

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, November 20, 1974

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

PETITION: COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

Mr. VENNING presented a petition signed by 88 electors of the District of Rocky River stating that they were dissatisfied with the first report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas, and praying that the House of Assembly would not bring about any change or alteration of boundaries.

Petition received.

PETITION: PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Dr. EASTICK presented a petition signed by 62 434 motorists and residents of South Australia stating that they opposed the introduction of the Business Franchise (Petroleum) Bill because it would significantly increase the retail price of petroleum products, and praying that the House of Assembly would not continue with such legislation.

Petition received and read.

QUESTIONS

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier say what are the two matters in respect of the Redcliff indenture that require resolution? The first sentence of the Ministerial statement given in the House yesterday states:

The Redcliff indenture has progressed to a stage where only two matters require resolution.

However, no indication has been given of what those two matters are. It is well known that there have been several difficulties, not the least of them being those associated with the environment, and one would assume that that was one of the two. There has been no indication whether the other is the price of the gas at the well-head, the amount of subsidy to be received from the Commonwealth Government in respect to the activities to take place with liquid petroleum gas, whether there has been difficulty in obtaining Commonwealth funds, whether there is a deficit in State funds to undertake the infra-structure work, or whether there are other matters difficult to settle, such as water, the disposal of water or any other matter of that nature. I believe it necessary that the Premier clearly indicate to the House what those two specific matters are so that members of the public in South Australia may be well informed on this vital issue.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The matters outstanding as regards the indenture are the environmental clauses and the question of rates for the Port Augusta council. The other matters the Leader has raised still require resolution, but do not require—

Dr. Eastick: Are there more than two?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Leader will for once in his life listen to a reply, he might get one.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am more than tired of the idiotic and juvenile interjections I get whenever I reply to a question. If members want a reply they will get one, and get one honestly, but I am tired of the juvenile behaviour with which I must put up.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Standing Order 169 makes certain specific requirements of all honourable members and, if they are going to disregard it, I will implement it. I will warn a member twice, but not a third time, and I will not hesitate to implement Standing Order 169. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Other matters require resolution, but not before the signing of the indenture. The questions of the gas price and of the provision of Commonwealth Government money towards the infra-structure do not require to be in the South Australian indenture with the companies; so, it will be possible to introduce the legislation in the House on the signing of the indenture, without the final resolution of those matters. I believe they will be resolved in time for the consortium to proceed, but I point out to the Leader that they are not between the South Australian Government and the consortium.

FORESTRY MANAGEMENT PROPRIETARY LIMITED

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Attorney-General say whether a firm known as Forestry Management Proprietary Limited has been the subject of an inquiry by his department and whether some action will be taken by his department to proceed legally against this company as a result of any such inquiry? I draw the Attorney's attention to an advertisement appearing on page 43 of the most recent *Sunday Mail* wherein the company I have named is again advertising for investors to invest a total outlay of \$565, not necessarily in cash (I believe it to be a type of hire-purchase arrangement), entitling them to have 650 pine trees planted and cared for by the company. No doubt the Attorney is well aware of my interest in people, particularly those in my own district, who invest in such a project. As I understand it, the advertised investment simply sets up the company as manager, with absolutely no financial risk to itself, and the project is open to extreme question regarding the amount of possible financial return the investors might obtain.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Having considered this matter, my officers believe that an offence may have been committed against the prospectus provisions of the Companies Act and, if that is so, proceedings will be instituted. I will, however, obtain a report on the other aspects of the matter raised by the honourable member and let him have a further reply.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

Mr. COUMBE: Is the Minister of Labour and Industry aware of the latest developments in the dispute on building sites in Adelaide where construction is being undertaken by Dillingham Constructions Proprietary Limited, which include a few of the major buildings now being erected in Adelaide? Moreover, has the Builders Labourers Federation forced a confrontation between several other unions because of the attitude of the B.L.F.? If it has, has the result been that several men have been forced off the sites? As this matter is serious, has the Minister tried to resolve the dispute? Further, has he any news of the conference that was to be held today in relation to this matter?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I am well aware of the dispute. The honourable member would also know that the dispute commenced in New South Wales and is a form of demarcation dispute. A black ban, originally placed on Dillingham Constructions in New South Wales, eventually spread to South Australia. Only yesterday eight other unions involved in construction on Dillingham sites ordered their members to return to work after consultation with the

company; the men returned to work. The day before yesterday I had discussions with Mr. Humphreys, from Dillinghams, and also discussed the matter with Mr. Peter O'Dea (Assistant Secretary, Builders Labourers Federation), but I could not contact the State Secretary (Mr. L. J. Robinson), who, I understand, is in Sydney. I was told by Mr. Fairweather, who spoke on behalf of the other unions that returned to work on the sites, that members of the Builders Labourers Federation also returned to work yesterday. I have heard nothing more from them.

Mr. Coumbe: Have you heard about instructions being issued that the members who returned should be dismissed?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I have had no information to that effect. I understand that a conference is taking place in Sydney today, but as yet I have had no information about the result of the conference and am not sure whether instructions have been issued to dismiss the builders' labourers who returned to work; as far as I know, they are still on the job.

HOUSING

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister of Development and Mines say what steps the Housing Trust is taking to make sure that the private builders who are to erect 63 new houses at Murray Bridge will do so in a reasonable time? I noticed in a newspaper recently that the Minister stated that Alpine Constructions Proprietary Limited would build 51 new houses in Murray Bridge and that their erection should mean rapid relief for the current heavy demand for homes in Murray Bridge. The carpet at my office at Mount Barker is becoming worn by the number of people walking over it who wish to move into houses that were started in January and February this year by Alpine Constructions Proprietary Limited. Apparently the trust has no control over the time in which the houses should be completed. I have frequently driven around the area concerned and have seen 30 trust houses where there has been only occasional building activity. Surely it is time that progress was made and a definite completion date fixed for the houses.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The trust tries to keep contact as close as it possibly can with its contractors to make them aware of the urgency of the situation. I suppose that the basic control we have in this case is that the contractors rely on the goodwill of the trust in order to obtain further contracts of this type. On the other hand, away from the city of Adelaide, the pool of contractors to whom work can be let out is limited. To that extent, the trust is in the hands of the contractors who are available and who are willing to put in tenders. The trust does not intend to introduce a day-labour force or anything of that nature, although I suppose that that would be one way of putting pressure on private contractors. However, we do not intend to do that at this stage. The ability of the trust to deliver depends very much on what is, I suppose, the implied threat in any arrangement between a vendor and purchaser that, if the goods are not satisfactory (and that involves the time for delivery of the goods), a different purchaser will be found. The honourable member will be aware that, as I have said, in some of the areas away from the city of Adelaide the number of prospective vendors is limited indeed so that, to a certain extent, we are in their hands. The honourable member has previously raised with me the situation at Mount Barker. As I have indicated to him, we are following that up with the contractors to try to get an early completion of the work.

BUSH FIRES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Education ask the Minister of Agriculture to define what is meant by the phrase "a fire in the open air" in relation to provisions in the Bush Fires Act enforcing fire bans? A council in my district has approached me today, as its officers are having some difficulty in interpreting the various bans. They would like clarified what is meant by "fire in the open air". Is a fire in a shed that has three enclosed sides and a roof with one side open considered to be in the open air? Is a fire in a tent considered to be in the open air?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will refer the matter to my colleague to see whether he can bring down a definition that will satisfy the honourable member.

MOTOR CYCLES

Mr. RODDA: Yesterday, the Minister of Transport replied to my question about statistics relating to the road deaths of motor cyclists. As he has said that no statistics are being kept relating to the horse-power of motor cycles involved in fatal accidents, will he take action to see that this information is collected? Several approaches have been made to me about the number of young people who lose their lives in motor cycle accidents. The statistics show that, of the 44 people killed in these accidents to November 11 this year, 36 were under the age of 21 years. Other information I have been able to glean shows that, in most cases, the fatal accident has involved a high-powered motor cycle. Therefore, the collection of the statistics to which I have referred is vitally necessary in helping to decide whether there should be some stipulation as to the size of the engine of motor cycles that young people use.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will certainly refer the matter to the Road Traffic Board, which is responsible for keeping accident statistics. The honourable member will be interested to know that we are currently in the process of improving statistical records in an effort to bring them up to date. In the past, they have been hopelessly behind for several reasons, not the least of which has been the legal implication involved. As the matter raised by the honourable member is important, I will ask the board to see whether this information can be obtained.

DEMONSTRATION SCHOOLS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Education decided that demonstration schools will cease to exist as a separate group with salary loadings? If so, was the decision taken without consultation with officers of his department? I received a letter last week from a person not connected with the Education Department, although he is active in school committee work and on a school council in one of the north-eastern suburbs. Part of the letter, dated November 11, explains my question and I quote from it as follows:

It is understood that the decision is to operate from January 1, 1975. It would seem rather a peculiar way of communicating with senior staff such as Headmasters. One wonders and is apprehensive as to what future decisions regarding education policy are to be taken in this arbitrary manner. Senior departmental officers have no information on the demonstration school decision, and are as much in the dark as the Heads who have received the notices. There is certainly a feeling of dismay both in the schools with which I am associated, and among department officers. Unfortunately neither are in a position to come out and say so.

His letter concludes:

These three matters I have dealt with are, I believe, the tip of the iceberg, and discussions with other members of school councils and of the staffs of schools in recent

weeks leads me to the conclusion that there is widespread discontent with the Minister's handling of his portfolio, his dictatorial attitude to his department which is staffed by some extremely able men and his growing habit of taking unilateral decisions after private discussions with the institute instead of with members of his own department.

He mentioned two other matters to which I need not refer today. The letter had attached to it two circulars from the South Australian Institute of Teachers, the one regarding demonstration schools simply stating that the Minister of Education had decided that demonstration schools as a separate group should cease to exist. Dated October 18, it is signed by the Acting President of the institute. These are serious matters. Although I have quoted at some length, I hope I have not tried your patience too much, Mr. Speaker, but I wished to give the Minister an opportunity to answer these charges which I understand demonstrate a widespread feeling amongst departmental officers and members of the teaching profession.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There is no basis for the rumours that the honourable member is peddling here this afternoon.

Mr. Millhouse: Did you say peddling?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes. You are a pedlar: a rumour-monger, in other words. The decision about demonstration schools was made as a consequence of the arrangements reached between the South Australian Institute of Teachers and the Education Department with respect to the appointment, after open advertisement, of a special school principal in both primary and secondary schools with a special salary loading applying to that special class of principal. The initial approach was made by the Director-General of Education to the institute in January, following an agreement, reached at an Education Department management conference, that this approach should be made. The decision with respect to demonstration schools flowed on as a consequence of that earlier decision. During a period of about six or seven months, no agreement was reached with the institute on the matter, and it was only subsequently that the detailed agreement was negotiated between the department and the institute on the reclassification of principals in both primary and secondary schools. However, the basic decision dated back to January this year, when the Director-General of Education wrote to the institute, making a specific offer in respect of reclassification.

Mr. Millhouse: Was this—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Education Department management conference comprises the Director-General of Education, the two Deputy Directors-General, and the Directors of the various divisions, namely the primary, secondary, educational services and resources, and administration and finance divisions. It is a group of the most senior administrators in the Education Department who take the basic decisions that must be taken on the administration of the department. The addition of the special class of principal at both the primary and secondary levels, the positions to be filled by open advertisement and with an additional salary loading, without any other changes taking place, would have added a further classification to the existing three classes of principal at secondary level and the existing five (four classes plus the demonstration heads) at the primary level. The basis of the proposition that the Director-General put to the institute back in January this year was that in any reclassification, in line with the broad banding

of these situations that exist in other States (and we knew that no other State had as many classes as we in South Australia had), there should be a reduction in the number of classes of principal at both the primary and secondary levels. The reduction at the secondary level was worked out so that we now would have, instead of three classes of principal, two plus a special class, and at primary level, instead of having four classes of principal plus demonstration heads, we now would have three plus a special class. The specific arrangements made in relation to the demonstration schools were negotiated directly between the institute and the department. Regulations in relation to this matter were tabled yesterday and, if the honourable member feels strongly enough about it, doubtless he will move for their disallowance. The other aspect of the matter about which he should know is that, by agreement between the department and the institute, the additional allowances for principals, deputy principals, and assistants at demonstration schools will persist for five years, unless those people are subsequently promoted to higher positions. That aspect of the situation is a feature of the latest award that the Teachers Salaries Board has handed down.

There will be a continuation of the special allowances paid to heads, deputy heads, and assistants at demonstration schools. In relation to the whole subject of demonstration schools, with the growth of teacher training the practice in more recent years has been for the basic teacher training to take place not only in demonstration schools but also in many other schools, and in the department there has been an increasing recognition that the old arrangement for demonstration schools, whereby student teachers did their teaching practice there, is no longer a satisfactory arrangement, because of the wide dispersal of the student teachers when carrying out their teaching practice. I cannot control the extent to which school councils or members of the institute are informed of decisions that are made, but the honourable member's informant, regarding officers of the department not knowing about the situation, is wrong. The main motivator in the development of changes of this sort is the Director-General of Education, with the management conference of the department, and I should have thought that the honourable member would be aware of that.

HEALTH INSURANCE

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to issue a statement as soon as possible warning South Australians not to allow their contributions to health insurance funds to lapse? Statements made by the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security (Mr. Hayden) imply that it will be possible for the Labor Party's universal health insurance scheme to be in operation by July 1, 1975. Other statements relate to local health insurance bodies and the Commonwealth Government's setting up separate offices in competition with existing health funds. It has come to my attention that many people have been so confused by these and other statements made by the Commonwealth Government that they do not know whether they now are permitted to continue their health insurance cover with their usual health insurance organisations. I point out that, if they do not continue, they will not be covered for benefits and will be at risk if the universal health insurance scheme is bulldozed into operation by July 1, 1975, against the wishes of the people. They would still be at risk and would be well advised to insure privately anyway if they want to maintain their cover for medical and hospital services at the high standard that they have come to expect. For that reason, it is extremely important that the people of

South Australia continue to keep themselves and their families covered under the existing health insurance provisions.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have no doubt that the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security is well able to advise the Australian people about any action they should take to procure the health services they need. Indeed, I see no reason why the national health scheme should not be in operation by July 1, 1975, unless the honourable member's professional colleagues pass beyond the sphere of political opposition to the measure and go to the stage of instituting a boycott. I am not prepared to assume that medical practitioners in this country are willing to deliberately boycott legislation that has been properly passed by the Australian Parliament and endorsed by the Australian people when they elected the present Government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L. J. KING: I remind the honourable member, since he calls the matter into question, that the national health scheme formed part of the Australian Labor Party's programme before the Commonwealth election in December, 1972. It was highlighted by the vehement, if not vicious, campaign in opposition, but nonetheless the Labor Party was elected to office. I also remind the honourable member, if that were not enough, that after the programme has been implemented partially by legislation and other actions, the Australian Government, having been forced to another election in May, 1974, once again put in the forefront of its programme its intention to implement a national health scheme, and once again that Government was returned to the Treasury benches. For the honourable member to talk about a national health scheme being implemented against the wishes of the Australian people is so absurd as not to justify getting the serious attention of the Minister of Health. I certainly would not refer such an absurdity to him. I hope that the honourable member will see to it that people are not to be confused about the contributions they should make by prevailing on his professional colleagues to say, "All right, we have opposed the measure, but we have acted according to the views we hold about it. It is now law, and we will do the proper thing as democratic citizens of this country and co-operate."

GAUGE STANDARDISATION

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Transport say what is likely to happen to the Northern lines in the State, particularly now that legislation expressing agreement between the South Australian Government and the Commonwealth Government for the next stage of gauge standardisation in this State has been passed? The original 1949 Commonwealth agreement on gauge standardisation for South Australia provided for the standardising of all lines in this State, and we all know that much has happened since 1949. Can the Minister say what is the Government's thinking with regard to the two lines in question, namely, the Gladstone-Wilmington and the Peterborough-Quorn lines?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am grateful that the honourable member has reminded the House that it was in 1949 that the Commonwealth Government and all States agreed that there should be a standard gauge rail service throughout Australia. As he has said, much has happened in the interim: we have had 25 years of stagnating rule by Liberal Governments, and, as a result, we are only now just reaching the stage where South Australia is getting its standard gauge connection.

Mr. VENNING: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Minister has not answered my question. I asked what was the Government's intention with regard to two Northern lines in this State, and he is off the beam entirely.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the honourable member's point of order. The honourable member has the right to ask a question but, as Presiding Officer, I have no control over any answer or the failure to answer a question.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The position is as I have stated. I have tried to answer the question and explanation of the honourable member. If he checks *Hansard* he will find that the points to which I referred were answers to the points he raised in his question.

RAILWAY HOUSING

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Minister of Transport confer with his colleague the Minister of Community Welfare and immediately arrange for any vacant housing owned by the South Australian Railways in the Islington area to be made available as follow-up housing for deserted wives and children who have been using these houses illegally? At present, four women and their nine children are squatting illegally in three vacant railway houses adjacent to the Islington railway yard. These houses have been vacant for varying periods of up to two years. I understand that there are still four vacant houses in the area and an additional 14 vacant railway houses on Hanson Road. All four women and their children have lived in the Adelaide women's shelter, at Ovingham, but they moved out because conditions became so crowded. One woman was faced with living in a single room with another woman and their six children. Such conditions may be accepted in Hong Kong, but they should not be accepted here in Adelaide.

The SPEAKER: Order! Comments such as those are out of order.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The women have been living in these houses illegally for up to five weeks. They have arranged for electricity and gas to be supplied. They have all offered to pay the rent in full—\$13 a fortnight. However, on all occasions the money has been refused or returned. The Chief Engineer of the South Australian Railways returned the \$13 postal notes from one woman and sent the following letter. With your permission—

The SPEAKER: Order! Is it necessary for the letter to be read as an explanation?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Yes, because it contains important information. Perhaps I could précis it. The letter states:

The house is for allotment to a railway employee and as your occupation thereof is unauthorised, I advise on behalf of the Railways Commissioner that a legal tenancy does not exist and the payment forwarded is not therefore accepted. Consequently, I return herewith the postal notes forwarded with your letter. Legal action is in hand for the repossession of the premises by the Railways Commissioner.

The Government is entitled to remove these people from this land. I realise that, because they are squatting illegally, as I have already said.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: However, if the ladies move out, they have told me that they have nowhere else to go, except to sleep under the trees. One woman has indicated that she had spent one night sleeping under rose bushes. I am not advocating that railway employees—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not comment in explaining his question. I point out that the honourable member is now commenting, following his explanation of the question.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Therefore, I will briefly outline the remainder of the detail I have. My question to the Minister is a plea that this housing, which is vacant and which is not required in many cases by railway employees, be made available to these deserted women. I appreciate that the Government has provided financial assistance to deserted women, but this does not involve—

The SPEAKER: Order! I withdraw the honourable member's leave. The honourable member has gone not only to the stage of commenting but also to the stage of debating the question. Consequently, he is out of order. The honourable Minister of Transport.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The whole of the honourable member's question, as I could understand it from his reading it, appears to be based on the fact that the houses are vacant railway houses that are not required for railway occupancy. It would therefore automatically follow that, if the houses were required for railway employee occupancy, the question would obviously be null and void, and I assure the honourable member that that is the position.

Mr. Dean Brown: They're not required.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: You're not the Railways Commissioner, so you wouldn't know.

Mr. Dean Brown: You'll throw them out, will you?

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. Dean Brown: But surely—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Davenport for the second time.

HEADMASTERS' AUTHORITY

Mr. GUNN: What action does the Minister of Education now intend to take to reinstate the authority of headmasters in this State following his disgraceful action in undermining the authority of all headmasters in this State?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is entitled to ask a question, but the latter part of his question is out of order and inadmissible. I therefore will not permit it.

Mr. GUNN: The Minister and other members would be aware that the Minister's decision in relation to recent events at Woodville High School has caused the public great concern regarding the future role of headmasters in exercising their authority and maintaining control at their schools. I now ask the Minister—

The SPEAKER: Order! Standing Orders provide (and this has been the practice of this House, upheld by honourable members many times) that an honourable member may ask a question; he then, by unanimous approval and with the concurrence of all honourable members, may explain his question, but that approval does not give the honourable member the right to ask a question, explain it, and then ask a further question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member is becoming renowned for a pretty shady practice.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Venning: Answer the question!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is to make a charge about certain things having happened and then to assume that the charge is accepted generally in the community and so base further questions on that charge.

Mr. Gunn: You just answer—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is a shady and dishonest practice—

Mr. Venning: Rubbish!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: —and it disgraces and lowers the standards of this House.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It was Opposition members who indulged themselves last week.

Mr. Gunn: You have no credibility whatsoever.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The statement by the member for Eyre—

Mr. Venning: Answer the question!

Mr. Dean Brown: You lack principle, like the Minister of Transport.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Again we have the member for Davenport indulging in the same gutter tactics. If he wants to do that, that is all right—

Mr. Gunn: You have no right—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I point out—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Eyre and, as I indicated at the opening of today's sitting, Standing Order 169 shall prevail. An honourable member will be warned twice, and then no further warning will be given. He will be named on the third occasion.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am pointing out, as I am justified in doing, that some members in this place degrade and debase completely the Standing Orders of this Chamber in making the kind of charge that they make.

Dr. Eastick: What's the charge—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader, if he wants to, can include himself in the same gutter as are the members for Eyre and Davenport.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Heysen.

Mr. McANANEY: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Standing Order 165 provides that, in answering a question, the Minister shall not debate the matter, and the Minister is debating the actions of members on this side.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. A question was asked, and I expect the honourable Minister to answer it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have denied previously in this place the charge made by the member for Eyre, and I point out once again that the only person who intervened and enforced a suspension against Jacquelynn Willcox was I. On no other occasion was a suspension enforced against that girl.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That's rubbish! What did you do when the police had to be called? You're a liar.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Kavel. He has been here long enough to know that interjections of that kind are out of order. I am not going to lose control of the House, and Standing Orders will prevail.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member for Kavel has just called out across the Chamber, "You are a liar", and that is unparliamentary language.

Mr. Coumbe: The Minister has often said the same thing.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Not today.

The SPEAKER: Can the Premier tell me of the circumstances?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member for Kavel called out, "You are a liar" across the Chamber to the Minister.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Premier has asked for a withdrawal of the words used. I ask the honourable member for Kavel whether he will withdraw those words.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In explanation, let me say that the Minister said that on only one occasion was the suspension of the schoolgirl upheld when he intervened. The fact is that the suspension was upheld earlier when the police were called on one occasion. The Minister has often called me a liar across the Chamber. I have never insisted on a withdrawal: I have simply tried to point out that I am not a liar. However, if the Premier is so sensitive about this matter, although the Minister of Education has many times called not only me but many members of the Opposition a liar (and it seems that Ministers cannot take it although they dish it out), in those circumstances, in order to quieten the Premier's ire, I will withdraw, but such a withdrawal is not justified. The Minister of Education has made a statement in this house that is completely untrue.

Mr. Venning: Hear, hear!

Dr. EASTICK: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Can you advise me and other members how the term "liar", when spoken by members of the Government, is not offensive whereas, when spoken by Opposition members, is claimed to be offensive?

The SPEAKER: The term has been used many times, and I have heard it used. I will ask the honourable member to withdraw the term, if another honourable member objects and asks for a withdrawal. That has been my procedure; it will continue to be my procedure; and it is the procedure I adopted this afternoon when I was asked whether a member would withdraw a statement after another honourable member had objected to it. I asked the honourable member to withdraw the statement, and that practice will continue.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Various charges have been made on this matter over a period. I do not accept them, and I have indicated previously that I do not accept them. Apparently, that is not good enough for the member for Eyre, who sees a political advantage in repeating the charges in a way that I do not regard as justified. There may be differing viewpoints on the way in which my job as Minister of Education should be done, but I do not believe that I have anything to apologise for. I am willing to stand up in this community and be counted on the way in which I do my job as Minister.

Mr. Wells: You are the best Minister of Education the State has ever had.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Ultimately, I am willing to abide by the decision of the community at large and the decision of the people associated with the Education Depart-

ment, but in no circumstances should I have to abide by the baseless and gutter-snipe approach of the member for Eyre.

Mr. Gunn: That's untrue, and a lie.

The SPEAKER: Order!

PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Transport obtain a report on further developments in installing a pedestrian crossing on Grand Junction Road, Hope Valley, for children attending the Modbury South Primary School and Modbury High School? The latest information I have received on this subject was a letter from the Minister dated August 12 this year which, in part, states:

The Commissioner of Highways informs me that investigations have been completed, and that it has been established that pedestrian and vehicular activity at the above location justifies the installation of some form of pedestrian crossing facilities. Discussions are now proceeding with the Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully and the schools concerned regarding the most appropriate location for the crossing. Two possible locations are under consideration, and the final decision will depend on the feasibility of developing a common walkway from the schools to meet Grand Junction Road east of Kennington Road. The type of crossing installed will depend upon the eventual location selected.

I urge the Minister to expedite action on this matter.

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

TREES

Mr. MATHWIN: What secret power does the Premier claim to have that enables him to grow trees along the foreshores of South Australia? In yesterday's *Advertiser* the Premier is reported as having described Adelaide's foreshore as "most often a treeless disaster area", and accusing public authorities of trying constantly to make Adelaide's parks and gardens look as though they had been "translated lately from one of England's damper counties". If anyone should know, the Premier should, that there are no gum trees growing in England. He would also know that councils, when considering the matter of tree planting, contact the State's leading authorities, including the Director of the Botanic Garden Department (Mr. Noel Lothian) and his committee. Moreover, the Premier should know, if he does not, that it is impossible to grow trees along the foreshores of this State. If the Premier believes we must plant something along the foreshores to provide shade, I suggest to him that little shade is gained from spinifex grass.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I understood the honourable member was the member for Glenelg.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He couldn't be!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I spent part of my school days living at Glenelg and know that trees grow along the foreshore.

Mr. Mathwin: How many?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There are trees growing there. Forebears, on my mother's side, came from Victor Harbor and, if the honourable member has not been to that watering place, apparently he is unaware that trees grow along much of the foreshore there.

Mr. Mathwin: Have you ever tried to grow trees on the foreshore?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I have done so successfully, and I assure the honourable member that trees can grow there. If he wants a list of names of trees that will grow along the foreshore, I will supply him with it.

VEHICLE INDUSTRY

Mr. BECKER: Is the Premier aware of any negotiations or the intention of the Commonwealth Government to acquire a 5 per cent share of Chrysler Australia Limited? Can he say what effect such a move would have on the motor vehicle industry and allied industries in South Australia and whether the South Australian Government would welcome such a move? An article on page 1 of today's *Australian* states:

The Federal Government has told Japanese car makers it is planning to buy a 5 per cent ownership of the Chrysler Australia company. The move is designed to encourage the top two Japanese car makers (Toyota and Nissan) to take over unused capacity at the Chrysler plant in Adelaide.

In this afternoon's *News*, an article on page 2 states:

Chrysler Australia Limited has received no approach from the Federal Government for the Government to buy a 5 per cent share in the company's operations. The company denied a suggestion that the Federal Government had arranged to buy 5 per cent ownership in the operation and had told Japanese car manufacturers of the move.

In view of the conflicting reports and the importance of this industry to South Australia, can the Premier say what is going on?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I know of no intention of the Commonwealth Government to purchase 5 per cent of Chrysler Australia Limited. I point out to the honourable member, however, that press reports, some of which were headlined in the *Australian*, appear to have emanated from reports in Japan. At the request of Chrysler on a previous occasion, I have publicly stated that the press reports were clearly wrong, and I have received the thanks of the Managing Director of Chrysler for doing so. The Commonwealth Government has approached Nissan and Toyota concerning the manufacture in South Australia of small cars under the 85 per cent local content plan. It may be that in the course of that arrangement some question of involvement with the Japanese companies by the Australian Industries Development Corporation arose. It appears that the matter has been distorted into a suggestion that the Commonwealth Government is buying a percentage of the existing Chrysler company. I know of no proposition of the latter kind.

BALTIC STATES

Mr. EVANS: Can the Premier say whether a report on a radio news service today, stating that he disagreed with the Whitlam Government's decision to recognise the Baltic States as States of Russia, is true? The report stated that the Premier believed the decision was unnecessary and unwarranted and that Australia would not benefit by such a decision. Many representations have been made to the Premier and others pointing out that, by taking the action that the Commonwealth Government has taken, it has condoned murder, confiscation of property, rape, and political arrest and detention. There has been a rule of gun in those States and even human extermination. I therefore ask the Premier whether the report attributed to him is true and why it took him so long to say that he disagreed with the Commonwealth Government's decision.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not taken long to express an opinion on the subject.

Dr. Eastick: Only about three months!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader is wrong on that score. I was approached by representatives of Baltic communities living in South Australia when the decision was originally taken. I replied to them, many of whom are members of my own Party, by saying that in my view if the decision had been for me to make I would not have made it in the way the Commonwealth Government did; in fact, I saw only harm and no benefit to be gained by Australia at all in a decision of this kind.

Mr. Goldsworthy: But you saw a great deal of benefit to yourself in making the statement.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is the kind of opportunism we see constantly from the Opposition these days if a member of the Government speaks out honestly—

Mr. Goldsworthy: That's rare!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —in relation to decisions made elsewhere in his own Party with which he disagrees and says frankly, "Well, this is not part of our policy; this is not something that I would have done." Members opposite, urging that that should have been said and that I have taken too long to say it, say, at the moment I do say something, that it is for opportunistic reasons only that I say it. Members opposite in the last few days having shown the depths of opportunism to which they are willing to sink, the honourable member's remark is just further evidence.

LAND TAX

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Treasurer say whether there is any current validity in the words "The above value is effective for calculation of land tax for five financial years from 1971-72" appearing on a 1971 South Australian land tax assessment notice? I have been approached by and have received correspondence from constituents who received an assessment notice in 1971 and who have since received an assessment notice dated June 30, 1974 (only three years after the previous notice), on which the words I have referred to appear. It has been pointed out to me that the present system of valuing one-fifth of the State each year has brought about anomalies and an unfair situation, because the instruction referred to applies to some property owners and not to others. Under the system, some land will not be valued again for five years, but other land has been valued in successive years from 1971.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The House agreed (in fact, members opposite agreed) to alter the provisions of the Land Tax Act to allow for more frequent assessments than the original quinquennial assessment applying to the whole State. It did so for the good reason that, as land values changed, it was more equitable to have more rapid assessments. However, if more rapid assessments were to occur, they could not occur for the whole State but had to be for portions of the State, simply because we could not maintain an administration (I have constant requests from members opposite to cut down on the number of public servants we have) to have a complete reassessment of the whole State each year. At the time that legislation was introduced in the House, and agreed to, to provide for more frequent assessments of parts of the State, it was praised by members opposite.

In fact, immediately the present Government got back into office, I arranged for a reassessment of parts of the State to the benefit of much of the rural community, including

areas in the honourable member's district, in order not to institute the bills for land tax that were about to be sent out by the Hall Government. We have made this alteration in the situation in order to benefit people, such as those living in the honourable member's district. I have already announced that, because of anomalies that can occur under the new system in an inflationary period, there will be, as from July 1 next year, an equalisation programme similar to what will be applied to water and sewerage rating in the metropolitan area.

BUILDERS LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council requested a conference, at which it would be represented by five managers, on its amendments and suggested amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

The House of Assembly agreed to a conference to be held in the House of Assembly Liberal Party room at 10 a.m. on Thursday, November 21, at which it would be represented by Messrs. Max Brown, Chapman, Evans, Hopgood, and Langley.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendments Nos. 1 to 3 to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL CENTRE TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust Act, 1971-1973. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill, to some extent, arises from another measure recently submitted to this House, which absolved the Council of the Corporation of the City of Adelaide from further financial liability in connection with the Adelaide Festival Theatre. As members will be aware, the festival theatre now forms part of the complex administered by the trustees of the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust. While the council had a considerable continuing financial interest in the theatre it was appropriate that it should have a substantial representation on the trust and, in fact, the principal Act, the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust Act, gave the council the right to nominate two of the six trustees.

However, since the council will have no further financial commitment in relation to the festival theatre it is now considered appropriate that the direct representation of the council on the trust should be reduced to one. That is agreed to by the council. This reduction is effected by the operative clause of the Bill, clause 2, the total number of trustees being retained at six. It is intended that this change in representation will be effected by bringing this measure into operation at about the time the term of office of the original trustees will expire.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOTTERY AND GAMING 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.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1973. Read a first time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to amend the Lottery and Gaming Act to provide financial assistance to the racing industry following the Hancock inquiry into racing in South Australia. The proposals that have been adopted seek to provide sufficient funds to horse-racing, trotting and dog-racing to give a boost to these sports and ensure their continued viability. It is expected that this Bill will result in additional funds to the industry in a full year of about \$960 000, including an annual provision of an estimated \$175 000, to write off the loss of the Totalizator Agency Board Dababet operation, without any subventions being required from the State Treasury. At the same time, the effects of taxation on bookmakers and totalisator operations have been minimised as much as possible.

Consequently, there will be no change in the turnover tax on bookmakers for local betting and in the deduction that is made on on-course and off-course totalisator win, place and quinella betting. The changes have been confined to interstate betting with bookmakers and multiple betting with T.A.B. and on-course totalisators. The Bill also provides that the Racecourses Development Board may borrow money with the consent of the Treasurer for the purpose of improving racing facilities, such loans being guaranteed by the Treasurer. Finally, penalties for illegal betting are increased. As the remainder of the explanation consists of an explanation of the clauses, I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the measure to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 inserts definitions of "controlling authority" and "multiple betting". Clause 4 amends section 28 of the principal Act and varies the deductions to be made from totalisator revenue, except off-course totalisator betting conducted by T.A.B. or moneys transferred to the club under section 15a of the principal Act, as follows:

- (a) There is to be a deduction of 14 per cent from revenue derived from betting otherwise than in respect of multiple betting.
- (b) There is to be a deduction of 16 per cent in respect of revenue derived from betting on a "double".
- (c) In respect of revenue derived from other forms of multiple betting, there is to be a reduction of 17½ per cent.

The clause allows any balance remaining to the club after certain dividends have been paid to be paid to the Racecourses Development Board, or to be retained by the club, instead of being put to charitable purposes. Clause 5 amends section 31n of the principal Act and varies the deductions to be made from money invested with T.A.B. for each event on which it conducts off-course totalisator betting in the same amounts as clause 4.

Clause 6 makes a consequential amendment. It also protects the position of country racing clubs by providing that the South Australian Jockey Club in allocating moneys for the promotion of racing shall have regard to the amounts allocated to country racing clubs by the Betting Control Board before the commencement of the amending Act. Clause 7 amends section 40 of the principal Act and varies the commission to be paid from bookmakers' revenue as follows:

- (a) Where the bets are made on a racecourse or coursed ground in the metropolitan area or in registered premises the commission is to be 2 per cent in respect of bets made on events held within the State and 2.6 per cent in respect of events held outside the State.
- (b) Where the bets are made on racecourses or coursed grounds outside the metropolitan area, the commission is to be 1.8 per cent of the bets made in respect of events held within the State and 2.4 per cent in respect of bets made on events held outside the State.

Clause 8 amends section 41 of the principal Act to provide that out of the commission paid to the Betting Control Board, 1.1 per cent of the gross betting revenue (with the exception of revenue derived from betting in registered premises) shall be paid to the racing clubs, and the balance of the commission is to be paid to the Treasurer in aid of the general revenue. However, in respect of commission recovered from bets made in registered premises between June 30, 1974, and the commencement of this Bill, the board is to pay up to \$10 000 for the benefit of country racing clubs.

Clause 9 amends section 42a of the principal Act and increases the penalties for illegal betting to a fine of \$2 500 or imprisonment for six months in the case of a bookmaker and a fine of \$500 or imprisonment for three months in the case of the person laying the bet. Clause 10 amends section 48f of the principal Act to provide that the Racecourses Development Board may borrow moneys with the consent of the Treasurer for the purpose of improving racing facilities. Where money is borrowed under this provision, the liabilities of the board are guaranteed by the Treasurer.

Mr. BECKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

LAND AND BUSINESS AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Land and Business Agents Act, 1973. Read a first time.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes a number of unconnected amendments to the Land and Business Agents Act, 1973. The amendments centre largely on section 88 which establishes a cooling-off period and section 90 which is designed to ensure that parties to transactions involving the acquisition or disposal of land and businesses enter upon those transactions on the basis of proper information. The amendments in this connection streamline procedures, and ensure against abuse of the cooling-off period by unscrupulous persons.

In addition, a new provision is inserted under which the board is empowered to appoint a manager where an agent becomes bankrupt or insolvent, misappropriates or misapplies trust moneys, is suffering from a mental or physical incapacity, or commits some serious irregularity in the conduct of his business. Another amendment allows the board to grant an exemption from the requirement of the principal Act that a branch office of an agent's business must be managed by a registered manager.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 38 of the principal Act. New provisions are inserted under which the board may exempt an agent from the obligation to have a branch office managed by a registered manager where the board is satisfied that the agent, after taking reasonable steps to do so, has been unable to obtain the services of a

registered manager at the branch office, and that a registered salesman of at least five years experience, whose work is supervised by the agent, or a registered manager, is in charge of the branch office. The exemptions may be made for a period of six months or for successive periods of six months, but no exemption is to be effective after the expiration of three years from the commencement of the amending Act.

