

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, August 21, 1975

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor will be prepared to receive the House for the purpose of receiving the Address in Reply at 2.10 p.m. this day. I ask the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply and other honourable members to accompany me to Government House for the purpose of presenting the Address.

At 2.2 p.m. the Speaker and members proceeded to Government House. They returned at 2.17 p.m.

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that, accompanied by the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Governor's Opening Speech and other honourable members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Address adopted by this House on August 19, to which His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:

I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which I opened the first session of the Forty-second Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best attention to all matters placed before you. I pray for God's blessing upon your deliberations.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: HOUSING FINANCE

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon D. A. DUNSTAN: The Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Savings Bank of South Australia announced today that his board had decided to lift its investment in housing during the current financial year by a further \$5 000 000, that is, an increase from \$45 000 000 to \$50 000 000. The new total figure will mean that about 3 000 persons will be assisted during the year to purchase their own houses. The rates of interest that will be applied to housing loans in future will be 9½ per cent up to \$15 000, 10½ per cent for loans between \$15 000 and \$20 000, and rates slightly higher for loans greater than \$20 000. These rates are the lowest of those offered by savings banks. I point out that they are above the rate for concessional interest rate loans made by the State Bank where it has available concessional interest rate money. Nevertheless, this addition to housing funds at the lowest competitive interest rates will, I am sure, go some way towards meeting the gap that I have previously announced that we would be faced with in housing finance in the State.

SEX DISCRIMINATION 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.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

RAILWAYS (TRANSFER AGREEMENT) BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

QUESTIONS

WAIKERIE PRIMARY SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. ARNOLD (August 12).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Work on the junior primary section of Waikerie Primary School is proceeding at present and will provide modern facilities for that section. To assist with facilities in the senior section of the school, a Commonwealth standard library is expected to be started soon and to be ready for use at the beginning of the 1976 school year. There are no further definite plans at present for the upgrading of the primary school, although initial design work has been completed. Consideration will be given to this project from time to time in accordance with available funds and the demands on departmental resources for the upgrading of schools in other places or the provision of new schools in the developing areas.

MANNUM PRIMARY SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. WARDLE (August 12).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: While Mannum Primary School has been listed for replacement for several years, it has not been possible to include it in the design programme, because of the tremendous demands made on available resources. I regret that it is still not possible to say when construction of the new school will begin.

FRASER PARK SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. WARDLE (August 13).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Tenders for Fraser Park Primary School have closed and are at present being considered. It is hoped that siteworks will begin in about four to six weeks time. The difficulties that have been experienced recently at Murray Bridge South are understood and the Education Department appreciates the manner in which the Principals of the two schools have worked in these circumstances.

RIGBY LIMITED

Dr. TONKIN: Does the Premier believe that the loss of the cost advantage, as compared to the Eastern States, enjoyed by South Australia under previous Liberal Governments is a factor in the transferring of a major part of the warehousing operations of Rigby Limited from Adelaide to Melbourne? Reports today indicate that Rigby Limited, the major publishers and book distributors operating in Adelaide for nearly 120 years, intends to transfer a major part of its warehousing operations from Adelaide to Melbourne. As the Premier well knows, under previous Liberal Governments South Australia had a considerable cost advantage compared to the Eastern States; that amounted to about 13 per cent in relation to book publishing. Indeed, it was deliberate Liberal Party policy to maintain such a cost advantage to attract industry to South Australia.

Mr. Wells: Yes, by paying low wages.

Dr. TONKIN: While the loss of this cost advantage may not necessarily be a major factor in Rigby's decision to move a major part of its warehouse operations from Adelaide to Melbourne, it does highlight the frightening facts confronting South Australia today. New industries attracted to South Australia in the 1950's and 1960's by the large cost advantage will no longer be easily attracted in the present economic climate, and existing South Australian industries with major markets in the Eastern States will seriously contemplate moving all or part of their operations to other States.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader says that South Australia's cost advantage has been lost, but that is not

the case. There has been some alteration in costs because of the transfer of South Australian employees from State to national awards, but that is not the responsibility of the State Government: it is a decision of employees and the court within the terms of the Australian Constitution. Therefore, South Australia maintains a real cost advantage compared to the other States, as has been shown by the studies of the Industrial Development Advisory Council. The Leader started his question by asking whether I believed that some change in the cost advantage (which he was unable to specify) had led Rigby's to make a decision about its warehouse. However, he had no facts and figures about the costs involved in Rigby's warehouse operations, and admitted that he did not know whether that was a factor at all in Rigby's decision. Therefore, it is obvious from the Leader's explanation that he is simply flying a kite and does not know whether any cost advantage was involved in Rigby's decision.

