000. Conveyancing (aimed directly at young people seeking to buy their own houses) will yield \$1 600 000 for the State.

The last charge is a new tax. People being in the happy position of discharging a mortgage (and that possibility seems to be getting more and more remote) will be taxed for the privilege. A new tax, it will yield \$250 000. Obviously, the number of mortgages discharged will be considerably less than the number of conveyances. However, for the privilege of discharging a mortgage as a result of prudent domestic management (and I do not know how they will save the money to do that), people are to be taxed.

The clauses of the Bill are reasonably straightforward, although clause 3 appears to be vague. It refers to the date on which the increased stamp duty on cheques will be implemented. The explanation of the Bill states that clause 3 will mean that cheques bought previously can have additional stamps affixed or suitable arrangements can be made by the bank to pay the new duty after a reasonable time. However, there is no indication of what might be regarded as a reasonable time: it is rather up in the air.

Clause 5 gives the banks authority to arrange to pay the excess tax for under-stamped cheque forms after proper arrangements have been made. The rest of the Bill simply puts into effect the matters I have already mentioned. The savage increases in this area are aimed at the people the Government purports, quite hypocritically, to protect. For these reasons, I and the Opposition oppose the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I certainly oppose the Bill. Of the five items with which we are dealing, four were presaged in the Budget and the fifth is now being added. When explaining the Budget, the Treasurer said that he intended to increase certain charges, and we are considering some of them this evening. However, I warn the House that the Treasurer also has said that additional charges will be imposed before long, probably in the next sitting week, and that will be a further slug on the people of South Australia.

This Bill, like the one that we considered last evening, imposes a heavy slug on the average person in South Australia. These increases are not isolated, either, because already we have passed, after due protest, Bills providing for several solid imposts. As I have said previously, the tragedy in all this is that it generates inflation.

The member for Kavel has correctly pointed out that this measure will affect the average person in the State and some young people in our community. The charges are set out in the schedule, and the honourable member has mentioned cheques. I am the first to admit that the fields of commerce and industry are those in which most cheques are handled, but members know that the practice is growing whereby husbands and wives, either jointly or separately, use a savings bank cheque account. Many of those people who pay their ordinary household accounts by cheque will be caught by this increase. Therefore, not only commercial or industrial enterprises in this State will be affected.

Mr. Duncan: If we listen to the banks, we will soon all have bank cards, and we won't need cheques.

Mr. COUMBE: I suggest that the honourable member put that matter to his Treasurer. Last evening the Minister of Education commented on every subject that one could think of. He was developing a theme that was not in line with what the member for Elizabeth has suggested. Occasionally it is interesting to hear the Minister postulating on financial matters. He is an instant expert on many items, or a self-professed expert, anyway.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You're not doing too well, John. You'll have to sharpen up your footwork.

Mr. COUMBE: I am still agile enough to dodge the Minister's slow lefts. The Treasurer has set out three main reasons why these increases must be imposed. The first is that the grant that this Government expected to receive from the Australian Government was not received. That matter has been mentioned several times in debates in this House, but we still have not heard why the \$6 000 000 was not forthcoming. Reference to the Treasurer's Budget papers shows that he confidently expected that the money would be received, but the money was left in Canberra and South Australia went whistling in the dark. In other words, one reason why we must consider this Bill is that the Commonwealth colleagues of the Treasurer and other members opposite did not come to the aid of the party. The second reason given for the impost is a reassessment of prospective movements of average wages as a result of inflation.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Go on!

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister in charge of the House is one of the most adept financial experts that I have ever met, but even he acknowledges the tremendous increase in the inflation rate in this country. Unfortunately, the figure given in the Budget papers as the figure suggested by the Commonwealth Treasury at that time has now been exceeded. The only person benefiting from the spiralling inflation is the Commonwealth Treasurer, who must be laughing all the way to the bank. Unfortunately for him, he will not receive additional money from those who are being laid off from work and therefore not paying taxes.

Mr. Crimes: Don't you like to pick and choose when engaging employees for your industrial enterprise, or have you sold it?

Mr. COUMBE: I hope the honourable member enjoys his private joke, but to me what has happened is a tragedy, not a joke. The third reason given for the increased stamp duty is a down-turn in the number of conveyances being stamped, and this down-turn has arisen because of the slowing down in the number of blocks of land and houses sold. Income from stamp duty has decreased dramatically and the Treasurer has admitted that a miscalculation was made. I ask why there has been such a marked down-turn in this field. Each member should examine closely why that has occurred in such a short time. The housing industry has got into such a parlous condition that houses are not being built in the public and private sectors at the rate at which they were being built previously. Further, there has been a decrease in the number of blocks of land being sold.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: We know that. You tell us how you would rectify it.

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister has touched on an important point. I will give him my remedy succinctly. The first action is to change this Government and the

Commonwealth Government, and the second action is to restore public confidence. Under the heavy-fisted administration of this Government and the Government in Canberra, public confidence has vanished. Surely even the most ardent Socialist will admit that in any State or nation the largest part of revenue is received from the private sector. The best way to boost that revenue and so avoid these imposts is to restore people's confidence in the public sector and to change the Government as quickly as possible. To improve our position, we must get more confidence in the community, or that part of it that pays taxes, whether corporate or private. One of the regrettable circumstances we are facing now with a high level of unemployment is that many people are being removed from not only the work force but also the prospective income tax paying section of the community. I regret that as much as anyone does.

We started to look at the incidence of the taxes now proposed, and the member for Kavel properly touched on this matter just now. Stamp duty will bring in \$550 000 in the remainder of this financial year, and \$1 000 000 in a full year. That duty is payable on insurance policies, and everyone is in some way affected by insurance policies. Motor vehicles have been referred to, and the next time anyone buys a new car he will be slugged again. No matter what size car anyone in the community buys, he will have to pay more in future for registration or reregistration, whichever the case may be; or, if he buys a secondhand car, he will have to pay more for the transfer of that car.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: We hear this every year. Members opposite said that when we were in Opposition. How long ago did prices start to increase?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. COUMBE: I think the Minister would agree with me that one Government department has granted a considerable number of price increases recently.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: How many prices have fallen in the last 20 years?

The SPEAKER: Does the Minister want to be put on the list as the next speaker?

Mr. COUMBE: For a moment, Sir, I thought you were going to warn him. Let us get this into true perspective. I will not go through every item here, because the member for Kavel has touched upon them already, but I am worried that the small people in the community are to be pelted and slugged by this present Socialist Government, which on many occasions has gone on the hustings saying, "We represent and care for the little people." The member for Spence has frequently said just that.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. COUMBE: The Party opposite has said that many times, yet that same Party which has this "holier than thou" attitude is slugging the very people it professes to support and to want to help. I said last night, and I say it again now in the context of this debate, that the people are beginning to wake up to what is going on and getting more and more resentful, not only of this Government but also of the one in Canberra. Many of the taxes we are considering, including the one under discussion now, are a direct result of the mismanagement from Canberra. Warnings have been given over the months, but no action was taken until recently, and some of the action has been taken belatedly.