Members will observe therefore that this is in the nature of a transition provision. The Land and Business Agents Act, 1973, provided the qualifications for a manager, who must be in charge of a branch office; that is to say, he has to be a licensed land agent. I have had representations to the effect that it has been difficult for some licensed land agents to procure the services of a licensed land agent to manage their branch office in some country areas, and they have requested that there be some transitional provision to enable them to rearrange their affairs to meet the requirements of the new Act. This exemption provision is therefore included in the amending Bill, but the maximum period of the exemption is three years. It is clearly indicated that it is a transition provision and that those engaged in the industry will have to adjust their affairs so as to comply with what is an important provision in the Bill, namely, that a branch office must be under the control of a person possessing the qualifications and subject to the disciplines of being a licensed land agent.

New subsection (4) provides that, where an agent has a registered manager at a branch office and the manager dies, ceases to be in the employment of the agent, ceases to be a registered manager, or ceases to have a place of residence in this State, the agent shall have a period of grace of one month within which he may obtain the services of a registered manager for the branch office. Clause 3 amends section 41 of the principal Act. This section, which is in the same terms as a previous section of the Land Agents Act, provides that any advertisement relating to the sale or disposal of land or a business must be authorised by the owner of the land or business. The section does not, however, cover the case of a mortgage sale or a sale by an officer of a court. An amendment is inserted to cover this position. This section in the principal Act is in the same terms as the corresponding section of the Land Agents Act. Why this difficulty did not arise under the old Act, I do not really know, but it seems now to have been thrown up simply by the fact that a new Act has been passed; but, nevertheless, we have introduced this amendment to cover the situation.

Clause 4 amends section 61 of the principal Act. The effect of the amendment is that an agent, or other person, who has a legal practitioner or land broker in his employment, may charge a fee in respect of the preparation of an instrument where he acted as agent in the transaction to which the instrument relates, or was a party to the transaction to which the instrument relates, and the legal practitioner or land broker has been in his employment since May 1, 1973, or some earlier date. Members will recall that section 61 of the Land and Business Agents Act provides that a person may not prepare a Real Property Act instrument for fee or reward unless he is a legal practitioner or a licensed land broker. Members will recall also that, at the time of the discussions relating to the original Bill that led up to the Act of 1973, it was put on behalf of land agents that they had in their employ brokers who would find themselves out of employment if the agents could not continue to make a charge for the preparation of instruments by those brokers, and, as a transitional provision and in an attempt to alleviate any hardship that employed land

brokers might suffer as a result of being displaced, it was provided that where a land broker was in the employ of a land agent as at May 1, 1973, and remained continuously in the employ of that agent the agent could charge for the preparation of instruments by that broker, provided it was a transaction in which the agent was engaged as agent: in other words, a matter within his own office.

Following the passing of that Act, representations were received from banks and some other organisations that said that they had land brokers in their employ and that they had been making charges for the preparation of Real Property Act instruments. Under the relevant section of the Real Property Act which has existed since 1886, no person other than a legal practitioner or licensed land broker may recover fees for the preparation of Real Property Act instruments, so that these fees were all irrecoverable; but apparently the instruments have been prepared and the banks and other organisations have been collecting fees for the preparation of instruments. They put forward the case that, if we were concerned about the possible displacement from employment of land brokers employed by real estate agents, we ought to be concerned about the possible displacement of land brokers employed by banks and other organisations.

Consequently, with some hesitation, the Government has decided to include a similar transitional provision relating to organisations other than real estate agents but, it is limited to cases in which the organisation itself is a party to the transaction, because it would be inappropriate and undesirable that organisations should engage in the general business of real estate conveyancing for other people. Indeed, it is undesirable that they should be able to make a charge for instruments prepared by their own employee land brokers, except as a transitional provision in order to avoid undue inconvenience to land brokers who are presently employed by those people and who have been so employed continuously since May 1, 1973. The effect of clause 4 is to extend the transitional provision, which was included in the Act of 1973 in relation to real estate agents, to banks and organisations other than real estate agents.

Clause 5 deals with the appointment of a manager where for some reason the agent is incapable of attending properly to his affairs. The manager is to have power to dispose of trust moneys of the agent to persons lawfully entitled to those moneys. In addition, no dealing with trust moneys is to take place except with the consent of the manager. An agent may appeal against a resolution appointing a manager under this provision. This clause has been included to deal with the problem we encounter not infrequently of a land agent who becomes insolvent, leaves the State or abandons his practice, or for one reason or another refuses or is unable to operate on his trust account. That means people who have entrusted trust moneys to the agent for use in a property transaction have that money tied up and cannot complete the transaction. Hitherto there has been no practical way of dealing with that situation. This clause will mean that the Land Agents Board can appoint a manager who will have authority to operate on the trust account, thereby freeing the funds. Clause 6 amends section 85 of the principal Act relating to powers of inspection. It enables an authorised person to inspect any books, accounts, documents or writings in the custody or control of a bank or other institution relating to trust moneys of an agent or licensed land broker. This is related to the provision I have just mentioned and is part of the practical machinery needed to give effect to it. Clause 7 makes a minor drafting amendment. Clause 8 amends section 88 of the principal Act which relates to the cooling-off period.

The first amendment makes clear that the notice of rescission may be given by the purchaser at any time before the expiration of two clear business days from the prescribed day, but that the notice must be given before the date of settlement. This is because of some doubts raised about the true construction of the existing provision; whether or not those doubts are justified is open to argument but, at all events, this makes it quite clear.

New subsections (1a) and (1b) are inserted under which the vendor may, if the purchaser exercises his rights of rescission under section 88, retain a deposit (not exceeding \$25) paid by the purchaser in respect of the sale. Members will recall that under the existing Act the vendor or agent is not entitled to receive more than \$25 prior to the expiration of the cooling-off period. Even then, if the purchaser rescinds during the cooling-off period, that money must be returned to the purchaser. Honourable members will recall the point that has been raised at various times that this may encourage purchasers to sign up for several properties, never intending to buy more than one of them, and that this would be exploiting the cooling-off period to their advantage and to the unfair disadvantage of the vendor. No evidence has been brought to my attention that this evil has developed, but it is always a possibility, and the fears continue to be expressed. The Real Estate Institute desires that there be a power to forfeit the \$25, and I have acceded to that suggestion, once again with some misgivings. However, the effect of this clause is that a purchaser, in exercising his right to rescind during the cooling-off period, will have to be willing to forfeit \$25 as the price of exercising that right.

New amendments are inserted providing that, where the vendor does not provide the section 90 statements at the time of making the contract, the purchaser has the right of rescission for two business days after those statements are given. The amendment also deals with the problem of undisclosed purchasers who act through nominees. In such a case it is only necessary for the notice of rescission to be served upon a person whose name appears on the contract as vendor of the land or business. The amendments extend the right of rescission conferred by section 88 in a qualified manner to sales by auction. Unless the section 90 statements are available for perusal before the auction, and all public advertisements relating to the auction give notice of the times and places at which the statements may be inspected, the right of rescission will exist, even in the case of a sale by auction, for two business days after the section 90 statements have been given. This clause is designed to ensure that, merely because a sale is by auction, the vendor does not fail to make known to the purchaser the information that section 90 expects of him in relation to other sales.

Clause 9 amends section 90 of the principal Act. First, the requirement that the statements be given before execution of the contract by the purchaser is deleted, and in its place a requirement is inserted that the statements be given at least 10 days before the date of settlement. A provision is inserted under which a statement may be compiled by the vendor up to two months before the date of the contract. This statement will be deemed to comply with the requirements of this section if the purchaser is notified at the time the statement is given to him of any variations in the particulars that have come to the notice of the vendor in the interim period. The definitions of "charge" and "encumbrance" are amended so as to exclude charges arising from a rate or tax imposed less than 12 months before execution of the contract by the purchaser.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972, as amended. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Honourable members may recall that section 133 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972, was intended to deal, at least temporarily, with the problems arising from the judgment of the Commonwealth Industrial Court in *Moore v. Doyle*, 15. F.L.R., at page 59. In fact, this section provided a two year period of protection for associations against actions arising from this decision of the court.

There is now legislation in contemplation, which must necessarily be complementary as between the Commonwealth and the States to dispose of the question. In fact, the preparation of this legislation has taken rather longer than was expected and it was only late last month that the Commonwealth Parliament enacted its amendments to the Conciliation and Arbitration Act of the Commonwealth.

It is hoped that the complementary legislation necessary from this State's point of view will be placed before the House early in 1975. However, before Parliament resumes after the Christmas break, the period averted to above will expire, the expiry date being January 4, 1975. For these reasons, this Bill, at clause 2, proposes the extension of the period by one year; that is, until January 4, 1976, which should provide ample time for this House to consider the complementary legislation.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

APIARIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to give effect to certain reciprocal arrangements agreed upon by the States, and it clarifies several matters relating to the keeping of bees for the production and sale of honey. Two recommendations of a meeting of State departmental representatives in this area have been adopted by the Government and require amendments to the principal Act, the Apiaries Act, 1931-1964. The recommendations were that bees kept in accordance with the corresponding law of another State and brought into this State be exempted from registration under the principal Act for a period of 90 days in any year, and that, during that period, if the hives are branded in accordance with the corresponding law, they also be exempted from the branding requirements of the principal Act. As the remainder of the explanation deals with the clauses, I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

The recent introduction of the solitary bee *Megachile rotunda* (leaf cutters) from Canada requires the scope of the principal Act to be confined to honey bees and, accordingly, this Bill makes provision for a definition of "bee" to be inserted in the principal Act. In addition, the opportunity is being taken in this amending measure to schedule a disease, chalk brood, that is common to all genera of bees, although at present unknown in Australia; to bring in a three-year registration period; and to increase the penalties for offences.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure shall come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 inserts in the definition section of the principal Act a definition of "bee" and of "corresponding law". As to the latter, provision is made in this clause for the corresponding law to be specified by proclamation. Clause 4 repeals section 5 of the principal Act and provides for a new section requiring registration of beekeepers. The registration is proposed to be for a three-year period, all registrations other than new registrations being dealt with at the same time. This provision includes the exemption from registration in respect of bees brought from outside the State. Clauses 5 to 9 increase present penalties of \$40 to \$200. Clause 10 is consequential to clause 4 and requires that bees be kept only in frame-hives.

Clause 11 substitutes a new provision, requiring the branding of hives, for the present section 13a of the principal Act and exempts hives from the branding requirements of that section while they are being kept in the State by an exempted beekeeper if they are branded under a corresponding law of another State or Territory. Clause 12 makes consequential amendments to section 19 of the principal Act, which empowers the making of regulations and also increases the maximum for penalties under the regulations from \$40 to \$200. Clause 13 adds the disease *ascosphaera apis* (chalk brood) to the list of diseases in the schedule to the principal Act.

Mr. CHAPMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (HOURS)

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 1—After clause 2 insert new clause 2a as follows:

2a. *Amendment of principal Act, s. 16—Leigh Creek Coal Field*—Section 16 of the principal Act is amended—
(a) by striking out the second and third sentences and the proviso;

and

(b) by inserting after the present contents thereof as amended by this section (which are hereby designated subsection (1) thereof) the following subsection:

(2) The trust shall be exempt from the obligations imposed by the following provisions of this Act:

(a) subsection (5) of section 19;

(b) section 168;

and

(c) any other provision from which the court thinks fit to exempt the trust.

No. 2. Page 2, line 39 (clause 5)—After "subsection (3)" insert "and subsection (3a)".

No. 3. Page 2 (clause 5)—After line 47 insert new subsection (3a) as follows:

(3a) Where an application for the removal of a retail storekeeper's licence was lodged with the court before the commencement of the Licensing Act Amendment Act (No. 2), 1974, and had not been determined at the date of the commencement of that amending Act, the application shall be determined according to the provisions of this Act as in force immediately before the commencement of that amending Act.

Amendment No. 1:

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

This Government amendment was introduced in the Legislative Council to deal with the position of the publican's licence held by the Electricity Trust at Leigh Creek. At least two of the provisions of the Licensing Act are inapplicable to that licence, one being section 19 (5), which prescribes the mandatory 11 consecutive hours of trading and the other being the provision of section 168, which is

the requirement to provide accommodation. It is thought expedient to include a general provision that enables the court to exempt the trust from any other provisions of the Act, if that is thought to be expedient, because of the unusual features of this licence and the unusual circumstances in which it operates. I ask the Committee to agree to the amendment.

Mr. COUMBE: As the amendment clears up certain anomalies in this area of the State, I support it.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3:

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 2 and 3 be disagreed to.

These amendments are linked and relate to a point which was raised by the member for Mitcham during the second reading debate in this Chamber and to which I then replied. I do not really want to say any more now or to add to what I have said, but perhaps I had better repeat the substance of it. All the amendments seek to do is to exempt from the provisions of this Bill applications that have already been lodged at the Licensing Court. The particular point in mind is the application for the removal of storekeepers' licences, it being the wish of at least one applicant for the removal of a storekeeper's licence that his application be determined under the present Act instead of under the provisions of this Bill, because he sees the provisions of the Bill presenting probably an insurmountable obstacle to the success of his application.

I think it is a wrong principle to say that an application for a liquor licence is to be determined according to the law existing at the date of the lodging of the application in the court, instead of the date on which the decision is made. It seems to me that it is necessary for anyone who seeks a liquor licence to be willing to take the law at the time the decision is made. Once we allow the date of the application to determine the matter, we could have, as we have here, applications being made to the court by people who knew that the move was afoot to change the law, even while the amendment was going through Parliament and even now while we were debating it, and that would be a most unsatisfactory situation.

There is, moreover, the situation that we might have others arguing that, if we are willing to go as far as meeting the wishes of those who have put applications into the court before the new Act comes into operation, why not meet the wishes of those who have entered into some arrangements, who have committed themselves to the expenditure of money or have actually paid out money in the expectation that they will be able to remove the licence under the provisions of the existing Act. Wherever we make a change in the licensing laws it will affect someone adversely, and someone relying on the existing provisions will be disappointed in his expectations. That is not unusual, and I sympathise with people caught in that situation, but it is unavoidable in relation to any change in the law. However, there are those who see it from a different point of view, and I notice that the member for Chaffey is paying attention to what I am saying. He, of course, has some constituents who would take a different view of this matter, because there is, I think, still current an application for the removal of a storekeeper's licence from his district into the metropolitan area.

At the time the Bill was previously debated, there was an application of that kind and, of course, residents of the honourable member's district who were opposed to that application on the grounds that they wanted the store-

keeper's licence to remain in their district to meet their needs and convenience would have wanted the application to be decided under the provisions of this Bill, which enables the court to take that factor into account, instead of what applies under the provisions of the existing Act, which do not enable the court to take that factor into account. Whichever way we go in these matters, someone will suffer inconvenience and disappointment. I think it is necessary to adhere to the principle that the law which the Licensing Court applies is the law that exists at the date on which it makes its decision.

I know that one applicant for the removal of a storekeeper's licence has expressed his disappointment over the position in which he may find himself. He ran into certain difficulties because, when his case was about to be heard, he found that two members of the Licensing Court were disqualified from hearing his case because of their previous contact with the matter. That was regrettable, and I did all in my power to get a court constituted as soon as I could. I got a court constituted within a few days by getting in two additional magistrates who had to be taken from their other duties, and considerable inconvenience was involved in doing this.

I do not know what has happened since then or how far the case has progressed. If the applicant manages to get his order under the existing Act, before the new provisions are proclaimed, that is his good fortune. However, if he does not, I think it is one of the disappointments in business expectations which inevitably result from a change in the law. The consequences of adopting this as a precedent would be disastrous and would mean that, whenever the law was changed, we would have to consider whether anyone might have suffered some disappointment of business expectations or financial loss as a result. It is impossible to follow that principle through to its logical conclusion.

Mr. COUMBE: I am disappointed at the Attorney's attitude in this regard, because what we are discussing are fair amendments. Although we may be dealing now with only one or two cases, an important principle is involved in them. As a result of my investigations and of representations that have been made to me on this question, I know that only a small number of applications was before the court at the time the Bill was introduced. This is a reasonable amendment, because representations have been made to me that applications have been delayed. Some points of law submitted by the Minister are open to question, particularly those regarding the practical working of the Act. This matter should be resolved not only because of the principle involved but also to help applicants. I support the amendments.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I raised these matters during the second reading debate, and would have moved amendments had I been present. I was not here, and the Attorney persuaded the member for Goyder not to go on with them.

The Hon. L. J. King: That's absolutely untrue, and I should be surprised if the member for Goyder would support you in that remark.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is what he told me had happened, but I am not blaming the Attorney.

The Hon. L. J. King: I did not persuade him at all.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I understood that the member for Goyder went to the Attorney-General with amendments that I had suggested, and found out from the Attorney that he would oppose them. That being so, he did not go on with them.

The Hon. L. J. King: That's a different story, isn't it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I would not have thought so, but the fact is that the amendments were not moved, and I must take some responsibility for that. However, they were moved in another place. If this Parliament can preserve a person's rights and he can be helped, why not do it? At present the Attorney is showing a rigidity of mind and an inflexibility that I regret. As this applicant did everything without knowing there was to be a change of the law, why should our acts deprive him of his chance? It is not relevant how much he may make: if he is acting properly, why should he be prejudiced by something we do?

The Attorney says that it is bad luck that we cannot make exceptions. All the Attorney-General can say is that if the person gets his application in before the amendments are made, he will be lucky. The Attorney did not say that he would make sure that the matter could be disposed of before the Act was proclaimed, and, in those circumstances, I oppose his move to reject the amendments. Will the Attorney give an undertaking that the Act will not be proclaimed for long enough to allow this matter to be disposed of by the court?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The member for Goyder, since being in this Chamber, has shown that he is an entirely straightforward person and worthy of respect. My dealings with him have been on a satisfactory and proper basis. In the absence of the member for Mitcham, the honourable member drew my attention to the fact that the member for Mitcham had an amendment on file. He asked what was my attitude to it, and I told him I intended to oppose it, if it were moved. I explained my reasons, as I have today. I then explained to the honourable member that he could move the amendment if he wished to do so, in the absence of the member for Mitcham. He then said that he did not know anything about the topic and did not feel disposed to move the amendment. That was the beginning and end of the conversation between us. I did not persuade him in any way, and I hold him that he could move the amendment if he wished.

Dealing now with the points of substance raised by the member for Mitcham, it would not be right to defer proclaiming the Act until a certain application had been disposed of. I do not know how many applications have been lodged, although I know of one because of the approach to me to constitute a court in order to hear it. If we believe, as I believe, that this is a proper amendment and that it is undesirable that a storekeeper's licence should be removed from one locality to another if the needs of the locality could not be met by providing other licences, the sooner that situation applies the better.

There is no proper time at which a change of the law is to come into effect. As far as an application is concerned, it is the time at which the case is heard. If a proclamation is deferred to deal with a person who already has an application before the court, such proclamation would have to be deferred until all applications that are before the court have been disposed of. Immediate pressure would be brought to bear by people who did not have their applications in but who had bought storekeepers' licences for the purpose of transferring them. They would say, "You have to defer the proclamation of the Act until we have had a chance to get our applications in and heard under the existing Act." That is just not on. I assume that we have decided that the provision should operate.

It is unfortunate for anyone who nearly came within the ambit of the old Act, but it is bad luck for him. If the provision is a proper one, the sooner it applies the better.

As far as holding up the provision until the court can finally dispose of the applications it has before it, that would be an inappropriate course of action. I will not give the undertaking sought by the honourable member, because I believe it would be inappropriate to do so. We should simply proceed with the Bill and let those people who have current applications before the court take their chances on what the state of the law will be at the relevant time, namely, at the time at which the court has to make a decision on their applications.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (21)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Corcoran and McRae. Noes—Messrs. Blacker and Wardle.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendments would be inconsistent with the sound principles of administration of the licensing laws.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL THEATRE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) brought up the report of the Select Committee recommending an amendment, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That the report be noted.

A minor amendment to the Bill has been recommended by the Select Committee.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support the motion. The amendment suggested by the Select Committee straightens out a slight misconception that was contained in the original draft regarding certain aspects of finance. In supporting the measure, I echo the words given in evidence before the Select Committee when I say that a tribute must be paid to the City Council for the part it has played in the establishment of the festival hall complex and its continued interest in the venture.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Discharge of further liability of council, etc."

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

In new section 7c (1) (b) to strike out all words after "by the" and insert "council in providing for the repayment of principal and interest in respect of any moneys borrowed by the council for the purposes of section 3 of this Act".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PARLIAMENTARY SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1, Page 3, line 14 (clause 6)—After "metropolitan area" insert "or electoral districts that lie partly within and partly outside the metropolitan area".

No. 2. Page 3, line 15 (clause 6)—After “fix, for” insert “members representing”.

No. 3. Page 3 (clause 6)—After line 17 insert the following:

(5a) In addition to any other determination that, but for this subsection, the tribunal is otherwise authorised to make, after the commencement of the Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Act Amendment Act, 1974, and before the election of members of the Legislative Council pursuant to section 14 of the Constitution Act, 1934-1974, that next follows that commencement, the tribunal shall determine an electorate allowance for each member of Parliament being a member of the Legislative Council on the basis that the electoral district of that member comprises the whole State and such a determination shall, on and from the day that next follows that election, take effect in lieu of the determination in respect of the electorate allowances for each member of the Legislative Council that was in force immediately before that day.

No. 4. Page 3, lines 25 and 26 (clause 6)—Leave out “holding the office of Chief Secretary” and insert “the Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council”.

No. 5. Page 4, line 10 (clause 6)—After “salary and” insert “where the tribunal considers it appropriate”.

No. 6. Page 4, line 41 (clause 7)—After “metropolitan area” insert “or partly within and partly outside the metropolitan area”.

No. 7. Page 5 (clause 7)—After line 6 insert new subsection (4) as follows:

(4) A person who is for the time being Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly whose electoral district is outside the metropolitan area shall be entitled to such additional remuneration or allowances as the tribunal shall determine in respect of his official duties and the tribunal shall determine such additional remuneration or allowances having regard, where appropriate, and in addition to all other relevant matters, to—

(a) any frequent or sustained absences of the Leader from his home by reason of his official duties

and

(b) any expenses incurred by the Leader in frequent and regular travelling to and from his electoral district by reason of his official duties.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to, with the following consequential amendment:

Clause 7, page 4, lines 31-33—Leave out all words in these lines and insert—

(a) In the case of—

(i) Members of the House of Assembly, acting as agents for constituents in their dealings with the Government and with officers of the Government and other persons;

or

(ii) Members of the Legislative Council, acting for constituents as a member of a House of Review;

The Legislative Council has inserted amendments that will provide for the fixing, by the tribunal that will meet before the next election, of allowances for the Legislative Council applicable after the next election in respect of members of the Legislative Council then acting for constituents of the State as a whole rather than for the present Legislative Council districts. The Government was willing to agree to such a fixation of the allowance applicable after the next election and to the various consequential amendments relating to areas, provided that that did not mean that the Legislative Councillors were then to be regarded by the tribunal as agents for constituents throughout the State in representations to Government departments. In other words, there must be a clear distinction between the situation of members of the House of Assembly who act as agents for their districts and directly for their constituents in representations to Government departments, and members of the Legislative Council who, in many cases, are not

approached directly by constituents at all and who should certainly not be given an allowance that would, in effect, be an inflated allowance beyond that given to members of the House of Assembly on the basis that they were doing a similar job to that done by members of the House of Assembly in representing constituents to Government departments, although doing it for the whole State.

The Government was willing to agree to the measure for the fixing of allowances immediately after the next election, only if there was that clear differentiation in the instructions to the tribunal. The first part of the agreement was written in, but the rest was not. If this measure were adopted in the terms now sent to us by the Legislative Council, there would be a vastly inflated allowance based on what I believe is an entirely wrong premise. As I do not think that is proper I do not believe we should pass a measure of this kind. I am perfectly content to go along with what was originally proposed.

Dr. Eastick: Who proposed it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I had discussions about the matter with representatives of the Opposition in the Legislative Council who approached me about it. I think that the original proposal was reasonable and proper. I believe it is reasonable that the tribunal should determine at its next sitting (whenever that is) or at some stage before the next election what should be the allowance applying immediately after the next election for the Legislative Council, but it should do it on a proper basis.

The other amendments made by the Legislative Council relate to the position of the Leader of the Government in the Upper House, and this position is not to be confined to the Chief Secretary. There is also an amendment relating to an allowance in respect of the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly on a similar basis to that which is provided in relation to Ministers (and I think this is proper) when the Leader represents a district outside the metropolitan area and has expenses associated with acting as Leader as well as acting as a member of a district outside the metropolitan area. With the necessary consequential amendment, I believe we should agree to the amendments of the Legislative Council, but I believe the consequential amendment is most necessary.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Apparently no member of the Liberal Party intends to speak on this matter. I was surprised when I came back from overseas that this Bill had not already been passed by both Chambers. In one way, I am glad that it has not been passed. I understand that what has gone on in the three or four weeks since the Bill was passed by this Chamber, against my wishes and those of the member for Goyder, is that it has been in the Legislative Council while, to use the Premier's term, certain discussions have gone on behind the scenes and in private between the Government and Liberal Party members of another place. There has been a bit of haggling and bargaining over what amendments would be allowed and what agreements could be obtained, particularly for members of the other place and the Leader of the Opposition in this place. I am glad that at least some of the things that I have heard were suggested have been rejected. I think that this has been a shabby way of doing business behind the scenes, as it were, rather than in the open on the floor of this place or of the Legislative Council. The Premier said that he had discussions with certain members of another place.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I've been known to have discussions with the honourable member.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Not very often these days, I am glad to say. I have made my protest, and I stick to it.

As I have said before, I do not believe this Bill should be passed at all. If I can hold it up by persuading members not to agree to these amendments, I shall do so. In the period of about 20 days that I was away overseas, there has been a remarkable change in the attitude of people and their optimism about the economy, and it was—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I point out that, in Committee, the honourable member must address himself to the terms of the amendments and not to his position on the second reading of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to address himself to the amendments.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am sure the Premier expects not to like what I say. In opposing these amendments because I want to see the whole Bill dropped, I believe this is a thoroughly wrong time for such a measure to be passed by the South Australian Parliament. It was bad enough four weeks ago but it is far worse now, particularly because of the actions taken by the Government to deprive the police of their pay increases.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. I ask the honourable member to confine himself to the amendments under discussion. If the honourable member can do that, I will permit him to speak.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is absolutely scandalous that we should go on with the Bill that is the prelude to an increase in salaries to members of Parliament, and these amendments—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The question of whether or not we go on is not for members to decide. The member for Mitcham must deal with the amendments before the Chair.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: These amendment will increase the emolument of certain members of Parliament beyond what was canvassed when the Bill was introduced. In my view they make the Bill even worse than it was when it was introduced. We have had an example of the attitude of the Government in its opposition to the police. I had two telephone calls this morning following the Premier's remarks to me yesterday about people in the hospital maintenance branch of the Public Buildings Department who are angry about what the Government has done and particularly about what the Premier said yesterday, because it was misleading. It was not until Monday week ago that action was taken by the Government to appeal—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to come back to the amendments before the Committee.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am putting the point of view that it is the wrong time to go on with this Bill and the way to stop it is to oppose these amendments in the hope that that will lead to a deadlock between the Houses so this Bill will not become law at this time. That is the point I am making. I believe that in the last four weeks the economy has taken a dive for the worst and I challenge particularly the members of the Liberal Party to say I am wrong. The economy of this country has taken a dive for the worst and, if it were immoral, as I believe it was, four weeks ago to bring in a Bill like this and to pass it, it is even more so now. If members stand up for what they believe to be right, they will oppose this Bill now by opposing these amendments because that is the only way now left to make sure that this Bill does not become law.

I challenge members of the Liberal Party, who I believe have been silent on these amendments, to get up and justify their stand if they intend to support the amendments.

Otherwise, they will be opening a way for an increase in their own salaries when the economy of this country is in a grievous condition. Since I came back the Premier has said many times how bad the situation is, yet here he is trying to pilot through a Bill that will lead to an increase in the salaries of members of this Parliament. What is good enough apparently for the police and 40 or so men in the hospital maintenance section of the Public Buildings Department is different from what is good enough for us. I protest as strongly as I can and I appreciate the leniency you have shown, Mr. Chairman, in allowing me to make this protest. I ask members to oppose these amendments as a way of showing some sincerity at least in preaching moderation in wage restraints, to show the lead to members of the community by showing moderation in restraint in regard to our own salaries.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has deliberately misrepresented the position along the lines of the opportunism he has recently shown on matters of this kind. The Government has not opposed increases for either the police or the maintenance workers in our hospitals.

Mr. Millhouse: They believe you have, and this morning they have been telling me about it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have not opposed the increases.

Mr. Millhouse: This morning—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the member for Mitcham to refrain from interjecting.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has not opposed increases for the police or hospital maintenance workers in the Public Buildings Department, and both of those groups will get substantial increases. These amendments do not relate to immediate increases for members of Parliament. They allow the tribunal to fix appropriate allowances to apply after March, 1976.

Mr. Millhouse: As soon as this is through you will call the tribunal together.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The allowance to which the honourable member was addressing himself is not for an immediate increase at all. It is for the taking into account of the new position that will occur after the next State election when there will be a changed basis of representation in the Legislative Council. The honourable member knows that full well and he also knows perfectly well that the Government is not opposed to appropriate wage increases in the community at all: it has not opposed them. In fact it has supported them; it has made offers in relation to them; and it will continue to do so.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In the interests of honesty, I believe the remarks of the member for Mitcham should be put into perspective. He has stated in the press on an earlier occasion that he has found it advantageous to build up for himself a source of income other than his Parliamentary salary. He has said that this measure of independence is desirable for members. Unfortunately, that opportunity does not exist for all members. I personally have an income apart from my Parliamentary income, but such an opportunity is not available to many members. As spokesman for the Liberal Movement, the member for Mitcham made public statements about allowances for members of Parliamentary committees. The member for Mitcham believes that the question—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I draw the attention of the member for Kavel to the suggested amendments and consequential amendment before the Chair. This is not a discussion on the Bill: we are discussing the amendments and the consequential amendment.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: A certain amount of latitude was allowed the member for Mitcham and I point out he was not addressing himself to the substance of the amendments. His remarks were in general an attack on what could possibly become a salary determination for members of Parliament. I think it only reasonable that I should reply to the statements he made.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Is the member for Kavel reflecting on the Chair?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: No, Mr. Chairman. I am trying to put the record straight in relation to the remarks the member for Mitcham made. I should like to make a few comments on this and I will link them up with the salary determination.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the member for Kavel that, although certain remarks may have been made by the member for Mitcham during my attempts to call him to order, the matter before the Chair is the suggested amendments and the consequential amendment.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Mitcham made certain statements and tried to link them up, and I wish to do the same thing. The complete hypocrisy in the remarks of the member for Mitcham is so transparent that I believe in all honesty these things should be said. The member for Mitcham frequently neglects his Parliamentary duties to engage in his other activity, namely, his legal practice. He was recently absent from this House for three weeks.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot allow the honourable member for Kavel to proceed on those lines.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will refer to the amendments made by the Legislative Council. For the member for Mitcham to refer to Opposition members and to members generally as he did was completely misleading and false. He often neglects his Parliamentary duties in seeking additional income outside. The Liberal Movement policy has been quoted in relation to committee allowances paid to members, and it has been said that such duties should be part of their normal duties. The member for Mitcham, in his pursuit of activities outside, earns far more than do members of Parliamentary committees, and he neglects his Parliamentary duties far more than they do.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the question before the Chair.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If I have been out of order, I will come back to the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to confine himself to the amendments.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The amendments are not of great impact, but the member for Mitcham has tried to seize on them to say again what he has said previously. The import of the amendments is clear, but it is not only completely misleading and false to weave this fabric of mythology around them: it is completely hypocritical to do so. Doubtless, a salary determination will result from this measure, but for the honourable member to take the stance he has taken when he earns thousands of dollars outside his Parliamentary duties is completely hypocritical.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: Before the honourable member for Mitcham commences his remarks, I suggest that he keep to the Legislative Council's amendments and the consequential amendment before the Chair.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will do my best, although the Premier and the member for Kavel have said several things to which I should like to refer. I can only say that I am

what I am: I cannot change my personal circumstances for the purposes of this debate.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You should stay here each Wednesday evening, not go off to earn thousands of dollars somewhere else.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Kavel is correct in saying that I have another source of income.

Mr. Wells: You've got two other sources.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member for Mitcham to deal with the amendments and the consequential amendment before the Chair. Otherwise, I will have to take other action.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What I have said will not deter me from dealing as I see fit with the amendments before the Chair, and for that purpose I am in the same position as is any other member. I do not suppose any member of this place has precisely the same income as any other member.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Some members have the same incomes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Some may not have any other source of income and may not be members of Parliamentary committees, but few members would all be in precisely the same financial position, and to state that, because the financial position of members in this place differs, we are in some way debarred from debating salaries now is wrong.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The member for Kavel didn't suggest that: he said you were hypocritical.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He said that I should not take part in this debate, because I do not spend long enough here. The Party to which he belongs has endorsed a candidate to stand against me at the next election—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —and the honourable member can come out—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the honourable member continues to defy the Chair, Standing Order 169 will prevail and appropriate action will be taken. If the honourable member does not address himself to the amendments, I will take other action.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope I have got the message through to the member for Kavel. If he likes to try to persuade my constituents that I am not an appropriate member of this place, he can do that. That would be the correct way to deal with it instead of the way he has done. He said nothing else about the amendments on behalf of his Party. He offered no justification for the obvious support that will be given to them, following the lead given in another place.

I ask that I be allowed to comment on what the Premier has said about employees in the hospital maintenance branch of the Public Buildings Department and about the Government's actions. The Premier canvassed that. I may have tripped him into it, but you, Mr. Chairman, allowed me to do that. I want to put the record straight because I consider that that matter is relevant to a consideration of salary increases for members of Parliament. I have been told this morning that 40 men who have particularly unpleasant work to do in some of the institutions in this State have for four years been trying to get an allowance for doing that work. It was not until they went on strike that action was taken. Commissioner Stanton of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission awarded them \$8 a week.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is not speaking to the amendments.

Mr. Millhouse: It didn't matter when the Premier canvassed it!

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Only in reply to you.

Mr. Millhouse: That may be, but he didn't put all the facts.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I uphold the point of order taken by the honourable Minister and I ask the honourable member for Mitcham to confine his remarks to the amendments and the consequential amendment before the Chair.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope I get another opportunity to put the record straight on this matter, because the Premier did not leave it straight. Many people are angry because of what the Premier said yesterday about their claim for a paltry \$8 a week.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I rise on a point of order. I suppose that the best way to describe the honourable member is to say that he is doing a Willcox, and I ask that he be requested to obey Standing Orders.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has sought to address the Chair on the Legislative Council's amendments and the consequential amendment. He has had adequate latitude and opportunity to put his point of view. I ask him to confine himself to the amendments before the Chair and not to introduce other matters.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I certainly do not want to try your patience, Mr. Chairman. You have been tolerant, and I appreciate that, because this is a matter of high policy in this place and it cannot be discussed without reference to these things. The fact that the Minister has tried to shut me up on them shows that he is—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I warn the honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think I have probably said enough, anyway. I will get another opportunity, I hope, to canvass the matters with regard to those men. I oppose the amendments and sum up my position by saying that they, of themselves, will tend to increase the salaries of some members of Parliament, either actually or at some time in the future. That, I believe, in the present economic climate, is something we should not be doing at all. I believe that it is wrong to do this, and I do not believe that this Bill should pass this Parliament at this time. The only way now left for us to see that it does not pass is to vote against these amendments, thus causing a deadlock with the other House, in the hope that the Bill will be lost.

I ask for the support of members, particularly Opposition members, who have not addressed themselves to these amendments at all. No Opposition member spoke before I did. After I had spoken, the member for Kavel made a personal attack on me, but he did not attempt to justify these amendments or the Bill itself. I believe that our situation in Australia is so serious (and so much more serious now than it was four weeks ago) that we should not proceed with the Bill. I cannot say it any more plainly than that and I am not allowed (and I defer to you, Mr. Chairman, on this matter) to expand or expound on my reasons for that. I make my own protest and I am sure that, if the member for Goyder were present, he would join me in this matter. I ask Opposition members particularly, if not Government members, to have some resort to their own consciences and to vote against these amendments.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): The member for Mitcham has requested members to take certain action, but I make the contrary request that they not follow his request. The last time we debated a similar matter, the honourable member's request to the

Government was that a certain Bill be assented to on a date earlier than it would otherwise have been assented to so that the former member for Goyder would get the advantage of it. The honourable member has a very short memory: it was only a few months ago, and it involved a substantial change—

Mr. Goldsworthy: It meant a fair bit to the member for Goyder.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: —which was meant for the member for Goyder and not for any other members, whose overall salary position as a result of the Government's action has not altered since July 1, 1973. I hope that, if the honourable member is going to make the kinds of remark he makes, with the kind of air of great purity and honesty with which he carries on in the Chamber, he will set the record right on these matters. He acted in order to seek an advantage for a Party colleague only a few months ago. He has not said that, regarding members of this Parliament, unlike any other member of the community in this State, the salary and allowances (outside the committee changes) have not been adjusted since July 1, 1973, nor is it likely that they will be adjusted before the end of this year.