Dr. Tonkin: Do you?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I do not.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: At least he's honest!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Rigby Limited has not consulted me about its decision. I am not making any claims about the matter or speaking on Rigby's behalf, except to say that the management of Rigby Limited has deliberately expressed to me, in writing, its satisfaction with the South Australian Government.

WINGFIELD STENCH

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Minister for the Environment heard complaints that Woollana Industries Limited is leaving parts of rotten animals on its property? I have received complaints about this matter. With a union secretary, I viewed these animal remains, which give off an unbearable stench about which the local residents regularly complain. It is not unusual for rotten parts of dead animals to be left lying in this area for a long time. Complaints have also been made that Simsmetal Proprietary Limited, in the same district, dumps vehicles and then sets them alight in order to retrieve the scrap metal. Dumping is being carried on by more than one company in the area. Although this is a noxious trades area, many people who have moved into the district have not known that, and they have asked that these grossly offensive activities be investigated soon. Does the Minister know anything about these complaints?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes, my department has received complaints from the area from time to time and, as a result, discussions about them are taking place fairly constantly between the Environment Department and the Public Health Department. I know that the problems relating to the Woollana company are being discussed between officers of my department and of the Public Health Department. If I remember correctly, I think it was the union secretary to whom the honourable member referred that reported the matter to us. I can assure the honourable member that, even if my memory is at fault on that point, I will take the matter up with the Public Health Department to see whether the matter can be dealt with, and I will let the honourable member know the result.

JUVENILE COURT

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Does the Attorney-General intend to open the hearings in the Juvenile Court to the press as suggested by Judge Herman Litsky, or does he intend to follow the policy previously dictated by Mr.

Justice King, when he was Attorney-General, before his elevation (in inverted commas) to the bench? Many members of the public believe they have a right to some knowledge of what is happening in the Juvenile Court; recently one of our own magistrates again voiced this opinion. No-one is suggesting for a moment that sensational reporting or, indeed, the divulging of offenders' names is necessary or desirable, but it seems that there is a growing opinion within the community (and among those in a position to know, such as Judge Herman Litsky) that hearings in the Juvenile Court should be freed from some of the secrecy that seems to surround its operations at present.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not intend to depart from the policy adopted on the recommendation of those magistrates (and, now, judges) specifically concerned with this area, a policy which was adopted when I was previously Attorney-General and which has been maintained since.

Mr. Duncan: Successfully.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Successfully and properly.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is the opinion of those people who are constantly engaged in the jurisdiction the people who have to deal with juveniles and who are in the best position to judge the result.

Mr. Mathwin: Why not release the Beerworth report?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know what the honourable member contends that he represents in that sphere. I can only say that the people on whom we rely in South Australia for advice on this matter are considered widely in this country to be some of the most able and best qualified people in the area.

Mr. Millhouse: Does that mean all the people on whom you rely?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have no recommendation from anyone to the contrary. If the honourable member knows of any, perhaps he will tell me.

Mr. Millhouse: That is a negative way of answering my question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is apparently on a fishing expedition. If he gets no fish and he thinks that is negative, that is what he will have to take.

Mr. Millhouse: It's not my fishing expedition, it is that of the member for Kavel.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Then, in that case, I suggest that the honourable member keeps out of the fishy waters. The answer is that it is not intended to change this policy, and no change in policy would occur unless it was strongly recommended by the people concerned in the jurisdiction.