Mr. Crimes: It might be better if you people had been there to hold the baby.

Mr. COUNBE: If I interpret that interjection correctly, the honourable member is now saying that Billy Snedden should have won the last election. Therefore, I ask you, Mr. Speaker: are we going to get an article in the next edition of the *Herald* to the effect that the editor is on record as saying that Billy Snedden should have won the last election?

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that members will confine their remarks to the Bill that is now being considered by the House.

Mr. COUNBE: Perhaps we might get it by a letter to the editor in the *Herald*. However, in all seriousness, this is another impost we have to consider. In conclusion, I warn the House that this is not the last impost to be introduced.

The SPEAKER: Order! Private discussions between members are not permitted. One member has the call, and on this occasion it is the member for Torrens who is speaking to the Bill.

Mr. COUNBE: This is not the last of the financial slugs that members will have to consider in this calendar year, let alone this financial year. Already the Treasurer has given fair warning of the types of tax he will impose. He has said that he has had to impose these taxes, first, because he has not received the reimbursement grants from the Commonwealth Government to which this State is rightly entitled; and, secondly, because of the \$6 000 000 which he did not get from the Commonwealth Government but which was promised and so confidently expected. Those are the reasons, apart from mismanagement, etc., why this evening we have to consider this Bill, which emanates from the Budget, except for the last line—mortgage discharge. As the member for Kavel has said, with stamp duty on mortgage discharges we are really scraping the bottom of the barrel, if a young person has to sweat away all his life to pay off a mortgage on his house and then has to pay stamp duty on the discharge of the mortgage to get the title to his property.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I was rather hoping the Minister of Labour and Industry would leap to his feet. Indeed, I thought I detected a movement, but I think he was just changing his weight. I was most impressed with the piece of philosophy that the Minister was kind enough to pass across the Chamber to us. It went something like this: "After all, what hasn't gone up in the last 20 years? Prices have been going up, so the standard of living has been going up." This is the first time I have heard the hypothesis that inflation is due to the rising standard of living in our country. I do not think it is going up at the rate of 20 per cent a year, and the Minister knows that very well. I wonder whom he thinks he is kidding.

The member for Kavel and the member for Torrens have carefully analysed this Bill, and I shall not keep the House very long; but it is necessary to speak about the three reasons that have been given as a smoke screen for why this Bill had to be introduced. The first is that the special grant that was expected has not been forthcoming. It is not the first time something like this has happened. I think the special grant system is now beginning to be shown up for what it is—a snare and a delusion. What a lesson this is. We have seen the same thing happen with promised grants for sewerage works, and now we see that we have insufficient money to maintain our deficit at only \$12 000 000. Without raising additional taxes, it will exceed this figure. Now we must depend on a special

grant to this State. Why should we have to do this? Can we afford to accept a special grant on these terms?

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Don't you think this has happened in the past?

Dr. TONKIN: Previously South Australia was given sufficient funds to enable it to decide how they would be spent, without being dictated to by the Commonwealth Government. It is totally immoral that South Australia is being deprived of funds. It is unable to undertake projects that it seeks to undertake itself, and it is impossible for it to maintain its everyday running at its normal standard. This is pure deprivation. It is not merely a question of giving the States enough money so that they can keep going at the same level so that the Commonwealth can put in the plums and get the electoral kudos for it: the States are being squeezed from both ends. They are being bled by the Commonwealth Government and, in turn, South Australia is having to bleed the people to bolster up the finances of the Commonwealth Government. As has been said so often, the Commonwealth Government does not need that bolstering up. It is raking in more money now through income tax payments than it has ever received previously, and South Australia is not getting its fair share.

Mr. Crimes: Now you're saying we should spend less.

Dr. TONKIN: That is the iniquitous situation we are in. We cannot afford to keep up the same degree of extravagant and irresponsible spending that we have seen under this State Government. That is one reason why we should get rid of this State Government as soon as possible, and the people are waking up to that. The Treasurer said we must accept special grants. Members on this side say that we cannot afford to accept special grants on the terms offered. We say that South Australia should be given its fair share of revenue, and it should be able to say how it will spend funds allocated to it. More importantly, the Treasurer completely trusted his Commonwealth colleagues. He confidently expected the special grant to come to South Australia. What has happened to it? It has disappeared, and it is now not coming. Can we afford to continue to trust the Commonwealth Government? Clearly, the answer is "No"; we cannot trust it, and I hear no members opposite standing up for it.

Mr. Crimes: Do you think there will be a change?

Dr. TONKIN: I am sure there will be change, as soon as the Australian people have the opportunity to bring it about.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bragg should come back to the Bill.

Dr. TONKIN: Mr. Speaker, I have never been away from this Bill, with respect, because this is why this impost has been introduced. Had it not been for the breaking of promises by the Commonwealth Government, among other things, we would not be considering this Bill.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You sound as though you're speaking at Burnside Town Hall.

Dr. TONKIN: I was surprised not to see the Minister at the Burnside Town Hall, as a resident of Burnside.

The SPEAKER: Order! That matter is outside the scope of the Bill.

Dr. TONKIN: The Commonwealth Government is blatantly using and abusing the control engineered specifically through the provision of special grants and the withholding of special grants by threat to control the States, thereby forcing them to raise their own finances. Not only is that Government not content with its vastly increased

receipts from income tax but it also seeks to bleed more money from the people through local taxation. This is the first lesson to be learned.

Mr. Crimes: The member for Alexandra said, "Hit them in their stomachs."

Dr. TONKIN: That is exactly what this State Government is doing, and it is doing it as an equal partner in a scheme engineered by it and the Commonwealth Government. That is the basic A.L.P. plan, to hit them in their stomachs. I refer to the \$4 000 000 increased estimated cost of wages. This is a direct cause of inflation, and at the same time it is the result of inflation; it is going round and round in circles. There is no other answer: inflation is the direct result of the Commonwealth Labor Government's total inability and lack of desire to control it. I say that deliberately, because the Commonwealth Government does not want to control inflation. It is going out of its way to increase inflation, because it suits it to have increased inflation, as a result of which it obtains increased income.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member for Bragg please address the Chair and not honourable members behind him.

Dr. TONKIN: I did not know, Mr. Speaker, there were any behind me. Inflation has had the effect of enabling the Commonwealth Government to control the States through financial measures. The Commonwealth Government blames the world scene (and I think I have seen this printed in a journal). It describes inflation as part of a world problem. The fact that it happens to be almost as high in Australia as in other countries having the highest rate of inflation in the world does not seem to matter.

Mr. Crimes: It is over 600 per cent in Chile.

Dr. TONKIN: The member for Spence is incredibly naive. Perhaps it is time he did retire. The Commonwealth Government blames the system. Yet the system has been around for a long time and, as far as I can see, it seems to have worked well; it is working well in other countries where inflation has been contained to a reasonable level, a level which, if the Minister said resulted from an increased standard of living, I would have to agree, and say that he was right. A level of 6 per cent or 7 per cent inflation is acceptable, but not 20 per cent.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: People demand more money. What causes industrial unrest?