The honourable member tries to make a great point of restraint at this time, but he fails to point out that this Parliament is the only Parliament in Australia that has shown restraint, and fails to point out also that the members of this Parliament, as a result of showing that restraint, receive a basic salary which, I think, is \$1 600 below that of any other State and \$2 000 below that of all States other than Tasmania. The only reason why the salary is \$1 600 below that of Tasmania is that Tasmania's salaries are based on the average of the other States, but South Australia pulls Tasmania down.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable Minister to come back to the Bill.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but I am sick of what I regard to be the sheer humbug and outright hypocrisy of the member for Mitcham on this matter. He has not stated the matter clearly. I venture to suggest that we would be the only people who have not had any change in salary since July 1, 1973. I think that the protest should be made on behalf of members that do their job with honesty, sincerity and on a full-time basis, and that we should say to the people of South Australia that the member for Mitcham is making these remarks only because he sees a political advantage for the Liberal Movement. If he were still a member of the Liberal Party, his attitude would be different: he would get up in the House and justify the contrary point of view.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am conscious of the hostility and, indeed, the personal animosity which members of both sides show me at this moment, generated largely but not entirely, I guess, by this debate. The Minister of Education has, I think, accurately expressed the views of most other members towards me at this time. I hope that it will not last forever, but I am conscious of that now. It is not a situation I enjoy, but I am afraid that it is not going to make me change the view I hold on this matter. I am not going to be beaten into submission either by Opposition members (my former colleagues) or by Government members. I do not believe that the Bill is a right Bill.

I will make several points to put the record straight, after what the Minister has said. First, it is a long time since I opposed any rise in the salaries of members of Parliament. I remember that I did so when I first came into Parliament in those early years, say, 15 or more years ago. I have not since then, until now, opposed the rises,

and I do it now because I believe that this is a particularly inappropriate time to provide increases. I have justified what is being said outside in the community, and not one member has contradicted me. The Minister was correct in his details about my approach to the Government during the previous session of Parliament to ascertain whether the Bill would be assented to before the former member for Goyder resigned his seat. However, that incident concerned a superannuation Bill and not a salary Bill, and the economic situation in Australia then was nothing like it is now. I do not apologise for what I did and, as it turned out, what I did had no effect on the Government's actions. It seems that not one member on either side has debated the merits of the case in opposition I have put, and not one has justified what we are doing. The Minister of Education tried to justify it, and I give Liberal members one last chance to do this.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I rise not at the invitation of the member for Mitcham but to make what I consider to be pertinent points. I will not follow the course that has been grossly misrepresented by the member for Mitcham in relation to the amendments being discussed. Nothing in the Bill or the amendments will cause the tribunal to meet, as this will happen only when a decision is made by the tribunal or by a direction of the Government. No indication of any such proposal has been given. Voting for the amendments will bring into reality consideration by the tribunal of the work load that can be expected to be placed on members of the Council under a changed system. It seems that a difference of opinion has existed between the Premier and others who discussed the matter with him, including members of another place, particularly those who were not a party to the general discussion. This problem can be solved according to the procedures of this Chamber, and I will not be party to a hypocritical attack in a matter that was so misrepresented, by the member for Mitcham.

Question—"That the amendments of the Legislative Council and a consequential amendment be agreed to"—declared carried.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Divide!

While the division was being held:

The CHAIRMAN: As only one member is voting "No", I declare that the question is resolved in the affirmative. Motion carried.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (PETROLEUM) 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 November 19. Page 2040.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I oppose the Bill. How can the Treasurer say in this House or anywhere else that he has managed the State well and has had due regard to all the factors that exist? How he can say that he has had frank and profitable discussions with the Prime Minister on matters affecting the well-being of this State, and has received assurances from the Prime Minister that the Commonwealth will provide South Australia with additional funds to prevent legislation of this nature being introduced, is beyond me and anyone else who considers the matter. It must, therefore, be a

case of misrepresentation over a period of years. For the Treasurer to have suggested that the South Australian Government would not need to introduce further taxation measures (at a time when it was clear from Commonwealth Government announcements that no further funds would be made available to the States); to have tried in the Budget to tell South Australians and members of this place that it was not intended to increase State taxes and that there was to be a \$6 000 000 grant from the Commonwealth; to have had no regard for or made no comment on the failure of his own Government and his Ministers to read correctly the economic climate; to have a situation, where after the first two months of trading in one sector there is a deficit of more than \$4 000 000, after taking a certain decision only six or eight weeks previously, clearly indicates the failure of the Government to review correctly the affairs of the State.

To have implemented the various measures that the Government has implemented, and then to come before the House and say, "We did not realise the effects were going to be so great," shows just what little regard the Government gives its measures. Through gross over-spending and a constant refusal to adopt certain strictures, the Government has shown how hypocritical it is in its responsibility to the people of South Australia.

The Treasurer has consistently lambasted members on this side for saying that reductions should be made in some field or other and for not giving a lead, pointing out where the Government could cut back expenditure. He has attempted to suggest that we on this side would deny South Australians social welfare, education, and hospital facilities. That has never been or ever will be the case. In all areas we must look to the progress of State programmes and to the extent of extravagances that, although ultimately required, are not immediately necessary. I have said publicly and in this House several times that many areas exist where the Government could cut back on expenditure, whether it involves \$100, \$1 000 or \$100 000, because it would be meaningful in the long run. If public servants visiting other States on business went by economy class air travel instead of first class, it would reduce expenditure considerably.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Most public servants travel on economy air fares, you know.

Dr. EASTICK: A large number of officers of the Government do not travel economy class; and I could name two in the department of which the Minister is the Acting Minister who did not travel on economy class air fares between Adelaide and Melbourne last week.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That would apply only when the Commonwealth Government was paying the air fare or if the person concerned was director of a department.

Dr. EASTICK: Does it really make a difference whether people are directors or whether they are public servants?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You said a large number.

Dr. EASTICK: A considerable saving could be made if Ministers and their entourages (and I am in full accord with officers of Ministers' departments travelling with them for legitimate business reasons) travelled economy class. I question the need for the entourage that travels with the Treasurer when he goes politicking in other States. Let us not deny that public servants or people travelling at Government expense do travel with him when he is away for that purpose. There are numerous examples of this nature where we could come face to face with the realities of life. We have indicated a need for a massive reassessment of the Public Service, which has increased in size by more than

20 per cent in the past three years, and the position concerning day labour has been allowed to get out of hand, too.

I repeat that I am not attacking individuals in the system: I am attacking the system itself. How can we justify a situation in which people who are fortunate enough to have become members of the State Public Service should be viewed any differently from the rest of the community? If there are retrenchments in the outside sector and an obvious decrease in the work load in some Government areas, there is a need for retrenchment or relocation in the Public Service. Regarding day labor, obviously there is a need for a return to a proper contractual basis, whether for road building, public buildings, or major maintenance works. Until that situation is reached, the Government will continue to squander money. It is being hypocritical when it opposes the salary increases to the Police Force, for instance, or to any other group and when it seeks to take such matters back to the court. It is all very well for the Minister of Education to raise his eyebrows. I accept that the Government is no different from any other organisation in this sense, and can go back to the court in the same way as other organisations can. However, I deplore a situation in which so much emotion is engendered that affects the people in the centre (members of the Police Force on this occasion) by placing them in an invidious position. Double standards have been applied. Large sums of money have been spent on projects that have no earthly chance of completion for many years to come.

I fully support the idea of a master plan for the years ahead so that we may know where we are going. However, I ask the Government, for the remainder of its term of office, to consider seriously how far certain projects can be taken, when it is obvious from the economic and practical point of view that they cannot be fully implemented. I believe that Ministers should frankly assess their departments and subdepartments, providing for the full utilisation of staff in an effort to increase productivity. They should also have regard to the amount of work available to do. I differentiate between the possibility of productivity in situations where there is work to be done, and the lack of productivity that occurs when there is insufficient work to be done. For instance, we have heard about the massive decrease in land conveyancing, resulting in the fall in stamp duties. Has this meant a reduction in staff in departments that handle this work, or has staff been relocated in other departments? Are members of these staffs waiting for something to happen, when it is known that nothing will happen because of the depression in that sphere of business activity that has been fostered not only by the State Government but also by the actions of the Commonwealth Government?

The last thing any member of this House wants to see is unemployment. However, as I was forced to say when we were debating the Budget, the fact is that unemployment is increasing. Unemployment has largely been caused by the *ad hoc* implementation of beliefs rather than practical solutions by the Commonwealth Government. This Government supports the Commonwealth Government; in fact, on Friday of this week the Treasurer and the Prime Minister will be on the same platform telling the people of Queensland that they will do better with a Labor Administration. To say that is absolutely farcical. Only this morning, the Treasurer belatedly attacked the Prime Minister for an action he took in relation to our friends from the Baltic States.

The SPEAKER: Order! Although this Bill deals with financial matters so that some latitude is permissible in debate, this is not an open debate.

Dr. EASTICK: Often a sham attack has been made against the Commonwealth Government. Of course, no reference to this measure was made in the Treasurer's Budget speech. When the Budget went to the Upper House three weeks after it had been in this Chamber, new provisions had been inserted in it. Either the Government had suddenly seen the need for these measures or it had decided to deny members of this place the opportunity to debate them when the Budget was before us. However, at the time the Budget went to the Council, the Government had decided that it was in dire financial straits, that there had been a decrease in the liquidity of the State, and that there was a \$19 000 000 deficit after two months of trading. Reference was made to Commonwealth funding, as is so often the case.

However, when we receive funds from the Commonwealth, we are charged massive interest rates. There are tied grants under section 96 of the Commonwealth Constitution. Therefore, our own funds become tied up in supplementary expenditure on certain projects, so that this State is denied the opportunity of deciding the proper priority for projects. On top of this, we have the whole problem of inflation, which is beyond the capability of the present Commonwealth Government to control. In fact, the flame of inflation has been continually fanned by the financial programme of the Commonwealth Government; indeed, it has also been fanned by the programme of this Government. The Bill with which we are now dealing is an inflationary measure, following the trend of other measures referred to in the Budget. Charges in respect of motor vehicles, pay-roll tax, and areas of stamp duty have been increased. These measures continue to have an inflationary effect on the economy of the State.

On September 12, the newspapers reported the Treasurer as saying that there would be no boost to taxes in South Australia from petrol tax. He was trying to make political capital from the fact that Sir Robert Askin (who will soon hand over the role of Premier of New South Wales to Mr. Lewis, a former South Australian) was standing up for his State in refusing to bow to skulduggery by taking part in a Commonwealth scheme to which our Treasurer was a party. Sir Robert Askin would not lie down and accept the statements being made by the Prime Minister. In fact, New South Wales, Western Australian, Queensland, and Victoria have not accepted money for a land commission under the terms proposed by the Commonwealth Government, and I am told that Tasmania has not accepted it, either. Each State was told to get in on the act because it was the only one holding out. The Commonwealth Government and many of its State colleagues suggested that the people in the various States would miss out on massive sums of Commonwealth money because they could not see the light.

Dr. Tonkin: Gutter tactics.

Dr. EASTICK: Simple gutter tactics! That is only one example of gutter tactics being used. Sir Robert Askin refused to be intimidated by the Commonwealth Government and introduced a petrol tax. The Treasurer of this State, for political reasons, castigated him for doing so and said he was going to introduce a much better tax and he would have no part in a petrol tax. Obviously the situation has changed because this Bill introduces a petrol tax which it is freely admitted is based on the New South Wales measure. Earlier this afternoon the member for Florey asked me to send to Sir Robert Askin a petition I presented containing almost 62 500 signatures which had not been solicited by someone running around obtaining signatures: they were obtained from people coming forward over a

period of 12 days. I have been informed that tomorrow I will be able to present to this House a petition containing over 11 000 names of people in another group who oppose this legislation. It is admitted that some people signed the petition after being asked to do so, but many people asked to sign it. The number of signatures on these petitions shows how many people in the community are against this measure. It is an indication of the way people feel about the Government, and they have taken the opportunity of expressing themselves to Parliament in a practical way. Even so, the member for Florey wanted to make a farce of it and suggested the petition should be forwarded to Sir Robert Askin. It is forwarded to the members of Parliament in this House asking us to face reality and recognise the fact that we will extricate ourselves from the difficult financial situation in which we find ourselves only when we start to look at priorities and do a day's work for a day's pay, putting value in the dollar.

This Bill is a better measure than the one applying in New South Wales because it is more concise. It is based on the Dennis hotel scheme whereby a charge will apply to those products which are not going to be resold but will not apply to those being passed on to another wholesaler or retailer. This method has been tried and proved to be successful in other fields. It also attempts to reduce the administration that would otherwise be involved by not pricing every gallon of petrol or kerosene or every kilogram of grease. There will be given figures for these products and all charges to be made under the Bill will be based on those figures. I commend that aspect of the Bill because it shows a sense of reality, compared to what could otherwise be a monumental build-up of paperwork.

Whilst accepting that some aspects of the Bill are sensible, it is a Bill which is oppressive to the South Australian people. This Bill would not be necessary if we received from the Commonwealth Government the sums we justly deserve. I believe we should be addressing ourselves to the following motion:

That this Parliament condemn the Commonwealth Government for its complete failure adequately to provide funds to the States, and in particular to South Australia, and call on the Commonwealth Government to either forthwith meet its financial promises or resign.

I believe most South Australian people would want the second course so that the Commonwealth Liberal and Country Party Coalition could set about making the funds available for Australia's progress and to Australians' advantage.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I oppose the Bill and support the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition. We were given only 24-hours notice of the details of this Bill, which affects every family and business undertaking in this State. We are always ready to challenge the Government and we are particularly ready to do so in relation to this Bill. Members of my Party are going to join in the fray because we believe that it is such a serious matter that it must be debated here and now in order to expose the complete sham of this Government and its colleagues in Canberra and the effects it is having on the welfare of the people of this country, especially in South Australia.

I do not care what is going on in other States because, whatever it is, it was brought about for the same reasons as apply to this Bill, but that is no excuse for us to keep referring to what is happening in other States. This financial measure, imposing an increase of 6c a gallon on petroleum products, was not mentioned in the Budget. Every person using a motor vehicle in this State will be affected. It will also affect fishermen, professionals or

amateurs, and it will affect rural producers who use their tractors, as well as affecting weekend motorists, motor cyclists or anyone at all who buys a petroleum product. This will be the biggest single slug the taxpayers of South Australia have had to face. That is this Bill which the Government is asking us to accept. Although it has been stated that 6c a gallon may not mean much to some people, the Treasurer has said that the tax will bring \$19 000 000 into the Treasury coffers in one year.

Mr. Mathwin: That's one of his crude guesses, I would say.

Mr. COUMBE: I agree with my colleague; indeed, some of the Government's guesses in budgetary measures have been worse than crude. However, I can only accept the figures given by the Treasurer, and about 24 hours ago he said that the tax would bring in that amount.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You said you wouldn't accept that.

Mr. COUMBE: I cast grave doubts on it, because of the Government's mistakes and because of how haywire things have gone since the Budget was introduced.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You're reflecting on Treasury officials, are you?

Mr. COUMBE: I am not, and I do not do that: I am attacking the Government and the Treasurer. The Minister cannot put those words into my mouth. I am attacking the Labor Government of this State and the Labor Government in Canberra. This State Government has shown an appalling lack of financial judgment. It has shown that in its financial measures, commencing with the Budget this year and following on in other financial matters. The linchpin of the Revenue Budget was the \$6 000 000 in additional funds that he expected to get from his Commonwealth colleagues to enable him to achieve a certain result. That infamous figure has been repeated many times.

The whole Budget dealt with promises by the Commonwealth Government of money from that source, and those promises have been broken more than once. A few weeks after he introduced the Budget, the Treasurer said that we would not get the \$6 000 000. The only interpretation that we can put on that is that it was a broken promise by his buddy-buddy who at the weekend will be with him on the election platform in Queensland. The Treasurer has stated in his explanation of the Bill that he will not put the measure into operation if the Commonwealth Government comes to the party and provides funds. Can anyone treat that statement seriously, after the treatment the Government has received from its counterpart in Canberra?

Our Government is completely naive in its expectations about receiving money from Canberra. Since I have been a member of this Parliament, I have never known of so much trust being placed in promises, with those promises being broken time and time again. Perhaps undertakings have been given on social or formal occasions, but they have been broken. This Government has been completely inept in the way it looks on Father Christmas in Canberra.

I refer now to another serious aspect of the Bill. Last May, the Commonwealth Government laughed at Bill Snedden's prediction that inflation in this country would reach 20 per cent. I think it was the present Prime Minister who said that we were over the hill, that things would get better, and that the inflation rate would decrease. However, we find now that inflation will reach 30 per cent, and this Bill will help inflation along the road in affecting South Australia. What has happened to Australia that requires us to consider a Bill such as this? Most members will remember the book *The Lucky Country*,

which was published a few years ago. I think it was cited by the present Minister of Development and Mines when he was a back-bencher.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: No, that doesn't sound like my language.

Mr. COUMBE: That book was written before the Labor Party came into Government in Canberra in 1972, but what has happened since? The need to consider a Bill of this kind is a tragedy. In itself, it will generate inflation.

Mr. Gunn: Mr. Hawke said this afternoon that 300 000 would be unemployed after Christmas.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes. This Bill will give inflation the biggest impetus that it can get. How many promises will be broken? The Treasurer has said that he will not put this legislation into operation if the Commonwealth Government comes to the party, but we are not likely to get more money from that Government, having regard to how it has been going recently. The Treasurer has also said that there will be further imposts on tobacco. Whether one smokes is beside the point, but it seems that that promise will not be broken!

The Government will be setting up a business franchise tribunal to deal not only with petroleum but also with tobacco. What else will the Government seek after that? I do not think that there are many other revenue-raising areas left. I have examined the Tasmanian legislation and its effects on the community there. Who will be affected in South Australia? Normally the type of high taxation measures introduced by a Socialist or an Australian Labor Party Government hits the tall poppies. However, this Bill will hit not only the tall poppies but also the member of every family, be it man, woman or child, who uses a motor vehicle. The man who drives his vehicle to work will be hit; the person who uses public transport will also be hit by the probable fare increase; and the man who earns his living by using his vehicle, whether he be a primary producer or a fisherman using a boat, will also be hit.

Mr. Nankivell: Particularly the primary producer: he cannot last long, whereas the others can.

Mr. COUMBE: The average man in the street and his wife will be caught by the effects of the Bill. As this legislation has been introduced by a Government that professes to be the friend and champion of the little man, how hypocritical can it get? The Bill is mainly a Committee Bill, and it is in Committee that its detail will be discussed. My local petrol reseller first of all must pay a \$50 licence fee.

Mr. Venning: He'll be happy about that, won't he?

Mr. COUMBE: Oh, yes! He will also be taxed 10 per cent on his gross sales, and this tax, amounting to about 6c a gallon will have to be passed on to the consumer. One can well imagine the amount of paper work in which the average reseller of petrol will be involved. Some petrol resellers, scratching for a living, now work all kinds of hours between 6 a.m. and 6 p.m. The Opposition immediately challenges the Government's attitude in imposing this extra slug on the community. I assure the Government that public resentment is really building up, and the Bill is just another measure that will feed the fire of resentment against the Administrations both here and in Canberra. It will be no good this Government going to its Commonwealth colleagues to be rescued. It tried that before, and it was left to find its own way out of its difficulties. The only way we can get out of the mess we are in is for the Commonwealth Government to resign and for us to have a little more common sense back in this country.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I oppose the Bill, which is probably one of the most obnoxious measures we have been asked to consider in the life of this Parliament and during the term of the present Government.

Mr. Wright: What tax would you impose?

Mr. BECKER: If we had more efficiency in administration it would be unnecessary to sack anyone. I would use sheer common sense and business practice, both of which qualities are completely absent from the front bench and from most Government members. Then, we would not be considering such a Bill as the one now before us. For many years, I have asked the Government why it did not try to balance its Budget, but it seems to me that it is not this Government's policy to bring down a balanced Budget or even to try to do it because, as soon as it has surplus funds, it finds a way of spending them. We generally get such a request in March of each financial year but, by the way inflation is now running, the Government will benefit in some taxation areas. The tax we are now considering is an inflationary tax. It has been estimated that the Revenue Account could at present be showing a deficiency of about \$36 000 000; perhaps it will even exceed \$40 000 000.

If the Government has got itself into that ludicrous situation it must do something, but why should the average man in the street be taxed on a commodity that is probably essential to him, because of our lack of good public transport, because of the inefficiency of our public transport system, and because of the way the Government controls it? We are being asked to consider a tax that will amount to about 6c a gallon. The Treasurer has said that this legislation will bring about \$9 000 000 to Revenue Account this financial year. This means that the first quarterly payment will be made in mid-March, 1975, and the second quarterly payment in July, 1975. So, the Revenue Account could benefit by about \$9 000 000 this financial year and, in a full financial year, it could benefit by about \$19 000 000.

The Bill pays no regard to conserving fuel in the State, so people will therefore go on using as much petrol as they want to use. Most people will be forced to pay this tax through no fault of their own, and the Government has no mandate for introducing this tax. Small wonder that, in 12 days, the Royal Automobile Association of South Australia Incorporated and one other organisation have been able to collect about 73 000 signatures on petitions objecting to this obnoxious tax. I believe that the Treasurer and his Government have lost all credibility because they have stooped so low as to introduce this legislation.

We know about the broken promises of the Commonwealth Government, and the present tax is the price we have to pay for the so-called luxury of a Socialist State. This legislation may involve legal difficulties. It has been said that it provides for a licence for a tax on fuel but, in fact, it is a turnover tax in relation to service stations. In reply to a question I asked on September 13, the Treasurer said that he did not intend to introduce this type of tax, although it had been suggested in New South Wales. When I recently asked the Treasurer why he had changed his mind and whether this meant that his word was no longer his bond, he began to answer my question in a round-about way with his usual prima donna manner, but there were interjections and that was the end of the matter.

That is the type of treatment Opposition members receive in this Chamber, and it has been demonstrated again this afternoon. Few people crowd the gallery or read *Hansard*, so that many are not aware of the happenings in

this House, but the message is loud and clear in the community at present, and I assure the Government that Opposition members will tell the community of the broken promises and the way elected representatives are treated by the Treasurer in this House. The Treasurer treats the Opposition with contempt and that seems to be his attitude in handling his portfolio. However, taxpayers are becoming sick and tired of having to meet extra taxes in order to pay for some of the airy-fairy schemes initiated by the Treasurer, particularly in this financial year.

Although this Government is trying to build up a model Socialist State, those who depend on social welfare are not receiving the benefits they should receive. The whole concept of a model Socialist State has failed dismally, and this Government is proving to be the most expensive that has been in power in this State. Indirect taxation has increased by 258 per cent.

On October 29, in Question Time, I asked whether the Government was aware of the problems that faced service station proprietors, as the average service station had between \$7 000 and \$8 000 in trade debts a month and I said that, although about 70 per cent of the debtors paid what was due within 30 days, the remaining payments were spread over 45 to 60 days. I suggested to the Government that, when the price of petrol had been increased by 3c, a tremendous liquidity problem had been created for service station owners, and the same situation will apply with this new tax. Working on the estimate that an average account is paid within 30 days, the proprietors will not receive their income until two or three months later, and will be compelled to carry a large part of the new tax.

Mr. Venning: Do you think they will get a commission for collecting the money for the Government?

Mr. BECKER: No, but they will be slugged for not paying the tax and will be penalised by having to do additional book work. Service station proprietors will also be abused by motorists who have to pay this increased tax. The first income from the new tax of about \$4 500 000 is due in March, and about \$2 000 000 may have to be carried by service station proprietors. To take that amount of liquidity away from service station businesses will create problems, and many service stations will have to seek financial help by borrowing working capital. If many businesses apply to banks for this help, someone must suffer.

It could also mean that banks may experience further liquidity problems about March or April next year, when the crunch will come in regard to the economic situation in this country. If inflation continues at its present high rate of about 30 per cent, additional problems will be created. I hope that that will not be the rate, but someone must take a realistic approach to solve this problem. It is also interesting to realise that the Government has estimated it will cost about \$170 000 to collect this tax. A new department will not be created.

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

Mr. BECKER: I hope that personnel from within the Public Service will be transferred into the new section that will administer the tax rather than people from outside being employed. The cost of administering the new tax will not be great, however. The poor old South Australian motorist is the one who always suffers. This State is proud of its car manufacturing industry; I suppose that is one of the reasons we depend so much on private motor vehicles. It is interesting to note that Governments are finding that if they wish to raise large sums of additional revenue they

can further tax the motorist. Man is an independent animal; his greatest form of independence is his wheels, and a motor vehicle gives him that independence.

Since June, 1970, the registration fee of a four-cylinder Holden Torana has increased from \$17 to \$25; the registration fee of a six-cylinder Holden Kingswood (or its equivalent) rose in the same period from \$32 to \$47; comprehensive insurance has risen from \$86 to \$141; on a smaller car comprehensive insurance has risen from \$86 to \$126; third party insurance, including stamp duty, has risen from \$13.50 to \$60; and the cost of a licence to drive a motor vehicle has risen from \$2 to \$5. The price of standard grade petrol, in June, 1970, was 38.2c a gallon; at the end of June, 1970, it had increased to 39.2c a gallon; and, when I obtained these figures in October, 1974, it was 55.7c a gallon. The price of super grade petrol on June 1, 1970, was 42c a gallon; at the end of June, 1970, it was 43c a gallon; and today it is 59.1c a gallon. That is a tremendous increase in the basic cost that a motorist is required to meet.

The number of private sedans and station sedans registered in South Australia at June, 1970, was 366 765, whereas in October, 1974, there were 453 402 vehicles. The number of commercial vehicles in June, 1970, was 84 017, whereas in October, 1974, it was 91 340. South Australia has about 524 000 motor vehicles on its roads, vehicles that would consume considerable quantities of petrol; that is all the more reason why this tax affects a high percentage of the community. In June, 1970, South Australia had 525 691 licence holders who could drive motor vehicles, and in October, 1974, the number had increased to 610 870. When one considers industry costs, affected by wages paid to service station proprietors, panel beaters, and other enterprises, one sees that wages on January 1, 1971, were \$59.40 a week, and on September 23, 1974, the figure was \$105.60, which reflects a tremendous increase in all costs—costs that have to be passed on to the motorist. Now the motorist is to be hit with this new tax.

In the political column of this evening's *News* it is stated that certain people have said that L.C.L. Premier Sir Thomas Playford was the greatest Labor Premier the Liberals ever produced. Today, in business circles, Don Dunstan is being called the greatest Liberal Premier the Labor Party has ever produced. That is the greatest load of cods wallop I have ever heard. I cannot see how a Liberal Premier would stoop so low as to tax the life's blood out of the very people who put him in Government, particularly when that same Government cannot provide the worker with transport to his employment, making him use his own motor vehicle, and hitting him with the enormous costs to which I have referred. The Premier and Treasurer of South Australia has been dancing around like a prima donna on behalf of the business community, whether commercial or industrial, saying he is going to introduce the measure. He has also written frantic letters to the Prime Minister, but we do not know whether he has received an acknowledgement, let alone an official reply.

Mr. Venning: Do you think he really writes the letters?

Mr. BECKER: Copies of the letters have not been tabled in the House, so we have to take his word for it. When the Treasurer introduced the legislation, I thought he was struggling to justify his action because in his second reading explanation he was making apologies as he went along.

Mr. Gunn: He's one big apology.

Mr. BECKER: It is all part of the show that this State and the Commonwealth are the pace-setters of Australia. The Treasurer said in his explanation that he believed he had an undertaking from the Commonwealth that additional

financial assistance would be provided, and therefore included \$6 000 000 in the Revenue Budget for 1974-75 and provided for a deficit of \$12 000 000. That Commonwealth assistance has not eventuated. It is not the first time the Treasurer has made statements about his believing he had an undertaking from the Commonwealth. One would think that, with his legal background (and I know his old partnership is under challenge), he would get an undertaking in writing. The Treasurer came before the House, when presenting the Budget, and said he believed he had an undertaking.

South Australians will give the Government an undertaking in writing by going to the ballot box; there will be no worries next election because the Government does not have a mandate for this legislation and will not get one in future. It is high time the Treasurer stopped referring to the Commonwealth's undertaking and faced the reality that, if he could not get something in writing, he should take other measures.

Dr. Tonkin: He could resign.

Mr. BECKER: Yes. Moreover, some of his Ministers have been discredited in the last 18 months or so, but it is like pouring water on a duck's back to refer to that. Until we can get through to the people of South Australia that the Government is incompetent, they will have to pay for their folly at the 1973 election. What worries me even more is the statement by the Treasurer that the impact of these increases can be related to a down-turn in revenue to the State in respect of stamp duty and other forms of taxation and the difficulty of holding expenditure to the Budget figure. One would have thought that, when the Budget was presented, the Treasurer would have sufficient foresight to realise that it would be difficult to remain within that Budget. I cannot see why this State cannot keep within its Budget, for in some areas the Commonwealth Government has curbed expenditure, such as in the area of airport safety. At present, work is being undertaken at the Adelaide Airport. To the inconvenience of residents living at West Beach Road, Netley, trucks are driving up and down at all hours.

The SPEAKER: Order! Although this is a financial measure, the debate is not as open as a Budget debate.

Mr. BECKER: I am saying that, although the State is having difficulty holding expenditure within the Budget, the Commonwealth Government is saving expenditure in the case to which I am referring. Because these trucks cannot be rerouted an extra kilometre, as this would cost more money, residents of this area are disturbed throughout the evening. The Treasurer has also said:

Whilst that is the invidious situation that now faces the State, the Government is nevertheless concerned at the clear inflationary effect of this Bill, and is deeply conscious of the anomalous position into which it is being forced.

We should like the Treasurer to make that statement when he visits Queensland for the election campaign there. He should then say that the Commonwealth Government has forced him to introduce this highly inflationary legislation. However, there is no way in the world that we will see this reported in the media. On October 21, the same day that it was announced that the petrol tax would be introduced in South Australia, on the bottom part of the same page of the newspaper a headline stated that inflation had hit a record 21.6 per cent.

Mr. McAnaney: That lasted only a month.

Mr. BECKER: Yes, now we find that Commonwealth Treasury officials are warning that inflation could reach a rate of 30 per cent. The Treasurer continued:

It is regrettably a somewhat complex enactment, but this complexity largely arises from the constitutional restraints

within which this State, in common with the other States, is obliged to legislate in this field.

We keep coming back to the reference to legislation in New South Wales. At this stage, there is no such legislation anywhere else in the Commonwealth, and we know of none that is contemplated. The whole point is that we could be one of the odd States out in this respect. Therefore, from the Commonwealth point of view this will create problems. It is all very well to say that this tax will add 6c a gallon to the price of petrol, but the price of so many other products will also be affected.

Mr. Gunn: He should be thoroughly ashamed of himself.

Mr. BECKER: This is the type of legislation that has no consideration for the people. This Government raised no objection when the Commonwealth Labor Government imposed the tax of 9.09c a gallon on liquefied petroleum gas. The collection of that gas tax is one of the biggest jokes this country has seen. A person must tell the Customs and Excise Department that his vehicle has been converted to the use of l.p.g. Each month, he must fill in a form, remitting by cheque the equivalent of the amount of tax due on the fuel he has purchased. Thank God the South Australian taxpayer will not be put in that sort of situation. As this Bill is complicated legislation, it will be far better dealt with in Committee.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mitcham.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): It is rather interesting on an important occasion such as this that the Leader of the Liberal Movement is out earning his supplementary income. This evening we are dealing with the credibility of a Government that should be ashamed of itself.

Mr. Crimes: We're only propping up your system.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members not to let their blood pressure build up on such a hot evening as this.

Mr. GUNN: It is interesting to gauge the attitude of the few members opposite who have even bothered to come into the House.

Mr. Max Brown: We knew you were speaking.

The SPEAKER: Order! In all seriousness, I call the attention of the honourable member for Eyre to the fact that statements such as the statement he has just made are referred to in Standing Orders, which I will be tempted to apply if he continues in that way.

Mr. GUNN: Thank you, Sir; I will not pursue that line. This measure will cause great hardship to the people of the State, as it is entirely inflationary. All sections of the community that cannot pass on costs will be affected. The Bill will have a disastrous effect on country people and on rural industry; it is a shameful piece of legislation. The Treasurer and his comrade in arms the Prime Minister must bear the full responsibility for the disaster they have inflicted on this country. I will reflect on that fateful occasion in November, 1972, when the Prime Minister announced his policy. He can be described only as a deceitful gentleman and political rogue of the worst kind.

Mr. Crimes: How can he be a gentleman and a rogue?

Mr. GUNN: I said he was a political rogue. On that occasion, he asked:

Do you believe that Australia can afford another three years like the last 20 months?

One would think he was referring to his own Administration. He continued:

Are you prepared to maintain at the head of your affairs a coalition which has lurched into crisis after crisis?

Have we not had crises over the last few months? The present Commonwealth Government does not even know whom it wants as Treasurer.

Dr. Tonkin: It knows whom it wants, but it cannot get rid of the other one.

The SPEAKER: Order! During the course of this debate, I have pointed out that the Chair recognises that we are dealing with a measure affecting the economy and financial matters. However, this is not an absolutely open debate, such as the Budget debate, in which any matter at all can be dealt with. Honourable members must link their remarks to this Bill.

Mr. GUNN: Of course, I abide by your ruling, Sir. However, when the Treasurer explained the Bill he went to some lengths to express his disappointment at the fact that the Prime Minister and the Commonwealth Government had refused to honour their obligations. The Commonwealth Government refused to supply the funds necessary for the State to maintain its services and fulfil its constitutional functions. I was reminding the House and, I hope, some people in this State of the Prime Minister's statement when he was telling the people what he had in store for them, and I was referring to the lengths to which he went to deceive them. In 1972, he said:

Will you again entrust the nation's economy to the men who deliberately, but needlessly, created Australia's worst unemployment for 10 years? Or to the same men who have presided over the worst inflation for 20 years?

Today Mr. Hawke has predicted that 300 000 will be unemployed next year.

Mr. Crimes: That's not because of the Labor Government: that's because of your system.

Mr. GUNN: The faults and problems inherent in this legislation have not been caused by a free enterprise system. That system enhances the rights of the individual and protects people against the tyranny that the member for Spence would thrust on them. It does him and his colleagues little credit to make such wild allegations. Why does not the honourable member support his Treasurer this evening? He, like his colleagues, is ashamed to do that. I challenge him to speak in this debate. What about the member for Stuart and the junior Minister, who is the only Minister in the House at present?

Regarding this measure and the reasons why it has been introduced, one can only conclude that it has been brought about by the sheer incompetence of Socialist Governments. The Commonwealth Government has received huge amounts of revenue but has refused to give money back to the elected State Governments. Those State Governments have as much right to the taxpayers' money as has the Commonwealth Government, and the State Governments should have adequate funds so that they can discharge their responsibility. On September 25 this year, in a good speech, Sir Robert Askin said:

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

This is a scandalous situation. The Bill before us is expected to yield about \$19 000 000 in a year, but has the Treasurer considered the serious consequences of it on every section of the community? I ask the member for Spence whether he will tell the House the serious effects that the legislation will have on the people of the State.

Mr. Crimes: Of course I will.

Mr. GUNN: If the member for Spence calms down, I will put some suggestions to him. Labor Party circles have never heard of efficiency or value for money, nor have they considered priorities for projects. Regardless of how much taxation they raise or how much money the central Government gives them, Socialist Governments never have enough money. They want to engage in irresponsible spending programmes and they never consider the effects of taxation measures on the people. They have never heard of asking people to do a decent day's work for a decent day's pay. They hate the private sector and want to destroy it.

Mr. Crimes: It's destroying itself.

Mr. GUNN: One of the biggest problems about the Revenue Budget is the present deficit of the South Australian Railways. As I have said previously, the interest charges ought to be scrapped. We must get rid of the deficit in at least three years, and we on this side are pledged to do something about that. We will not shirk our responsibilities, because we believe that there must be responsibility in management. We will apply that to the South Australian Railways. We have the courage of our convictions and the policies and the people to carry them out. Why does the Treasurer always stand behind the shallow argument of whom would we sack and in what departments would we cut down? We will prove to the Treasurer that we have the courage and capacity to administer. The voters should remove most of the Government members at the first opportunity they have.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must come back to the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Clause 10 might be termed a Gestapo clause, because it gives an inspector power to enter any business or premises. As many service stations are attached to residences, under the terms of the Bill an inspector will have the right to enter the private residence of any occupier. This is a disgraceful set of circumstances, which this House or any democratic body should not tolerate. The Government stresses the right of privacy yet, under the legislation, it will allow that right to be abused. There is no greater privacy than that associated with a person's home. I refer the member for Spence, who claims to be a democrat, to the Fisheries Act, 1971, section 12 (6) of which provides:

This section does not authorise an inspector to enter any premises or to exercise in residential premises any power conferred by subsection (1) of this section unless—

- (a) the occupier of those premises consents to such entry and exercise of powers; or
- (b) the inspector has obtained from a justice a warrant under subsection (7) of this section.