PARKING SIGNS

Mr. WHITTEN: Will the Minister of Local Government use his good offices in an attempt to influence the Port Adelaide council to reconsider its decision to refuse to erect parking signs directing motorists to off-street parking areas? The Port Adelaide Traders Association recently requested the Port Adelaide council to erect green "P" signs so that motorists would realise that free off-street parking areas were available near the main shopping area of Port Adelaide. If these signs were erected and motorists used these areas, it would relieve parking congestion in Commercial Road and St. Vincent Street, creating a better traffic flow through Port Adelaide. This morning, the

President of the Port Adelaide Traders Association contacted me, expressing grave concern about the report printed in the local *Messenger* newspaper yesterday, as follows:

Council also rejected an application from the Traders' Association for council to erect parking signs directing motorists to areas at the rear of Commercial Road and St. Vincent Street.

Large free parking areas are available at the rear of Commercial Road and St. Vincent Street, and another parking area is located near my office. If motorists were aware that these parking areas were available, they would be used, so that congestion in Port Adelaide would be relieved.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to discuss this matter with the Port Adelaide council, because I am disturbed that, from what the honourable member has reported to the House, it would appear that the policy of trying to get cars off the streets into car parks is not being pursued. It is certainly the policy of this Government to try to get people to park in off-street parks, so that the roads can be used to travel on, not park on. I will certainly take up the matter with the council to see whether anything can be done about it.

RELIEF DIVERS

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Fisheries to examine the present situation regarding the use of relief divers in the abalone industry, with a view to maintaining their use in assisting divers? Will he also examine the proposal for transferable licences, as this would enable divers to leave the industry without undue hardship? I understand that the situation presently relating to relief divers will expire at the end of this month. The divers are concerned about this, because it means that the licensed divers will have to remain longer on the seabed, consequently putting themselves at greater risk. Transferable licences are suggested as an attempt to overcome this by enabling divers, who at present risk their health by spending unnecessary hours under water, to leave the industry, with new men being trained to enter the industry. The undue hardship placed on divers, together with the economic situation facing the industry, concerns all those involved. Therefore, I ask the Minister to raise with his colleagues the possibility of a thorough investigation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to do that for the honourable member. I will get him a report as soon as possible.

GOODWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Education ascertain when the Goodwood Primary School will be completed, and when the official opening will take place? Teachers and students alike are eagerly awaiting the transfer from the old school to the new area. Over a period, the teachers and students have been handicapped because of the noise, as the old school is on a main road. The infants school is now in use, and everyone concerned is delighted with the change, which has been extremely effective regarding teaching methods in the school.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will get a report for the honourable member.

CROP DAMAGE

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Premier say whether the Government will pay the legal costs of two of my constituents who have lost crops of tomatoes and capsicums because of hormone sprays used by the Monarto

Development Commission in destroying boxthorns? Two of my constituents are on the immediate edge of the designated site of Monarto, a road separating them from the designated site, and the Monarto Development Commission has had people in to deal with the boxthorns, these people having used a hormone spray. About five years ago there was much difficulty with the use of hormone spray in the glasshouse area: I think the Premier will remember those occasions. To my knowledge, at that time the use of hormones within about 1.6 kilometres in the case of one hormone and about 8 km in the case of others in carrying out these projects was prohibited. However, these hormones have been used on this occasion not far from the glasshouses. I understand that the Weeds Officer of the local council and the Weeds Officer of the Agriculture Department have visited these areas and have confirmed from the nature of the damage that it certainly is from the use of hormone. The constituents have approached the State Government Insurance Commission, which states that it accepts no responsibility on behalf of the Monarto Development Commission. Therefore, it is obvious now that my constituents must engage counsel to go to the commission to get some sort of compensation. That is the reason for my question whether the Government will pay the costs of these two constituents in seeking compensation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We cannot undertake to pay costs. The position, as I am informed of it at present, is that liability is denied by the Monarto Development Commission. There is a contest about whether the commission has used any spray that could conceivably have affected the glasshouses, and consequently we will have to investigate the matter further. However, I will get a more complete report for the honourable member. I can only say at this stage that, on my instructions, liability is denied.