Dr. TONKIN: The Government blames the previous Commonwealth Liberal Government for the things it either did or left incomplete. It totally ignores the fact that inflation has turned completely around until we now have cost-push inflation, which is almost impossible to control under the conditions imposed by the present Commonwealth Labor Government. It blames everyone but itself. Now it is adopting the measures suggested by the Opposition to deal with inflation. True, it took a long time, because members of the Commonwealth Government could not adopt these measures too soon. They might have worked, and inflation could have been dealt with sooner! No, it carefully calculated the time, and it now introduces them knowing it will take at least nine months for them to have any effect. That is something with which we will have to live, and I believe it is something that the Commonwealth Government has not taken the trouble to find out. Either that or the Government is wilfully delaying the introduction of these measures and, if that is so, the situation is even worse. Another lesson to be learnt is lesson No. 2, which is exactly the same as lesson No. 1, namely, we must get rid of the Commonwealth Labor Party Government as soon as we can.

Mr. Crimes: That wouldn't solve a single problem.

Dr. TONKIN: I can think of so many problems we could solve if we got rid of that lot in Canberra.

Mr. Keneally: Your only answer to inflation is unemployment.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bragg.

Dr. TONKIN: It comes back again to the need for the Commonwealth Government to have a stranglehold on the States through special grants, and it does not care whom it hurts on the way. Because its ideology pushes it inevitably towards central control of the States, and because of its belief in the ultimate abolition of the States, it will push on as fast and hard as it can to control the States financially, and it does not care whom it will hurt in the process. If there is to be unemployment (and there will be unemployment, I am afraid)—

Mr. Keneally: You'll be delighted!

Dr. TONKIN: I will not be delighted, but it will be directly the fault of the Commonwealth Labor Government, and no-one else. Until it realises that it must be reasonable, and gets off its ideological runaway train and brings it to a halt, it will create unemployment in this country, and it will be to blame. The third factor is supposed to be the down-turn in conveyancing.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: If it is as you think it is, what is your remedy?

Dr. TONKIN: Get rid of the Commonwealth Labor Government, for a start.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: That's why the people got rid of your Government.

Dr. TONKIN: It is not difficult to understand why there has been a large-scale down-turn in conveyancing. Building costs have increased tremendously; the member for Kavel and other members have dealt with these factors. There is a lack of liquidity. There is no money. Percentage interest rates have increased. People who are trying to buy a house are unable to borrow money, and moneys are being made available too late. Many people who now have mortgages have found that, after one or two years, they owe more money than they did when they started to pay them off. That has been because of the increased interest rates and the difficulty in getting money generally. There are so many more who cannot afford even to consider buying a house now. This, of course, suits the Commonwealth Government very well, because it does not approve of the idea of people owning their own house. People know perfectly well that this is the Government's line of thought and approach to life.

*Members interjecting:*

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Only one speaker must address the Chair at a time. Honourable members must refrain from interjecting, otherwise Standing Orders will have to apply. The honourable member for Bragg.

Dr. TONKIN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. All these factors have led to a down-turn in conveyancing. The thing I find hypocritical to the degree is that this Government, which has brought about all these factors and which has helped to create these situations, is now trying to take advantage of the general down-turn in conveyancing to increase charges for conveyancing. It may have brought about this situation as part of its policy, but it will not do without the revenue that comes with it; so, up go the charges.

Lesson No. 3 is exactly the same as the other two lessons. As we cannot trust the Commonwealth A.L.P. Government any more than we can trust the State Labor Government, we should get rid of it as soon as we can, and I hope that the people of South Australia will take this action as soon as they have an opportunity. The reasons in the Minister's second reading explanation were detailed as something of a smoke screen. He made it look as though he had carefully examined the reasons, and detailed them out. It was unnecessary for him to do that. There is only one reason why we are considering this Bill this evening.

*Members interjecting:*

Dr. TONKIN: I am glad to hear that the member for Stuart is so anxious to take the credit for introducing this taxation measure. The only reason it has been introduced is that South Australia is being forced into a situation where it has no option but to increase taxation, because it has a Treasurer and a Government which will not stand up for it but which make noises, bang big drums, and charge around like white knights on white chargers, achieving nothing. When one realises that it is the State Treasurer who, among others, has taken part in the evolution and planning of these policies from which we are now smarting, one realises that he has no right to stand up publicly anywhere in the State and say that he is concerned about the people of South Australia.

It will be interesting to see whether he will acknowledge, as he did in the House about eight weeks ago, that he had something to do with the planning of the Commonwealth Government's fiscal policy in relation to the States. We have not heard about that lately, yet that is what he has admitted. I think it is about time that we got away from all this sham. I think it is high time that the Treasurer acknowledged that we were in a spot, and went along to the Prime Minister and said, "I think the plans we have worked out and evolved for the control of the States are too tough on the people. I think we should modify our plans." I am sure he could do it if he wanted to, without all the hoo-hah that is going on now. He could manage to do that without any trouble at all. That is what I believe he should be doing. I am not even sure, because no-one seems to know where he was last Thursday.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that we are supposed to be debating the Stamp Duties Act Amendment Bill, and some of the matters that have been debated in the last few minutes were far from the subject. The honourable member must confine his remarks to the Bill now before us.

Dr. TONKIN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Keneally: He was talking with the Deputy Prime Minister on behalf of South Australia.

Mr. Mathwin: He was—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: For your information, Mr. Deputy Speaker (because I would like to ensure that you see how I am linking up my remarks with the Bill), I reiterate that it is being introduced to impose a State taxation that has been found necessary because the Commonwealth Government is not providing the State with the money it needs, and the Minister said as much in his second reading explanation. This failure of the Commonwealth Government to provide the State with enough money has come about because of a policy evolved by the Labor Party; and the Prime Minister and the Treasurer, as A.L.P. members, together with others, had much to do with shaping this policy. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I submit that

my remarks are entirely linked with the Bill, and are in order. I conclude by saying that it may be that the Treasurer has already been to see the Prime Minister privately and said to him, "This is too tough for the people of South Australia." I am not referring to the official meetings, but I am sure he may have said to the Prime Minister, "This is too tough, let's change our plans and modify them." If he has done that, however, he has not had any success. This Bill is not good enough: we are considering it only because South Australia is being deliberately kept from receiving its fair share of Commonwealth Government funds. The blame for the imposition of this tax lies fairly and squarely on the Commonwealth Government and on the Government of this State for scheming and conniving in the way they have. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I oppose the Bill in principle, because part of it was not included in the Budget statement made by the Treasurer. In the second reading explanation of this Bill, the Minister said that there were three matters of significance that had occurred since the Budget had been introduced some months ago. The first point was that the additional special grant of \$6 000 000, which had been expected, was not forthcoming. I consider that it was unfair to include in the Budget figures an amount the Treasurer thought he might receive. Because of the folly of including that amount and because the Commonwealth Government was unable to fulfil its promise (if it were ever made, and we do not know), we have to raise additional taxes. The second point raised by the Minister referred to movements in average wages; he said that it was expected that the impact of these movements would have an effect of \$4 000 000 on the State's deficit. The third matter was the down-turn in the number of conveyances submitted for stamping. I do not think the Treasury has realised that it was not the reduction in the price of land as much as the introduction of legislation dealing with land and business agents that affected conveyancing. When the Land and Business Agents Act came into operation, it caused general confusion in the real estate sector of the community and, for some time, people employed in that industry were not sure of what to do. When one is in doubt the best thing is not to proceed, and there was considerable delay because of the attitude of some people in the real estate profession. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