This Bill should include a similar provision, otherwise it makes a mockery of privacy. In fact, the Bill should be tossed out in the second reading stage, and the people of this State would be saved much hardship. Clause 4 deals with the licences. As we will have nine different licences, a great bureaucracy will have to be set up, and that will be difficult to organise.

Mr. Keneally: It will be interesting to see your amendments.

Mr. GUNN: That is an admission that the Bill is bad. I oppose the Bill outright. If the Government is so inefficient and discredited, the Opposition should be allowed to govern.

Mr. Crimes: You haven't said a single constructive thing yet.

Dr. Tonkin: Yes he has: resign!

Mr. Crimes: That's not constructive.

Mr. GUNN: The Bill provides:

A "class 9 licence" means a licence that authorises the licensee to carry on at the premises specified in the licence the business of selling, at the premises specified in the licence, petroleum products not manufactured by him and not manufactured at those premises and to sell them only to persons who are not licensees.

The worst aspect is that not only must a reseller obtain a licence and pay a fee ranging from \$50 to \$500: he must also pay 10 per cent on his fuel turnover. What justification has the Government for inflicting a \$50 licence fee on a small proprietor? Such people are experiencing grave economic problems at present. Workmen's compensation has had a detrimental effect on them yet they must pay at least \$50 for a licence to operate their premises. Is that democratic justice? I think it is disgraceful. They must already pay a fee to register their business name, and that is bad enough, yet these people, who work long hours in difficult circumstances, will also have to pay a licence fee.

Mr. Crimes: They have to work under the domination of the oil companies.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member is so obsessed with his Socialist policies that he is the victim of his own propaganda. How much will the legislation cost the taxpayers of the State? We are dealing with a serious situation, trying to balance the Budget, and to pay for the huge deficit this State will suffer as a result of the Prime Minister's refusal to provide certain funds. What concerns me greatly is that people who use their tractors and machinery will have to pay this tax on diesel and petrol, and this will have a disastrous effect on primary producers. I ask the member for Spence, the Treasurer, and other Government members to justify why such people should have to pay this tax when they are making a living by operating machinery that uses fuel. If we must have this legislation, I believe that these people should be exempted from its provisions. Industry will pay a double tax; for example, people engaged in the road haulage industry, who already pay a ton-mile tax, will now be caught for a second time. If the Government finds it necessary to impose the present tax, it should abolish the road maintenance tax immediately. Government members seem not to have heard about efficiency. We as a Government would encourage efficiency, but any inefficiency in the Public Service is not the fault of public servants: those in charge must bear the responsibility.

Mr. Keneally: You said the Public Service was inefficient.

Mr. GUNN: No, I did not: I said we would improve efficiency.

Mr. Keneally: Would you name the areas of the Public Service that are inefficient?

Mr. GUNN: I have named the South Australian Railways, and my argument can be supported by the Lees report which made many recommendations, but the Government has not had the guts to implement practically any of those recommendations. One can only conclude that the attacks and sham front that the Treasurer has displayed in his relations with the Prime Minister are nothing more than a set programme, part of which has been drawn up to centralise all power in this country.

Mr. Crimes: You sound like the League of Rights.

Mr. GUNN: The Treasurer has written to the Prime Minister allegedly complaining about the shabby deal he has received, and he has promised to table those letters. As we have not seen them, I ask the Treasurer to table the letters tomorrow so that members can read them. However, he must accept full responsibility for the shabby deal he has received from the Prime Minister, because he is part of the same machine. He travelled around Australia with the Prime Minister asking people to elect Gough Whitlam, but now he has been caught in his own trap: he would resign if he were honest. This is a deplorable measure, and I implore Government members to consider Government priorities in a time of national emergency. We must be willing to curtail expenses—

Mr. Langley: Where?

Mr. GUNN: The Government cannot continue to play Father Christmas all the time, and it should cut down on some of its wild and outlandish expenditure.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I totally oppose this measure, and members can imagine the effect it will have in my district. This measure has been necessary because of poor management and the philosophies of the Government. With its socialistic philosophy, the Government has never learned to manage finances, and that situation has been proved many times through the years. Periodically, people elect a Socialist Government and, eventually, financial disaster follows. It is time that this Labor Government (and especially the Commonwealth Labor Government) learned to live within its means, and obtain value for the dollar. This Government must get value for the dollar in its approach to capital works. Instead of undertaking capital works with inefficient methods, the Government should allow these works to be done by private enterprise under a system in which the work is let out on contract and the contractor has to comply with the terms of that contract.

At present we have no idea of the cost of any project, yet the taxpayer must pay for it. We are over-legislated for in this State, and most of the legislation introduced since 1970 imposes a fee of some sort. It has been suggested that the inflationary trend is world-wide, but in Australia, from a static inflationary rate that reached between 4 per cent and 5 per cent under a Liberal Country Party Government in office for about 20 years, we have seen the rate rise to almost 30 per cent. Economists throughout the world agree that a rate of about 20 per cent creates an impossible situation in which no economic community can survive. Government members keep asking what can be done. We hear a continual call from this Government and the Commonwealth Government for primary producers and small businesses to become more efficient. Has the Government ever considered applying that philosophy to its own affairs and to the running of the State?

Mr. Keneally: It's easy to say that.

Mr. ARNOLD: Members of the Government have never run anything in their lives, let alone a small business enterprise or primary-producing undertaking. Let us be honest; the majority of small business men in Australia have to run their businesses efficiently. The Government compels them to become more efficient, or they will go out of business. Most business men and primary producers recognise this and work on this basis. What a complete farce! During the last week the Industries Assistance Commission has been taking evidence at Berri in relation to the grapegrowing industry. This measure will have a crippling effect on all small businesses and

primary-producing operations throughout the State, but the Government continually calls for more efficiency, when it should be looking for more efficiency itself. Previous Labor Governments have failed in the same way. Socialist philosophies do not provide for efficiency.

Mr. Crimes: You can't put it into operation.

Mr. ARNOLD: The Labor Government would not know how to put it into operation. Governments must provide an incentive, which is something Socialist philosophies do not allow. People must receive a just reward for their efforts. If they do not, we shall not have value put back into the dollar. This evening we are being asked to support a measure that has been introduced to try to keep the Government in South Australia solvent. It is a substantial measure that will net the Government about \$19 000 000 a year. I can remember sitting on the other side of the House in the period 1968-70, when we introduced one or two small measures to raise \$1 000 000 or \$2 000 000, and the present Minister of Education and the Minister of Transport (then members of the Opposition) were highly critical of those small taxation measures. This measure will net \$19 000 000, but the Government does not turn a hair and expects members of the Opposition to support it.

That is totally out of the question. It is ludicrous that we should be debating a measure such as this. This Government, because of its philosophies, is faced with an enormous deficit this financial year, and it is incredible that people of South Australia and Australia have supported Labor Governments for as long as they have. Labor Governments can rest assured that, at the next State and Commonwealth elections, people will revert to a safe, sound philosophy where individual effort is justly rewarded. Until we reach that objective the country will continue to deteriorate financially, and problems will increase. The philosophy expounded by the present Government has not worked in other countries of the world and will not work here.

Mr. Crimes: Neither has yours.

Mr. ARNOLD: Socialist philosophy has never worked and never will.

Mr. Crimes: Where has yours worked—in the United States of America?

Mr. ARNOLD: More progress has been made under a free enterprise system. Within the last month the Deputy Prime Minister has been in America trying to convince American people to invest in Australia.

Mr. Crimes: Not the American people; big business organisations.

Mr. ARNOLD: What an incredible about-face! The Commonwealth Government is trying to convince Americans to reinvest in Australia when, for 20 years under a Liberal and Country Party Coalition Government, we had steady development in Australia, a stable economy and, what is more, an inflation rate of about 5 per cent compared to 30 per cent at present. The member for Spence referred to America and its inflation rate of about 11 per cent, certainly not 30 per cent as it is in Australia at present.

Mr. Crimes: It has 84 000 automobile workers out of work.

Mr. ARNOLD: No-one in Australia is more disillusioned or disenchanted with the performances of the Commonwealth and State Labor Governments than the President of the Australian Labor Party (Mr. Hawke). Whether he likes it or not, he has almost reached the point where he

accepts that the Socialist philosophy is not all he thought it would be. It is a theory that, when put into practice, does not work.

Mr. Crimes: It has never been put into practice in Australia, and you know it.

Mr. ARNOLD: It is a theory that people have tried to put into practice for many years, but it has never worked and never will, because it does not consider the human element; it tries to put people in the same category as machines, sheep or other animals, when, in fact, each human being has a different ambition or aim in life. Let us now look at the effects of this impost on the primary-producing industries of this country: the wine, citrus, dried fruits, and grain industries, all of which are exporting industries. The wine industry is not a large exporting industry. However, this country exports substantial quantities of citrus, dried fruits, grain, wool, and other products. If we have an inflation rate of 30 per cent and the average inflation rate throughout the world is 10 per cent, how on earth can we sell products on the world market? Until members opposite recognise this point, we will continue to get into greater financial strife each year.

If the member for Spence can tell me other countries in the world which have an inflation rate of 30 per cent (as the Prime Minister has admitted our inflation rate to be) and which are willing to buy our products, I am sure industrial leaders will be interested and will be glad to sell our products to such countries. As long as the Governments of South Australia and Australia have their present philosophy, there is no future for primary producers or small business men in Australia. Yet the Labor Government claims to represent small primary producers and business men. These people are being forced out of production because they have nowhere to sell their products. How do members opposite intend to solve the present problems? Until they can put value back into the dollar, there will be no financial stability in this country. As the Treasurer admitted when he introduced this Bill, its provisions are highly inflationary.

The Prime Minister has admitted that we are heading for an inflation rate of 30 per cent. The member for Stuart smiles at this prospect: he could not care less. I suggest that it is high time members opposite tried to run a small business. If Labor representatives did this before they entered Parliament, they might have some idea how to run the State. After all, the same principle is involved: you must make ends meet, and productivity must equal or exceed the cost structure. However, the present Government does not know anything about that. What the Commonwealth Minister for Labor and Immigration (Mr. Cameron) said the other day is right: things have got so out of hand that he has been forced to admit that it is impossible for the present situation to continue. Unless the manufacturing companies make a profit, how can they pay employees? Although members opposite do not recognise this point, many employees recognise it and know well that, unless the manufacturers who employ them make a profit, they cannot expect to have a stable job or to reap the benefits of profitability.

Each day the number of unemployed increases. Mr. Hawke has said that soon there will be about 300 000 unemployed. As the member for Stuart has a safe seat, he can probably afford to laugh about unemployment. However, he should go to the employment office in Adelaide and tell the people there that, with a little luck, they might get a job. I can remember that, just before November, 1972, Mr. Whitlam and Mr. Cameron made great play

about the unemployment figure, but it was minute compared with the present figure. The present situation has been brought about by the socialistic philosophy of the Commonwealth and State Governments. Try to convince the people outside that that is not the position!

Mr. Crimes: You can't institute Socialism in the State or Commonwealth.

Mr. ARNOLD: Labor Governments have had a darn good try.

Mr. Crimes: Certainly. We're entitled to our philosophy, just as you're entitled to yours.

Mr. ARNOLD: Incentive in the community has been killed and, if incentive is killed, so is productivity. If costs increase so that we can no longer trade with the rest of the world, we will become an island on our own able to trade only with ourselves.

Mr. Crimes: What do you do about the 300 000 000 people in the world who are starving?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I should like the honourable member for Chaffey to come back to the terms of the Bill.

Mr. ARNOLD: Australia can no longer trade with the rest of the world as a result of inflationary measures such as the Bill before us. The member for Spence says that countless millions of people in the world are starving. His philosophy is one of the reasons why they are starving. Australia is a country with the ability to produce abundant food. However, because of his philosophy, the cost structure in this country is so high that the remainder of the world cannot afford to purchase that food. People are starving because of the philosophy that the member for Spence supports. People overseas do not have the galloping inflation position that we have, and our position is stimulated by measures such as the one we are considering this evening. This Bill will have a drastic effect on all people, and it will make it more difficult for people overseas to purchase our food.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): This Bill involves an extremely serious matter that concerns everyone in South Australia except, apparently, the Treasurer and his Ministers. Since the debate commenced, the Treasurer (and he introduced the Bill) has been in the Chamber for an extremely short time. I should have thought that, if he wanted to back up what he said in his second reading explanation and if he did introduce the Bill reluctantly and was concerned about it, he would be in the House to reassure the people. Seven Government members now have drifted into the House. There were three, then five, then four, then seven, and we now have the Minister of Labour and Industry coming in to give us eight Government members in the Chamber.

This Bill, which should never have been introduced, has been introduced as a result of an agreement made a long time ago by the Treasurer, the Prime Minister, and the financial committee of the Labor Party. The Treasurer is a co-author and co-architect of this entire financial debacle. We know that he can act: in fact, this is all an act. He was one of those who designed the whole system, and he has known very well what would happen. He has known that the State would be in financial straits and that he would have to say that he introduced the Bill reluctantly. How much further will he go when he introduces the Bill for the tobacco tax? That will tax his ability to the extreme. This measure may be called the Business Franchise (Petroleum) Bill, but it is a direct taxation measure, and cost increases will be passed on to every section of the community.

Mr. Wright: What if a person doesn't own a motor car?

Dr. TONKIN: The honourable member does not understand what the Bill is all about, because he owns his own motor car and I do not think he realises that there is no doubt that public transport costs will increase, as will costs for primary and secondary industry and for every small business. I suggest that the honourable member find out what the effects of the Bill will be. If he has not looked at the Bill, perhaps I can excuse him for his apparent total disregard for the people of this State. However, if he does look at it, I expect him to speak in the debate, as the member for Spence will do. I do not think that anyone can justify this measure. The increase in Commonwealth income tax as a result of inflation and inflationary wage claims that have been granted has not in any way been altered significantly by the recent announcements in the mini Budget. The Commonwealth Government is ripping more taxation from the people of South Australia than it has ever done previously and our people are paying more State taxation than they have paid previously. Since the Labor Government came to office in this State, taxation has been increased steadily until two years ago, since when the increases have accelerated.

Despite all these taxes that the people are paying under protest, South Australia is not getting back the money to which it is entitled. If this State introduced its own income tax system, it would be much better off. I stated previously that it was a shame that the States gave their taxing powers to the Commonwealth Government, and it was a bigger shame when they did not insist on getting those powers back after the Second World War.

Mr. Langley: Were you here then?

Dr. TONKIN: I do not care what Party was in Opposition. The Commonwealth Government is a liability to this country at present. The member for Unley may laugh at that.

Mr. Langley: Give it a chance.

Dr. TONKIN: If the member for Unley and other Government members do not recognise the dire situation into which this State has fallen, I will at least do the Treasurer the credit of saying that he recognises the dire situation we are in; at least, he pretends to recognise it and says that he recognises it. I refer members to the Treasurer's second reading explanation, as follows:

Previously, I have spoken of the unsatisfactory Budget situation that now confronts this Government: a situation that has developed since the Premiers' Conference last June, when the Australian Government announced that the established practice of providing supplementary financial assistance, in addition to the general purpose grants made in accordance with the tax reimbursement formula, would be discontinued for the financial year 1974-75.

Whatever makes the Treasurer think that this will be discontinued only for the 1974-75 financial year I do not know. There is no guarantee that we will ever see those supplementary grants made again under a Labor Government. However, we may get some grants in an election year, because that is the only way the Australian Labor Party can get votes.

Mr. Langley: How many times have we got more votes than you?

Dr. TONKIN: I wish that the honourable member would not interrupt when I am reading from his Leader's second reading explanation.

Mr. Langley: You've won only once.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Dr. TONKIN: I should have thought that the honourable member would have more respect for the speech. It goes to show what he thinks of the Treasurer's second reading explanation. He obviously agrees with the Opposition that it was a lot of cuds wallop, and nothing more. It was a pretence, a sham, and it is patently obvious that it was a sham. This legislation is part of a deliberately contrived situation. As I have said before, the Treasurer is a co-architect of this whole structure. He cannot escape the blame for the present financial situation of this country and this State. The Treasurer is entirely and equally to blame with the Prime Minister and the Economic Advisory Committee of the A.L.P. Let him deny that if he will. I can understand why he absents himself from the Chamber: he does not want to hear the truth. He is not willing to stay here and deny this. Where is the Treasurer? Why is he not here looking after the Bill he has introduced—this crippling taxation measure on the people of South Australia? I hereby issue a challenge to the Treasurer who, if he is honest—

Mr. Langley: Debate the question with you! I'd like to see that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bragg would be well advised to debate the Bill. I suggest that that would be a more profitable line for him to take. Interjections are out of order, and I am going to ask honourable members to refrain from making them. The honourable member for Bragg.

Dr. TONKIN: I have not been off the Bill at any time during my speech, because we are dealing with a taxation measure, thinly disguised as a business franchise measure, to be levied on the people of the State as a result of the Commonwealth Government's deliberate incompetence, with the connivance of the South Australian Government. That is the matter at issue.

Mr. Wright: What about the challenge?

Dr. TONKIN: The challenge I issue to the Treasurer is that, if he is really serious about his concern for South Australians, he will refuse to go to Queensland.

Mr. Langley: What's the matter with you? Wouldn't you go there?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I should like to know from the honourable member what Queensland has to do with this Bill. The honourable member for Davenport was warned this afternoon, and I give him one more warning. I suggest that the honourable member for Bragg contain himself and not jump up and point his finger at me. The honourable member for Bragg.

Dr. TONKIN: We are dealing with a Bill which the Treasurer has said he has introduced reluctantly. The Treasurer defends his situation and publicly attacks the Commonwealth Government by saying that it is only because of that Government that he has had to introduce this taxation measure. If the Treasurer is honest about his concern and his belief that the Commonwealth Government is totally to blame for this situation, he will refuse to go to Queensland and support that Government. Let him come into the Chamber and say that he will not support the Commonwealth Government. If he is honest that is what he will do, but I should be surprised if he did it.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the remarks he has just made and to his disregard of the direction the Chair has already given with regard to the mention of Queensland. Queensland

is not referred to in the Bill. The honourable member may address himself to the Bill, but his remarks about Queensland are out of order.

Dr. TONKIN: I must bow to your ruling, Sir, as always. I suggest that, instead of canvassing the idea of the Treasurer's not going to Queensland, I should say that if he goes there he should campaign actively against the Commonwealth A.L.P. Government.

Mr. Nankivell: That's if he wants to be honest.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes. If he is unwilling to take any deliberate action against the Commonwealth A.L.P. Government, which he says he blames for this whole situation, or to accept my challenge, I suggest that he will be totally discredited, and he should stop performing and acting up.

Mr. Langley: You ought to talk about performing!

Dr. TONKIN: It is about time that someone did, and Opposition members are willing to do that because they are concerned about what happens to this State and to this country. We will not be sold down the drain by the Treasurer, or by his stooges sitting behind him who can do nothing but interject. The Treasurer has made statements in the press about this matter, as well as other statements in relation to the Commonwealth Government, and he has said that he has had to introduce these taxation measures because he has not been given a fair go by the Commonwealth Government. I will not canvass what the Treasurer should do in Queensland, but I do not think he should support the Commonwealth Labor Government whether he is in Queensland, Victoria, New South Wales, or Tasmania.

Mr. GUNN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Standing Order 159 provides:

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

The member for Unley has deliberately set out to interrupt not only the member for Bragg but also other Opposition members who are trying to make constructive contributions to the debate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order. If the House is to be controlled, it will be controlled from the Chair. I am doing my best to control it, but I am not getting much co-operation from members on either side.

Dr. TONKIN: I think, Sir, you are controlling the House very well indeed, in the circumstances. If the Treasurer is honestly concerned about the people of South Australia and is reluctant to introduce this taxation measure, he should take the obvious action. Opposition members have said how Government spending in this State could be controlled. A far more important way would be for the Treasurer to actively withdraw his support for the Commonwealth Government, with which he says he is totally dissatisfied. If he were honest, he would do that. It will be interesting to see whether the Treasurer, if he returns to the Chamber for the conclusion of the debate, will be honest enough to say that he will take this action.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): Government members will not be surprised when I say that I oppose the Bill. Having had a fairly chequered history since the State Budget was introduced, it has been one of the on-again-off-again measures. The Treasurer suggested that he might have to impose a tax such as this Bill seeks to impose, but then he said that this economic unit, or a branch of the Treasury that he had established and staffed

with highly paid officers, had said it would be a most regressive tax. After that, the measure was off again. The Treasurer has been in a difficult situation because of his failure to receive the \$6 000 000 he expected to receive from the Commonwealth Government. When the State Budget was introduced, it included a clear statement that we would receive a grant of \$6 000 000 from the Commonwealth Government to help solve budgetary problems. In reply to questions by Opposition members the Treasurer (and in his absence, the Minister of Education) suggested that a firm undertaking had been received that \$6 000 000 was to be available. There was much consternation after the Premiers' Conference, because the supplementary grants that had been available to the States were to be discontinued.

Also, there was much consternation in the Labor family throughout Australia as a result of the Commonwealth Budget, and at that time the stocks of the Prime Minister were low. There was a family get-together with the State Labor leaders (Premiers and Leaders of the Opposition) and the Prime Minister, and they had a happy family gathering. They were assured that they would receive further assistance with their Budgets. Unfortunately, when they were out of sight, they were out of Whitlam's mind, and he conveniently and promptly forgot about the undertaking, whether it had been formal, verbal, or in writing. It is a confused background: confusion on the part of the Treasurer, and confusion on the part of the Economic Intelligence Unit. From a question asked by the member for Hanson it seems that the findings of this unit are secret, because its report is considered by the Government to be an internal working document.

The Treasurer said earlier that the Economic Intelligence Unit had advised against this tax, and that other measures were open to the Government. I do not know what they were; perhaps they were the series of stamp duty taxes that were imposed recently or taxes on mortgages, but they would not raise the money the Government needed. I can understand the Government's difficulty because the economy of this country is in complete chaos. We had a Labor Socialist philosophy coming to the fore when the Commonwealth Budget was introduced, because Mr. Crean (Commonwealth Treasurer) said that it was the Government's aim to transfer resources from the private sector to the public sector. Apparently, this was Budget strategy. A newspaper article, published on the day after the Commonwealth Budget was introduced, states:

In a deliberate shift away from the private sector, the Budget provides huge increases in expenditure for cities, education, child care, health, social welfare and Aboriginal advancement.

Mr. Keneally: It is a worthwhile programme.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, but one must examine its import. The member for Chaffey has said that good Government is like good housekeeping—living within one's means and balancing the budget. The report also states:

Mr. Crean said the readily subdued conditions in the private sector provided the first real opportunity the Government had to transfer resources to the public sector.

What a complete about-face by the Commonwealth Government in the last week or two! Suddenly State and Commonwealth Labor Governments have decided that private enterprise warrants consideration because it provides 75 per cent of the employment opportunities in the country. Mr. Cameron (Commonwealth Minister for Labor and Immigration) is reported in yesterday's *Advertiser* as saying, "Company profits can save us." This statement comes only weeks after the Budget was handed down in Canberra, and

there was a deliberate attempt to shift from the private to the public sector. The report in the *Advertiser* states:

Only increased company profits could save Australia from the present recession, the Minister for Labor (Mr. Cameron) said last night. He urged unions and workers to try to increase productivity and hold back on claims for further wage and salary increases. This would enable private enterprise to take on new investment programmes, he told members of the Australian Workers Union.

What a complete reversal of outlook from the Socialist philosophy to the philosophy advocated by the Liberal Party! It is a feature of Labor Governments everywhere that they are shifting from the private to the public sector after finding that the end result is disastrous to the country. The Commonwealth Government has never realised that excessive Government spending is as inflationary as any spending. The Labor Party came to power in Australia after making a mixed bag of promises to spend not hundreds of millions of dollars but thousands of millions of dollars: it is that increased expenditure which has set off the inflationary spiral that the Government has been unable to check.

It is that background that leads to this type of legislation. Even the meanest intellect in South Australia must realise that the Bill is highly inflationary: it will be disastrous to South Australia and will add to the disastrous economic climate of Australia by adding costs in every walk of life. The Treasurer has criticised budgetary proposals that will hit the little man; he criticised trenchantly charges on the motor vehicle industry, sales tax and stamp duty. The Labor Party frequently seeks to advance the idea of class distinction in society and plays on people's emotions. The Government refers to the poorer section of the community and says it is the little man's Party. An article written by Peter Samuels in the *Bulletin* at about the time of the last Commonwealth election states:

It is part of Labor mythology that there is a nice sharp class division, with the downtrodden workers down below and the middle-classes above, so that any measure which helps wage-earners can be construed as a progressive redistribution of income and a move towards the egalitarian society. Less ideologically blinkered examinations of income distribution suggest the picture is far untidier than this—that both the relatively poor (older people) and the relatively rich are disproportionately dependent on company *earned income* for example, and that there is no significant difference in the distribution of income as between wage and salary earners and the self-employed and small business people. The greatest differences in income probably are quite unrelated to economic class as Labor mythology defines it, but revolve more around such mundane matters as one's intellectual endowment and inclination to work, and indeed whether the wife works outside the home.

So much for class distinction and helping the downtrodden. This legislation will raise the cost of living for everyone in the State. Last weekend I attended a seminar conducted by the Australian National Travel Association, an association the Government has decided to support financially. I wonder how this measure will affect that industry and the transport industry in general. Moreover, I wonder how it will affect the cost of production of goods.

Mr. Duncan: It will not affect people travelling on Government transport.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If fares are not increased, the Government's subsidy to the Municipal Tramways Trust will have to be increased by at least 10 per cent to cover the increased cost of fuel. In fact, it will probably rise by more than 10 per cent because other costs are involved.

Mr. Simmons: Wages are involved, too.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I take the point of the economist from Peake that the effect on wages will be highly inflationary. It will cost more for a man to travel to work,

and delivery costs will increase, too. Our whole way of life centres around transport and the movement of goods, so the effect of the measure will be greater in the long run than the direct 10 per cent increase in the cost of fuel. Small businesses were affected recently by the introduction of legislation to license petrol stations. The member for Chaffey made an excellent speech about the way in which a person must run his business affairs if he is to stay solvent; the Government has never learnt that.

I should like to quote what a small business man in Black Hill had to say about the matter. Black Hill is on the Murray River, near Swan Reach; it is not a township but has a marble quarry nearby, a few properties surrounding it and is a pleasant drive among red gums in the area. This little store at Black Hill serves petrol. It is convenient for local people to have the supply, and it is used by those who happen to be passing through. Although the profit made from selling the petrol is small, the small bits add up, and this is enough to keep this store in business. I have a letter from the operator of the store which was written to the Commonwealth member for the district but which was passed on to me as it concerned a State matter. I shall quote this letter, which was written in August before this legislation was announced, to show the effect of these charges on the little people that the Government claims to represent. It states:

May I draw your attention to the Motor Fuel Act of July, 1974, which requires a permit to sell petrol. I sell about 100 gallons a week and make about \$5 profit. There is no likelihood of anyone wanting to put in another petrol pump, situated as I am, in the bush. Now, I have to pay \$10 a year for the privilege of selling petrol. Two weeks profit gone for nothing. Surely there is another way of raising money, besides making one pay for this honour. I would appreciate it if you could at least protest on my behalf, and many more small store and petrol store operators.

As this legislation would involve this person in a fee of \$50, he will probably have to stop selling petrol. To pay the fee, he would have to use up his profit for two months, so it would hardly be worth his while to run this service for the convenience of people in the area and those passing through. Members opposite will probably say that a bigger and better service station can be set up in a main town in the area, but that is nonsense. If this little business has to close because of increased imposts, although it may make members opposite happy, it will not make happy people in the area of Black Hill or people who are out for a drive on a Sunday afternoon and want petrol.

Members of this Government and their Commonwealth colleagues are hell-bent on looking after the people whom they call underprivileged and who live in the four or five major sea-port cities of Australia. They are channelling resources into this area. Road funds are being used in these cities, with funds for roads in rural areas being cut back. Education funds for so-called disadvantaged areas are also involved. I challenge members opposite to operate a small business, such as the store at Black Hill. They would not think of taking on such a business, because they would have to show a bit of initiative and financial nous and put up with hardship. If there were not people in the country willing to do this, the country would not tick. If all these small businesses in rural communities are shut up, the country will go broke faster than it is going broke at present. What the writer of that letter says is typical of what applies in hundreds of cases in outback areas.

I deplore this legislation and the fact that the Treasurer has been let down by the Prime Minister, who has dishonoured his promise. However, the Treasurer wants to

have it both ways. He has recently announced a five-point plan or six-point plan (three years ago it was a 12-point plan) to save the economy of the State. However, in a day or two or a week or two he will go to Queensland to campaign for the A.L.P. The Treasurer once said that Gorton was the toughest Prime Minister with whom he had had to deal, but now he thinks that the present Prime Minister is tougher, as he has cut out supplementary grants that have previously been available for years. As the Leader of the Opposition in 1969, the Treasurer said:

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. That was the advice that the then Leader of the Opposition doled out to members of this Party. At that time, the Hon. Sir Glen Pearson was Treasurer. The present Treasurer said that we should get out on the hustings.

Mr. Simmons: That's correct; now he's practising it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I was going to suggest that he should put his words into practice. He should get up alongside Joe Bjelke-Petersen in Queensland and say what is happening to this State as a result of the Commonwealth Government's policies. The *Hansard* report of the exchange between the then Treasurer and the then Leader of the Opposition (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) in 1969 continues:

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. Why does he not follow his own advice? Let him go to Queensland, stand up with Bjelke Joe, and campaign for States' rights. Let him say in Queensland what he has been saying here, that he cannot trust the Prime Minister and that we cannot get budgetary help from the Commonwealth Government. This should be the most important plank in his platform. An article in today's *News* states that the Treasurer invites business leaders in for a drink. He is trying to shrug off his mates in Canberra as if they do not belong to him. He talks about transferring from the public sector to the private sector. He wants it all ways. Let him tell the people of Queensland what a shonky deal South Australia has had from the Commonwealth Government.

Perhaps we will have to cut back some of the glamorous social welfare programmes, but those programmes will come to nothing in three or four years if inflation continues at a rate of 30 per cent. Education expenditure is affected, as the building of schools is inhibited by inflationary cost increases. The Minister of Education has refuted the suggestion that the Government should worry about inflation. When the Liberal Party suggested during the last election campaign that it was the most serious problem, that suggestion was ridiculed. However, we will not beat inflation with this type of measure, which inflicts a tax on everyone in the community. This will pour petrol on to the fire of inflation.

The Government should consider some of the new committees it has appointed. What about the Economic Intelligence Unit? I do not know how many people are involved in it, but I will bet that none of them receives less than \$15 000 a year. Let us consider the "think tank" and the 20 per cent increase in the State Public Service since Labor came to office. The Treasurer ought to have second thoughts about how he is running the State. I understand

that one of the recent appointments to the Premier's Department is Mr. Bruce Guerin, who was previously employed by the *Advertiser*. Doubtless, he has been appointed to the Economic Intelligence Unit.

Mr. McAnaney: He's got some brains.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: He has. On one occasion he said the Labor Party was treading on the sound base built by Sir Thomas Playford, and that statement was correct. When economic conditions change, the wind blows chill and the day of reckoning comes. If this State had been more prudent in looking after the private sector, we would not have to tax the people blind or to consider a Bill such as this, which will add fuel to the fire of inflation.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member for Victoria.

Mr. Gunn: When will the member for Spence take part in the debate?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I will call honourable members. The honourable member for Victoria.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): It does not give one pleasure to be speaking on a measure of this kind. In the long history of economic management of this State, we have had troughs and peaks, and the wind has blown chill, as the member for Kavel has said. We are in such a situation now. In 1972 we heard the theme "It's time" and then we had that election campaign. I remember "Billy Big Ears" getting a quivering about what he was not doing. However, perhaps he was not such a bad guy and not such a bad kind of Prime Minister.

Mr. Simmons: His mates didn't think so.

Mr. RODDA: That is true. We all make forecasts, and sometimes we are sorry afterwards. I remember my friend the member for Mitcham making forecasts. We have had Mr. Connor taking a strong stand against some of the wealth of this country, and foreign investment has been fiddled with. I think one chink in the armour of the present Australian Government was that anyone investing money in this country from overseas had to lodge 35 per cent, to show his good faith. Later that was reduced to 5 per cent, and more recently it has been abolished.

Further, we have had a taxation cut, but that does not seem to be having much effect. Then there was a 25 per cent tariff cut across the board. All these actions came against a backdrop of industry across Australia that was employing many people, keeping their confidence, and maintaining them in their careers. The Government is faced with unemployment, and this State no longer is a low-cost State. We have had wage spirals and we have also had strike action, such as the strike on shifting the steel from the Port Adelaide wharf.

All this has contributed to the position in which we now find ourselves. Challenges have been thrown up to the Opposition to make suggestions, but I am sure that any Treasurer who comes into office gets the shocks when the day-to-day accounts come in, and the period of three months that I served as a Minister prevents me from charging madly into saying what we would do. Running the Government is not much different from running a person's own affairs.

In my enterprise as a farmer, I have had to cut back this year on some expenses that I intended to incur. The Government must act in a similar way, and perhaps this is where I part company with members opposite. During the short time for which I was in the Ministry, officers on one occasion drew my attention to an account for a large amount, but subsequently we were able to halve the amount.

It was one of the things a Minister could do, which most could do, and which most Ministers do, but I do not think I was popular for doing it. However, it often works out to be the best thing for the country. Challenges have been thrown across the Chamber about what I would do. I am unable to say authentically what I would do, because I have not had a close-up look at the situation. The action the Government is taking with the Bill, for which it must be responsible, will affect everyone in the community. In his Budget speech the Treasurer had some prognostic things to say, and there was some enthusiasm at that time that things were not going to be all that bad. The Treasurer said:

Longer-term programmes: I believe that Governments are now finding it harder than ever before to make reliable forecasts of what the future may bring and to plan the use of funds in ways which will yield the most effective results in real terms for the community. Difficult though the task may be, I consider that it has better prospects of success if Governments are able to set up longer-term aims and objectives and, at the same time, retain sufficient flexibility in their financial affairs to be able to meet short-term problems without disruption to those longer-term objectives.

Only two weeks ago the Treasurer, in replying to a question by the Deputy Leader about the Budget figures, said that stamp duties were much in deficit of what the Budget had forecast. By way of interjection, I said "By 10 per cent or 50 per cent?" The Treasurer said, "Not 50 per cent, but in excess of 10 per cent."

Mr. Mathwin: Who's to blame for that?

Mr. RODDA: I believe that it is the inactivity in the economy of the State. People tend to button up, and this buttoning up and lack of movement in the economy have caused the transactions to stop moving. In his Budget speech the Treasurer also said:

As to economic management, this, of course, is a responsibility primarily of the Australian Government, but there may be times when a State Government considers that it should take some action appropriate to the economic climate in its own area. For example, in September, 1972, this Government decided that the level of unemployment was sufficiently serious to justify a special provision of \$2 000 000 to finance special employment-producing works, despite the fact that the Budget presented shortly before had made no allowance for such measures.

Things have changed somewhat, because we find now that there is a need for the Government to take some initiative, but it has been unable to raise the meagre sum of \$2 000 000 up to this point. The Government is asking the people of the State to accept this piece of legislation that will touch everyone in the State. In this regard, there will be a series of licences; so, the Government will be unable to run this type of administration without an army of administrators. Under the Bill, a "petroleum product" means the following:

- (a) a liquid obtained by refining or processing petroleum;
- (b) a liquid obtained by refining or processing a liquid referred to in paragraph (a) of this definition;
- (c) any grease obtained by refining or processing petroleum or a liquid referred to in paragraph (a), (b), (d) or (e) of this definition or any mixture of any such grease or any other substance;
- (d) a liquid which is the residue after refining or processing—
 - (i) petroleum;
 - (ii) a liquid referred to in paragraph (a), (b) or (e) of this definition;
 or
 - (iii) any grease referred to in paragraph (c) of this definition;
- or
- (e) a liquid which is a mixture of all or any of the liquids referred to in paragraph (a), (b) or (d) of this definition and any other substance,

Although it will be a tax of about 6c a gallon as a basis, the tax will extend considerably further than what has been forecast in the towns, cities and country areas of the State. In Committee, I should like to know how these charges will be levied. In his second reading explanation, the Treasurer said that this tax would yield about \$9 000 000 in this financial year and about \$19 000 000 in a full financial year, but it could yield considerably more than that. The Treasurer's statement about the down-turn in stamp duties could easily apply to this legislation if the prudence of South Australians came to the fore. This legislation might not be the goose that laid the golden egg after all. If the Government cannot be prudent in its management, I say to the Minister on the front bench that I foresee that, instead of a motor vehicle going to the local village or to the city two or three times a day, it might go only once a week. South Australians have known privation, and we have seen this plurality of travelling that finance dictates. There is little use in the Government's trying to lay the blame at the door of its colleagues in Canberra who, because they wear the same guernsey and support the same philosophies, must take their share of the blame.