CROYDON PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. ABBOTT: Can the Minister of Education tell me of any development by the Public Buildings Department in regard to its planning of the redevelopment of Croydon Primary School? Following a visit to that school early this year by the former Minister of Education (Hon. Hugh Hudson), several proposals were suggested to improve the facilities at this school. These include a new Demac building for the junior primary school (the need for which resulted from the loss of that school by fire), acquisition of several properties within the school area, conversion of the two-storey building to open-space, and removal of the craft building.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will take up the matter with the Minister of Works to find out whether the matter is at present one for his area of administration or my area. The only information I have for the honourable member offhand is that I understand that the library resource centre was on the B list. I will get confirmation of that for the honourable member and also get information on the other matters that he has raised regarding the school.

POSTAL VOTING

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Premier consider appointing a committee to investigate ways in which the postal voting system in this State could be simplified so that people living in outer areas would have time to exercise their right to vote? In the recent State election, many voters in the outer areas of South Australia were deprived of a vote because the time was insufficient for them to obtain the necessary voting papers. I pointed out last week in the Address in Reply debate that at the 1970 State election

526 persons did not vote, that at the 1973 election 539 persons did not vote, but that at the recent election 703 persons (almost 200 more than usual) out of a total of 8 600 on the roll did not vote. The number of non-voters always is high in these areas, because many stations receive only one mail delivery a week. In fact, some receive only one delivery a fortnight. The time from the closing of nominations until voting day is not sufficient for people to carry out the necessary procedures. It is considered by most people that the present postal voting system, or the provisions regarding application for postal vote forms, needs revising.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will examine the matter for the honourable member. It is intended to introduce, during this session, some amendments to the Electoral Act, which will include matters concerning postal voting.

PRIORITY ROADS

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Transport ask officers of the Highways Department to examine the possibility of having a complete priority road system initiated, particularly on some of the main road arteries within the city of Whyalla? I appreciate that the Minister may find it difficult to carry out such a project, but there is currently a difference of opinion between the Highways Department and the Whyalla council about accidents occurring at certain intersections in Whyalla. I also point out to the Minister that, in my opinion, the main problem occurs along Nicholson Avenue, which is the longest and busiest street in Whyalla, and I consider that the priority road system may do much to curb the number of accidents, particularly on the basis that we are currently waiting for money, etc., for street lighting.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to ask the northern area engineer of the Highways Department to consider this matter and particularly to consult the Whyalla council. I think there is merit in the suggestion that the honourable member has put forward, but I hasten to say that the current programme provides that the first roads that will be converted to priority roads are those that are now clearways, and obviously the priority has been determined by virtue of the fact that these roads have been declared clearways. This line has been followed now in the declaration of priority roads. Notwithstanding this, I will ask the Highways Department to examine the suggestion to find out whether it is possible to accede to the request.

SOUTH-EAST ELECTRICITY

Mr. ALLISON: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say what guarantee there is of a permanent reserve of electricity to safeguard the power supply to the South-East of South Australia in the event of failure in the State electricity grid? The Mount Gambier power station is to be closed down for one month at Christmas time this year. Should there be a failure in the grid supply from Adelaide, essential services and industries could be seriously affected. The last time such a problem occurred, there was no power for 13 hours. That was when an insulator was shot to pieces. It may be said that the line is now duplicated. But this is not exactly true. From Mobilong to Tailm Bend there is only a single line, where accidents might occur.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As the honourable member would know, at Mount Gambier the Electricity Trust operates a small steam power station fuelled with wood waste from the Woods and Forests Department's sawmill and other mills in the district. The station is situated next

door to the department's sawmill and provides steam for the drying kilns and other processes in the mill. In recent years, the quantity of wood waste available as fuel has dropped as other uses have been found for it. At present waste is being supplied at the rate of about 100 000 tonnes a year compared to 295 000 tonnes in 1972-73. Further reductions are expected over the next year or so. With the reductions that have already occurred, the power station is generating at only about one-third of its capacity. It is that problem coupled with the fact that, over the period of the proposed shutdown of the station, the sawmill will also be closed, which has led to the decision to shut down for four weeks. The closure of the station at that time will mean that it will not be necessary for large quantities of wood fuel to be stockpiled beforehand. I think that, unless there is an assurance for the future of an increased supply of wood waste, no guarantee can be given in the long run for the continuation of the Mount Gambier power station for all time. The honourable member recognises (and I will quote from a report published in the *Border Watch*) the following:

Cr. Allison said the cost of generating power in Mount Gambier was somewhat higher than the cost per unit on the State grid system. "This means that locally produced power is somewhat of a luxury," he said.