The proposals contained in this Bill presage an additional revenue return of \$4 100 000 in 1974-75 and \$6 100 000 in a full year. Whilst the Revenue Budget forecast \$1 000 000 less from these taxes during each of these periods, I would stress that, at the time the Budget was prepared, insufficient detailed information was available to accurately assess the return arising from the expanded value categories proposed for motor vehicle registrations and conveyances.

I believe that is a smoke screen, and I do not believe the statement. When the Budget was being prepared, we know that the Treasurer was overseas on his \$55 000 jaunt. He had to return for a few days, not to campaign in the Commonwealth election but to attend to Treasury matters!

Mr. Mathwin: And sign a few cheques!

Mr. BECKER: No, to prepare the 1974-75 Budget! Whom is the Treasurer trying to fool? When he returned from overseas to campaign in the Commonwealth election, thus placing an extra financial burden on the taxpayers of this State, he also looked at the Treasury documents and apparently made a complete mess of them. Had he been in South Australia and not gallivanting all over the world, and had he not also been gallivanting in the Eastern States in order to further his Party's cause instead of remaining

in South Australia and attending to matters that affected the State, we might not be in the present position. The Treasurer should stand condemned for placing taxpayers in the present situation, because of his selfish and arrogant attitude and of playing politics in other States instead of attending to financial matters concerning this State.

Treasury officials are paid to advise him: we know what has happened in Canberra and what is happening in this State. The advice of these officials is being ignored, and that is why we are in the present financial mess. If the Commonwealth Government had taken heed of warnings given by its Treasury officials, the people of this country would not be in the present situation. Three years ago it was predicted (and I predicted it) that we would have a run of inflation, but no-one would take any notice. At that time Japan's rate of inflation was about 10 per cent. Japan was one of our most important trading nations: it had a tremendous impact on Western countries, but no-one in Australia took any notice of these predictions. Those stupid fools who went into the Commonwealth Government in 1972 took no notice, either; if they had, we would not be in the present mess. Because the Commonwealth Government has put the country in such a mess, all States, but particularly South Australia, are feeling the impact and the pinch.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: You are suggesting that this Government has not taken any notice of its Treasury officials: would you be more specific?

Mr. BECKER: I do not think that any Minister is competent to handle the money allocated to various departments. Not one has any experience of conducting a business, so how can any Minister know what is going on in his department? We have only to read the Auditor-General's Report to see what is happening because of the lack of supervision by Ministers. Public servants and heads of departments cannot be blamed: they must be the most frustrated public servants in Australia, because they are responsible to Ministers of the standard of the Minister of Labour and Industry, the Minister of Environment and Conservation—

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Are you leaving me out?

Mr. BECKER: The Minister has reasonable intelligence, because he was elected Chairman of the Industries Development Committee. This legislation also increases the amount of stamp duty payable on cheque forms. It may be only 2c, or 33½ per cent, but this impost will hit the average man in the street. This is the person who gets hit first by stamp duty on a cheque form, because a cheque is a convenient method of paying accounts and of keeping a record of payments. New section 47d(2) provides:

Subsection (1) of this section shall have no effect in relation to any cheque referred to in that section drawn after a day to be specified by proclamation for the purposes of this section, being a day not earlier than the thirtieth day after the publication of the proclamation in the *Gazette*.

That provision means that any person who buys a quantity of cheque forms before the legislation is enacted will have only 30 days in which to use them. If he does not use them within that time, it is the responsibility of the drawer of the cheque to attach the additional duty stamp. I have seen many customers rushing in and buying many years supply of cheque forms with the intention of beating the Government, but they have later found that the bank has had to attach an extra duty stamp and debit their account. New section 47d(2) clarifies the matter. The public will not be allowed to hoard cheque forms, and it will be the public's responsibility to add the extra duty stamp to the cheque forms. I do not think anyone has realised the impact of that provision.

If there is anything I appreciate in the Bill it is clause 5, which will relieve some of my former colleagues of the extra work and worry of ensuring that cheque forms carry the correct amount of stamp duty. This clause authorises the banks to make arrangements with the Treasurer. The banks generally get the bulk of their cheque forms printed once or twice a year. They hold in their vaults a colossal supply of cheque forms, on which is printed "South Australian stamp duty paid" or the amount of the stamp duty. When the cheque forms are taken from the vault, a certified document bearing the numbers of the cheque forms is sent to the Treasurer with a cheque for the amount of stamp duty. This means that, in the period after the change from 6c stamp duty to 8c stamp duty, the banks will be able to pay to the Treasurer an extra amount by arrangement and will not be requested to stamp the cheque forms. In the current age of computerised banking, it would be most inconvenient to attach adhesive stamps separately to cheques.

So, members should remember, first, that people are not permitted to hoard cheque forms to avoid paying additional stamp duty and, secondly, that banks will be able to make arrangements with the Treasurer without having to stamp the cheque forms to certify that the additional stamp duty has been paid. The Bill increases by .5 per cent the amount of stamp duty on premiums for life insurance. Lately, insurance companies have been hit by Governments. We have seen what has happened in regard to third party insurance. Most private insurance companies have got out of the field, and the State Government Insurance Commission has accumulated losses of \$4 000 000. One shudders to think what the loss will be in the next financial year.

The pressure is being applied to life insurance companies by means of a .5 per cent increase in the duty on premium income. There is to be a 1 per cent increase in the stamp duty on premiums for general insurance; this will affect the man in the street, because he will be affected by the flow-on of that increase. He must insure his house and furniture and, if he has any sense of responsibility, he will take out a public liability policy in relation to his property. It all adds up; it would easily reach \$100 worth of insurance. So, if the increase in stamp duty is passed on, the man in the street will lose another dollar.

There is to be a 50 per cent increase in the stamp duty on third party insurance, and the duty on the registration of transfers of ownership of motor vehicles is to be increased. Further, the stamp duty on conveyances has been increased. If a person is fortunate enough to live long enough and has enough initiative to pay off his mortgage, he is slugged \$4—the lousiest tax of all. Fancy charging a tax on that! All in all, this Bill is not good; it is not the type of Bill that we should allow the Government to get away with. The Treasurer has often used his acting ability to smooth over the rough periods that this Government has gone through. Some people seem to think, "The Government must have money to spend, and it must raise taxes. It would not be any different if there was a change in Government."