It behoves Ministers to have a good close look at all their accounts and perhaps to take strong measures in curtailing expenditure right across the board, because they may be assured that, when this legislation is enacted, the people will do this. This is probably the most far-reaching legislation the Government has ever introduced. This is a far-flung State, many people using motor vehicles to move around in it, and, as the legislation embraces a commodity used by almost everyone, it may make the people sit up and take notice of it. Everyone needs an income to provide succour in this day and age. We are now at the cross roads and, when we have to consider this sort of legislation, it is the Government's responsibility to find ways and means of reducing expenditure. I admit that it is the Government's responsibility to introduce legislation to raise revenue, but I think the Treasurer should whack the Prime Minister over the head with this measure. With the state of the economy being so fluid last financial year, the Commonwealth Treasury should have money running out of its ears.

I am astounded at the disdain with which the Prime Minister treated the Premiers at the last Premiers' Conference, at which he said that the tax reimbursement formula was to be discontinued for the 1974-75 financial year. When the present Prime Minister took office, he said that all would be well with the States, but now this Government is introducing a measure to raise revenue that will affect everyone in South Australia. The need has arisen for the Government to show some prudence in its activities and, because of its past record, I cannot support this legislation. We could well do without it, and the Government should consider curtailing some of its capital expenditure. I have lived for many years among people who, when the need arises, can buckle their belts. Charity and responsibility start at home, and this is where it must start with the Government. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. DUNCAN (Elizabeth): I support the Bill, and no doubt this will be a pleasant surprise for Opposition members who have predicted that no Government member would speak in this debate. Mine will not be the only contribution from this side. I listened with interest yesterday to the Treasurer introducing this Bill, which, as he said, was introduced with some reluctance.

Mr. Venning: Are you speaking with some reluctance, too?

Mr. DUNCAN: No: if the honourable member will keep quiet, I will explain my views. The Treasurer emphasised what I considered to be the negative aspects of this Bill, although his assessment of the financial situation was correct, and I support him. Many comments of Opposition members concerning this aspect do not stand up in the existing situation. However, I emphasise the positive aspects of the Bill, because I believe it has positive aspects. If one takes a medium-term view of society, where it is going, and where the environment is heading, one must conclude that, if taxes have to be raised, they should be raised in a way that has some social responsibility for the future. I strongly believe that taxes should be imposed heavily on non-renewable resources, such as petroleum products. I believe that taxes on petrol and other non-renewable sources will become a regular facet of Government that will be widely accepted in the community, but I am aware that this sort of tax is unpopular at present. I believe I am expressing an opinion that is held by a minority in the community, but will soon be held by more people who will learn to appreciate the validity of my argument.

Mr. Mathwin: How would your Arab friends consider this?

Mr. DUNCAN: I am pleased that the honourable member has referred to my Arab friends. I believe that, although the Arabs did not intend to do so when introducing the oil embargo late last year, they have done Western societies a considerable service.

Mr. Mathwin: They didn't intend to.

Mr. DUNCAN: I have said that, but I believe the Arabs have done a considerable service in giving us a trial run as to the future of society. Any rational view of the future of the resources of the world, as they are being used at present, must lead to the conclusion that we will have to change drastically our life style, our economies, and the way we treat our environment, if we are to live in any way similar to that which we enjoy at present.

Mr. Evans: Do you think there is any chance that solar energy will be used in future?

Mr. DUNCAN: I believe there is, but that is not the subject of the Bill, and solar energy is not yet available. I do not wish to be distracted by members opposite, because the matters I am raising are of much greater substance than those raised by them. However, I do not blame them for referring to matters in which they see political mileage. The matters to which I will refer, however, are of greater concern to the future of this State than the narrow, sectional matters that have been raised by several members opposite. In the next few years there will be a fundamental reappraisal of the way society allocates its resources, part of which will be a reconsideration of the role of the private motor vehicle. Private transport is a possibility of the future, but there is no future in the medium term for the internal combustion, petrol-burning motor vehicle.

Mr. Becker: What has that got to do with the Bill?

Mr. Millhouse: It has at least as much to do with it as most of the matters raised by members on this side of the House.

Mr. DUNCAN: It has much to do with the Bill, because this tax will increase the cost of petrol to the State and some people may decide to use public transport to get to work. That is an important aspect of the measure which has not been referred to this evening, probably because no members opposite have had the foresight to see these matters in the important light in which they should be seen.

Mr. Becker: Are you going to tell the worker that he has no right to drive a motor car? Don't be stupid!

Mr. DUNCAN: Members opposite are concerned about this.

Mr. Becker: It has nothing to do with the Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will determine whether the honourable member is speaking to the Bill. I have often said that this is a financial measure: it is not a Budget measure, and all remarks must be linked with the Bill. The Chair will determine that, not members of the back bench.

Mr. DUNCAN: My comments are easily linked with the Bill, because it is a tax measure and because increased taxes on private motor vehicles will deter some people from using them. That point is patently obvious; that is why it is unpalatable to many members opposite. The member for Davenport referred to *Future Shock* by Alvin Toffler and said that many of the matters in the book are frightening. I can well understand that some of the more conservative members opposite do not like to hear the sort of things I am saying this evening.

Mr. Becker: You are not speaking to the Bill.

Mr. DUNCAN: Nevertheless, the matters to which I am referring will in future be of vital importance to this country and the State.

Mr. Venning: We don't deny that, but speak to the Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DUNCAN: The role of the internal combustion engine and petrol in society has been important for many years past: it is something on which society has been completely dependent. However, that role is likely to change in future because of the increased cost of motor fuel, which will be increased not only through taxation but also through the general shortage of motor fuel throughout the world. Petrol and petroleum products will become more expensive and less and less available for use in private motor vehicles.

Mr. Coumbe: And in public transport.

Mr. DUNCAN: Public transport can be easily adapted to use other types of fuel. I am pleased to say that the State Government, with the assistance of the Commonwealth Government, is starting to electrify the Adelaide suburban rail network, a commendable action that shows the great depth of feeling that the Commonwealth Government has for the future of Australia. The Commonwealth Government is defending the right of Australians to continue to enjoy the standard of living they enjoy now.

Mr. Coumbe: What generates electricity?

Mr. DUNCAN: At present it is natural gas, coal, and hydro power.

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member for Elizabeth that we are dealing with a revenue measure, not a Budget measure and that any remarks made must be linked with the subject of the Bill being considered.

Mr. DUNCAN: The member for Victoria believes the tax to be levied under the Bill will cause people to use smaller cars and less petrol, which is a highly laudable aim and, if that is the result of the Bill, I strongly support it. Therefore, the Bill's potential as a revenue-raising measure may be limited but it will be a marginal limitation only. Australian society is not yet at the stage where it can do without private motor vehicles; however, it has reached the stage where it must start looking at other methods of transport and, if the Bill helps towards that end, I strongly

support it. Numerous criticisms have been made recently about private motor vehicles travelling on roads. One has to look only at the Government's safety campaign that has been introduced to try to reduce the road toll. Many people in big cities in other countries are concerned about traffic noise, too.

Mr. BECKER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the member for Elizabeth do not in any way relate to the Bill before the House, so I ask you to draw his attention to that matter.

The SPEAKER: Many times during the debate I have called honourable members' attention to the fact that we are discussing a revenue Bill. I have allowed honourable members wide latitude but, at the same time, the Bill is not a Budget measure and, therefore, honourable members cannot speak about any financial matter they wish. Remarks relating to a revenue-raising measure such as this must be confined to the Bill. I advise all honourable members, which I have done consistently since the House started to debate the measure, that all remarks in relation to the Bill must be linked with it. The honourable member for Elizabeth.

Mr. DUNCAN: I seek leave to continue my remarks.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Elizabeth seeks leave to continue his remarks.

Mr. Rodda: No!

The SPEAKER: Leave is refused. The honourable member for Elizabeth.

Mr. DUNCAN: My remarks can easily be linked with the Bill. As I have said, the fact is that, because of the tax, the automobile, which is the main user of petroleum products in our society, will become less attractive to people to use.

Mr. Nankivell: Then how will you get the revenue?

Mr. DUNCAN: What the Treasurer has suggested will be the sum raised is probably realistic, because it is likely that less petrol will be used when the price of petrol is more expensive. When I was interrupted, I had referred to safety and was referring to the matter of noise.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that noise and safety are not dealt with in the Bill. As this is a money Bill, wide latitude is allowed to honourable members in debate. However, at the same time, the honourable member must link up his remarks with the Bill.

Mr. DUNCAN: The point I am making is that the internal combustion engine, which burns petroleum fuel, is a noisy means of power. As petrol will now be more expensive, the effect will be that fewer motor vehicles will be sold and less money will be raised by the Bill than has been suggested by members opposite.

Mr. Becker: Are you saying that the Treasurer is wrong?

Mr. DUNCAN: I am referring to what members opposite have suggested. The member for Glenelg referred to the situation in the Arab world concerning petroleum products, and it is important to consider this. Australia's supply of petroleum fuel is limited, so it is important to conserve the supply instead of wasting it as it is being wasted at present. I believe it is of the utmost importance for us to look at alternative sources of fuel. If the Bill assists in that process, it certainly has my support. As I have said, the Treasurer has said that he has introduced the Bill with some regrets. I have some regrets because possibly this measure has been introduced before its time. However, I firmly believe that taxation

measures to discourage the use of non-renewable resources will have to be taken in future. As this is a step in the right direction, I support the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Although I do not agree with the point of view of the member for Elizabeth, I congratulate him on it. I think his was the best speech since I have been back in the Chamber this evening. I thought it was rather churlish of the Liberal Party to refuse leave to the honourable member to continue his remarks. However, it was apparently the decision of the Party to refuse him that leave.

Mr. Nankivell: That's not true.

Mr. BECKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member for Mitcham has said that my Party decided to refuse leave to the member for Elizabeth to continue his remarks. As no such decision was made, I suggest that the member for Mitcham should withdraw that remark.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order. As a decision was made by the House, that decision must be accepted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What I said, I said advisedly, but I say no more about it. I do not agree with the point of view expressed by the member for Elizabeth in relation to motor cars, and I think that many of his own constituents who work at the General Motors-Holden's plant at Elizabeth will be appalled to hear what he has said. Undoubtedly, in the long term, the sort of considerations that he put before the House are the ones with which we will have to grapple. However, I do not believe that this Bill should be used for that purpose; nor do I believe that it was introduced for that purpose. Finally, in respect of the member for Elizabeth, I shall be surprised if he gets home in any other way than with the aid of an internal combustion engine.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: For so serious a subject, the debate so far has been a lamentable one. Members on this side of the House who have spoken have not (I warrant not one of them) looked at the contents of this Bill at all. All they have done is concentrate on the culpability of the Commonwealth Government. The member who was speaking when I first came back into the Chamber spoke in such a way that I could not even tell about which Bill he was speaking. He said not one word about petrol, petrol tax or the Bill at all. However, he was allowed to do that, and members who have subsequently spoken, notably the members for Bragg, the member for Kavel and others, have followed the same line. I can only conclude that the Bill itself was too hard for members.

Mr. Venning: Only you could understand it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I do not make that claim: the Bill was too hard for them to tackle at all, so they preferred the easy line of criticising this Government and the Commonwealth Government. That is not to say that I do not think that both the Governments require criticism, but I do suggest that on a major measure such as this, when Opposition members have the opportunity to oppose with some strength, they should make the most of that opportunity and not just make speeches for the sake of filling up time.

Mr. Becker: You just wasted four minutes.

Members interjecting:

Mr. VENNING: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: the trend of this debate seems to have changed. Has your attitude changed, inasmuch as you have told previous

speakers that they must speak directly to the Bill and yet we have heard nothing about the Bill from the member for Mitcham so far, and four minutes of his time has now elapsed?

The SPEAKER: I repeat what I have previously stated: it is apparent that points of order have been raised by speakers just to hear the Speaker repeat what he has stated many times before. This is a financial Bill, and any remarks made must be linked up with the Bill under consideration. This is not a Budget Bill, and remarks must be in connection with the Bill under discussion. I have repeated this and I will continue to repeat this information to the House. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In some ways I do not blame Opposition members for bucking the Bill itself, because it is an extraordinarily complex Bill.

Mr. Rodda: We couldn't do without you!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: True, you can't do without me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: You know, Mr. Speaker, they protest too much. This Bill is an extraordinarily complex piece of legislation. It has been introduced on one day and we are expected to debate it on the next.

Mr. Venning: It's too hard!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is. It is far too hard for me to understand, but at least I have tried. I intend in the course of my protest about the haste with which the Bill is being pushed through this House to refer to some of its provisions, and this is more than any other members who have so far spoken on the Bill have done. Clause 4 defines nine classes of licence. If anyone can tell me, by looking at those definitions, the difference between the classes of licence, I will take back what I have said. I refer to the definition of just one licence, and I ask any member to tell me what it means. Selecting a class at random, a class 2 licence, I ask whether the member for Tea Tree Gully, for instance, can tell me what it means.

Mr. Becker: That's an unfair remark.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Why? The member for Tea Tree Gully plays the same part as any other honourable member plays, and I have more chance of getting sense from her than from the member for Hanson.

The SPEAKER: Order! Personalities are out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not in the slightest way interested in what I can get from the member for Hanson.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I realise that I am pretty unpopular today because of the debate this afternoon when I let the team down. However, that did not deter me then and it will not deter me now from proceeding with this Bill. The definition of a class 2 licence is as follows:

a licence that authorises the licensee to carry on the business of selling petroleum products manufactured by him and no other petroleum products and to sell them to other licensees or to persons who are not licensees, if, in the case of the sale of any petroleum products prescribed for the purposes of this class of licence to such a person, the quantity of that petroleum product is not less than the quantity of that petroleum product prescribed for that purpose:

Can any member possibly tell me what that means? I do not know what it means, yet we have this sort of definition, if not in exactly these precise words, repeated nine times in this clause. Even the draftsman in his speech of explanation did not attempt—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no reference to the draftsman. The Bill was introduced by a Minister.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: So it was, Mr. Speaker, but let us be realistic about this. The explanation was not prepared by the Premier, who introduced the Bill: it was prepared by the draftsman, but I am willing to say it is the Premier.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has been in this House long enough to know that the Bill was introduced by a Minister. It is the Minister's Bill, and no matter concerning the draftsman is under discussion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Premier did not even see fit to explain the difference in the types of licence as set out in clause 4. I defy any member to explain to me or to the House exactly what they mean. Yet, we have so far had four hours of debate on this Bill, and no reference has been made to what these classes mean. Clause 4 (4), which is an extraordinary provision, states:

Where pursuant to a sale made outside the State petroleum products are delivered within the State, that sale shall for the purposes of this Act be deemed to have been made within the State.

In other words, we are saying that black is white, that a sale made outside the State will be deemed to have been a sale made within the State. That is an absurd piece of drafting. It is not, I am assured by a person who must remain nameless, according to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, meant to overcome section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution. Of course, that leads me to the point of the constitutional validity or invalidity of this legislation. Anyone who read the *Advertiser* this morning would have seen that previous pieces of legislation which attempted to introduce such a tax as this had fallen foul of the Australian Constitution, and it is quite likely that this Bill will do the same thing.

Finally (because it is useless going through every clause of the Bill, which contains 35 clauses), I refer to clause 10, which gives the most sweeping powers of inspection and which provides:

An inspector may at any time, with such assistance as he considers necessary, without any warrant other than this section—

And then the powers of entry and search are set out. There is a prohibition against any person who may try to hinder or obstruct an inspector. I know that members have so far been more intent on making a political point.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think that I missed a thing through missing an hour of the debate. I do not believe that members in their pursuit of a political point should overlook such clauses as these. They should take some action at the appropriate time with regard to them, and I hope that that will be done. This is an appallingly complex Bill, which should not be proceeded with on the day after it has been introduced in the House; yet, that is exactly what is being done and, apparently, debate is to continue until the Bill is through. I do not presume to understand the Bill, and I do not believe there is one member who, if challenged, could explain its purport, let alone anyone outside who will be affected by it. People outside have not even had a chance to see or appreciate it, nor will they get a chance to do so before the House has passed it.

Having said what I have said about the complexity of the Bill, I will reiterate briefly what I regard are the main political points in relation to it. Undoubtedly, the Commonwealth Government is intent on squeezing the life out of the States in one way or another.

Dr. Tonkin: That has been said before.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I make no apology for putting rather better points than have been put by the member for Bragg and other members and I hope in rather shorter compass than they put them.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I think you have an inferiority complex.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member can think whatever he likes. It leaves me entirely unmoved. I seem to be even less popular this evening than I usually am with the so-called Liberal Party. I think I have judged the Party right. It does not like me, and that is all there is to it. Even when I am adding so much strength to the case it has tried to put—

Mr. Goldsworthy: I'm sure it is an inferiority complex.

Mr. Nankivell: A rose by any other name.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Mathwin: What clause is "loving the member for Mitcham?"

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is deplorable that the largest Opposition Party should debate a matter of this gravity as lightly as it has done this evening and should interject when others are trying to put their points. Anyone would think that they knew that what they had said was a complete waste of time and completely in vain, and that they are just going through the motions of opposing it without having any real heart in the job at all. That is my impression as an outsider, and that is the impression that members of the Liberal Party have given in the way in which they have debated the Bill. If members want me to stop, they should allow me to conclude what I want to say uninterrupted. Undoubtedly, the Commonwealth Government is intent on squeezing the life out of the States, and it will do it in any way it can. This Bill is as good a way of doing it as by direct legislation or by some other administrative act. Undoubtedly, if the States are starved of funds, they must resort to legislation of this kind. This is bad legislation, as we all agree (and that is why so much of what has been said has been such a waste of time), and the Treasurer has said so in his second reading speech and on previous occasions. It is part of a plan by the federal part of the Australian Labor Party to destroy the system of federal Government in Australia. Let there be no mistake about that, and I hope that the member for Mitchell, who I think is to speak next after me, will say something about this point. It can be done in many ways, and this Bill is one of the ways by which it is being done.

It is being done at the expense of the State Labor Government. I have in my possession, and I suppose all members have read, the extract from the *Advertiser* of the letter from the Treasurer to the Prime Minister in which he complained bitterly about the deal he had had. The Treasurer said that there would be a storm of objection about the Bill, and that is what makes so futile what has been said by members of the Labor Party so far. The Treasurer said:

I believe it to be not unreasonable that you should accept responsibility for the consequences to State Government revenues of your earlier credit policies. As a result of increases in prices of materials and in tenders for maintenance work, I find that, notwithstanding Cabinet instruction that economy must be practised in all areas of Government and notwithstanding that a brake has been placed on expansion of Government employment. . . .

I do not believe that for a moment. I heard that only today a team of surveyors from the Lands Department had been surveying the site of the artificial lake at Monarto. If that is not a waste of time and money that could be

saved, I do not know what is. The Treasurer continued: . . . it is likely that excess expenditure to the extent of \$6 000 000 will be incurred in areas other than salary and wage increases. Despite all efforts which I make to effect further economies, I am looking down the barrel at a prospective deficit of close to \$30 000 000. If I receive no further grants and do not proceed with new franchise taxes, this becomes a figure of the order of \$36 000 000, since I have allowed in my Budget for a minimum of \$6 000 000 from these sources in 1974-75.

The Treasurer then complained that he had been let down, and let down he had been. What will he do about it? He complains now about these things, because it is easy to do that. We are a long way from an election, but I challenge any Government member to say whether there is the slightest likelihood of the Treasurer, a Minister, or any member of the Government not supporting the present Labor Government at the next Commonwealth election. None of them will take that challenge, and none of them can: they will all support the present Labor Government when the time comes. They will all say, "Well, it is done", and also, "It is so much better than any alternative Government." That will mean that any criticism which we now get from Labor Party members is absolutely hollow, even hypocritical, because it is not backed up by the only way in which one can back up criticism of a political Party, namely, by withdrawing support from it. I do not accept at its face value what the Treasurer says; it is all acting and shadow sparring on his part. Indeed, he is going up to help the Labor Party in the Queensland election, which is being fought on Commonwealth issues, and on no other issues whatever. The Treasurer is going up to support his colleagues.

The SPEAKER: Order! Reference to the Treasurer in Queensland has been ruled out of order.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Why don't you say something about the Bill?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Kavel, since it was announced that he would be opposed by a Liberal Movement candidate—

The SPEAKER: Order! References to political issues are out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, this is a political forum. I do not know why references to political matters should be ruled out of order. It will be hard to debate anything in the future if that is done. The member for Kavel has added even more vinegar to all his remarks since he discovered that Mr. Teusner, the son of his predecessor, was to oppose him at the next election.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member has just given a prime example of the vinegar he mixes with the comments he makes in this place. I can tell the member for Kavel that the bitterness he shows so often in this place (and, regrettably for his sake, outside this place) will cost him his seat.

The SPEAKER: Order! We are dealing with a certain Bill; we are not dealing with internal matters in political organisations. We are dealing with this Bill, and the subject matter must be confined to it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Really, the members of the Liberal Party do amuse me.

Mr. Gunn: You amuse us, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I know I do not amuse the members of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Venning: You bore us.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There would not be such a full House if I did that. When the member for Mallee—

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I feel sorry for the two Ministers, the Minister of Labour and Industry and the Minister in charge of housing and development, who have had to alternate during most of the evening and listen to what has been said in this futility of a debate.

Mr. Becker: Especially the past 24 minutes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, I have done my best despite the constant barrage of interjections from members of the Liberal Party. The big political point that comes out of this is the one I have made—that in the ultimate it does not matter what Don Dunstan says now in his criticism of the Commonwealth Government: he will support it at the next election, and so will every honourable member opposite.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the member for Mitcham is speaking to this Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and I am referring to the criticism of the Commonwealth Government that the Treasurer made in his second reading explanation. I am saying it is entirely hypocritical, as is the criticism made by every member opposite on this matter, because, when the chips are down, they will not take the only effective step of criticising a Government in a democracy— withdrawing support from it.

Mr. Simmons: The alternative is too horrible to contemplate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Peake puts me in an appalling dilemma when he makes that comment; I must admit that. However, all honourable members opposite must take the responsibility for this Bill, because they support a Government that has forced it on their own Government. I hope that even now this Bill will never come into operation. It will pass through this place and, unless the old gentlemen upstairs are particularly foolish, they will pass it, because they will not want to force an election—

Mr. McANANEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, when I came into the Chamber I heard this little boy behind me referring to the elderly gentlemen in another place.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot raise a point of order on the basis that he has mentioned so far.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The problem with the member for Heysen is that the honourable members in another place are not all old people.

Mr. McANANEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the member for Heysen is not included in this Bill.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I oppose the second reading of this Bill. I hope it does not pass but, unless something effective is done and there is not merely talk by members opposite with their Commonwealth colleagues, we shall have to have this Bill with all the undesirable consequences on which we are agreed, and with the long-term result that it will further weaken the fabric of Government. I know that is something that members opposite regard with equanimity, but it is not something that I like or that most people in this State or in the Commonwealth like.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I oppose this Bill. I find it difficult to follow a genius; it is always hard to face. The member for Mitcham spent most of his time ridiculing the members of my Party and reiterating the speeches made

by members on this side. He was not here when they made them, unfortunately. I cannot support this Bill unless the Government cuts down on its excessive spending in all fields. Many cases can be cited. Indeed, the Leader of the Opposition cited several cases where the cost could be reduced by many hundreds of thousands of dollars. I have only to remind the House of the telephone bills incurred by some of the smaller offices in Government departments.

A recent example was the film corporation, one office of which incurred a telephone bill of \$13 000, the total telephone bill for the whole corporation being over \$30 000. Many more examples were given. The Treasurer was hypocritical in introducing this Bill. He said, "If this amendment is enacted, it will provide additional revenue of about \$9 000 000"—that is, in this financial year; and this is from March onwards only but "in a full financial year it will provide \$19 000 000." That is what one would term a "guesstimate", which is something that is near the mark but often far from it. When dealing with the Government, we realise that its guesstimates are far from the actual figure. So, with a guesstimate of \$19 000 000, one would expect an income from this revenue of probably about \$20 000 000 to \$25 000 000. As the Treasurer has said, it is a measure that will cause inflation, which we have to avoid if possible. However, the Prime Minister has slapped the Treasurer on the cheek so often that it now hurts, yet the Treasurer appears on television and speaks about the Prime Minister with crocodile tears pouring down his cheeks. The Prime Minister has said openly that he is a Socialist and will provide Socialist policies for Australia. The Treasurer believes in Socialism by stealth, a quieter and easier way of bringing this State to its knees. There is a possibility of a Commonwealth election in mid-1975: no doubt the Prime Minister will decide to give money to the States as a political carrot, should that happen, in which case the Treasurer will say, "We will not have to introduce this horrible legislation, because there is no need: the great Gough has decided to relieve us of the pain." This action would help the Commonwealth Government, and would increase the Premier's image in South Australia.

The Treasurer said that the Bill would have an inflationary effect and that he was conscious of it. If that is so, why does not the Government get its priorities straight? If it needs more money, it should investigate how money is wasted in Government departments. Although it is difficult to ascertain, because supplies are obtained by tender, as far as I can assess, for its petrol the South Australian Government pays about 16c for 4.5 litres. Therefore, it does not have to worry about cutting down its consumption. From petrol and fuel tax the Commonwealth Government receives 22.3c for every 4.5 litres, yet it can ignore the State's plea for financial assistance. The Commonwealth Government can spend money as if it were water, and I believe its policies are completely wrong. Tax from petrol is supposed to be used to improve roads and for public transport, but nothing is being returned to this State. It is ironical that Mr. Cameron (Minister for Labor and Immigration) now believes that private enterprise has to make a profit. It seems that the member for Spence also believes that private enterprise deserves a profit: obviously, unless it receives a profit, it cannot work, but those are enlightening remarks from Labor members.

Mr. Crimes: There's nothing wrong with profit. It's where it goes that counts.

Mr. MATHWIN: Although some members opposite seem to think that foreign investment is wrong, anyone who has a knowledge of it would know that a young country must have foreign investments in order to advance. We cannot go it alone, as pleasant as that practice may be in theory. Socialism is good in theory, as is Communism, but they do not work in practice. At present we have an inflation rate of 30 per cent, and this measure will increase further cost-push inflation. The Commonwealth Government believes in centralism and is willing to release money to State Governments, councils, and many other organisations, but it decides in which way the money is to be spent. What a ludicrous situation. The Treasurer introduced the Bill yesterday afternoon, and now expects it to be debated and passed through this House this evening. I register my complaint about this situation. What opportunity do members have of contacting petrol resellers, who are vitally affected by this difficult Bill? Although we have assisted the Government in the past, and although Question Time has been reduced, we are again seeing legislation rushed through prior to a recess. Petrol resellers in my district whom I have contacted are concerned that they will be forced to charge an extra 6c for 4.5 litres, a considerable increase. The Treasurer is openly opposing increases in salaries for the Police Force, yet he is willing to increase the price of petrol by 6c for 4.5 litres. This Government has no understanding of business management. Further, it is obvious from what has happened over the past two years that the Government has no knowledge of budgeting. Every business man must have such knowledge.

Mr. Venning: If he doesn't have that knowledge, he does not stay in business for very long.

Mr. MATHWIN: I agree. Further, unless a person gives value for money, he is soon out of business; that is the first thing that the Government has to learn. So, we can see how the Government has fallen in the estimation of the people. It is all right for the Treasurer to say, with tears in his eyes, "I am very sorry that I have to slug you an extra 6c for each 4.5 litres of petrol." This measure affects all people, whether or not they use private transport. The member for Elizabeth let the cat out of the bag this evening when he implied that this was one of the ways in which the Government would force people to use public transport. He implied that the Government would force up petrol prices to such an extent that people would have to use public transport. The member for Spence said, by interjection, that we ought to do more trade with China.

Mr. Crimes: I said that you were willing to trade with China.

Mr. MATHWIN: I suppose the honourable member is very proud of the fact that a gentleman representing the builders labourers returned from China recently and stated that that country was a marvellous place now, as everyone had a bicycle.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN: In his second reading explanation, the Treasurer said:

All available evidence suggests that some relief from indirect taxation is one of the more important methods of stimulating the economy. In this regard, I would make quite clear that, even at this late stage, my Government would not proceed with this Bill, and also a Bill to be introduced later this session to license retail tobacco sales, if Australian Government assistance were made available to the extent contemplated by these taxing measures.

If a Commonwealth election is in the offing the Prime Minister will say to the States, "You can have more money." He will make himself a good fellow, as will the Premier. Mr. Hawke has had second thoughts on the whole situation. He has painted a very black picture in connection with inflation and unemployment by predicting that 300 000 people will be unemployed. Clause 4 provides:

"premises" includes any place, vehicle, ship, vessel or aircraft.

Clause 7 provides for the setting up of an appeal tribunal. More tribunals are being set up than were set up during the French revolution. The member for Eyre referred to the question of inspectors. Clause 10 provides:

(1) An inspector may at any time, with such assistants as he considers necessary, without any warrant other than this section—

- (a) enter and remain in any premises at which or at which he reasonably suspects the business of selling petroleum products is carried on or which is or which he reasonably suspects is being used for the storage or custody of any accounts, records, books or documents relating to the sale or purchase of petroleum products;
- (b) take copies of, or extracts or notes from, any such accounts, records, books or documents; and
- (c) request any person found in or upon any premises used for the sale or purchase of petroleum products or on which petroleum products are stored for sale—

- (i) to produce any accounts, records, books or documents which relate to or which the inspector reasonably suspects relate to the sale or purchase of petroleum products and which at the time of the request are in the possession or under the control of that person;

and

- (ii) to answer any question with respect to any such accounts, records, books or documents or the sale or purchase of any petroleum products.

By these provisions, the powers of the inspector are greater than those of the police, as has been the position in other legislation the Government has introduced giving powers to inspectors. Clause 11 provides:

(1) On and from the twenty-fourth day of March, 1975, a person shall not carry on the business of selling petroleum products unless he is the holder of a licence.

The penalty under this provision is \$1 000. Therefore, a person has Hobson's choice: if he does not take out a licence, he must pay a fine of \$1 000. For licences class 1 to class 6 the cost will be \$500; for licences classes 7 and 8 the fee will be \$100; and for a licence class 9 the fee will be \$50. For the privilege of being in business the Government will rob these people of anything from \$50 to \$500, yet they are having a hard enough time now to make ends meet. They will receive nothing in return for paying this fee. What will the Government do with all the money it receives in this way? Hundreds of ordinary guys who are trying to run petrol stations will be faced with a fee of between \$50 and \$500.

If this measure is not designed to kill private enterprise, I want to know what is. These provisions will also kill initiative. We well know the Government's attitude towards private enterprise: it wants no part of it. It wants to kill private enterprise, initiative, and the rights of the individual. The Bill is designed to bring people in private enterprise to their knees. Clause 15, another complicated provision, relates to particulars of sales and purchases of petroleum products. It lays down what people in this business will have to do. The Government is requiring them to look after the administration of this matter. Of course, the Government will reap the benefit of the licence fees and the increase in the price of petrol of 6c for each 4.5 litres.

Yet it will force these people, who already have problems, to do all the administrative work involved. If they do not do the work, they will be fined. This is another kick in the guts for private enterprise. All members opposite who support the Bill should be ashamed of themselves. Clause 24 provides:

(1) A person who carries on the business of selling petroleum products shall keep such accounts, records, books and documents as may be prescribed containing such particulars as may be prescribed relating to petroleum products and shall preserve each of those accounts, records, books and documents for a period of five years after the last entry was made in it.

Penalty: One thousand dollars.

The policy of this Socialist Government is to bring private enterprise to its knees. There is hardly any difference between Socialism and Communism; the only difference is that Socialism takes a little longer. However, the principles are exactly the same.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must come back to the Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN: The member for Elizabeth said that there were positive aspects associated with this tax as it would help to preserve non-renewable resources. Recently, he spent some time with the Arabs. When he came back he said that "no-smoking" signs should be erected in bazaars. He has said in this debate that the Arabs have helped the world by increasing the price of petroleum.

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

Mr. CRIMES (Spence): I speak primarily to support my Leader, because I have been challenged to do so. I am just as reluctant as is the Treasurer to see a Bill such as this introduced. However, with him, I regard it as inevitable that the Bill should be introduced in order to obtain funds to keep the public services of the Government operating. From what we have heard from members opposite, we would imagine that taxation is tantamount to what they call Socialism. Actually, taxation existed long before Socialism was ever an issue, and before people anywhere in the world—

Mr. Venning: Deny that you're a Socialist!

Mr. CRIMES: I unashamedly admit that I am a Socialist. At the same time, I am aware of the difficulties that exist in this country in the Commonwealth and State spheres in relation to introducing matters that I believe would be of tremendous benefit to the people of this country. Consequently, I believe that a Government of this type has to act in accordance with surrounding circumstances, doing the best it can for the ordinary people of the State and the Commonwealth. That is precisely what the Dunstan Government has been doing and will continue to do to the best of its ability. I am not willing to condemn the Whitlam Government for all it has done. Opposition members have dwelt on only one aspect of the administration of the Australian Government—its attitude to State finances. We have some objections to the procedures of the Australian Government in relation to its treatment of the States, but I am well aware that many other policies of that Government have been of tremendous benefit to people in this country and, indeed, to the people of the Western world.

Difficulties being faced by the Commonwealth Government are difficulties that have to be faced by this State Government and all other State Governments in the Commonwealth. We must be sufficiently broad-minded to see the breadth of the issue facing us. One would think, from the remarks flowing from Opposition members, that

we in South Australia alone are facing the difficulties of inflation and unemployment. That is just not true, and if Opposition members were willing to accept the evidence appearing daily in the *Advertiser* (a paper for which I have very little regard), or even if they were to read and accept the news appearing in the columns of that newspaper, they would understand that the difficulties we face are those faced by the whole of the Western world.

I remind Opposition members that, while our State Treasurer complains about the treatment of this State by the Australian Government, he has been in concert with the Treasurers of all the other States on exactly the same issue. If Opposition members were in Government today they would be joining their confrères in the Liberal States of Australia in making the same complaint.

Members on this side have been waiting during this debate, which has gone on for far too long (and I am aware that time is going on), for the slightest indication from our friends on the other side that they have any solution to offer for the problems facing the Australian and South Australian economies. We have not heard one constructive suggestion. We have heard much raving about the benefits of free enterprise, and if Opposition members dare to say that this Government has not helped private enterprise (or free enterprise, as they call it) in this State, they lie in their teeth and they know they do.

Opposition members say they stand for free enterprise. If they do that, and if they believe they genuinely and validly have a solution to our problems, a solution we are trying to put forward in the short term by supporting this Bill, why are they not loyal to their comrades in other countries? Conservative Governments in other countries are waiting for solutions to problems such as those facing us today, yet Opposition members are so selfish and so self-centred that they keep from their comrades in other countries the solutions they claim to have. Why do they not send the message to the United States of America, telling that country how to solve its problems, which are exactly the same as those we face today? The United Kingdom had similar problems under Ted Heath, but Opposition members did not help him out.

I am referring to this Bill, the aim of which is to get us out of our difficulties on a short-term basis. We do not claim that these will be the answers in the long term; indeed, they will not. I am aware that the long-term answers are the answers I believe in, the answers I have been charged with holding, and which I have no shame in holding.

We have heard much from Opposition members on the menace of public enterprise. They hate anything that begins with the word "public". They dwell lovingly, time after time, on the word "private", which in itself indicates that they have regard only for the selfishness of the individual and not for the public at large.

Mr. Becker: We believe in free enterprise.

Mr. CRIMES: I, too, believe in freedom.

Dr. Tonkin: As long as it is the way you see it.

Mr. CRIMES: Is not that the way the honourable member sees it? The honourable member thinks he is right, and I think we are right. I believe in freedom of the press, but I cannot have freedom of the press because it is impossible for me to start a newspaper, as I do not have sufficient capital. What members opposite talk about is a completely artificial and fictitious freedom, freedom only for the people controlling the wealth of the community. We have heard suggestions from Opposition members that they claim will do away with the

need for this Bill. One such suggestion is that we should cut down our expenditure in the public sector. Surely members opposite realise that, in saying expenditure should be cut in the public sector, they are declaring that they will accept less in contracts and important purchases from the private sector. If Government departments were to cease purchasing from the private sector, I suggest the loudest noise would come from Opposition members. That is chicken feed compared with the amount involved in the Bill, and members opposite know that. We have heard the public pronouncements of the Leader of the Opposition, a delightful fellow socially but a thorough scoundrel politically. We have heard from members opposite that we should cut down on the Public Service, but what does that mean to private enterprise? It means more people out of work.

Mr. McAnaney: Come on!

Mr. CRIMES: Of course it does. It means more people out of work and fewer people purchasing the goods and services provided by private enterprise. The economics of the Opposition are completely and absolutely ridiculous and outdated. The Opposition has not the slightest understanding of pure economics.

Opposition members have continually levelled against the Government the charge of Socialism. Personally, I welcome that charge, because I believe that only in Socialism do we have the true solution to our problems. However, Government members are realists: they know that in the current situation, with the States dependent on Commonwealth finance, we do not have the financial wherewithal to institute genuine Socialism within the confines of this State. The same thing applies to every other State, too. I say it is a lie when Opposition members charge us with trying to institute Socialism. Would that we could! However, in the current circumstances it is impossible, although I hope from my heart that the time will come when we can do just that. I refer the Opposition to the Commonwealth field, where the same situation prevails. The Opposition knows this. Indeed, what they do with Socialism is what they did previously with Communism, before that with Bolshevism, and even before that with the Socialist tiger: members opposite introduce a bogey.