It is in those circumstances that the matter must be judged. I will take up this matter further with the trust, but I do not think that it is possible to give a long-term guarantee (by that, I mean 20 years or more) of an alternative source of power through this power station. If other possibilities are open about which the trust knows, I will obtain that information and provide it to the honourable member.

MONARTO

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask a question which I think should go either to the Special Minister of State for Monarto or to the Premier, because the latter may regard it as a matter of policy, and he has already made a statement on it. Is it intended, following the virtual collapse of the Monarto project, to use the Monarto Development Commission on other work both within and outside of the State? I read in a newspaper yesterday a reference by the Premier to this matter in commenting on the Federal Budget in which he said that the Government would legislate to allow the commission to do extra work for other regional and development centres in South Australia "so that we could keep the work of the commission as a team at full capacity". I was intrigued several hours ago to have recounted to me a news report to the effect that, with Liberal Movement support, the Premier hopes to expand the role of the commission so that it can continue its role and undertake similar projects both inside and outside the State both for the Government and for private enterprise. I may say, in explanation, that this is the first I have heard of it.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The first I've heard of it, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It has been said on news broadcasts today that the Premier had said this—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It's nonsense!

Mr. MILLHOUSE:—and was expressing the hope that the L.M. would support him in it. However, I can tell him that the Liberal Movement will not support him in it. Whether or not it is his intention to do this sort of thing, I ask whether he has any firm commitments from the Commonwealth Government or firm ideas of what work the commission could do for the State Government or whether any sector of private enterprise has indicated even

the slightest interest in using the commission's services. I think it should be wound up myself.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Amending legislation will be introduced to provide for the commission to carry out work as a consultant body for other organisations. This arises in relation to arrangements at present being made with the Australian Government that have occurred as a consequence of the problems of the Darwin Reconstruction Commission. A special request has been made through Mr. Uren (Australian Minister for Urban and Rural Development) for the services of the Monarto commission to be made available on a consultant basis to the Darwin commission.

Mr. Millhouse: I thought you always believed that federal bodies—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I know the honourable member's propensity for asking further questions, having asked one. The Government has accepted this request, because during the period of deferment of the commencement of the construction of the Monarto project—

Mr. Millhouse: How long will that be?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:—this will enable the work of the Monarto commission to continue and enable its capacity to be used to the fullest possible extent. I should also like to correct a report that appears in today's *News* which refers to the financial provisions being made by the State Government for Monarto as \$1 200 000. That is incorrect; the provision that appears in the Loan Estimates is \$3 200 000, which is additional to the \$500 000 supplied by the Australian Government and any other earnings the Monarto commission might make as a consequence of doing consultant work.

Mr. Millhouse: Can you give any estimate of what they are likely to be?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member is being his usual idiotic self. He does not want a reply: he wants to get himself recorded in *Hansard* as making more interjections. He is more interested in saying things than in hearing any reply that is given. Briefs for Monarto will be submitted by the Darwin commission. Some preliminary discussions have already taken place between the General Manager of the Darwin commission (Mr. Powell) and me, and with the General Manager of the Monarto commission. The amendment to the Act will also enable the Monarto commission to use its services elsewhere as and when required. The expectation is that construction on the Monarto project can commence towards the end of the next financial year, and that will govern the extent of the deferment.

Mr. Millhouse: About two years?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No, it is not two years: between 16 and 18 months is the period of the deferment of the commencement of construction, and this will enable the necessary planning to be carried out in a more thoroughgoing way than would otherwise be the case. I think that that should indicate in general that the Government is committed to the continuation of Monarto, that it can continue, and that it has not collapsed, as certain honourable members with a purely short-time selfish and purely political interest would like to have us believe. The honourable member is the head of a certain Party that has the most short-sighted policy of all in relation to Monarto and the least concern for the long-term interests of metropolitan Adelaide and the quality of life in the

metropolitan area. The Liberal Movement would have this State spend millions of dollars—

The SPEAKER: Order! I must call the Minister to order.