In 1970-71, the State Treasury received \$20 571 000 from various stamp duties, and in 1974-75 it will receive an estimated \$49 700 000—an increase in four years of \$29 129 000, or 142 per cent, apart from increases in indirect taxes. What have the people of South Australia received as a result? The Government brags about what it has allegedly done, but South Australia is experiencing

unemployment at a level that no-one desires. The Government has not achieved what it set out to achieve. It has always said that it has a mandate to do various things, but there is one mandate that the people of South Australia never gave the Government—to increase taxes at an unprecedented rate.

Mr. Coumbe: There was no mention of this at the election.

Mr. BECKER: No, nor will there be any mention of it at the next one. The Treasurer will be making all sorts of airy-fairy promises, worrying about Redcliffs and Monarto, talking about anything except what it will cost the taxpayers. The economic intelligence unit, or whatever it is called, will throw it back to the Opposition. The Opposition believes in sound management of the taxpayers' funds, and we promise the people of South Australia value for the dollar and sound common sense in priorities in handling and spending that money. The Labor Party makes all these promises, but it has no mandate to raise taxation in this way. The Government should have shown some responsibility instead of following the whim of the Commonwealth Government and getting itself into an economic mess. We must be concerned about the future of South Australia; we are not so concerned with the other States. We are put here by the people of South Australia, and we want to see that South Australians have full employment and the best standard of living in Australia. However, there is no way they will ever have this or share in the things that South Australia can offer if we are to be continually taxed without any consideration for the impact on the community.

That is the message we have to get through to the Government. It is not a case of accepting the Treasurer's challenge when he asks whom we would sack or where we would cut down. That is the red herring usually drawn across the trail when we advance our theories. My Party is pledged to full employment, and we would do everything possible to encourage and maintain full employment the moment we took office. We would fight inflation and take a responsible role in the handling of the taxpayers' money. That is in our policy, and those are the principles of our Party. We would give value for the dollar, and that is what the taxpayers of South Australia are demanding.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I oppose the Bill. The member for Hanson has covered most of the aspects that need to be mentioned in relation to the provisions being made by the Government to bleed the taxpayers just a little more. The position in which the Government finds itself has been created in part by itself and in part by its colleagues in Canberra. Government members worked to get the Labor Government re-elected in Canberra. A percentage of Australians accepted that the Government should be given a fair go. The difference in the percentage vote for the major Parties was quite small, but the fair go the people of Australia gave the Commonwealth Government is now acting in reverse: the people are not getting a fair go.

The Treasurer admits that he is in his present position because of the failure of his Commonwealth colleagues to accept a responsible approach to the handling of Commonwealth finances. The money belongs to the people, not to the Government, but the Government regards it as its divine right to say how the money will be spent. It has taken away from the States the right to decide where the money will be spent. We have a duplication of services, with the Commonwealth Government employing public servants to administer the funds it makes

available, while at the same time the States retain them, although the direction is frequently given from Canberra as to where the money shall be spent.

The South Australian Labor Government has condemned the speculator, the person who goes out to take a gamble. It blamed the speculator for the rapidly increasing prices of land and houses, yet we find that, in the public sector, building costs have doubled in the past 21 to 24 months. That is not the fault of the speculators; it is caused by Government action (or inaction). In some cases, it is caused through legislation and in others it is because the Government has seen fit not to take action to rectify the situation.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I direct the honourable member's attention to the fact that we are debating the Stamp Duties Act Amendment Bill.

Mr. EVANS: In introducing the Bill, the Minister said, first, that the additional special grant expected from the Australian Government following discussions with the Prime Minister was not forthcoming. That was the first argument in the second reading explanation to justify bringing in these impositions on the people of South Australia. Therefore, I believe I have every right to attempt to prove where the State and Commonwealth Governments have fallen down in drawing priorities for deciding where money will be spent and where action will be taken.

The Minister, in introducing this measure, was saying that the Commonwealth Government broke its promise that it would give \$6 000 000 to South Australia. Now the Government attempts to justify this action by introducing these imposts. A rather vague statement was made that the Government could not be sure of the extent of the down-turn in conveyancing, which was greater than was expected. Surely, with the actions the Government was taking through the Land Commission and the Housing Trust, etc., it should have been able to predict that it was taking away the opportunity of many people interested in development. Those bodies acquired the land to stop the speculator. The Government knew that a big down-turn in conveyancing would result, with an even greater down-turn in the next two or three months, yet it was willing to increase stamp duty. Because fewer conveyances are being processed, the Government wants to bleed further those that are going on. In the main now, only the genuine house purchaser is being got at. If he has the initiative and willpower to save and buy his own house, he must pay \$650 for the transfer fee on a house costing \$30 000, even if he has insufficient money to pay for the house. He may have \$24 000 on mortgage, but he must still pay stamp duty on the total amount.

Mr. Mathwin: For the privilege of owning his own house.

Mr. EVANS: It is for the privilege of trying to own one's house. There is no guarantee that people will be able to complete the payments, given the kinds of Government we have in this State and in the Commonwealth sphere. The Government is not attacking the speculator. He has moved out of the field. The Government is attacking the person who is trying to buy a house and that person will have to pay on a pro rata basis. The Government is out to bleed the average man of every cent he has, yet it has not pulled its own belt in and cut expenditure.

We have the increased transfer tax on the purchase of a motor vehicle, and the Treasurer has been going around saying that we must save the motor industry and that that industry is vital to this State, yet at the first opportunity that is the area that he attacks. When inflation is running riot, people think of every dollar they have. If the Treasurer

is genuine and thinks that the motor vehicle industry is in a crisis, the last thing that he should do is put on pressure that could affect some sales. The member for Hanson has mentioned insurance policies, and the man in the street will foot the bill for the increase being made. I wonder whether it is not time that the State Government Insurance Commission offered people insurance against inflation, although I suppose the premium would be out of the reach of most of us. A new tax being introduced is that on the discharge of a mortgage, and that is one of the worst taxes that I have heard of in the Parliament. A person who has the initiative to pay off a mortgage will have to pay a penalty of \$4 for his thrift. Rich people can pay for their houses and they do not have a mortgage, but the person who has been paying his house off for 30 years will have to pay \$4. That amount may not seem large, but the Government will get \$250 000 a year from the tax.

Government back-benchers say they are interested in the worker, the average person who is trying to maintain a family unit, yet they back up their Ministers and say that it is all right to impose on people who want to own their own houses a penalty for thrift. They say, "It is a new tax. Put it on and we will put a smile on our faces to try to make out that it is justified." One member has suggested that \$185 000 has been paid to Theatre 62, and other concessions have been given to theatres. The Treasurer has admitted that the Government gave money to the management of Theatre 62, which could not meet its debts because of bad housekeeping. I admit that the new tax on mortgage releases may provide employment for a few people in the Public Service, and we can deduct their salaries from the \$250 000, but I do not think it matters to the Government whether a person survives. The Government is not interested in that philosophy and it wants everyone to depend on the State so that the State can then tell people what to do. That is the long-term ambition of the present State and Commonwealth Governments, regardless of the face-saving and the criticism by the Treasurer of his Commonwealth colleagues. I cannot in any circumstances support a charge being made for the discharge of a mortgage.