Mr. VENNING: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the member for Spence is not talking about the Bill at all. He is talking about Socialism and other matters. There is nothing in the Bill about Socialism.

The SPEAKER: I did not hear the member for Rocky River take a point of order when a previous speaker referred to Socialism. However, the same rule applies to the member for Spence. Any speech must relate to the Bill before the House.

Mr. CRIMES: How right you are, Mr. Speaker. I have had to deal with these sorts of argument put forward by members opposite. They did not speak to the Bill: they merely raised irrelevant points to get our minds away from the real purpose of this Bill. Its real purpose is to keep viable the services of the State for the benefit of the people of the State.

Dr. Eastick: To shackle the people.

Mr. CRIMES: I have heard Opposition members cry crocodile tears before. They have accused the Treasurer of the same thing. They have cried crocodile tears over the situation that has developed in the Police Department. Do not Opposition members realise that, if we cannot maintain the finances of the State, if we cannot keep Government departments financially viable (and those

departments include the Police Department), we shall not be able to afford to pay the police whatever is awarded to them subsequently when the appeal in respect of the current wage decision is heard?

Perhaps members opposite have their own view. Certainly, they blind themselves on this issue. By not voting for this Bill, they are ensuring that the Government will have to reduce the services of the State. We will cut down the number of people in work. I refer to the railways, water supply, and other public amenities. I need not be conducted by the member for Bragg as if I were an orchestra. Certainly, I will not need his services as a doctor, and I hope the time will come when there will be a medical scheme that will not need the services of people such as he.

We are trying to keep viable, as a result of the finance to be obtained through this Bill, and to keep the Government's work going. We are trying to maintain finances to keep our roads in order, to keep the railways in order, to maintain our water supplies, to keep the Police Department in proper order, to keep our other State services going, to maintain consumer protection, to provide housing, and to give the Agriculture Department funds to continue.

In supporting this Bill I am saying that, although it may be an incubus on certain people of the State (indeed, on many people in the State), it is designed to keep going those services of which South Australians are so proud. Opposition members must remember that we have something to be proud of in this State. South Australia is in a position where it needs help. It has not received it from where we thought it would come from, and we appeal to the people to understand what we are doing through this Bill. We want to keep this State in the position it has developed under the Dunstan Government, enabling it to remain a shining example to all other other Australian States. We intend to do this and, if the people of South Australia understand our purpose, they will support us in our advocacy of this Bill.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I oppose the Bill. It hurts me to hear a man of my age or even slightly older talk so much utter bunkum, although we might expect it from the member for Elizabeth and the member for Mawson, who have not yet been out in the world to see how it works. When the member for Mawson delivers the goods and provides houses, in his capacity as Minister in charge of housing, I will withdraw my remarks. The basic fact is that the Treasurer has said, "I alone in Australia must go on spending as I would like to, not according to my means." That is the problem.

Mr. Duncan: That is not what the Treasurer said.

Mr. McANANEY: He has claimed that, if he does not raise funds through taxation measures and if the Liberal Party subsequently comes to Government, we will cause unemployment in South Australia. True, I am only an amateur economist, but I am a book-keeper. The Government must realise that, if it takes \$20 000 000 out of the private sector, that is \$20 000 000 that the private sector cannot spend. The Government spends it and no more employment can be created. The Treasurer says he has to go ahead and spend as he can. Frankly, I have admired the Treasurer over the last year or two. He has been a reasonable Treasurer, but he has had a honeymoon period. He had Mr. Gorton who, as Australian Prime Minister, gave South Australia the best deal it has ever had from the Commonwealth Government. The Treasurer admitted this in this House this week. The Treasurer said that, when he put up a case, the Prime Minister said that South Australia

had a raw deal. That is what Mr. Gorton said. He told us that, if we were discontented, we should go to the Grants Commission.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: He didn't think we could.

Mr. McANANEY: The States agreed with the Commonwealth Government that they would not go to the Grants Commission for a certain time. Mr. Gorton said that he would wipe out that agreement so that, if the States wanted to go to the Grants Commission to put a case for additional funds, they could. The Treasurer said that, because Mr. Gorton did not do his homework, he did not realise what he was doing. However, it was mighty good for South Australia, but it ruined the Treasurer: he lived so easily for two or three years, but now he has to face up to the fact of life that one cannot spend more than one receives.

Dr. Eastick: And the country will never prosper under Labor.

Mr. McANANEY: This is a basic fact of life. What has the Treasurer done this year? Since July 1, he has already levied about \$59 370 000 in taxation in the first four months of the financial year, whereas last year in the same period only \$41 624 000 was collected. But the Treasurer's expenditure has increased from a deficit of \$2 000 000 to \$19 000 000. Rex Jory, a journalist of some ability who should know the facts of life and should be giving proof to the people of this State, said that Dunstan was a mighty man for business. The Treasurer put industry out of this State, assisted by Barry Cavanagh and others who had caused the situation. Even Max Harris praised good old Don, but I think that he was being satirical. I am sure that he did not mean what he wrote. We must face up to the fact that the Treasurer himself thought, "I alone, the Cassius Clay of Australia, have made South Australia great. I am noted for my achievements." The Treasurer, however, has had an armchair ride with the money the Gorton Government gave him.

When the Treasurer came back, like a little boy, from seeing Mr. Gorton, he said that the Prime Minister had been rude to him, but a report in the *Australian* stated that South Australia had had the best deal ever. In 1970-71, by wiping out the debt and giving interest-free grants, we received a grant of \$26 000 000, debt taken over, which saved us \$1 500 000 in interest and debt services, and interest-free grants of \$27 400 000, which did not save us any interest in that year. I will not go through the document year by year, but in 1974 we got \$26 000 000 again, a debt taken over of \$7 500 000, and interest-free grants of \$33 700 000, which saved us \$8 300 000. In addition was what the Treasurer had taken out of the private sector. When he takes money from the private sector, the private sector cannot spend it on itself. One does not have to be a member of Parliament to know there are unhappy groups of people streaming into members' offices and complaining about the situation they are in; this has developed only in the last year or so. During the first four months of this financial year the Treasurer has collected \$31 270 000 in pay-roll tax, compared to \$15 025 000 last year.

Mr. Nankivell: Over a 100 per cent increase.

Mr. McANANEY: Yes, but do we see people getting anything extra from this money?

Mr. Nankivell: No.

Mr. McANANEY: They have the same problems. Some highly-paid people are tearing around the country, and there is a group of supposed experts in the Premier's Department. The best case ever taken to the Commonwealth Government was when my Party was in Government and Steele Hall was Premier. Although I do not

agree with what Steele Hall is doing now, I remind members that the Treasury officers, combined with a Liberal Government, took a well prepared case to the Commonwealth Government and got good results. Don Dunstan went to the Commonwealth Government saying "Provide a sufficient level of tariff protection for South Australia's most vulnerable industries." About 18 months ago, when we had a Liberal Government, we were exporting motor vehicles to many countries of the world. A boot factory in my area was doing very well because, according to Dunstan, it was protected by tariffs. Yet with a tariff cut of only 11 per cent, the boot industry was put out of business. What really put the factory out of business was a 25 per cent increase in wages, a 42 per cent increase in wages for females, plus a month's extra leave.

We cannot give increased assistance to the people who need it if an extra week is taken off as leave. Fortunately the Attorney-General is now Minister in charge of prices. Once, when the Treasurer was Minister in charge of prices, he had received from the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs a report that the House messenger brought over to me in this House before I asked my question. When I asked the Treasurer whether he had a reply to my question, he said he did not have one. The Treasurer took the report back with him and redrafted what the Commissioner had said. On another occasion, the Attorney-General provided the necessary reply. The following extract is a condemnation of Socialism, if ever one was needed:

Recent increases in the prices of many goods, including grocery lines, have been brought about not only by wage rises but also by added costs due to improved workmen's compensation, four weeks annual leave, 17½ per cent leave loading, and by the introduction of equal pay for equal work performed by women.

We are not opposed to many of these things, but we must accept the fact that, if we are going to increase nominal wages, real wages will also be increased. Listen to this:

There is little indication, however, that price rises under present conditions are excessive compared to wage increases as in the last eight years average weekly earnings have almost doubled whilst the consumer price index has increased by 51.7 per cent.

It is not possible under the South Australian Prices Act, 1948-1973, to control interstate manufacturers' selling prices. However, all industries with annual sales of over \$20 000 000 are subject to the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth Prices Justification Tribunal, and a number of large food processors fall into this category. It is also not possible to devise a satisfactory system of price control for commodities, such as vegetables and meat.

These are subject to the law of supply and demand which greatly affects prices usually on a seasonal basis. From time to time retail prices of meat are checked to see that retail margins are not excessive. Further, excessive profits are not being made by manufacturers in this State, including bakers, and retailers such as grocers, both supermarket and small corner stores, and butchers show low percentage profit returns on trading. We benefit from a free enterprise system where competition exists. I have not always been opposed to price control in South Australia, but we must have good strong restrictive trade practices legislation, which is now on the Statute Book. If there is competition, we do not have to worry much about price levels. The Treasurer asked the Prime Minister to provide a sufficient level of tariff protection for South Australia's most vulnerable industries. The Prime Minister has made it impossible for us to compete on world markets, and there has been a marked change within 15 months. So, if the Premier wishes to have tariff protection, what will it mean? It will mean that more cars will be made for home consumption but we shall never get back to expanding our export industry on a large scale as a result of cheaper production.

Mr. Simmons: Firms all over the world are trying to do that.

Mr. McANANEY: I should not really take notice of such ignorant remarks, but I suppose I must answer that interjection by saying that, when I was in Singapore, only three years ago, the Trade Commissioner for South Australia was a little late coming to a meeting because he was working out with a group of manufacturers and the South Australian agent, who was an agent for Dunlop and about 10 other firms, whether they could export quality machines to Singapore as the yen had been revalued by 3 per cent. Three years ago we could not begin to export. If we had had the wisdom to control our inflation (which was an artificial inflation, except at the start when food prices rose a little) not long ago, we could have exported manufactured goods to the rest of the world.

Let us take Japan, which has to pay three times the price for its oil and wheat that it paid previously, whereas here in Australia we get our wheat for little more than it cost 15 years ago. Yet what has happened to the price of bread? It has more than doubled over the past year, partly because of increased wages for the middleman who makes and handles loaves of bread. This article continues:

. . . provide compensatory subsidies or support to industry already in or planned for outside major population centres.

We must agree that, if we are to get people to go to Monarto, they must be subsidised and given concessions. A balance must be struck—whether we derive any benefit from having Monarto (where residents will have to pay more for their goods) or whether we have more in taxation compensation. In these difficult times that is only a piddling little thing compared with the realities of life. The article continues:

. . . provide State Governments with special money to reduce the added costs of industry in fringe areas.

What is our Treasurer doing when he asks the Commonwealth Government for more money at this stage? Does he come out and say that the Commonwealth Government should not have reduced income tax or should not have done what it has done to try to curb inflation, or should the Commonwealth Government have given the money to him? Then Mr. Crean made one of his few statements (he is not allowed to say much nowadays):

Mini Budget result. The Treasurer (Mr. Crean) said yesterday the Budget deficit for 1974-75 was likely to be about \$1 850 000 000 as a result of the latest economic measures.

Mr. Dean Brown: Did you say \$1 850 000 000?

Mr. McANANEY: Yes. That is even higher than the deficit of last March when inflation really started in Australia. The Treasurer, I suppose, will be Treasurer for a while but he cannot fool the people any longer when he gets the assistance of a man like Jory, who I thought was rather an intelligent type of chap. That is the situation. We want \$30 000 000, and the other States, with 10 times our population, want another \$300 000 000, so there would be an increased deficit of over \$2 150 000 000. We all believe there is merit in the Keynesian theory of financing deficits when there is unemployment.

This can be argued, and it was argued in the 1972 Budget when we had a balanced economy with very little unemployment; but, when people are being forced into unemployment because their costs are at world parity and we have lost our ability to export, the pumping of more money into the economy will bring worse results than ever before. For instance, the tannery in my little township

of Mount Barker has sacked men. The shoe factory has gone at Strathalbyn simply because it cannot compete on the export market. What will happen if we put all this extra money into the economy? There will be an increased demand for goods, admittedly, but the demand will be for oversea goods unless we introduce import restrictions.

Mr. Coumbe: What happened at Mount Barker?

Mr. McANANEY: If the tannery had been in China or Russia and it had not kept its production up and its costs down, one or two people would have been shot. It is amazing that we are pumping more and more money into education but are we getting any results from it? What is the situation when the Treasurer of this State says, "I can go on spending as much money as I want to, but the Commonwealth Government must come to our assistance and spend more so that there will be a greater demand for goods"? We must get down to the basic principles. We may have a stomach ache through eating too many green apples, but the Treasurer gives us more green apples in the hope that they will cure us. After the Second World War we had import restrictions for about five years, but they only got us into trouble.

Members interjecting:

Mr. McANANEY: I have set out the basic fiscal principles involved. Even the member for Ross Smith admitted that last year he finally understood that I was doing my best for him with the fiscal principles I have espoused. He said, "You are talking a lot of sense, Bill." Let us see what this Government has done.

Mr. Max Brown: You have only eight minutes left in which to explain your principles.

Mr. McANANEY: I can explain them, but I do not know that it would be of any use as no-one here would be capable of understanding them. The Government will get less money from stamp duties. I stated in the Budget debate last year that the way things were going this would happen and that we would run into a period when we would not get a bonus from stamp duties, as we did last year. In other words, the receipts from stamp duties would be less than the sum budgeted.

[Midnight]

What I am saying I have said before. I am not stating anything new. Pay-roll tax receipts have doubled, and that is an inflationary tax. What benefit have we had from this tax? No doubt we need more education facilities, but in the 1960's we had to provide for a large increase in the number of children attending primary and secondary schools, and this was a strain on our resources. I believe that the Minister of Education is a fairly efficient Minister, but he does not realise that one has to live within one's resources. At present there is a decline in the number of primary schoolchildren with a corresponding reduction in necessary expansion. We do not oppose the need for education, hospitals, and other facilities, but we have to assess properly what people need today.

Money that is spent on education buildings cannot be used to build houses, and many people are waiting in vain to occupy houses, because they are not available. Houses are needed at Mount Barker, but are not being built, and many young people are broken-hearted because they cannot obtain a house. It seems hopeless to apply to the Housing Trust for accommodation, but, at the same time, the Government is depriving the private sector of money that could be spent on housing. In its way the Commonwealth Government is trying to stop inflation, but is not using the basic concepts of bookkeeping. That Government

collected \$15 000 000 in pay-roll tax in four months, but this impost has increased the cost of school buildings and houses.

The State Government is now to take \$20 000 000 from the private sector, so that many people will be affected. If members think that the Commonwealth Government has been stingy, they must realise that it is only stingy compared to what Gorton gave to this State. This year we are to receive \$255 000 000 compared to \$204 000 000 last year, and there have been increases in special grants and grants for specific purposes. The Treasurer should realise that money and goods are not available now, and, because of the Treasurer's action and the action of trade unions, fewer goods will be available in Australia and South Australia next year. The Treasurer has to button up his pockets and reduce expenditure, because he will not reduce unemployment by taking money away from the private sector. I defy the Treasurer or any Government member to deny that statement. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): The Treasurer's second reading explanation clearly indicates that this taxation measure is necessary because of the break-down in finance coming from the Commonwealth Government. Australia as a Federation is in a unique position in which the centralised Government raises more money and has greater power to raise that money than is available to any similar Federation. In Australia the Commonwealth Government raises about 77 per cent of all revenue; State Governments raise about 12.9 per cent; and local government raises about 9 per cent. Compared to our figure of 77 per cent, in Canada, the figure is 51.5 per cent; in the United States of America it is 62.9 per cent, and in West Germany the figure is 49 per cent. These figures show the marked difference in the power of centralised Government to raise finance.

Mr. Simmons: Do you think the centralised Government should give us more money?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I do, and I hope the honourable member thinks that, because that is what his Leader thinks.

Mr. Simmons: That's what the Bill is all about.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: And that is why I am referring to the Commonwealth-State financial relationship. The States have had to rely heavily on the Commonwealth Government for necessary finance, but that Government has been reluctant to hand over money. I disagreed somewhat with the policies of John Gorton when he was Liberal Prime Minister but, under the present Prime Minister, the situation has deteriorated markedly and, by comparison (if I can make a comparison between Whitlam and Gorton), obviously Gorton appreciated the problems of the States more than has the present Prime Minister, who seems determined to strangle the States as regards finance. In fact, he will strangle them by holding back finance.

During the nine years to 1971-72 the Commonwealth Government's revenue increased by 100 per cent, but during that period the States' revenue increased by only 70 per cent, yet the States had the responsibility for education, hospitals, community welfare and urban transport, which all required increased finance. In those fields the increases required were greater than the increases required in fields covered by the Commonwealth Government. So, over the last decade the States have been slowly starved of finance, and they are now in the unfortunate position of having to impose a consumer tax. It amazes me that the Treasurer has had the gall to condemn his Commonwealth colleague regarding his Commonwealth policies. After all, the Treasurer agreed with those policies in the past. He

supported them before the Commonwealth election in December, 1972, and before the Commonwealth election in May of this year. Yet suddenly, because the Treasurer can see things turning against him in his own State, he is now trying to create the impression that he is on a totally different course from that of the Prime Minister. Of course, we realise that that is not the case. On July 31, 1973, I made my first major speech in this House.

Mr. Duncan: You have never made a major speech in this House.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If the honourable member reads the Treasurer's recent comments he will agree that the points I made in that speech were correct. The States are being raped by the Commonwealth, and we are now seeing the effects of that rape. This Bill will raise about \$19 000 000. I would have thought that the first thing we should ask ourselves was whether the public can trust the Cabinet with this sum. Recent history shows that we cannot afford to trust the Cabinet with the extra \$19 000 000, because it has shown incompetence, irresponsibility and lack of discipline in handling the State's finances. Why should we impose a further tax on the public so that the Government can continue to show lack of responsibility and lack of discipline? I shall show why I am not willing to entrust members of Cabinet with a further \$19 000 000. Let me take, first, the Jekyll and Hyde of the Cabinet, the Treasurer of this State. Of course, the people now realise that he is no more than a Jekyll and Hyde.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: The people reckon you are a banana.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: In the news media the Treasurer tries to placate the public by attacking the Whitlam Government. We have heard a series of attacks lately on financial matters, and we heard another attack today in connection with the Baltic States. The Treasurer has realised that, in the minds of the public, he needs to dissociate himself completely from the Whitlam Government. Of course, the Treasurer is only putting on an act. Turning to his other side, we see the real lie: it is a pity he does not back up his glib words with positive action. Why did he suddenly stop supporting the Whitlam Government, which he supported earlier? Next Friday he will stand on the same platform as the Prime Minister and support him. Of course, behind the scenes the Treasurer is hunting with the hound, the Prime Minister. And some hound, too! I suppose a suitable description of the Whitlam-Dunstan coalition would be "a dastardly duo with a predilection for economic disaster". That would be a reasonable description of the way that duo has brought South Australia to the brink of economic disaster, and I hope that this process does not continue much longer. To back up my statements concerning the way in which the Treasurer has supported the Whitlam Government, I shall refer to some newspaper articles. An article in the *News* of November 29, 1972, just before the Commonwealth election, says, in reference to the Treasurer:

He said a Federal Labor Government would mean greater benefits for all States, including New South Wales. The Treasurer made that statement because he was speaking in New South Wales during one of his interstate campaigning tours. We can see, from the pattern in South Australia over the last three or four months and from our economic situation, that that is nothing but a lie. The States are now suffering from the economic policies of the Whitlam Government. The article continues:

"It is vital for the States to get the right Government in Canberra," he said. "The States have been grossly neglected at Premiers' Conferences under the Liberal Gov-

ernment and even Sir Robert has complained bitterly." Tonight Mr. Dunstan will address a rally in Lowe, the Prime Minister's electorate.

Of course, at that rally he supported Mr. Whitlam, yet now he attacks him. A report in the *Advertiser* of September 15, 1972, stated that the Treasurer would take responsibility for raising election campaign funds in South Australia from business and commerce. An article, headed "We're ready to go", in the *Sunday Mail* of December 3, 1972, states:

The South Australian Government already had plans for State development to put before the Whitlam Government, the Premier, Mr. Dunstan, said last night. "I expect to be on the doorstep with plans in Canberra the week after next," he said.

What has happened to those plans? They have not been forthcoming, and the States are worse off than they were under a Liberal Government. In 1972, the Treasurer condemned the Commonwealth Liberal Government. If he were honest with himself and the public, he would now praise that Government in comparison with the Whitlam Government. I hope the people of South Australia appreciate what is involved in the Whitlam-Dunstan coalition. These two men, who have the same political philosophy and economic outlook, are producing the same disastrous economic results in the Commonwealth and South Australian spheres. The Treasurer's verbal attempts to disassociate himself from the Prime Minister will not work, because the people will not accept this.

The nature of the Treasurer's increased attacks on the Prime Minister indicates that even he realises that the people are not being fooled. He is rapidly reaching the stage of panicking about his own political position in this State, and that is becoming obvious. In considering whether we should trust his Ministry to spend \$19 000 000, I have dealt with the first and most important member of the Cabinet. The next man, who is currently sitting in the Chamber, is the Minister of Education, whom an independent arbitrator has recently revealed as being willing to destroy completely the authority of his department.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Bill deals with taxation measures. I realise that the honourable member wishes to indulge in a discussion of many other matters, but I ask that he be kept to the Bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order and ask the honourable member for Davenport to confine his remarks to the Bill under discussion.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I should have thought that I was very much addressing myself to the Bill, which relates to raising \$19 000 000 in extra taxation. I am simply examining whether we can trust the Cabinet of the State to spend that \$19 000 000. If we conclude that it is not capable of spending that sum, obviously we should not raise it. I know that the Minister of Education is touchy about some of his weaknesses. He does not like it said that he puts political decisions ahead of others.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why do you bring in personalities all the time?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I understand why the Minister wants to take a point of order. I need not condemn him myself, as a Royal Commissioner has already done that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have asked the honourable member to confine his remarks to the Bill under discussion. That Bill has nothing to do with matters that have been discussed in this House previously. I ask

the honourable member not to raise matters such as those he is canvassing now but to confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I do not wish to dwell much longer on this point.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member not to dwell on it at all.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I will dwell on the point whether the Cabinet will spend wisely the money that it is attempting to raise. As the Bill refers to the raising of an extra \$19 000 000, we must question how that will be spent. I am pointing out that I disagree with the way in which money has been spent in the past. I could refer to the Attorney-General and how he is leaving the sinking ship. I disagree with the expenditure in certain fields by the Minister of Environment and Conservation.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! None of the issues that the honourable member is raising applies to the Bill under discussion. I ask him again to confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Sir, for pointing that out. I have sat here almost the entire evening and have listened to nearly all members who have spoken in the debate, including the member for Spence, who spoke about the way in which money is being spent. I see no reason why I should be precluded from continuing to talk about how the Government is spending its money, especially as the member for Spence spent much time dealing with that point, even though it is now after 12 midnight and the Bill should not be debated at this time. If Cabinet had any sense, it would adjourn the matter until tomorrow.

Mr. Crimes: I stuck to the Bill.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am putting forward areas in which I believe the Government has wasted finance. However, I will not deal with the matter further, as the credibility of Cabinet members has been destroyed. Despite the housing crisis caused by the Government, the Minister of Transport has been willing, under the protection of the courts, to turn three women and nine children out of houses that are not now being used. I think that is absolutely despicable, and I cannot think of any worse way in which a Minister could possibly act.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The allegations made by the honourable member during Question Time today about some alleged action of the Minister of Transport are not relevant to this debate. The honourable member keeps on ignoring your rulings. I suggest again that he be asked to get back to the Bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having upheld a previous point of order on this matter, I uphold this point of order. I can only appeal to the honourable member to confine his remarks to the Bill. I trust that he will do so.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I will move away from that matter, but I point out that it is interesting to see how the Minister of Education reacts when comments start to get close to the bone.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I do not know how many times I must appeal to the honourable member for Davenport to confine his remarks to the Bill, but I appeal to him again to do so.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I could refer to other matters, such as the media monitoring system and the 12 per cent

growth rate in the Public Service. I hope I will not be pulled up on that matter, as the member for Spence suggested that we are advocating the sacking of people, but we are not doing that.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The Leader has publicly stated it. Are you repudiating what he said?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I know that the Minister of Transport would like to build up his little empire so that there would be even more people to turf out of houses.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What a childish statement from a little baby!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: A group of men are showing signs of becoming megalomaniacs. I certainly would not trust those men with \$19 000 000, as they have betrayed trust already. There is another valid reason why this tax should not be imposed on the people of South Australia.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Tell us whom you'd sack.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Every time I try to get down to specific details the Minister of Education takes a point of order; then the Minister of Transport asks me for details.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Whom would you sack?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: To start with, I would sack the Cabinet of the State.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That wouldn't save \$19 000 000.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It would probably save much more. It would certainly save the people the \$19 000 000 to be raised by this measure, despite the claims of the Minister.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It wouldn't save a cent, as you'd realise if you had any brains.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It is interesting to see how Ministers take points of order and interject when comments are getting close to the bone. They will allow debate to continue if it is not hitting home, but once it does hit home the Minister of Education takes a point of order. He is thin-skinned. He can hand it out, but he cannot take it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Standing Order 169 refers to the case when an honourable member refuses to conform to any Standing Order of the House or disregards the authority of the Chair. At this stage the member for Davenport is disregarding the authority of the Chair. On several occasions I have asked him to confine his remarks to the Bill, and he has persistently refused to do so. I request the member for Davenport to confine his remaining remarks to the Bill.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when a point of order is upheld by the Chair and the member against whom the point of order has been upheld then reflects on the taking of the point of order, that is an actual reflection on the Chair itself.

Mr. Coumbe: Are you telling the Chair what to do?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have not finished taking my point of order. It is, I submit, a reflection on the Chair when the honourable member reflects on the point of order that has already been upheld.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point of order and the matter raised by the Minister are for the Chair to decide. I have pointed out to the member for Davenport on several occasions that he must confine his remarks to the Bill. Apparently he does not intend to accept the authority of the Chair. If he does not do so, he will have to suffer the consequences.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I have accepted the authority of the Chair. I left the topic I was asked to leave. I shall now deal with the views of some other people on consumer taxes. I deal, first, with our new unofficial Treasurer of Australia, Mr. Robert Hawke, who is the President of the Australian Labor Party and also the President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions. The Australian Broadcasting Commission news this evening reported that Mr. Hawke said that indirect taxes should be reduced, yet the Government of this State, of the same political Party and the same political philosophy as that of the Party under his control, is trying to increase State taxes. It is a classic example of the hypocrisy currently existing within the A.L.P. It is a Party of factions and splinters throughout Australia, some of its members going in one direction and some in another.

We have one official Treasurer and about a dozen unofficial Treasurers in Australia. The official Treasurer (Mr. Crean) is the last to speak. He speaks simply to protect his own back, which is being stabbed by the Prime Minister and several other people. It took backbenchers, such as Mick Young, to protect him, as well as the unofficial Treasurer, Robert Hawke. I refer Cabinet members to other articles absolutely condemning the current tax. In an article in the *Australian Financial Review* on June 27, 1974, Professor Sawyer absolutely ridicules this tax.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Quote it!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister has effectively taken all my time with trivial points of order and I have only two minutes left. I refer also to the *Australian Financial Review* of June 10, 1974, and June 19, 1974, in which articles appear on State taxes. I refer, too, to an editorial in the *Advertiser* on October 23, 1974.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You wrote the editorial for the *Advertiser* up in the press gallery this afternoon.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Has the Minister seen the editorial of the *Advertiser*? The case raised this afternoon must have come close to the bone. Had I not been interrupted by the Minister of Education and the Minister of Transport, I would have talked about clause 10, but I shall talk about that as we go through the clauses. I oppose the legislation. I do not trust the men who are going to spend the \$19 000 000, and I would not trust them with my daughter if I had a daughter. I certainly would not trust them with \$19 000 000. As a group, they spell economic disaster for this State.

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

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): I oppose the Bill. I cannot support a Bill of this nature introduced by a Government that is not prepared to spend its money in an economical way. It is unfair to slug the motoring public and the primary industries with such a tax. Those people have been over-taxed for a long time. From the advent of the motor car the motorist has been singled out for taxation, and ever since the primary producer moved to tractor farming he has, through taxation, been a target for Governments. He has been considerably over-taxed. When we add the various fuel taxes, sales tax, and also other taxes, the motoring public is being directly or indirectly affected. Only a few months ago the Commonwealth Government saw fit to remove the subsidy on fuel applying to country areas, where the effect of the subsidy was that petrol would not be more than 5c a gallon dearer in those areas than in any city centre.

That tax amounted to about \$28 000 000 and, as a result of the Coombs report, the Government saw fit to remove the subsidy. The result was that 10c a gallon was added to the price of fuel in the outer areas. The tax provided in the Bill will add a further 6c, making the price of petrol almost prohibitive in the outer areas. Many industries will be affected; tourism will be considerably affected.

If the funds raised from the imposition of this tax were to be applied to roadworks, the public might not have reacted as strongly as it has done. All honourable members must agree that the condition of South Australian roads is deteriorating. The funds to be obtained through the tax will be \$9 000 000 in the remainder of this financial year and \$19 000 000 in a full year. Imagine how the roads could be improved if these funds were applied to roadwork. Unfortunately, however, the funds collected will go into general revenue, and not one cent will be spent on our roads.

It has been an accepted custom in this State that all taxes levied in respect of registration fees, road tolls and driver's licence fees are allocated to the Highways Fund to be spent on State roads. Further, a large proportion of the fuel tax collected by the Commonwealth Government is returned to the State as grants. This Bill represents a departure from that past custom. What other taxes will be imposed on the motoring public, placing an additional burden on it?

I now refer to how this new tax will affect people in my district. The word "petrol" is a loose term relating to all automotive fuel. Petrol is the lifeblood of the community in the outer areas of the State. People in these areas just cannot operate without petrol, and this tax is just another burden that will be placed on people engaged in primary industry. The member for Elizabeth can refer to the greater use of public transport resulting from the imposition of this tax. True, that may apply in urban areas where such transport is available, but it will not apply in outer areas where there is no public transport. In these areas people depend entirely for their livelihood on petrol.

Mr. Evans: Could they use a community camel?

Mr. ALLEN: It is all right if one has time to use it! The four-wheel drive vehicle has been the traditional and accepted mode of transport for many years in outer areas. However, such vehicles are heavy on petrol, and the tax will represent an additional burden on people using them. People in the beef industry are currently obtaining low prices for their products, despite a good season. This tax will be of no assistance to the industry, as the high cost of labour requires the maximum use of motor transport.

The implementation of this tax could result in the closure of several small pumps in outer South Australian areas. Last year as a result of legislation dealt with by this House, many single pumps were closed, and others were relieved, but, with the implementation of this tax, it will no longer be economic to run such pumps having sales of about 450 litres a week. Such closures will provide a distinct disadvantage to the tourist industry of the North, because tourists rely heavily on such pumps in isolated areas.

We have been told that \$9 000 000 will be collected in the remainder of this financial year and \$19 000 000 will be collected in a full financial year. Will this estimate be as accurate as the estimates in respect of revenue from stamp duties? Last year this House dealt with legislation

controlling land values and restrictions on subdivisions. That had the effect of retarding land sales to such an extent that the income accruing to the State from stamp duties in this financial year is down by several million dollars. I believe the same situation could arise in respect of this tax, as less petrol will be sold, and estimated revenue will not reach the figures expected.

Today I received several telegrams from constituents about this matter. Such action shows how disturbed people are, especially when they spend 50c or 60c to send telegrams to their local member. People are worried about this new tax. By interjection the member for Spence asked, "Why is it that we can sell goods to the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics and China?" I point out that we have negotiated a beef sale to the U.S.S.R. only because the price of beef has dropped so markedly that the U.S.S.R. can now afford to buy our beef at the current price. This is possible only because producers are accepting less than the cost of production for their beef.

The member for Spence, in relation to \$36 000 spent on telephone calls by the film corporation, said this was chicken feed. However, all these small sums add up. If the \$36 000 is added to the cost of the monitoring system and press secretaries, the total amounts to several million dollars. The member for Spence suggested that members opposite were interested in genuine Socialism. I remind the honourable member that I spent eight days in the U.S.S.R. and, if I had several hours, I could give him a true picture of the situation existing there. Finally, the member for Kavel said that the Treasurer had an economic intelligence unit. I suggest that he needs an intelligent economic unit. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): I believe that the Government is not genuine about this Bill and that all the words spoken by members opposite represent nothing more than a charade. We must give the Treasurer, in introducing the Bill, star billing as usual for his performance in attacking the Commonwealth Government in the way that he did. I say this because, although clause 2 provides that the Act shall not come into operation until a date to be fixed by proclamation, clause 11, which refers to licensing, specifically refers to licensing coming into effect on March 24, 1975. The fact that this is most unpopular legislation should not be overlooked. We know that, and Government members know that. In his second reading explanation, the Treasurer stated:

In this regard I make it quite clear that, even at this late stage, my Government would not proceed with this Bill, and also a Bill to be introduced later this session to license retail tobacco sales, if Australian Government assistance were made available to the extent contemplated by these taxing measures.

That is fair comment. I support my previous remarks about the Government's being genuine or otherwise by reminding Government members that they, as well as we, are aware that there is every prospect of a Commonwealth election taking place perhaps in April or May next year. The Treasurer is really saying to the Prime Minister, "You have until the end of March to pin the tail on this donkey, and it will be on your own head if we are forced to implement this legislation." I believe that the Bill is a neat exercise in political brinkmanship, and I am sure that the Treasurer expects to win the game.

Some of us remember a similar exercise with respect to the receipts tax under a previous Government. I would be pleased to see the Prime Minister having to capitulate to a State Government. I hope that he will be forced to do that, and to a State Labor Government at

that. Who better than I should know what the Prime Minister thinks about State Governments and State members of Parliament after the experience I had in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association of being shot at in two consecutive elections by the Commonwealth Government, which would not accept me as a State representative to represent adequately that high and mighty Parliament? There is no question in my mind that the Prime Minister's original intention in withholding money from this State Government and from other State Governments is part of his master plan to bring the States to their knees and force them into even greater dependence on the Commonwealth Treasury.

Despite the regrettable, indeed vituperative, comments made by the member for Mitcham, who obviously considers the Liberal Party rather than the Government to be the enemy, I and other Opposition members in the short time available to us to study the Bill, a complicated Bill at that, have become aware of some of the pitfalls in it and have drawn attention to them. I support the views that other Opposition members have expressed. This is a complicated and important piece of legislation in relation to revenue raising by the Government, but we are not short of time. There is nothing but chaff and rubbish on the Notice Paper, yet here we find ourselves at almost 1 o'clock in the morning being asked to filibuster the Bill through. I resent that and see no reason for it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: We're not asking you to filibuster.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You just want us to lie down and let it go through. You have a cheek to bring it on.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The member for Mitcham asked some Opposition member to explain to him what was meant by clause 4. No-one expects to see the member for Mitcham in the House at this hour in the morning, so I am not expecting to have to explain to him what is intended by the clause. Undoubtedly, it is one of the most important clauses in the Bill, because by the drafting of these definitions the Government expects to be able to defend any challenge to the legislation in the High Court. Every clause in the Bill is so drafted as to make it necessary for that court to interpret each separately. I can understand the confusion of the member for Mitcham, and he has spent most of his working life studying legislation that had to be interpreted by the Privy Council. I am not sure that he understands legislation that has to be interpreted by the High Court. A challenge under section 92 before the High Court is likely, especially as clause (4) directly taxes fuel delivered within the State but sold outside the State.

This means that we will collect a tax on fuel delivered into Victoria, but I wonder what will happen in the reverse situation as it stands at present, where people in South Australia, adjacent to the Victorian border, have access to retail outlets in Victoria. I wonder whether they will have to pay any tax. I wonder whether, under the legislation, there is any way in which the Government can get them. I doubt it, because I do not think that would be a breach of section 92. I suggest it likely that people in that position will attempt to do what I have said.

Licensing is a vexed question, first, on the part of the small retail outlets, and secondly, on the part of those people who retail or sell petrol in areas to be declared zones, under clause 17. The smaller outlets, under clause 19, will be required to pay a further fee of \$50: I say "further" because they already pay \$10 a year under the Motor Fuel Distribution Act to enable them to operate a

pump. In support of this, I will quote from a letter, dated November 19, I have received from the storekeeper at Sherlock, which is in my district. The letter states:

I would like to raise a few points which are distressing all country shopkeepers:

1. Medicine seller's permit \$5 p.a.
2. Milk licence storage \$2 p.a.
3. Milk licence selling \$2 p.a.
4. Petrol storage licence \$15 p.a.
5. Petrol selling permit \$10 p.a.

In addition to this, we are proposing to add, under the legislation, \$50 for the privilege of selling petrol from a pump to be licensed under this legislation. No doubt many other charges are not mentioned in the letter. I will read the last paragraph of the letter to support the view that these additional charges are progressively crippling the small country storekeeper who, as the member for Kavel said this afternoon, provide an essential service to small communities, and even to the travelling public in country towns. The letter concludes:

If it was not for the post office and telephone exchange I, like plenty more, would close down. Can you please help?