KAROONDA AREA SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Is the Minister of Education aware that the master plans for the redevelopment of Karoonda Area School have recently been presented to that school's council by his department? As the plans proposed for redevelopment are scheduled to take place over a period of five years, and as the council considers the reconstruction of the primary school of the utmost urgency, can the Minister obtain a report indicating in what year it is expected that the five-year redevelopment plan will commence and what will be the order of priority of the work?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will obtain that information. As three or four questions have been asked today about specific projects in honourable members' districts, I think I should say for the general information of members that, in view of the grants that we expect from the Schools Commission, there will have to be a lessening of effort in the schools construction programme compared with what we had expected. The money in the capital area coming from the Schools Commission does not represent a maintenance of effort in real terms. In this situation it is necessary for me to set priorities relating to what sorts of project should continue unaffected and what sorts of project will have to be reviewed. It seems to me that the most important programme which has to continue is the provision of new schools in developing areas of the metropolitan area and in country towns where there is the continuing demand for school accommodation because of the increased numbers of children in those areas, so this will remain number one priority. The areas that will be subject to review (and I am not in a position to say just how thoroughgoing a review will be necessary at this stage) are, first, replacement programmes, and secondly, development of spaces at schools other than the basic teaching spaces. I am not yet in a position to say exactly what that means in relation to certain projects. I want to confer further with the Deputy Premier before any final decisions are made about specific projects. That is the general framework in which we will continue: priority will be given to the provision of further buildings in those areas where there is the increasing demand for school places because of demographic factors.

CARAVAN PARKS

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister for the Environment ask the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport to endeavour to assist the people who use caravan parks in the metropolitan area, often referred to as semi-permanents, who until recently have been allowed to stay in a caravan park for a specified period, after which they move on to another caravan park and then they are able to return to the original caravan park again? It has been claimed that there is discrimination at some of the Government-controlled parks in that people with children are refused admission and the privileges that used to prevail are no longer available. A housing shortage exists in this State (the Housing Trust is still dealing with applications made in 1970), and the position has been aggravated by the influx of about 600 families from Darwin, many of which are using caravans for accommodation. Because of the housing shortage, because the department concerned is losing many thousands of dollars in revenue, and because vacant sites are available, I ask whether the Minister will try to assist these people.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be happy to refer the question to the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport.

NATIONAL PARKS

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister for the Environment say what is the Government's current programme for the purchase of national parks and recreation areas? Have all of the areas already publicly announced been acquired and, if not, which have not been so acquired and for what reasons?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall have to get that information for the honourable member. Many announcements have been made in recent months by the department, in conjunction with the Commonwealth Department of the Environment. The honourable member will perhaps appreciate that the question of the purchase of lands is a complicated matter: it is not something that can be undertaken and concluded quickly, particularly when there is argument between the landowner and the Land Board in relation to prices. I will get as much information as I can on current negotiations, and let the honourable member know.

AGRICULTURAL MISSION

Mr. RODDA: Can the Premier say what progress has been made with negotiations made by the former Minister of Agriculture on his visit to the Middle East? A friend has sent me a clipping from the *Tehran Times* of May 13 in which reference is made to the fact that a three-man agricultural mission from the State of South Australia was to arrive in Tehran that week. It went on to say that it was the second visit sponsored by an Australian State Government in the past 12 months, and that that showed the strong regional support for the initiatives taken by the Commonwealth Government of Australia to develop trade in agricultural products between the two countries. This clipping was sent to me by the person from Iran who is extremely interested in the development of trade between these two countries and particularly, of course, in relation to the mission that Mr. Casey headed. Can the Premier inform the House whether there are any developments?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There have been developments in a number of countries, including Iran, but I will get a full report for the honourable member about the present stage of developments.