We are in our present position because the Commonwealth Government wants to control all the strings, and it wants centralism at any cost. It does not matter to that Government if it breaks the States. It will say that the States cannot manage their affairs and that they have gone broke. The Government nearest the people should decide how it will spend money that it collects, not the Prime Minister or his colleagues. If the Commonwealth Government achieves centralism, it will say to the States, "We have all the money now; goodnight." I condemn the present State Labor Party members for having this Commonwealth Government elected and for not saying now that that Government has let us down and placed us in an impossible position.

Mr. Duncan: Rubbish!

Mr. EVANS: I challenge the honourable member to say that more often and more strongly.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): It is obvious from the lack of attention that Government members have given to these taxation measures that they are not concerned about the massive imposts being made on the South Australian people. The blame for the taxes can be put on the shoulders of the Prime Minister and the State Treasurer. The Prime Minister stated that, if the people elected a Commonwealth Labor Government, everything would be rosy. However, we have massive unemployment and the highest inflation rate and interest rates ever, and people

have been taxed out of their houses. That is the benefit of a Socialist Government! I agree with the member for Fisher that the Commonwealth Government is using the State taxation system to destroy the States. If we examine the amount of money that the Australian Government has received and will receive and also examine the allocations to the States, we can see what programme that Government has in mind. Sir Robert Askin's Budget speech, delivered on September 25 this year, states:

I should also mention the huge increase in Commonwealth revenues which the Commonwealth Budget papers disclose. Total receipts are estimated at \$15 704 000—an increase of no less than \$3 702 000. Their receipts are really skyrocketing. Within this total sum, personal and company income tax is expected to yield \$10 532 000. This is a huge \$3 009 000 more than last year and over \$4 800 000 more than in 1972-73—an increase of 84 per cent in just two years.

This is the interesting part:

No wonder the Commonwealth has no difficulty in finding funds for its selected priority schemes. By comparison, the increase in the general purpose tax reimbursement grants to all six States this year, including amounts provided through the Grants Commission, is only \$452 000 000.

That is the shabby and rotten deal that the present Commonwealth Government is inflicting on the States. The Treasurer, who now dozes in his seat, goes around the country and asks the Australian people to elect a Government that is taxing them out of their homes and is deliberately setting out to destroy free enterprise and initiative. When members on this side of the Chamber condemn that Government, the only answer we get is, "What would you do?" A Commonwealth Liberal Party Government would not create the economic mess that this country is in today. Our past record will prove that.

Mr. Duncan: You won't make the gallery happy by abusing members on this side.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections will not be tolerated.

Mr. GUNN: That is the type of interjection one would expect of the honourable member.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. GUNN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I have made the reference I wanted to make. Let the member for Elizabeth stand up in this House and deny what I have said. Rarely does he get to his feet except to malign someone. He has not tried today to justify this tax, because he knows that what members on this side have said is correct, that under proper management and proper administration these massive increases would not be necessary. Looking at the current situation of private industry, we find that over two-thirds of the people who are self-employed are working for much less reward than they should be. This Government's policy is a systematic campaign to destroy them. Looking at this measure and at the Treasurer's speech delivered by the Jack of all trades, the Minister of Education—

Mr. Mathwin: The Premier twice removed.

Mr. GUNN: —yes—we read:

First, the additional special grant that we expected to receive from the Australian Government, following discussions with the Prime Minister, was not in fact forthcoming.

What a revelation that was! Did the Treasurer honestly believe that the Commonwealth Government would provide funds for this State? I think the Treasurer was unwise to include that consideration in his Budget, when he did not have a firm assurance. The Minister goes on to say:

Thirdly, there is a down-turn in the number of conveyances submitted for stamping, a down-turn that became apparent in August.

Whose fault is that? It is not the people's fault—it is the fault of the Commonwealth Government and its friends and assistants, this State Government, because it has destroyed the people's incentive to buy houses. There has never been such a chronic shortage of housing. The Government has made it impossible for a person to buy a house. It is not the people's fault—it is that of a vindictive Government. Lastly, I refer to the duty to be paid on the discharge of a mortgage. After someone has battled for years to pay off a house or a mortgage on something else, he then finds he has to pay a tax for the right to have that mortgage discharged. What a despicable form of taxation it is! Is it democratic? Of course it is not. It is something that every honourable member opposite should be ashamed of.

Mr. Duncan: What has that to do with democracy? How stupid!

Mr. GUNN: If a person borrows money to build a house, why should he be taxed to get the mortgage discharged?

Mr. Duncan: What has that to do with democracy?

Mr. GUNN: It has a lot to do with democracy. We on this side of the Chamber, who are true democrats, believe in home ownership. We do not want a society of people who rent houses, as members opposite want. I think all members of this House, and particularly those on the Labor Party side, should take stock of themselves and be prepared to do the same as private industry has had to do—tighten their belts, look for greater efficiency, and see where they can reduce expenditure. The spending spree cannot continue. This Government knows nothing about economy; it has never tried to be more efficient in its operations. It has not tried to put into effect the Lees committee recommendations on the railways. I think it was a sad day for the country, and particularly for the States, when they were tricked into returning to the Commonwealth Government their income tax rights.

Mr. Duncan: The Commonwealth Liberal Government was not prepared to handle it.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. GUNN: The unfortunate position in which we find ourselves today—

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: The current economic situation will be rectified only when we get a Commonwealth Liberal Government that will carry out its election policy of returning to the States a fair proportion of income tax revenue; then the States will know exactly how much they are getting. They will know that, if inflation increases by 5 per cent (a reasonable increase), they will get so much money from the Commonwealth. Then, we shall not have the current situation where our hands are tied by section 96 grants, which this Commonwealth Government is using to destroy the States. I hope members opposite will act responsibly and oppose this vicious form of taxation.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I oppose this Bill, and in particular the provisions attacking the workers of the State, the little people. The Bill imposes a shocking form of taxation. Without doubt it is a cost-push measure and will help inflation, which this Government and the Commonwealth Government encourage. We know the Commonwealth Government is enjoying the present inflation, because it benefits from it; of that there is no doubt. Let me look at the second reading explanation, which the Minister tried to have inserted in *Hansard* without its being read.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member that that comment is being made many times, but it is a decision of the House. The second reading explanation is in *Hansard* as a record. Therefore, reference to its being inserted without being read cannot be made, because it is a decision of the House. That decision must prevail, and this sort of reference to it will not be tolerated in the future. The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. MATHWIN: Reading the second reading explanation of the Bill in *Hansard* which the Minister of Education gave, we see that the first reason is as follows:

The additional special grant that we expected to receive from the Australian Government, following discussions with the Prime Minister, was not in fact forthcoming.