I will elaborate further on the second group, those referred to in clause 17 as licensees who fall within a zoned area to be defined. I am concerned about their position, and I ask what will be done to assist those people who provide retail outlets in towns in my district adjacent to the border, such as Paringa and Pinnaroo, and, in the adjoining district of my colleague, the member for Victoria, the border town of Bordertown, which, I suggest, will suffer more than the other towns because of the large volume of traffic that passes along the interstate highway. All we are offered as a concession under this legislation for these people is a reduction in the licence fee, but that will in no way compensate these people. It will not enable them to sell petrol at a competitive price. I raise the point again that I raised in my question, that the people who operate roadhouses, retail and wholesale outlets and hotels will suffer seriously as a result of this differential that will exist between the price of petrol in this State and the price of petrol in Victoria. It will need more than a reduction in the licence fee to offset that hardship. It will need a special concession by a reduction in the 10 per cent turnover tax that they are obliged to collect: it will need a reduction in the price of petrol. Unless the price of petrol in Bordertown is comparable with the price of petrol in Kaniva, people will not stop at Bordertown to purchase petrol; nor will people deal with their local traders when they can get delivery from Serviceton.

This means that people in Bordertown (which was once in my electoral district) will suffer undue hardship from this Bill. There is also a slight concession in clause 19 for other people in hardship, as this clause will enable people to pay their fees by instalments. In neither of these cases that I have referred to will the payment of fees by instalments be of any significance. I cannot imagine that the big petrol retailers mentioned in these earlier definitions (such as Ampol and Shell) will be upset by having to pay \$500; nor will it cause them very much more book work to administer this legislation; but it will cause considerable additional work for the small retailer, who is obliged to be careful about it because he is responsible under clause 15 for furnishing full returns to the Commissioner, and a penalty of \$200 is provided if he does not; if he wilfully furnishes an incorrect return or wilfully refuses to lodge a return, he can be fined up to \$1 000.

Also, under clause 24, if honourable members care to study it, records are to be kept. I cannot understand why honourable members would not want to listen to me,

because I think I am putting forward a reasonable argument on behalf of the people I represent. I thank the member for Peake for giving me his attention. The Bill also is at some pains to prevent double taxation being paid; but, notwithstanding all this, I repeat that additional costs of collecting this tax will fall heavily on the retail outlets and it will be only fair and reasonable if at some stage they make representations to the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs for an additional charge on petrol just for the servicing of this tax alone.

I will not deal further with clause 10, which has been dealt with at length and which was covered adequately by the member for Eyre. I should like now to make one or two observations. I disagree with the member for Elizabeth that this legislation is in any way designed to discourage people from using petrol by taxing it as a luxury. I suggest to him that his Treasurer has been putting up a tremendous fight on behalf of the motor vehicle industry of this State.

Mr. Simmons: He didn't say it was for that purpose.

Mr. NANKIVELL: He suggested it would have that effect. I stand to be corrected, but I think he said that. I suggest it may have a secondary effect: it will have further reactions on the motor vehicle industry that we have been trying carefully to protect by making representations to the Commonwealth Government, in opposition to the claims of the Industries Assistance Corporation, to ensure the continuity of the motor vehicle industry of South Australia, which, at this moment, is a vitally important section of the commercial enterprise of this State. One can also ask why we are not taxing liquid petroleum gas. If we are to think in the terms that the honourable member has suggested of conserving expendable resources by imposing taxes on them, surely liquid petroleum gas is also an expendable resource, and we should be trying to protect it.

Let me say finally that I believe this is most regrettable legislation, and I deplore the action of the Commonwealth (or Australian) Government in forcing its introduction. Without doubt, this Bill, if enacted, will cause undue and further hardship to people living in country areas, and in this regard I am most concerned, because the people who live in those areas, whether or not we like to admit it, depend for their very existence these days on road transport—even road transport to and from a railway station, for these people in many cases are still many kilometres from a railway station. We talk much in this House about the quality of life. I suggest that, if these people are to continue to enjoy the same quality of life that can be enjoyed so much more readily by their city cousins, we should seriously think about the effect that this additional 6c for 4.5 litres will have on them and their way of life, because these people will have to bear the added costs. They cannot pass them on, as other industries can. In this respect, it will be a sectional tax and will be inflationary, because it will add further to the cost of production.

I suggest to the member for Spence (or it may be the member for Elizabeth; I apologise to the member for Spence if I am wrong) that there is no political mileage for me in opposing this Bill, but I would be falling down on my job as a representative of people in the country (on whom, as I have just pointed out, this tax will fall heavily) if I did not oppose it. The country people will pay more than their fair share of the tax if and when this Act is proclaimed. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): During the debate last night and this morning, I have witnessed your attitude,

Mr. Speaker, towards members who have drifted from the contents of the Bill. You may rest assured that I shall not be drifting, because I claim at the outset that there is plenty of room in the Bill for me to make pertinent remarks. It is 20-page document, containing 35 clauses, and its effects on the community present plenty of material for debate. Despite all this volume of detail set down in the Bill, it has not hoodwinked the Party on this side, nor does it cloud the Government's intent. There is built into this Bill a direct and vicious attack on every South Australian, and it is designed further to weaken the State generally, so that later we will become more dependent on the centralist Socialist system, and find ourselves from here on tripping to Canberra with cap in hand to that big white monster. At this stage the Bill is promoted to be the only course of action to be taken by the Treasurer and this Government to relieve the hell of a mess they are in financially. It is an action which, if implemented, will be against the interests of the manufacturing industries; it will be a burden on food and export producers, and a cruel blow to everyone depending on transport or petroleum usage in the ordinary course of business or private movement. More particularly, it is an insult to members of Parliament, because only weeks ago the Treasurer, when presenting the Appropriation Bill (No. 2), grossly or deceitfully misled members. To support my allegation I quote briefly from page 774 of *Hansard* of August 29, when the Treasurer was presenting the Bill. In reply to an interjection, he said:

If the honourable member is unhappy by having a balanced Budget, he is going to be unhappy, because a balanced Budget we are going to have.

A short time has proved the opposite in this regard. We have gone downhill in the State's finances beyond all expectations, of Opposition members in particular. In that speech the Treasurer told the House how he aimed to achieve this without further consumption or retail taxes, except for the one subtle proviso that he carefully cited, recorded on page 776 of *Hansard*, as follows:

At that conference there was a great deal of discussion about the budgetary problems of the States, and the Prime Minister has promised to give further consideration to this matter during the Australian Government's Budget preparation. I am confident that one way or another, either as part of a general allocation to all States or by way of additional specific purpose grants as requested in my special submission, South Australia will secure an additional \$5 000 000 to \$6 000 000.

At that time the Treasurer made great play of his association and close relationship with the Prime Minister of the Australian Government, and confirmed his comments regarding the assurances that we would not have to face such taxes and that it would only be as a result of a gross breakdown with the Prime Minister if anything like that had to be adopted. One of two things has happened in this period: either the Treasurer has deliberately lied to Parliament (and I have no evidence to support that remark), or the Prime Minister has cheated South Australia and our Treasurer has either fallen for the trick of the Prime Minister or, by his own political Party tack and the fact that he is so naive, has fallen for the promises at our expense. Apart from the disastrous effects this measure will have on business and society, we have learned the real truth about the white monster at the top of the tree, our Treasurer's political buddy and Australia's most expensive Christmas present of 1972. We cannot afford leaders who kill our long-established oversea customers, and globe-trot around the world collecting *Blue Poles*, and making promises back home that cannot be upheld.

Citizens of South Australia have got the message, and the Treasurer would do well to withdraw his proposed petrol tax that he is to inflict on the community. Instead of rubbing shoulders with Gough in Queensland on Friday of this week, he should get down to the business of mopping up the problems at his own back door. I join with my colleagues who have criticised the Government for introducing such a measure, and I do so by opposing this Bill. There could be one other motive for introducing this Bill: perhaps it is a repetition of the political exercise that we saw our Government go through earlier this session when it intended to introduce legislation relating to the law on torts, and then, under pressure, withdrew it. At this point the same public pressure is on the Government, and perhaps it is a hoax after all. The stage actor on the local scene has entered the field as a producer and joined his buddy the Prime Minister. Maybe the motive of the show is for him to come out again the little white hero and, at the eleventh hour, big white Gough, with permission from his little Mohammed in Canberra, will come good with his promises and let this pace-setter State off the hook. We certainly hope so.

In the meantime, there is no way in which I will support this Bill. During the debate the Leader of the Opposition outlined alternative measures that could be used to get this State out of trouble. If the Treasurer will not accept them, I join with an earlier Opposition speaker when he said, "Let the Treasurer step down and someone reliable and responsible take his place." In the interests of South Australia generally, the quicker that happens the better. In accordance with my promise to deal with the Bill, there are several important aspects to which I now refer in detail. People in small business outlets in the outer and more remote areas of the State have had serious shocks recently. They have been told to upgrade fuel sales at the outlets, or they will have their pumps withdrawn under the 10 per cent proposed reduction programme introduced by the Government.

Whilst the sale of petrol at some of these local stores does not constitute a great part of their business, it is an attraction in their other multiple trading, and I believe this will be the last straw to those storekeepers who, in no way on the margin enjoyed by fuel retailers, can afford a further \$50 a year loading for a licence fee. They cannot afford to take a chance on customers who do not pay their accounts. My interpretation of the Bill and the second reading explanation indicates there is no provision to protect that sort of operator when a customer fails to pay his account. The operator would be required to pay a 10 per cent loading on fuel products and, whether or not he recovered the money from the purchaser, he would have to pay his contribution to the Government. There again, it is unfair to inflict this practice across the board on the outlet operators.

Clause 10 deals with the powers of inspectors. I realise that, if premises are licensed for a special purpose, it is necessary for an inspector to be able to inspect the operations, the books and records. However, I strongly object to the provision enabling an inspector to question any person found on the premises. I cannot understand why the Government persists in giving such a power to inspectors. The provision gives an inspector an opportunity to intimidate or frighten any children who may be on the premises. There is no reason why the word "person" cannot be struck out and the word "adult" or "part-owner" inserted. In his second reading explanation, the Treasurer said:

The Minister shall set the value of petroleum products on which the percentage fee is based. This is left to the discretion of the Minister, and not strictly related to the

prices of products, for the reason that, after consultation with the oil companies, it is intended to set values in relation to the class of products in order to simplify administration. The value set by the Minister, however, will be based on city retail prices and, in any subsequent licence years, the tax component of city retail prices will be ignored.

That matter is not clearly covered in the Bill itself and one can only hope that the regulations will cover the matter. This Bill inflicts a regular tax on an irregularly priced product. The member for Mallee said that country people would be burdened to a greater extent than would people in urban areas.

Let us consider the freight differentials that apply to fuel products in outer areas. People at Cordillo Downs, which is a long way from a supply point, pay a freight differential of 29·6 cents a gallon on their fuel products, and this Bill will inflict a further charge of 6 cents a gallon on those people. At Mount Davies the freight differential is 39·4 cents on each gallon of fuel. Of course, many outer areas depend totally on privately owned vehicles for transport.

Gross anomalies exist in connection with places nearer the metropolitan area. At Port Pirie, 240 kilometres from Adelaide, the freight differential is 0·8 cents a gallon; at Morgan, 160 kilometres from Adelaide, it is 2·8 cents a gallon; at Burra, also 160 kilometres from Adelaide, it is 2·4 cents a gallon; and at Cape Borda, on Kangaroo Island, in my own district and also 160 kilometres from Adelaide as the crow flies, it is 9 cents a gallon. So, there is plenty of scope for remedying this unfair situation. On top of these anomalies the Government intends to add a further loading.

I point out that Port Pirie has facilities for road transport, rail transport and sea transport. So, it is not as dependent on privately owned transport as are Kangaroo Island and other isolated areas, where farmers, business men and all the residents need privately owned transport. In such circumstances it is unfair to introduce a Bill that imposes a blanket form of taxation on an irregularly treated community. Some members, by way of interjection, have suggested alternative steps that the Government could have taken after the Treasurer failed to receive the financial assistance the Prime Minister had promised to South Australia.

Mr. Venning: The Prime Minister is saving money.

Mr. CHAPMAN: No, he is not. He has demonstrated irresponsible and wasteful expenditure since he has been the Leader of the country. A report in the *News* of November 19 refers to a grand tour of 10 European nations that the Prime Minister intends to take that is expected to cost more than \$500 000. That is what it will cost to send the Prime Minister and his large entourage on a globe-trotting tour of Europe.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CHAPMAN: While that sort of wasteful expenditure of public money is taking place, we cannot expect to meet our own local commitments without imposing further taxation. Before we go on with this measure or with any other form of taxation affecting people who are already over-taxed (particularly, as I have said, in the food-producing areas and outer areas of the State), the Treasurer should encourage the Prime Minister and his other colleagues to curb expenditure. I add my remarks to what the Leader said at the beginning of the debate. In this State, we cannot afford to inflict on the community further inflationary taxes of this type. Therefore, I oppose the Bill.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): At 1.32 a.m. on November 21, I oppose the Bill, which I believe is a most iniquitous measure. It is most disappointing to know that South Australia's finances are in such a state that it is necessary to introduce the Bill. As I look around the Chamber, I see several members who have recently travelled around the world. They all come back with the same story that, when they tell people overseas that they have come from Australia, the reaction is "Oh! Australia!" People overseas think this is a country flowing with milk and honey; that is the reputation Australia has enjoyed over the years. However, I am sorry to say that that situation is rapidly deteriorating, particularly in South Australia.

The economy is such that the Treasurer, with tears in his eyes, has had to introduce the Bill. This is not just a matter of increasing the price of petrol by 6c a gallon. If that was all that was involved, the people would perhaps accept it, believing that they would get some benefit from it, such as improved roads; they may look on it as an investment in the country. However, I believe that this increase will not make one iota of difference to the development of the State: the extra revenue will be used up as other taxation raised by the Government has been used up. As the member for Alexandra has said, when the past two Budgets have been introduced, press releases made available to newspapers by the Treasurer's officers have said that the Budgets have been mild and have not included any new taxes. However, in between those Budgets, we find that the Government continually introduces new taxation measures, as it has done on this occasion.

My colleagues and I are annoyed to think that we are being asked to debate this Bill at 1.35 a.m. The Government was hoping that it could steamroll the Bill through the House, but we will talk it out on behalf of our constituents. This Bill is so important that I believe it is our duty to our constituents to debate it to the last. Although the Treasurer has blamed the Prime Minister on some occasions, he has spoken with his tongue in his cheek. We see newspaper reports daily that he is disappointed with his Commonwealth colleague. However, they are a team. The attacks he makes on the Prime Minister do not mean a thing, but are simply a cover-up; he is trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the people.

Those of us who are constantly in touch with the situation know that what he says is a smokescreen. I hope that the people will learn the truth of the matter. It is appalling to hear what the Treasurer has said about introducing this measure. He has spoken about falling returns from stamp duty, and about the down-turn in business. As a man on the land, I know (and many of my colleagues in other avenues of life know) that, if money is running short, we must tighten our belts and make do with what we have at our disposal. The point I make is that this Government will never have enough money, regardless of what measures it introduces. It worries me to read the weak comments in the second reading explanation of the Treasurer, as follows:

However, in the absence of that assistance we are left with no alternative but to proceed with these measures. Turning now to the Bill itself, there are several general comments I should like to make before considering its specific provisions. The Bill follows closely recently enacted New South Wales legislation.

It is all very well to talk about New South Wales, but the Treasurer should have dealt with other matters affecting that State. We should consider the revenue this Government will receive through rural land tax, compared with what New South Wales will receive in that way. New

South Wales does not impose rural land tax! The Treasurer says that, because our colleagues in that State have introduced a tax similar to that contained in this Bill, we should not express concern about the introduction of the tax here. If he wants to follow New South Wales, let him follow it all the way. If he did so, at least the rural sector would get much relief with regard to rural land tax.

I do not think it will be long before we will not have anyone operating a business in this State. In my home town this week the proprietor of a big business told me that he would be giving it up. He said he could earn \$100 a week and that his wife, who was not afraid of work, could earn \$60 or \$70. When the facts of this legislation become known to business people they will decide they have had enough. However, it will take a little while for people to understand the significance of the legislation. In the short time available, it is difficult to study the various aspects of the Bill and the way it will work. It will not be long before we will have no-one in the petrol business. We will have large installations in country regions, and the smaller businesses that meant so much to country towns and helped decentralisation will be gone for all time.

The imposition of the 6c a gallon is bad enough, but the flow-on of this increase will be inflationary. I hope that somewhere, perhaps in another place, consideration can be given to straightening out this aspect, but it is a difficult matter to handle. We have seen what has happened when people have had salary increases of a few dollars. Because of additional tax and increased costs, they are worse off than they were previously. The same situation will apply here. It is not just the 6c, but the overall cost of all items will rise considerably.

If the people knew that the money raised by this legislation would be wisely spent (and I have yet to see this Government spend wisely, because it does not know how to handle money), that might help our thinking in supporting it. However, when we see the state of our roads and express our concern for the safety of people and our alarm at the high death rate, we realise that, if the money were spent on our roads (after all it is collected from a fuel tax) some benefit would accrue. However, this will not be the case. The situation is rapidly deteriorating and our roads have never been worse. It is with a great deal of concern that, at this early hour of the morning, I express my views on behalf of the primary producers I represent, and on behalf of the people in the fuel industry that has meant so much to the development of this State.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): I agree with the comments made by my colleagues on this side in relation to the Bill. I do not support it. It has become necessary because of the need for revenue raising in the State as a result of the deficit confronting the Treasurer. In presenting his Financial Statement on August 29, 1974, the Treasurer intimated that there would be no large increases in taxation; in fact, it was stated at the time that the Budget did not contain any great increases in charges or taxation. However, the Treasurer failed to reveal that charges had been made before the introduction of the Budget, and we are now confronted with these present increases.

I am reminded of the horse dealer who sold a horse after telling the purchaser, "This animal doesn't look too good." The sale was concluded and a day or so later the purchaser came back and told the dealer that the horse was blind in one eye. The salesman said, "I told you he didn't look too good." I think that illustrates the attitude of the Treasurer in presenting to the people of this State

his comments about taxation. Although he has given the impression that there will not be increased charges, he has then said it is necessary to increase charges because we will have a deficit of \$19 000 000 and we could have a deficit of about \$30 000 000.

I do not wish to reiterate the points made by other members, but it would appear that the Commonwealth Government is bent on bringing the States to their knees by depriving them of necessary finance collected from the people of the States by way of direct taxation; the amount that should be returned has not been returned to the States. I was most interested to read in the *Advertiser* of November 19 the comments of the Minister for Labor and Immigration (Mr. Cameron). The article is headed "Company profits could save us." I saw a documentary on television a couple of months ago. If I remember correctly, it was entitled *Two Steps Forward, One Step Back*. It was the true story of the development of Socialism in Russia. In its initial stages the plan was extended to such a degree that it got out of control, and it was subsequently stated that at one stage there had been a dependence on the private sector, or private enterprise. I hope that we are not passing through a similar stage in the implementation of Socialism in Australia. I hope that the Commonwealth Government has not taken its offensive so far that it has been found necessary to come back one step. Is this part of the plot? When the Minister of Labour says companies should make bigger profits, does he really mean that we should stand where we are and consolidate so that the Commonwealth Labor Government will have a better springboard from which to go forward in the future to extend its policy of Socialism? Private enterprise provides most of the employment in Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must come back to the Bill.

Mr. RUSSACK: The Treasurer said he implemented this tax because South Australia had not been provided with sufficient funds. Now is the time for the private sector to come forward in respect of this taxation. Were it not for private enterprise there would be even greater difficulty facing the State. I support the views of the Commonwealth Minister in respect of company profits and increased productivity in industry. Although some people believe that company profits go to a few rich people, that is far from the truth because most of the large shareholders in modern industry are life assurance companies, pension funds, and investment companies.

The SPEAKER: Order! This Bill is not a Budget Bill. The honourable member must confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. RUSSACK: The revenue of this State depends on private industry. The member for Whyalla referred to five companies. Broken Hill Proprietary Company—

The SPEAKER: Order! As I have repeatedly pointed out, this is a financial measure. It is not a Budget Bill. Therefore, this is not an open debate, and the honourable member's remarks must be linked with the Bill.

Mr. RUSSACK: In a full financial year, \$19 000 000 will be raised by means of this tax. It will be levied on people who use fuel. Many companies use fuel, especially B.H.P. Company Limited, which has 54 920 employees and 182 233 shareholders. What will be the effect of this Bill on businesses that provide fuel? First, the business must pay for a licence. Secondly, much time is involved in such businesses, and today time is money. As records

must be kept, inspectors have authority under the Bill to inspect service station records, and this will involve much time and expense. The member for Elizabeth referred to public transport. The imposition of this tax will definitely increase the fares, because in my district the only available transport is by bus, and buses use petrol as their fuel.

I refer to a service station on Main North Road. The imposition of this tax will probably mean the end of the business. Previously, the owner of the business held the post office agency, but for carrying mail about 6 km from his service station to pick up the mail and return he was offered the grand sum of \$1 a day. This business man must still pay \$50 for a licence.

Mr. Groth: Where is this?

Mr. RUSSACK: At Rhynie. This business man has invested thousands of dollars in his service station, and he will probably lose the lot. The implementation of this tax will be the last nail in his coffin. Other members have referred to the effect of this tax on tourism. Many areas in my district are of interest to tourists, for example, Port Hughes, Moonta, Wallaroo Bay, while nearby, in the Rocky River District, we find Port Broughton and several other areas that rely on tourism to a certain extent. All these towns are visited by tourists in motor cars, and the implementation of this tax could seriously affect the tourist industry.

Section 37 of the Motor Vehicles Act recognises outer areas not serviced by local government and provides that consideration should be provided in respect of motor vehicles. The Registrar of Motor Vehicles recognises this, and I believe that these people should be exempt from the imposts levied by this Bill. Clause 17 of the Bill reduces fees in respect of petroleum products delivered in certain zones. Like many other measures introduced in this House, this one contains much inequality, too. I refer to an article in this morning's *Advertiser* headed "Less fuel tax at the border", which states:

Towns near the Victorian border may not suffer as much from the State Government's proposed fuel tax as was feared. Chamber of Commerce and petrol station men at near-border towns have been more critical than other country people over the proposed tax which could add 6c a gallon to the price of petrol. They say motorists travelling to and from other States would tend to buy cheaper petrol at towns across the Victorian border. However, the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) has indicated to Parliament that his proposed legislation provides zoning which would allow retailers in border areas to remain competitive.

The South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce General Secretary (Mr. G. L. Mill) yesterday said he was confident zoning would be so graduated that places such as Mount Gambier would pay only a small portion of the proposed tax. The legislation before Parliament appeared similar to that in New South Wales where 16 varying zones and one special zone had been fixed. On that basis, Mr. Mill said, he guessed the new tax at Mount Gambier could be about half a cent a gallon.

This would disadvantage those other towns around Mount Gambier because, if people knew that cheaper petrol was available in Mount Gambier, they would come from the nearby smaller towns, even from Penola, to buy their petrol, and this situation would apply to other zones. This tax will not only affect the big firms and those who use large quantities of fuel, but it will also place an imposition on the smaller person. Take, for instance, a pensioner who owns a motor vehicle: I consider that the average distance that person would travel in his vehicle would be about 6 400 kilometres a year. At about 32 kilometres to the gallon, the 6c a gallon tax under the Bill will cost him about an extra \$12 a year. The average family man travels about 16 000 kilometres a year in the family car,

again at about 32 kilometres to the gallon, and the 6c a gallon tax will mean that it will cost him and his family about \$30 a year more to enjoy their car.

It will cost the business man, such as the traveller or agent, about \$90 a year extra. Freight charges will also be affected, and here again country people will be affected because, the farther they are from the distribution point, the greater the freight cost they will pay. The greater the fuel cost, the more prices will increase, particularly in the country. I have made inquiries about the impact of this legislation on the primary producer. The average farm of between 400 hectares and 500 hectares would use about 6 000 gallons of fuel a year, half of that quantity in petrol and half in distillate. Calculated at the price the producer pays for the fuel, it will cost him an additional \$157 for petrol and \$78.50 for the distillate, at the 10 per cent tax provided in the Bill, or a total of \$235.50 a year. That may not seem much but, together with other rising costs (and we know this only too well, because it has been mentioned so often) such as land tax, and with the reduction in the selling prices of primary products, it will impose a considerable burden on the primary producer.

I understand that, within the last two weeks, fishing boats in a Spencer Gulf port have taken on about 30 000 gallons of distillate from one company but, as two other companies have also supplied these fishing boats, it is estimated that, from this one outlet, about 80 000 gallons of distillate has been taken on by the prawn-fishing fleet in the last fortnight. At the same cost price, and allowing for the 10 per cent tax, the total tax for that fleet would amount to about \$2 080 in two weeks. I also understand that, as a result of the introduction of this measure, fuel companies have had to apply quotas. In country centres the quota has been applied because it is feared, I suppose, that there will be a rush on fuel and that it will be in short supply. As other members have said, this tax has been necessary because the Commonwealth Government, in the Treasurer's words, has not made available the necessary finance for this State, even though the Commonwealth Government and State Government share the same political philosophies.

I believe that this measure, which will bring in about \$19 000 000 in a full financial year, is an impost that cannot be accepted. It will hit everyone. The motorist has already been hit this year by increased registration fees and increased drivers' licence fees, and now he will be hit by this tax on petroleum. Not only the private motorist but also businesses, particularly small businesses, will be hit drastically. Undoubtedly, some small service stations will go out of business, and others that have a fuel outlet as an adjunct to their undertaking, may be just on the brink and will, as a result of this legislation, go out of business. I do not support the Bill.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I also oppose the measure. I know that it is an early hour in the morning, but it is the Government's intention to put the Bill through. We are discussing a completely new tax, a kind of tax which the Treasurer said he would not be introducing; indeed he attacked the Premier of New South Wales for introducing such a tax in that State. The Treasurer said that we were living in a wonderful place under an Australian Labor Party Government, that there were no problems, and that the people would not have to suffer the consequences of the severe taxation that other States might be imposing on their citizens. He campaigned and worked hard with his colleagues to have the Commonwealth Government elected. He attacks them at times with tongue in cheek but, at the same time, he is always ready to help that Government continue with its shoddy programme in Canberra.

The Government has introduced this measure, which is really the result of its own shoddy performance in economic management. The Treasurer has said several times in the past that the State Government's job is managing the biggest business in the State: the State Budget, and I believe it is completely improper that a Government should set out and say, "Bad luck; we have made some bad errors. We have not been able to keep costs down, to balance our Budget, or get anywhere near it. This year it will be \$36 000 000 in deficit, or perhaps even \$40 000 000. If you do not agree to a new form of tax we are introducing at this stage, we must look at the matter seriously and consider another form of tax that will have to come in to cover the possible deficit for this financial year." There is an advantage in speaking at 10 minutes past two in the morning, well after the debate has commenced, because one can get a copy of the *Advertiser* for the day, which I have. I refer to an article headed "Less fuel tax at border". This article is not accurate, and I know the *Advertiser* reporters have gone home now (they leave at 2 o'clock in the morning). Clause 14 of the Bill gives the Commissioner power to reduce fees. The article in the *Advertiser* states:

However, the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) has indicated to Parliament that his proposed legislation provides zoning which would allow retailers in border areas to remain competitive.

The Treasurer said that he was going to allow zoning, but he did not tell the people that the only provision for any reduction would be on the licence. He did not say that under a class 3 licence Ampol or any of the other companies that own individual stations could take out a collective licence. The Bill provides:

"Class 3 licence" means a licence that authorises the licensee to carry on the business of selling petroleum products manufactured by him and no other petroleum products and to sell them only to persons who are not licensees.

So the big companies can get one licence for \$500. A big company may own 50 individual outlets, so it is getting something considerably cheaper for each outlet than would be received by the individual small operator, who would have to take out a class 9 licence. The Government has taken the trouble to include the word "premises" in the definition of a class 9 licence, which means:

a licence that authorises the licensee to carry on at the premises specified in the licence the business of selling, at the premises specified in the licence, petroleum products not manufactured by him and not manufactured at those premises and to sell them only to persons who are not licensees:

So the small operator must pay \$50 for the licence plus, as a result of a recent innovation in State charges, a retail petrol seller's licence, which is \$50 if he chooses to take one out, although he may ask for a permit, but permits are not easily come by. He pays \$50 for his licence. The bigger operators could, if they owned enough outlets, get them for about \$10 for each. If the Government intends putting this Bill through by using its numbers in this place, it should look at that aspect closely, because I am sure it was not the Government's intention. If it was, I would appreciate the Minister's saying so when he replies to the debate. I make the point that the General Secretary of the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce (Mr. G. L. Mill) said in the article to which I have referred that he was confident that zoning would be so graduated that places such as Mount Gambier would pay only a small portion of the proposed tax.

There is no reduction at all. The only provision in the Bill where the Commissioner has the power to vary the license fee is clause 14. We also find that the tax cannot be that severe, even though it will bring in \$19 000 000, because, if we look at today's *Advertiser*, at page 14, where the earlier part of this debate is reported, we see only a small comment. In other words, it appears that the *Advertiser* is satisfied that the tax is not a big slug and needs little comment, even though more than 100 000 signatures will have been obtained from people objecting to the proposed tax. So it appears that that organisation has no real objection to the sort of new tax the Government is imposing to try to cover some of its own bad budgetary deficit.

There is no doubt that this tax will add a burden or cost to all forms of transport using petroleum products, and also to the building industry, because many of the bigger brickyards use gas in their kilns. Many of them use fuel oil, a petroleum product. This tax will increase the cost in that area. Every article we buy will be transported, in the main, by a vehicle propelled by a petroleum product; and so the costs will rise. With that, there will be a trend to sap even further the confidence in the business sector. There will be less incentive to invest because people will not know whether or not there will be a profit in it.

However, what concerns me most at the moment is the public transport sector. We are subsidising the Tramways Trust to the extent of \$5 000 000 a year and there is every possibility that by this measure we shall be adding to that sum another \$1 000 000. It will be interesting to see next year's budgetary figure to cover the trust's losses. The private bus operator who operates in the closer country areas is in trouble now. The Minister of Transport says, "It is private enterprise; it should stand on its own two feet." The Tramways Trust is going all right; that is subsidised. However, we are loading the private bus operator with an extra fuel charge, so the people are subsidising the public transport system. That is part of the Government's philosophy but I do not blame it for doing that. We know that it intends to break private enterprise as soon as possible. The member for Spence is an exponent of that argument.

Mr. Crimes: I did not say that at all. As usual, you are misrepresenting me.

Mr. EVANS: He knows that this is the direction in which the Government is going and he is saying that the Government is not going quickly enough in that direction. In the end, that is their ambition.

Mr. Crimes: In the end; that is right.

Mr. EVANS: The honourable member is now admitting it, so what I said earlier was accurate. I do not want to misrepresent the honourable member's attitude, expressed in a former debate, towards ideology. The Government asks, "Where can we save some money?" Some small and big amounts can be saved, whether in one's own family business or in the people's business. There are times when the State Government must take a second look at priorities and tighten up. There are cases where we could employ more tradesmen without increasing the overall expenditure. The Minister of Education, as the Acting Minister of Works, replied to me in this House that the Public Buildings Department could not give the House a figure showing how much overtime was costing that department.

What a shocking state of affairs it is that the Government, which says it can manage the Budget and the Treasury of this State, has a department that cannot

tell the Minister (or the Minister is not prepared to ask it) how much overtime is costing it! I go so far as to say that at the moment more than one-third of the money being paid for wages by the Public Buildings Department is for overtime. I challenge any member of the Government to produce figures to prove that I am wrong, because they know I am right. The department is paying these high overtime rates when it could be employing at the normal rate some of the unemployed people of this State. We could help the unemployment situation, reduce expenditure, and show value for the dollar with more work done. The Cleland wildlife reserve in the Adelaide Hills was considered to be one of the best in Australia. A film was made this year that is a credit to the department and the Minister, if he will back it. However, what has happened? We are losing the person who was in charge of that reserve and his successor has suggested a grandiose scheme that will cost up to \$100 000 in the next 12 months for something that is unnecessary.

The Minister of Transport should check the cost of building the interchange at the corner of Sturt Road and Shepherds Hill Road; he should check how long this project has been continuing and how many men are employed, because he will find that too much is being spent for the work being done. Money is being made available to Theatre 62 because someone could not keep proper books of account, and about \$80 000 of taxpayers' money is being poured into this venture. If Theatre 62 cannot make a go of it, it should go broke. That was the attitude of the Attorney-General this afternoon regarding another matter.

Dr. Eastick: Theatre 62 is one of the sacred cows.

Mr. EVANS. I refer to the Film Corporation. We can forget the \$35 000 for telephone calls. I give credit to the corporation for placing bars across the telephones so that the staff cannot make calls to other States, because that action shows that the management is concerned about high costs. However, the allocation to the corporation this year was increased from \$780 000 to \$1 400 000, with a return in payments of \$400 000 to be received. With the State running into a deficit of more than \$30 000 000, why is that amount allocated to the corporation? It is not an essential community service. To the member for Elizabeth and other Government members "profit" is a dirty word, but Mr. Cameron has learned that without profit we are in trouble, and the private sector must receive a profit unless taxes are paid to keep the public sector going.

The Commonwealth and State Governments introduced legislation to peg the price of and to prevent people speculating in land. The Government was the biggest speculator, but why is it complaining about reduced stamp duties receipts? When it introduced that legislation, the Government intended to reduce the numbers of land deals, and accepted that stamp duties receipts would be reduced. Obviously, the Government has achieved its aim. An amount of \$90 000 is to be spent upgrading the Belair Recreation Park golf course. About \$50 000 has been spent in the past two years, but all we can see for it is the destruction of a scenic area. Another burden placed on the State is in relation to education. The Commonwealth Government reduced the tax deduction for education expenses, and children who have been attending private schools will now return to public schools.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's not so.

Mr. EVANS: I assure the Minister that, if he has not yet received these figures, headmasters have them. Private schools will tell him that students are not able to continue

because of this factor and increased costs, and will return to public schools.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Figures as at August 1 of this year indicate that the number of children not attending Government schools increased.

Mr. EVANS: That was in August, but much has happened since then.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It's the first time that the number has increased in five years.

Mr. EVANS: Children will return to public schools, and for every secondary student who returns to these schools the taxpayer will have to pay \$800, and this will place another burden on the State's finances. The introduction of this Bill is not a good move. There is no way that an Opposition can sit back and say, "Well, it is just another tax; forget about it." This tax could be doubled next year; in that case, \$38 000 000 would be involved. The community is already over-taxed. There are many areas where expenditure could be cut down. Today members received copies of a glossy booklet advising people what to do when buying a colour television set. The booklets were posted to members at the rate of 24c for each booklet.

Mr. Crimes: What about the private enterprise rubbish that we get in the post every day?

Mr. EVANS: Unfortunately, the private sector is forced to pay exorbitant rates on its mail. However, I am referring to public money. Surely the booklets need not have been posted. This is a simple suggestion for economising, but it is in this kind of area that economies can start. The Government has not taken steps to save small sums, and there is certainly room for economies to be implemented on a wider scale. If the Government had properly planned its economic programme, we would not be considering this imposition. I oppose the Bill.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Crimes, Duncan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson (teller), Keneally, Langley, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wright.

Noes (14)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, and Vennings.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Corcoran, Jennings, King, McRae, and Wells. Noes—Messrs. Blacker, Dean Brown, McAnaney, Mathwin, and Wardle.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

MARGARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council requested a conference, at which it would be represented by five managers, on its alternative amendment.

The House of Assembly agreed to a conference to be held in the Legislative Council conference room on Thursday, November 21, at 5.30 p.m., at which it would be represented by Mr. Dean Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Crimes, Hudson, and Rodda.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MUSEUM BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (RULES)

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (POINTS DEMERIT)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPISTS BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendment.

BUILDERS LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the conference on the Bill to be held during the adjournment of the House and that the managers report the result thereof forthwith at the next sitting of the House.

Motion carried.

ADELAIDE TO CRYSTAL BROOK STANDARD GAUGE RAILWAY AGREEMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 14. Page 1996.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): This extremely important Bill is associated with an expenditure of \$81 000 000. It is so important that it is ludicrous for it to be debated at this time of the morning. It has been the subject of much discussion over a long period. Indeed, when arrangements were made for standardising the line between Port Pirie and Broken Hill, it was indicated that the next line to be standardised would be the line from Adelaide to Crystal Brook.

Several inquiries were undertaken. Soon a situation evolved in which there was a major conflict amongst the parties about the extent of the standardisation and what other work in this regard would follow. Before 1970, the matter was placed in the hands of a firm of consultants, Maunsell and Partners Proprietary Limited. It is interesting to read from a letter to the Minister, dated March 20, 1970, the following extracts:

We would refer to the Secretary's letter of October 15, 1969, requesting that we proceed with the feasibility study of a standard gauge railway connection between Adelaide and the east-west standard gauge railway. We have studied the problems related to the construction of this railway to the fullest extent possible in the time available and have made a particular study of the traffic carried by South Australian Railways, the points between which it is carried and the likely growth of the traffic over the next 10 years. Our aim has been to produce a fast, efficient railway system.