DEPARTMENTAL HOUSES

Mr. VENNING: Will the Premier take the necessary action to see that departmental houses no longer required by the Government are made available for occupation immediately? Some Government houses throughout the State have not been occupied for more than 12 months. For example, the police station at Red Hill has been empty for more than 12 months. When I visit Gladstone I see that some houses have not been occupied for a year, yet people with children looking for accommodation are forced to live in caravans. They have been trying to procure these houses, but to no avail. I ask the Premier to see whether a short cut can be taken to make these houses available to the people of this State in view of the housing situation.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The position with respect to the problem of empty houses in various parts of the State is currently under thorough examination, and measures are being adopted at present to ensure some effective degree of co-ordination and also co-operation of the various Government departments that may or may not

be involved in having vacant houses under their control. My research officer has been busy on this matter, and I hope that he will be better able to provide details about measures that will be applied later. I will make that information available to the honourable member.

HOUSE-BUILDERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Housing consider taking Government action to help potential house-owners to form a house-builders' association? Young people and other potential house-owners today face a virtually impossible task in building or buying houses. In the Address in Reply debate I said that, just after the war, returned servicemen formed a club, contributing an equal number of working hours towards the construction of houses through the club. A clerk could work as a labourer or as secretary for the association for about 12 months or two years and would, in this way, contribute to the association and help to construct houses. In the same way, plumbers, engineers, draftsmen, etc., could band together to help, too. To form such an association people would need a start. I suggest that, as the Monarto Development Commission has resources that the Government will have to consider dispersing, it could provide help to this association. Monarto personnel could be used, not on a long-term basis, but for a couple of years to get the association off the ground so that potential house-builders would not have to face escalating labour costs, a major cost factor involved in building a house. The overall cost of a house would not be as high, because interest rates would therefore be lower. I am sure that people today would be as dedicated as were people who came back after the war and built their own houses. I realise the association would face difficulties under the Builders Licensing Act, so that aspect would need to be investigated by the Government. There are people in the community who would like this challenge if the Government would give them the opportunity, providing assistance and guidance in the initial stages. I therefore ask the Minister to consider this proposal.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not sure how the Monarto commission is relevant, because its existing personnel are largely involved in planning and are not directly associated with house construction. Commission personnel could well be associated with a constructing authority, but they are not themselves house constructors. However, independently of that, I will have the honourable member's suggestion examined and discuss it with the South Australian Housing Trust to see whether there is any advantage that can be offered.

DISASTER FUND

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Treasurer say whether the Government will introduce a Bill to set up a freak disaster fund? The Treasurer will recall, in January this year, the storm disaster in the New Residence district. At that time, several questions were asked in the House about what assistance could be given to people involved. It was pointed out that the damage suffered by many residents of the area was equal to that suffered by the people in the Darwin disaster. Unfortunately, no State or Commonwealth Government legislation exists to set up such a fund. I therefore ask the Treasurer whether he will consider setting up a fund on the basis of subsidising assistance provided by people in the community.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Several examinations have been made by Government departments of problems in the New Residence area. I will reconsider those examinations in the light of the honourable member's suggestion.

PINE PLANTATIONS

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, say whether the Government intends to plant and cultivate pine forests on Kangaroo Island and, if it does, can he ascertain the area and location involved and say when the programme will commence? It is understood that officers of the Agriculture Department have undertaken surveys and have determined that the soil types and climatic conditions are favourable—

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS

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

That the House of Assembly request the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment for the present session of a Joint Committee to which all Consolidation Bills shall stand referred, in accordance with Joint Standing Order No. 18, and to which any further questions relative thereto may at any time be sent by either House for report.

That, in the event of the joint committee being appointed, the House of Assembly be represented thereon by three members, two of whom shall form the quorum of the Assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolutions.

That the Premier (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) and Messrs. McRae and Vandepier be representatives of the Assembly on the said committee.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 14. Page 267.)

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): This is a most peculiar document, a most sorry document; indeed, it is not a very accurate document. It was unfortunate that the Loan Estimates were introduced into this House before the Commonwealth Budget was introduced.