The implication of that is obvious, and it has been dealt with by several members who have spoken on this matter. Because of the failure of the Commonwealth Government to keep its promise, the Treasurer was forced to raise additional taxes. He has sought to do this by introducing several measures including this Bill. Although the Treasurer made estimates and budgeted for many things, there are certain matters he did not foresee, and the Opposition has a good argument in this respect. In the second reading explanation, the Minister of Education states:

Thirdly, there is a down-turn in the number of conveyances submitted for stamping, a down-turn that became apparent in August.

This was referred to by the member for Eyre, and I support his remarks. Who is responsible for that situation? The responsibility lies directly with the Treasurer and the Minister in charge of housing. This is one case where these gentlemen cannot blame the Commonwealth Government at all. Doubtless, that is what they would do if they could. I refer to the Australian Labor Party's State election policy speech delivered at the Norwood Town Hall on February 19, 1973, by the Treasurer. Concerning housing it states:

We have spent record amounts on public housing—in fact, twice the national average. Assistance from the Federal Labor Government means that we will increase this achievement markedly. We will set new records in providing public housing.

This is the way in which the Treasurer hoodwinked the South Australian people to make it appear that his Government would set further records in the provision of housing. The Treasurer said, "We will set new records in providing public housing." What is the situation now?

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member's attention to the fact that we are discussing a particular Bill, and any remarks made should link up with the Bill. Whilst it is a budgetary Bill it is not a Budget debate and all remarks must be linked up with the Bill now before the House.

Mr. MATHWIN: I intend to link them up, Mr. Speaker. In the second reading explanation, the Minister of Education made an excuse for the implementation of this new tax. He referred to conveyances on building and land transactions. I draw the attention of the House to the following statement in the 1972 Commonwealth Labor Party policy speech regarding such revenue raising:

A Labor Government will request each State authority to estimate the funds needed to reduce the waiting period for houses to 12 months.

We have a situation where it takes 12 months to build a house, let alone waiting for a house. I cannot understand why the State Government has seen fit to impose an additional tax on the discharge of a mortgage. This is a most unfair tax to apply, especially to people who have paid off their house or land over many years. When they have completed their payments, they must then pay this additional

tax for the privilege of finalising their mortgage commitments. That is a shocking tax, which is most unfairly levied on the people of South Australia. Certainly, the Government is not trimming the tall poppies, to whom the Treasurer so often refers; indeed, this tax will affect mainly the people who support this Government. It is levied against all people seeking to own their own houses. This merely proves that this Government is not in favour of people owning their own houses; rather, it would see the people of South Australia living in rented accommodation. The imposition of this tax proves without doubt that the philosophy of a Socialist Party results in higher taxation. If people want a Socialist Government, a Labor Government, they must pay for it, and pay for it heavily. Socialism means higher taxes, and it means putting the ordinary man's dollar in the Government's pocket. I oppose the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 10 passed.

Clause 11—"Amendment of second schedule of principal Act."

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): It has been suggested in a letter I intend to read to the Committee that there may be an alternative method of implementing the tax imposed by this clause. The letter states:

I refer to the item in the new Stamp Duties Bill imposing a duty on discharges of mortgage. Unfortunately, no provision has been made in the Bill for the duty in this case to be denoted by an adhesive stamp. By not permitting the use of an adhesive stamp the public will be put to the extra expense of having a solicitor or broker present the discharge for stamping. Also, the net gain to revenue must be less because of the extra departmental time taken to process these documents.

I suggest that there is no risk to the revenue in using an adhesive stamp. The Lands Titles Office always rejects documents which are not stamped and, no doubt, discharges of mortgage will be treated in the same way. For the reasons given, I shall be glad if you will urge the Government to amend the Bill to allow for the use of adhesive stamps on discharges of mortgage. I might add that adhesive stamps have been used on hire-purchase and other instalment purchase agreements for many years without any apparent loss to revenue.

I have been advised that one of the problems in the past has been that, if the document was not presented to an authority such as the Stamp Duties Office for official stamping, the person affixed an adhesive stamp often of less than the required value. If the document was taken and officially stamped, the imprint imposed by the office would leave no doubt in the mind of any other department which subsequently had to handle the document that the correct duty had been imposed. Although I accept that as a general premise, I point out that only one value is being dealt with on this occasion. In other words, the transaction will have, by virtue of the Bill, a value of \$4. Therefore, an adhesive stamp of \$4 denomination would be easily recognised by any department subsequently handling the document.

Therefore, it tends to destroy the claim that, without the document going through the Stamp Duties Office, there will be the question of the adequacy of the stamping undertaken. Can the Treasurer say whether this aspect has been considered and whether there is any real reason why arrangements could not be made for the alternative adhesive stamp? I come back to the point made by the writer of the letter I have quoted, namely, that extra expense will be involved if the document must be handled by either a solicitor or a broker in arranging the discharge. There may be some conjecture on this matter, but this point, having been made by a South Australian lawyer, should be considered by the Treasurer.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The Commissioner of Taxes believes it far preferable to provide for an impressed stamp, not an adhesive stamp, in the case of the discharge of a mortgage. The point here is that, where there is a formal discharge of a mortgage, it is normally in the case of a document where that discharge of mortgage will be registered: that is, where we can be certain of getting the tax paid is in the case where the document will go for registration. There are, as members would know, some cases where documents are signed but remain merely on deposit. They are never registered; they are called equitable; they have not taken effect under the Real Property Act; and we are by no means certain of getting the stamp duty paid on them at the time.

Dr. Eastick: Something like the road maintenance tax?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not always possible, as the Leader knows, to ensure collection of due taxes where a document does not have to be produced publicly. The only hindrance that really exists to the people concerned in relation to the document is that they could not produce it in a public court in evidence without its being stamped. Normally, if an undertaking is given that it will be stamped, that does not seem to be much hindrance to its acceptance in evidence, anyway. The documents where we are certain of getting the cash are those that are produced for registration at the Lands Titles Office. If they are produced for registration there, it is not difficult to produce them at the Stamp Duties Office on the way. That is standard procedure.

Anyone who has operated in a land broker's office or in a solicitor's office knows that there is always a clerk employed on what is called the milk run. As an articulated clerk, I did this job for years. One takes the documents to the Stamp Duties Office and, whether or not they are to be stamped, one has a bundle of documents going to the Lands Titles Office, so one goes to the Stamp Duties Office first to get the documents impressed, and then on to the Lands Titles Office. There is no saving to be made on adhesive stamps in this business by not producing the documents for assessment at the Stamp Duties Office, simply because our experience in other areas with adhesive stamps is that people constantly put the wrong stamp valuation on documents. Such documents are thrown out by the Lands Titles Office if there appears to be a wrong stamp valuation put on by adhesive stamp.