Messrs. P-E Consulting Group have helped us with the analysis of traffic patterns, projection of future traffic flows and with interviewing transport users. Mr. R. M. L. Lemon, C.B.E., M.A., has acted as our advisor on railway operating matters and rolling stock requirements. Using the figures obtained from these studies we have investigated the most economic means of providing a standard gauge line to join the recently completed railway between Port Pirie and Broken Hill. We have found that the solution to this problem is a new line generally parallel with the existing broad gauge line from Adelaide to Port Pirie but joining with the east-west line at Crystal Brook. The new line should be built to a standard suitable for fast freight trains with grade separations between road and rail at major crossing points.

On the basis that the majority of the goods can be carried on fast through block trains we believe that virtually all the existing traffic between Sydney and Adelaide

will divert to this route to avoid gauge transfer. Our calculations of locomotive and rolling stock requirements have been based on this premise.

I think it is extremely important to have this background information. The letter continues:

One standard gauge line must be taken right into Adelaide station to serve the east-west passenger train but we believe it would be uneconomical and in fact wrong in principle to endeavour to make standard gauge goods services available to every part of the metropolitan area. The existing railway complex and goods terminal at Mile End is difficult for standard gauge access and could not be converted into an efficient two gauge terminal. For this reason we recommend the construction of a new combined freight terminal and new marshalling yards in the Islington-Dry Creek area north of Adelaide. A standard line should be built from Dry Creek to serve the Port Adelaide area and certain essential private sidings, but it is recommended that no separate goods yard be provided at Port Adelaide. A bogie changing installation built between the broad and standard gauge marshalling yards would serve the through traffic between Victorian and Commonwealth Railways.

That pinpoints one of the areas of real contention, and certainly a problem that arose early in the term of office of the present Government. Indeed, the member for Rocky River asked several questions about this matter. I will give the following references to the dates on which these questions were asked and answers given, and also the relevant page numbers in *Hansard*: July 15, 1970, page 37; July 28, 1970, page 333; August 19, 1970, page 819 and subsequent pages; October 22, 1970, page 2001; and October 27, 1970, page 2045. From those questions and answers, it became apparent that the problem to be decided was the distribution of rail traffic at what might be called the Adelaide end of the system. The most recent publication on the matter is a report entitled the Master Plan Report and Appendices which is dated January, 1974, and which has been put forward again by Maunsell and Partners. In a letter to the Commonwealth Minister for Transport (Hon. C. K. Jones) dated January 31, the following passages appear:

Dear Mr. Minister,

We would refer to the letter dated January 7, 1972, from the South Australian Minister of Transport, commissioning us to undertake the Phase II study of the rail standardisation work to Adelaide and to your letter, received on October 10, 1973, instructing us to complete the study and master plan for the project. The master plan has been developed and agreed with the Liaison Committee with which we have worked closely and successfully. However, the final meeting was held on October 27, 1972, and we therefore feel it necessary to draw your attention to section 2.9. of the report concerning matters that should receive early attention to ensure an expeditious start and implementation of the proposed ambitious construction programme.

We would draw your attention to the fact that while this study has considered the economics of siting the standard gauge freight terminal either at Islington or Mile End we have felt that the Ministerial agreement precluded us from proceeding with the recommendation contained in our phase I report that a joint broad/standard gauge terminal should be built at Islington. Similar considerations applied to the siting of the carriage servicing shed at either of these sites. Comment is made in the report regarding the introduction of colour light signalling into the Adelaide station yard. Although we are unable to recommend that the whole area should be resignalled as a project cost we believe that the retention of the existing obsolete system for broad gauge operations is a most undesirable feature of the plan.

They then put on record their appreciation of the services of various members of the liaison group and state:

We desire to record our appreciation of the assistance provided to us by Mr. R. M. L. Lemon and Mr. N. H. Husemeyer who respectively acted as our advisers on railway operating matters and rolling stock requirements and on signalling matters. We would also record the assistance and courtesies of Mr. Stockley and officers of the civil

engineering, signalling and traffic branches of the South Australian Railways, all of whom went out of the way of their normal duties to provide us with background, information and preliminary schemes essential to the study.

Another area of contention was that, apart from the Maunsell plan to which I have referred, there also evolved what was known as the Fitch plan. Both plans were noted in a report on page 1 of the *Advertiser* early in October, 1970, with the variations between the two systems being depicted. Over several days public debate ensued about relative advantages of the two schemes. In a discussion of the procedure followed and the history of the study, we find the following interesting comments:

A draft master plan and report was presented by consultants on August 20, 1972. Although there was general agreement among the liaison committee members on the scope of the project, concern was expressed at its high cost then estimated at \$79 200 000. A review of possible economies was undertaken and a supplementary report dated January 27, 1973, was produced by the consultants which modified the scope of the project, reducing its costs ultimately to \$62 300 000.

I sincerely hope that, in bringing down the cost of the project in 1972 from \$79 200 000 to \$62 300 000, no alteration was made to disadvantage the eventual scheme or to give the South Australian standardisation programme a system of lower overall quality and safety than would have applied with the larger expenditure. In pinpointing these sums at the reduced figure of \$62 300 000, I believe we were dealing (going back to the statement of March 20, 1970) with the self-same project. That letter goes on to say:

The total cost of work outlined above is \$42 500 000 at present-day prices. Provision for escalation of costs will amount to a further \$5 000 000 by the date of completion of the project, which we estimate to be mid-1974.

Of course, 1974 has nearly ended, yet in the first report made available to the Government it was intended that the project be completed by mid-1974, and on values then obtaining the overall figure would have been \$47 500 000.

The escalation today and the figures given to the House by the Minister and those set out in the documents when an enabling Act went before the Commonwealth Parliament give a figure of \$81 000 000. Above that, we find special mention at page 147 of the Maunsell report of the problems of future escalation. I should like to read one or two pertinent comments about that escalation. Under the heading "Future escalation", the report states:

There are no official Australian indices for recording directly variations in costs of labour and materials in the civil engineering and construction industries. The best indicators available, while not being specifically applicable, are those recorded by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics for weighted average minimum weekly rates for the building and construction industry group in South Australia and the wholesale prices of materials used in the building industry, other than house building, for Adelaide.

Likewise no indices are available for the particularly specialist mechanical and electrical engineering work required in the railway industry for the manufacture of, and modifications to, locomotives and rolling stock or for the manufacture and installation of modern signalling equipment. It is therefore only possible to make judgmental assessments regarding future trends in escalation. Using the general trends of the building industry referred to above as a general guide but with due allowance for the increasing yearly rate of escalation over the past 10 years, a general annual escalation rate of 13 per cent has now been reached and would be indicative of all costs in all branches of engineering connected with this project.

Even if it is possible to hold the escalation to the 13 per cent mentioned in the report, the final cost of the project will be more than double that contemplated when it first came to the attention of the House, and we will be about

six years later with the final implementation of the project. That is regrettable, but it is a fact of life we have to live with. In the information made available in the Maunsell report we find, under the heading "Route Generally" at page 18, the following statement:

The proposed standard gauge alignment generally follows the existing broad gauge main line on its eastern side, except between Dry Creek marshalling yard and Penfield and between 52 km to 67.8 km where the standard gauge is to be on the western side. In general the new line lies within the existing reserve of the broad gauge main line with encroachments of not more than 20 m width into adjacent farm land. The following major deviation from the broad gauge main line are proposed:

These are important to many people who will be involved, so they should be listed for the attention of the House. They are as follows:

- (i) 23 km length between Kallora (95 km) and Nantawarra (118 km).
- (ii) 10.4 km length by-passing Snowtown (140.4 km to 150.8 km).
- (iii) 24.5 km length between Redhill (170 km) and Crystal Brook (194.5 km).

To meet the geometrical requirements for a high speed main line the following minor deviations are necessary:

- Two Wells—4 km length (partly determined by road requirements).
- Mallala by-pass—2 km length.
- Long Plains—4 km length.
- Redhill—2 km length.
- Crystal Brook link lines—total length 5 km.

These areas will see some change from the general line pattern existing at the moment. Unfortunately, the report gives only a scanty indication by map of the route. A master plan is referred to, but there is nothing available in the sense of a definitive hundreds and sections map to enable the information to be obtained. I take it that the material is available, but for the benefit of the House I simply say that this is shown in the report at pages 155 and 157. Strangely, there is no page 156. The programme for implementing the whole of the undertaking is defined at page 129 of the report, and under the heading "General" it indicates the main stages of construction in a series of events. More particularly, it indicates that the original plan of the liaison committee was aimed at an official start to the project in January, 1973. This is an updated version of the whole programme. The report continues: . . . with the introduction of a standard-gauge service to Adelaide at the beginning of 1977.

Those dates have been by-passed. The report goes on to state:

Because of the delays which have occurred since the submission of the draft report in August, 1972, and the current uncertainty on the official starting date for the project, the consultants have assumed a start to the project will be authorised in January, 1975.

I trust sincerely that the assumption of a commencement in 1975 will become a reality. The passage of this measure and its speedy passage in another place will allow that to happen. The report continues:

The introduction of standard gauge interstate freight services to Adelaide from Perth and Sydney will therefore not be effected until the beginning of 1979 with the completion of the whole project in mid-1980.

As this matter is of considerable concern to the community, and as the detail is not provided elsewhere, I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard*, without my reading it, statistical details appearing on pages 132 and 133 of the report dealing with the implementation and period of development of this project.

Leave granted.

DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECT

Phase	Dates and Period from Start of Project, January, 1975	Service	Details
I	Period, 3½ years Completion, March, 1978	Direct standard gauge freight service between Adelaide, New South Wales and Queensland for service to forwarding agents at Islington and Mile End and to industry, container sidings and Central Australian Railway container depot at Mile End.	Single standard gauge main line Crystal Brook-Islington-Mile End with rudimentary signalling facilities. Access to forwarding agents and industry. Limited container facilities at Mile End. Close Peterborough bogie exchange depot. Victorian "through" and C.A.R. and W.A.G.R. interstate traffic carried by broad gauge main line and bogie exchanged at Port Pirie. Standard gauge access to Islington workshops and Mile End loco depot. Completion of supply of new S.G. locomotives and freight rolling stock.
II	Period, 4 years Completion, December, 1978	Direct standard gauge freight service between Adelaide, Western Australia and Central Australian Railway for service to completed standard gauge freight terminal at Mile End and also to Islington freight terminal.	Fully signalled and centralised traffic controlled standard gauge main line, doubled in metropolitan area. Completion of standard gauge freight terminals at Islington and Mile End. Limited bogie exchange facilities at Dry Creek marshalling yard. Victoria "through" traffic bogie-exchanged at Port Pirie. Intra-state traffic by broad gauge main lines. Completion of conversion to standard gauge of broad gauge freight rolling stock.
III	Period, 5 years Completion, December, 1979	Full standard gauge freight service to Dry Creek marshalling yard, Mile End and Islington freight terminals and all standard gauge stations. Full standard gauge passenger services to Adelaide and all standard gauge stations including Port Augusta and Whyalla. Standard gauge service to Wallaroo.	Completion of Dry Creek marshalling yard but for one bogie exchange depot. Standard gauge facilities at Pooraka. Completion of duplication of standard gauge line between Crystal Brook and Port Pirie and of Port Pirie by-pass. Exclusive standard gauge layout at Port Pirie. Completion of centralised train control between Port Pirie by-pass, Crystal Brook, Pooraka and Peterborough. Victorian "through" traffic bogie exchanged at Dry Creek. Phase out broad gauge main line service between Port Pirie and Adelaide. Port Pirie bogie exchange depot closed. Completion of new standard gauge passenger rolling stock. Completion of Snowtown to Wallaroo branch to dual gauge.
IV	Period, 5½ years Project completion, June, 1980	Full bogie exchange facilities at Dry Creek. Standard gauge service to Gillman and industry at Port Adelaide. Completion of project.	Provision of third bogie exchange depot at Dry Creek. Completion of standard gauge service to Gillman yard and industry at Port Adelaide. Removal of Port Pirie bogie exchange and transfer to Dry Creek. Removal of broad gauge main line between Port Pirie and Virginia.

Dr. EASTICK: At page 8, under the heading "Final Ministerial Agreement", the following statement is made:

The following is the text of a letter received by the consultants on October 10, 1973, from the Department of Transport concerning the final agreement reached between the Federal and State Ministers for Transport on the scope of the project and the final instructions for the preparation of the master plan.

Dear Mr. Sands,
Agreement has now been reached between our Minister and the South Australian Minister of Transport on the Adelaide to Crystal Brook standard gauge railway project. The Ministers have agreed that you complete your report in accordance with your supplementary report, incorporating of course any adjustments to estimates, etc., rendered necessary since that report was submitted, such as the revised rolling stock estimate and the inclusion of a grade separation at Crystal Brook, referred to in a letter from Mr. Meagher on June 29, 1973.

The next sentence is interesting, and, as I am not sure of its full ramifications, I hope the Minister will indicate to the House its importance when he replies in the debate. The letter continues:

It is expected that your report will take into account recent developments, such as the G.M.H. decision to change its production plans at Elizabeth.

As the spur line going to the Elizabeth plant was one of the areas contained within the general works programme associated with this report, obviously there is some major change of influence. Certainly, it is not intended (and this is highlighted elsewhere in the report) that there be a spur line to the G.M.H. plant at Woodville. I shall be interested to know the significance of this point. The letter continues:

However, major changes in your proposals for the alignment of the main line track between Dry Creek and Crystal Brook would not be envisaged and in particular we anticipate that your report will include the deviations at Snowtown and Mallala as well as the alignment through Salisbury, as recommended in your supplementary report. Ministers have agreed to the proposals for Mile End as recommended in your supplementary report, and that a standard gauge connection will not be provided to Woodville. The apportionment of cost of grade separations as recommended in your supplementary report are agreed to except that you may consider reviewing the project involvement in the North Adelaide level crossing area, having regard to the future use of Memorial Drive.

Here again we have an area of considerable importance to many people. Indeed, it may be the basis of the public debate that erupted about 10 days ago with the questioning by the Adelaide City Council of the further alienation of park lands. The letter continues:

It is anticipated that a decision on the use of timber or concrete sleepers will be left until tenders for the alternatives are examined. We would expect you to provide in the estimates for the cost of whichever would have the higher capital outlay.

I believe that the detail provided elsewhere in this report and in the supplementary report, which is known as the "Master Plan Estimates", refers to the additional cost of concrete sleepers to the extent of about \$2 700 000. There may be some adjustment depending on subsequent decisions at Ministerial level. The letter continues:

With regard to the weight of rail to be used, your recommendations should be based on overall economics and technical considerations. Apportionment of any additional costs which might be incurred would be a matter for negotiation between the Governments concerned. As the report will now be required as early as possible would you please advise when it may be available.

That letter was received by the consultants on October 10, 1973, and the report to which I have referred extensively was made available to the Minister on January 31, 1974. The report was produced with great speed and efficiency, and it is the basis of the Bill now before the House.

The final point to which I refer puts a sour note to the project. On page U3 of the Appendices, under the general heading "Adelaide-Sydney express passenger service" and under the smaller heading of "Commercial viability of the new service", appears the following:

There is very little information available about the extent to which the proposed service would be patronised, but in the opinion of the South Australian Railways traffic officers, the prospects of the service attracting sufficient patronage to make it commercially viable are not very optimistic. Information on the numbers of passengers travelling from Adelaide to Sydney via Peterborough on the Indian-Pacific indicates an average per train of 27, with a maximum of 52 and a minimum of 9. Even if the maximum figure was taken as an indication of the average number of passengers likely to travel on the proposed Adelaide-Sydney service, this would still only give a load factor of about 33 per cent—far short of that necessary to make the service profitable. There appears to be no reliable way of assessing the potential demand for a direct Adelaide-Sydney service. The only conclusions that can be reached on the information available are:

- (i) The service would give no time or distance saving compared with existing services, though it would give a service not involving a change of trains.
- (ii) A reasonable frequency at commercially attractive times would be impossible to achieve with only one set of rolling stock.

Obviously, this is a reference to the fact that only one set of rolling stock had been included in the pricing of the project. The statement continues:

- (iii) There appears to be no commercial case for the service.

This is the sour note to the project, and it is unfortunate that it had to be made, but it is only reasonable that we know the situation. Doubtless, the comments regarding

the value of the project in respect of general freight is different from that relating only to the undertaking of a passenger service.

I refer to the latest issue of the railway publication *Railways of Australia*, provided each month to all honourable members, in which reference is made to the bogie exchange system existing in the South Australian portion of the railways of Australia. I have had the opportunity, with the member for Frome, of inspecting the bogie exchange facility at Peterborough. I recognise the speed with which the men can effect a changeover and their proud record of being able to get freight on the move with a minimum of delay. I suspect, again from reading the publication, that much of the traffic that now goes through Peterborough will go through the longer route via Crystal Brook then on to the system (longer in the sense of the distance travelled, but probably not longer when one considers the time it takes to marshal the train at Peterborough, effect the bogie exchange, and get it connected and away on the route to Sydney).

I am also aware from the figures in the same publication that the Port Pirie bogie exchange is, I believe, the second largest bogie exchange point in the Australian railway system. Some of the railway employees in the area will have to be relocated. Whilst I accept that there will be a bogie exchange provision on the Adelaide end of the line, the relocation of certain railway staff may not necessarily be to their liking. However, if they want to maintain an interest in this area of railway activity, they will need to make that change.

I am concerned at one other aspect of the whole project, and this is spelt out in the schedule to the Bill. It indicates that the South Australian Government has no clear knowledge of what the cost of this project will be to it, in respect of the interest to be paid. The Commonwealth Government will be making available all of the funds for the construction, and seven-tenths of the funds will be a non-repayable grant. However, the remaining three-tenths must be repaid to the Commonwealth on a pre-determined scale; but the only indication given is that it will be at an interest rate varying from time to time and associated with the bond interest rate. At a time of rapidly escalating bond interest rates, some concern must be expressed by the Government and honourable members in accepting the project. I want to see it proceed by all means, and I have said that before, but, for future budgeting, there is this question mark about what our commitment will be. I hope (and this has been stated on more than one occasion) that the interest rates prevailing at present will decrease rapidly and will remain at a much lower level than they are now. Until that happens, however, the South Australian Government will have to pick up the tab for this higher interest rate, and the result will be against our Budget for some years to come.

This will cause a problem to us in the raising of revenue, no matter what form of tax it may be. I question whether at some time soon the various Governments in Australia will not have to look at their whole railway systems and accept the responsibility of making the railways pay for themselves. Whether that is flying a kite that will never be satisfactorily launched, time alone will tell. I think that this factor of the Commonwealth Government's making available our own funds, giving them back to us for our use and accepting a high rate of interest, is definitely against the economic success of the project we are considering. Much of the detail I have been able to present to the House was supplied to me by the Minister,

and I appreciate the speed with which he made the documents available to members on request; these documents will be of benefit to people in the community. I commend the provisions of the Bill, but I am gravely concerned about what the ultimate cost will be to the South Australian public.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the Bill and, as the Leader has said, over a period of some years I have asked questions in the House of the Minister about what progress was being made with regard to the ratification with the Commonwealth Minister on the next stage of rail standardisation in this State. It is pleasing that we have now reached the stage when this Parliament is engaged in passing legislation to ratify the agreement with the Commonwealth Minister.

This project is of significant interest to me, because the railway line comes to my home town. The history of the line is interesting. In about 1933, the railway line from Adelaide to Port Pirie stopped at Redhill, and a bus service connected Port Pirie with Redhill. In 1933 or 1934, it was decided that the line should be extended from Redhill to Port Pirie. I remember that, after the route of the line from Redhill to Port Pirie had been decided, I was a member of a deputation from Crystal Brook (I would have been about 19 at the time) to the then member for Rocky River (the late Mr. Jack Lyons) to put a case to bring the line from Redhill to Port Pirie via Crystal Brook. Having given our case to the then member for the district, Mr. Lyons opened his desk drawer and pulled out his reply to the matters we had put to him. We were unsuccessful in getting the line brought through to Crystal Brook. The line was constructed as it is today, from Redhill through to Merriton and Wandearah and on to Port Pirie.

Those were the days of the horse buggy and trollies, and I suppose it was fair enough that the member should consider the outlying areas. However, the significant point is that the route of this standardised line will be over a new area, namely, the route we had asked for back in 1933, that is, from Redhill to Crystal Brook and on to Port Pirie. The Leader has given much of the detail the Minister has made available to him, and has covered the situation well. It is interesting that, when there were Liberal Governments in this State and in the Commonwealth sphere, Maunsell and Partners were called on to prepare a report on the standardisation of this line. However, when a Labor Government came into office in South Australia, it asked Mr. Fitch to prepare a report. Mr. Fitch's recommendation was that the standardisation of the line be carried out on the present route, and that would have meant shifting all the rail from the broad gauge.

The Leader said that there had been a modification in the standardisation of this line to economise in its construction. I agree with his comment that we hope the fast service will not be impaired by any economising in cost. Whereas I believe that the original Maunsell report referred to an over-way, etc., I do not believe now that this will be provided. Where there is a dual line, at the main crossing at Crystal Brook there will be a half-boom barrier that will provide for the safety of road traffic using that crossing. An over-pass at Crystal Brook would be a monstrosity right in the town. Although a level crossing is not as convenient as an over-pass, it will preserve the environment of the area of Crystal Brook.

It appears that from Crystal Brook to Port Pirie there will be a dual track. There are various aspects of the situation. As the line comes into Crystal Brook, there will be a by-pass where trains will be able to go straight

through, by-passing Crystal Brook on to Port Pirie, and there will possibly be a loop line at Crystal Brook where trains going through to Sydney will be able to pass through the link and through Crystal Brook. There has also been a modification here. At one stage it appeared that all trains would pass through Crystal Brook, but that will not now be the case. The people of Crystal Brook for many years have had to travel 11 km to catch a train. For many years a bus service used to run but for several years now that service has been done away with and the private motorists have had to go out to Merriton to catch a train at that small railway siding. Now, they will be able to catch the train in Crystal Brook itself, which will be a great innovation for the local townspeople.

Some other problems have concerned the people of Port Pirie: for instance, the cafeteria people that service the cars. A meeting was held (and I believe the Minister went there) 12 months ago to discuss the problem with the people who would be affected by employment in the changing rail situation. These things have to take place in the name of progress, but it is only a matter of time before these problems will be ironed out. I am pleased we have reached the stage of talking about the legislation in this House, and it is with much pleasure that, at this early hour of 3.25 a.m., on November 21, 1974, I support the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support the Bill. I have been interested in the standardisation of railway lines, particularly in South Australia, for some years. I recall having the advantage a few years ago, before I was in Parliament, of discussing the whole matter of the standardisation of railways throughout Australia with the Hon. William Wentworth, who later became a Minister in the most recent Liberal and Country Party Government. He was a back-bencher at that time, and did a great job as Chairman of a special committee, not an official committee. He did much work that led to the first line between Albury and Melbourne being constructed. Much credit must go to Bill Wentworth, working as a back-bencher on an unofficial committee which led to the final work being done in that connection. So I have always been interested in the standardisation of the rail systems of Australia and look forward to this system coming into South Australia.

Members on either side of me have spoken on various aspects of this matter. I want to talk about the metropolitan area and some of the problems I see that I think can be solved. They are touched upon in the Maunsell report, particularly in the section dealing with the situation where the rail system goes through a part of my electoral district and part of it goes through the district of the member for Spence.

I want members to realise, if they care to picture in their minds the inner part of the metropolitan area, that, according to the maps and the schedules laid out, at Islington some marshalling yards will be provided, with the necessary servicing facilities for the standard gauge system and the rolling stock. Also, there will be a connection down to Dry Creek. Stock yards must be provided there and the link through Dry Creek to Gillman, a by-pass line, will run to at least one of the wharves with which you will be familiar, Mr. Speaker. Then the line will run through into the Adelaide station and around the back of the gaol, on the loop line and into the Mile End freight yard.

Let us look at some of the requirements and physical features we are facing in this section. It is solid, and I appreciate the work done by consultants in this regard. Let us start at the Adelaide railway station. It is planned

that the platform shall be on the northern side of the station, the side nearer the river and the festival theatre. So that the train may get under the Morphett Street bridge, part of the bridge will have to be removed, the line will be sunken, and the platform itself will be sunken. So that will provide for two additional standard gauge lines and platforms associated with the work.

The Morphett Street bridge itself will have to be widened to a total width of 26 m which will involve the partial closure of the bridge to traffic for some time, the replacement of the northern abutment, and alterations to several of the platforms now used by interstate, country, and metropolitan broad gauge services. The report goes on to say how the line will come away from that bridge and the drop towards the lake. Then we must look at this bridge and see how it will be altered.

It will be fairly difficult to get under the bridge, while, at the same time, conforming to the standards provided. From an engineering point of view, the level of the rail will have to be lowered for it to get underneath to provide head clearance, the platform being adjusted accordingly. To get the line over the Torrens River is the next problem so, where we have the two existing beam bridges at present side by side, one for the Port line and one for the northern line, it is intended to put a new bridge on either side of those beam bridges.

Then the line must get around the loop line. Coming to the other part, which will go through North Adelaide, the information I previously sought was not available. At North Adelaide, which could present a problem, a grade separation has to be provided, and it seems that two fly-overs will have to be installed. Members who have travelled on the standard gauge line on the Southern Aurora into Melbourne from Sydney will know how fly-overs are used, and much construction work will be necessary. It seems from the report that much temporary work will be needed whilst construction work is proceeding, in order to allow normal services to continue. It has been suggested that there should be different levels of fly-over so that they would be as least unsightly as possible, and a special study will be undertaken in relation to this matter.

Once again we come up against a problem, and it seems almost inevitable that unless someone has a bright idea there will be an intrusion into the existing park lands. It has been suggested to me that parts of the park lands now used by the South Australian Railways or by the existing road system could be made available to compensate for park lands that will be alienated.

Mr. Venning: Do you think there will be problems with the park land area?

Mr. CUMBE: Possibly, because the areas to be resumed by the Adelaide City Council will be smaller, although of the same total area, and there may be problems in providing the same number of football ovals. I have considered this matter, but at this stage I am not definite. Although I have asked the Minister, he does not have the information and has explained the situation to me. For people of Adelaide, and particular those of North Adelaide living in my district or passing through it, or those coming from the Port Adelaide area or along the Port Road and wishing to travel to the northern part of the metropolitan area or of the State, some temporary arrangements will have to be made in order to handle road traffic, Mr. Speaker, if you wish to travel from Parliament House to your home you will have to cross at the North Adelaide crossing, unless you can travel over the proposed over-pass at the Ovingham crossing. There will be an over-pass at

the Islington crossing, too. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, you would have to use that over-pass, but I am sure that you are fully awake to these proposals.

In referring to these matters, I highlight some of the engineering problems and design features that will have to be undertaken. Money has been set aside and detailed planning will have to be made. I have considered the schedule of the Bill, but that does not set out these details clearly. It refers to the master plan in clause 5 of the schedule of the Bill, but the only maps I can find are in the report and are not as big as they should be. The metropolitan area map does not show the lines in great detail. I make a serious plea that, although I am in no way connected with any protest group moving in relation to the park lands, I am a firm believer in maintaining the right of people to use them, and I believe that we should not alienate the park lands unnecessarily. In fact, I should like to see them extended, and an excellent programme of reforestation conducted wherever possible.

We must acknowledge the wonderful work of the late Mr. Veale (former City Clerk) in relation to parts of the park lands, especially in the western parts of my district. In the northern part we have the golf links on which some Government members play at times. My plea is that we should try to save as much of the park lands as we can, because once the park lands are lost we will never get them back, and that possibility worries me. Having said that, I cannot refer to the schedule, because it is in the form of an agreement, so I content myself by saying that I welcome the Bill, and suggest that it should have been introduced earlier. It is unfortunate that such a major project has to be debated at this hour, because it is one of the most important projects that has been introduced for many years, and will have many benefits for South Australia. I have read some of the earlier railway Bills that used to be referred to what was then the Railways Standing Committee and which later became the Public Works Standing Committee in, I think, 1927.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): In supporting the Bill, I express my appreciation to the Government for its introduction. Not only will a standard gauge line be provided between Crystal Brook and Adelaide, but there will also be a branch line in which I am most interested. For years this decision has been expected, and it is pleasing that the plan is now to become a reality and that the standard gauge line will link with the rail network of other States.

Mr. Payne: I think some credit should go to the Commonwealth Government, under Mr. Chifley, for initiating the original agreement in 1949.

Mr. RUSSACK: I give credit where it is due, and I commend the Government for introducing the Bill so that this project will proceed. I shall not discuss matters which the Leader, in an expert way, referred to, indicating the hard work he had done to research details regarding the laying of this line. It is not necessary for me to repeat those details, but I should refer to the parochial interest I have in this venture.

Much of the route from Crystal Brook to Adelaide will pass through the District of Gouger from Snowtown, through Lochiel or Bumbunga, through Bowmans, to Balaklava, and then through Mallala to Adelaide. The portion from Snowtown to just beyond Balaklava is of particular interest to me, and I know that people in those centres are very pleased that the project is to go ahead. In his second reading explanation the Minister

referred to the principal items of the project examined by Maunsell and Partners, and subsequently included in the Bill, including the following:

Standard gauge connection to Wallaroo by conversion of the line between Snowtown and Kadina from broad gauge to standard gauge, and the construction of a new standard gauge line between Kadina and Wallaroo.

Section B of the schedule refers to the branch line between Snowtown and Wallaroo. I understand from the second reading explanation that between Snowtown and Kadina the present line will be converted to a three-track line. Possibly the Kadina-Wallaroo line will also be a three-track line but, as far as I can see, a new line may well be laid. I hope the Minister will clarify this matter. The Leader referred to bogie exchange; trucks are converted so that they can travel on broad gauge lines and standard gauge lines. A mixed gauge line will be used between Snowtown and Wallaroo. Because it is so late in the morning, I seek leave, Mr. Speaker, to have an article in *Keeping Track* inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot have the article inserted in *Hansard* without his reading it if it is not of a statistical nature.

Mr. RUSSACK: In that case, I will quote from the article. The article, in the July, 1974, edition of *Keeping Track*, states:

As an example, no standard gauge locomotives or brakevans would work west of Snowtown. A train out of Wallaroo would have a broad gauge locomotive, a mixture of broad and standard gauge waggons and a broad gauge brakevan. At Snowtown, all the standard gauge waggons would be shunted out to be picked up by standard gauge trains working between Adelaide and Port Pirie (or Broken Hill) and the broad gauge train would continue on to Brinkworth or Gladstone. In fact, the existing train service could be worked without alteration.

The idea of mixed gauge working in the manner described takes getting used to and a lot of people would need to be convinced before the concept could be considered seriously. A Mixed Gauge Working Committee consisting of Mr. Stewien (Permanent Way Engineer), Mr. Both (Assistant Signal and Telegraph Engineer), Mr. Parsons (Acting Designing Engineer, Islington) and Mr. Wilson (Traffic Inspector) was set up to carry out further investigations.

The investigations were made in various places. Regarding one test, the article states:

For this test, three and a half miles of main line running out of Snowtown towards Barunga Gap was fitted with a third rail as was also one leg of the triangle at Snowtown. Also, the article says:

At present, the economies of this method of working are being given further consideration but from tests carried out there would appear to be no reason from a physical and engineering point of view why the idea should not be successful. If eventually mixed gauge working either in shunting yards or in main line operation is introduced on the South Australian Railways, it is thought that we may rightfully claim a world first—perhaps a claim of doubtful honour as such a claim could only be made in a country dogged with more than one gauge but certainly no other case is known where vehicles of two gauges have been worked indiscriminately on mixed gauge track as if they were all of the one gauge.

So, I am pleased that this branch line will be in my district. In reply to a question from me about this matter, the Minister said:

No formal report was prepared after finalisation of the tests although the details and their results have been documented. Whether mixed gauge working is used in any particular locality will depend on the relative economics of this method against the alternatives, and this will be considered in preparing various detailed plans. The consultant's report on the Crystal Brook-Adelaide standard gauge project, as accepted by the State and Australian Governments, provides for the section between Snowtown

and Wallaroo to be a mixed gauge track. This will allow for the operation of mixed gauge trains, with significant locomotive operating savings.

I am glad that the tests have been conclusive. This track will be unique, and it will be mainly for transporting grain to the silo terminals at Wallaroo. The standard gauge line will enable grain to be brought from outlying areas. Retreated concentrates from old tailings of the mining days are being sent by rail from Kadina to Port Kembla. How much cheaper that operation could be if the standard gauge line was available! The Wallaroo-Kadina-Moonta area could have been used as a nucleus for a new town, instead of Monarto. Because interstate communication will be possible to Wallaroo, industries may be attracted to the area. In a speech prior to the 1970 election the Premier made a feature of the proposed standard gauge line to Wallaroo; he said that it would attract industry to the area. I hope that that will happen.

The final thing I want to say on the matter is that, besides the potential the line could introduce, perhaps now the Government will take into account the building at the Kadina railway station, which has possibly been there since the line was laid in the last century. Although there is at present no passenger service, there should be congenial office accommodation where railway officials can work.

I support the Bill. I am glad that after so long this line will be a reality. I believe it will be of benefit to areas in the Gouger District through which the main line passes to Adelaide. The branch line will be of great benefit to the areas of Snowtown, Barunga Gap, Bute, Kadina, and Wallaroo, through which it passes. Perhaps the Minister will say later what will happen to the existing line between Wallaroo and Moonta.

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): I, too, support the Bill. When I was speaking the other evening in relation to the Tarcoola line, I said that when this line and the Tarcoola line were completed freight could pass right through to Alice Springs with the one break of gauge. I want to speak about how this line will affect Peterborough. At present, as the Leader has said, Peterborough has a bogie exchange that is working three shifts a day with about 25 people on each shift. All freight for the narrow gauge line between Quorn and Orreroo, for the Peterborough township, and for the standard gauge line is now taken on the broad gauge line to Burra through Peterborough and changed on the bogie exchange. When the Crystal Brook line is completed there will still be the necessity to retain the bogie exchange at Peterborough. It is contemplated that they will work only one shift a day. There will always be a need for a bogie exchange at the centre to cater for livestock from the Burra line going to Broken Hill and also for livestock from Broken Hill coming to the Burra markets.

Although there will always be a need to work the bogie exchange in the centre, about 40 or 50 people will have to leave the township of Peterborough. I believe the Government could counter this by diverting more railway repair work to the workshops at Peterborough because they are well equipped and capable of doing most work for the railways. The township of Peterborough is worried about its future. The local residents know that the standard gauge line to Crystal Brook is coming and that it will have some effect on the town. The people are also worried because the Commonwealth Government has said from time to time that it may take over the country railway lines in South Australia. If this happens, it could well be that the workshop for all repair work on the Commonwealth Railways could be carried out at Port Augusta.

This would also have a detrimental effect on the township of Peterborough. Over the last few months this subject has gone quiet, and we have not heard so much about it.

The businessmen's association at Peterborough, which has been operating for several years and doing excellent work, and the Peterborough corporation have over the years tried hard to attract industry to Peterborough to counter the effect of the factors to which I have referred. They have even gone to the extent of buying excellent land near the railway; they have sent out brochures inviting industry to come to the town; and they have even offered to lease land at a peppercorn rental to any industry willing to set up in the town. I must congratulate them for the effort they have put in. They have left no stone unturned to try to attract an industry, but so far they have had no luck. The town has a good water supply and gas and power are also laid on. All the necessary facilities are there, so the Government should try to attract an industry to suit that town.

During my recent trip to England, I took with me much literature from this town in the hope that I might find someone there connected with industry who would be willing to come to Australia and perhaps set up in this township.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must link up his remarks with the Bill.

Mr. ALLEN: As this railway will have a detrimental effect on Peterborough, Mr. Speaker, I am pointing out that by attracting an industry to the town the effect of losing the railway may be offset. On two or three occasions, when I spoke to business men in England about the possibility of coming to Australia, they said that they could not, in any circumstances, come here, because the costs of production here were far too high. They said they could manufacture an article in their country and ship it to Australia at far less cost. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Schedules.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): In the second reading debate, I read a letter which was the final Ministerial approval indicating a change of plan, apparently of some significance, in relation to the spur line for General Motors-Holden's at Elizabeth. Can the Minister give information on the changed circumstances? Further, is there any alteration in relation to the route of the line from Dry Creek to Gillman? It is a developing area and, with the containerisation programme, it has been suggested that there should be a more direct road link. Can the Minister say whether the route will be markedly different from that of the railway that goes through Wingfield and whether any joint action is planned in relation to a highway to open up the area?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): My recollection of the matter is that the line to Gillman follows substantially the existing track. Plans are proceeding for what I think will be called the Gillman highway, and some preliminary works have been undertaken. The position from which the original determination was made in relation to the rail connection for G.M.H. changed quite markedly, and after discussion between the consultants and the firm it was considered that the warrant for the connection that previously had existed had altered because of changed circumstances. That is the reason for the subsequent alteration. I could confirm what I have said in greater detail by checking the records and provide more detailed information for the Leader. I would be happy to do that.

Schedules passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.5 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, November 21, at 2 p.m.