It is not a saving for documents to be thrown back from the Lands Titles Office and requiring them to be represented, because they must be taken back to the Lands Titles Office for reassessment, and they must be taken out to get them restamped. We will not save on administrative costs if we operate on the adhesive stamp principle. It would be more simple to get them stamped in the Stamp Duties Office then take them on to the Lands Titles Office. That is the view of the Commissioner of Taxes, and one with which I agree.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I oppose the clause. The Opposition made clear in the second reading debate that it opposed the Bill because of the steep increases it will levy on the public of the State, increases which the Treasurer indicated earlier he would not have to levy. My main reason for opposing the clause outright is that this is a new tax. The sum of \$4 may appear to be modest to some people, but the Treasurer has said that he estimates that the tax on the discharge or partial discharge of mortgages will raise about \$250 000 a year. So, it is no mean tax.

Mr. Evans: It will never be reduced.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Having opened the door, we can say with certainty that this tax will in time be increased. The Opposition adamantly opposes the clause.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, and Venning.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Corcoran and Wright. Noes—Messrs. Evans and Wardle.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MUSEUM BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 9. Page 1393.)

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I support the Bill with some reservations, because to all intents and purposes it regularises a situation as, since February, 1972, the South Australian Museum has been under the control of the Environment and Conservation Department. As we all know, officially the museum is still a division of the Education Department, but, if this Bill is passed, that situation will be altered and it will be under the control of the Environment and Conservation Department. No doubt because of the work it does the museum is more aligned with this department but, once that work has been completed, the museum remains an extremely valuable part of the education facilities of this State. When this Bill was before Parliament previously, there was considerable opposition to clause 13, which outlines the functions of the board, but with its present facilities it would be virtually impossible for the board to fulfil those functions.

Clause 13 (1) (d) provides that the functions of the board shall include the accumulation and care of objects and specimens of archaeological, anthropological, biological, geological, or historical interest. With the inadequate buildings and facilities at the disposal of the board, however, it cannot care for objects and specimens as they should be cared for. The South Australian Museum has many objects and specimens that have been collected and then stored for many years, because no suitable part of the museum can be used for their display, and many specimens have to be stored in a controlled atmosphere in order to prevent deterioration.

I refer particularly to the museum's work in the field of Aboriginal engravings and paintings. The museum is regarded as the foremost authority in the world on Aboriginal culture and artefacts. It conducts expeditions throughout Australia to record details of engravings and cave paintings; it thereby traces the progress of the Aboriginal throughout Australia. Messrs. Hale and Tindale are well known for their archeological excavations of Aboriginal sites. Although South Australia has the best collection of specimens and artefacts, it is extremely difficult for the Museum Board to care for many of them. When the previous Bill was before Parliament, the main objection related to the autonomy of the board. Clause 13 (1) provides:

The functions of the Board are as follows

(g) to perform any other functions of scientific, educational or historical significance that may be assigned to the Board by the Minister.

It was in connection with that provision that the previous Bill ran into trouble when it was before Parliament. The provision takes away the autonomy of the South Australian Museum and imposes a restriction whereby the museum is answerable to the Minister of Environment and Conservation. This is a different situation from that applying to our universities, which are not under the control of the Minister of Education. In supporting the second reading of the Bill, I stress the two areas that must be considered before the third reading is carried.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Constitution of Board."

Mr. ARNOLD: Subclause (1) provides, in part:

The Board shall consist of the following members:

(a) the Director of Environment and Conservation who shall be a member of the Board *ex officio*;

Can the Minister say whether the Director will be on the board purely in an advisory capacity or whether he will have the full voting rights of any other member of the board? Will the Director be eligible to be Chairman of the board?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation): Although I cannot see any provision that prevents the Director from being Chairman, I am certain that the Director would not make himself available to be Chairman even if that was permissible. Clause 10 (1) provides:

The Governor may from time to time appoint one of the appointed members of the Board to be Chairman of the Board.

The requirement that the Director of Environment and Conservation shall be a member of the board *ex officio* is in keeping with the other object of the board—to ensure that the museum serves a role in research work on environmental matters. It is necessary for the Director to be available to provide the necessary liaison between the two wings of the department.

Mr. Arnold: Has he full voting rights?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: That is right.

Clause passed.

Clauses 8 to 12 passed.

Clause 13—"Functions of the Board."

Mr. ARNOLD: Subclause (1) provides, in part:

The functions of the Board are as follows:

(d) to accumulate and care for objects and specimens of archaeological, anthropological, biological, geological or historical interest.

Because of the limited facilities at the museum, it is extremely difficult for it to care for many of the excellent specimens it has. Some specimens cannot be displayed unless they are displayed under atmospherically controlled conditions; if they were displayed under any other conditions, they would deteriorate. It seems virtually impossible at the moment for the board to fulfil completely the intentions of the Government in relation to clause 13.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I do not think it fair to say it is impossible for the Museum Board to undertake the obligations outlined in the clause, yet I admit that considerable difficulties are involved. The real difficulty in relation to the care of specimens is the problem of space. We have a tremendous number of items to be

stored. Frankly, many are not important for display purposes but are necessary to complete a range of specimens that might be required for scientific work. The difficulty of location is recognised, and efforts are being made to alleviate the problem, with some success.

We have transferred some areas from the existing museum. The scientific section has recently been moved to Goldsbrough House, which is reasonably close to the museum. The unit can work effectively there. We have two substantial storage areas away from the museum where specimens and materials are being stored; it is most unsatisfactory to have the activities of the museum in different locations. The existing museum is reasonably substantial, but much material has been accumulated over the years and will continue to be accumulated.

It is difficult to find a suitable alternative; the main criterion is the ground space area. A building of many floors is not desirable because it is necessary for the display, to meet the convenience of the community, to be at or near ground level. To shift the existing museum presents major difficulties because the present site is ideally located close to the heart of the city in an area close to other cultural activities. We cannot find a site close to the existing one with the necessary ground space. The only alternative is to look to some area outside the heart of Adelaide, but this would involve inconvenience to the community. We are faced with a dilemma and we are trying to overcome it. I have had discussions with members of the Museum Board. We do not want to rush into a decision, but we are doing all we can to find alternative storage space so that the existing specimens can be adequately taken care of.

Mr. ARNOLD: The other matter concerns subclause (1) (g), which produces a situation in which the board does not have complete autonomy. Why should the Museum Board be answerable to the Minister?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Subclause (1) (g), in effect, provides that the board shall "perform any other functions of scientific, educational or historical significance that may be assigned . . . by the Minister". As has been canvassed in this House during the past year, the object of that provision is not to interfere with the day-to-day activities of the board. We are providing the traditional activities in paragraphs (a) to (f) of the role of the museum. Paragraph (g) was inserted in accordance with our general philosophy that the museum should serve as a useful wing of the Environment and Conservation Department.

To use the expertise of the museum for many environmental matters would be a philosophy I suspect all members would support. The Minister would not instruct the board on its tasks, but there may be a situation (for example, in relation to the Redcliffs development) where the museum could undertake some type of research. It is only reasonable that the Minister or the Government should require the board to perform any function associated with environmental matters. It is a sensible and reasonable proposal.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (14 to 20) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 10.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 31, at 2 p.m.