Mr. Becker: It always happens.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, and that is unfortunate. That miserable document that was introduced in Canberra last Tuesday evening has brought forth major changes in South Australia's document. Parliament and the people of this State have every right to expect an accurate document of this nature. It would have been better to have introduced it after the Commonwealth Budget was brought down. The South Australian Government would have avoided much embarrassment had it waited to see exactly what its Commonwealth colleagues were going to give it. It has even been suggested that this document might be withdrawn, redrawn and resubmitted to the House. Perhaps supplementary or amended Estimates could be introduced so we could get a clear and accurate picture of what were the Loan programmes for South Australia in the forthcoming year.

The Opposition would be entirely sympathetic to such moves; we would co-operate and do everything we could to ensure that the information presented to the House was accurate. Although we have no desire to save the Government from embarrassment, on this occasion we believe we have a duty to the people of South Australia. Certainly, it is difficult to consider this document in its present form in the light of the new knowledge we have. Unfortunately, that knowledge is incomplete. There appears to be an air of unreality about the document presented to us. It reminds

one of a work of fiction and is rather reminiscent of a novel. The novel that comes to mind is one written by Dickens—*Great Expectations*. This document is laced all the way through with great expectations: it contains nothing firm. Like Mr. Micawber, the Treasurer appears to be waiting for something to turn up.

That is typical of the Treasurer's attitude. It is an attitude that has been forced on him by the actions of his Commonwealth colleagues. However, the choice is his, because he has the same political complexion as the Commonwealth Government. He has to wear the Commonwealth Government, and I just wonder how long he can honestly go on supporting his Canberra colleagues. I guess that he will go on doing that whether or not it is for the good of the people of South Australia. Two major points emerge through the facade put up by this document. First, despite the frequent references to the projected Revenue Account being balanced, the statement demonstrates clearly the gross financial mismanagement of this Government. It is an unusual situation that we should get into balanced budgeting. South Australia has not had balanced budgeting since the Labor Party came to office, yet we are told that for the first time we have a most unusual situation where we have a potential balancing of our Revenue Budget. Circumstances at present are very peculiar also, and we have a potentially balanced State Budget simply because we have been selling off valuable parts of the State's assets to make ends meet. Certainly we have paid off the overdraft (or we will have done at the end of this period) but only by selling capital. As someone put clearly, the Government has balanced the overdraft situation by selling off the bottom paddock of the property, and that paddock will no longer be part of the property. This is an unusual circumstance, and for that reason I do not think any credit is to be taken by the Government regarding the proposed balanced Revenue Account, yet time after time that reference is made throughout this document.

The second thing that comes out clearly from this document is the almost dependence that this State now has on the Commonwealth in relation to specific grants made for specific purposes under section 96 of the Constitution and the amounts made available for allocation and consideration in this Loan Estimates programme. After the Commonwealth Budget we can clearly see the dangers that arise from that attitude, from that total dependence on the Commonwealth Government. Not only are we dependent on the Commonwealth Government for our money supply but we are totally dependent on the Commonwealth Government to determine our priorities. No longer have we in this State the ability to decide our own priorities for spending; those decisions have largely been taken out of our hands and taken over by the Commonwealth Government, because those who pay the piper call the tune. Whether or not we want them to pay the piper is another thing: we are not given any option in the matter. This degree of dependence has been arrived at by collusion between the State Government and Commonwealth, which are both working to implement Australian Labor Party policy for centralism. They both have as their long-term objectives, clearly and obviously stated, the abolition of the States, and the sooner they can get this State into a totally dependent condition where it will have to sell out all its assets to the Commonwealth and cease to exist as an entity the sooner they will be pleased. This is something we must continue to keep in mind at all times. I think it is appropriate to look at the Treasurer's statement more carefully and in some detail, although I must

repeat that it is difficult to consider it in the light of the information that has subsequently become available in the Commonwealth Budget.

I suppose I should discuss the document as it is presented, but nevertheless it is important that we look at the variations that have occurred since the document was presented. I wonder how much we can rely on the Treasurer's estimate of the Revenue Budget being in balance. How much can we rely on his estimates for loan expenditure? Over the past 12 months, both in this House and in public statements, the Treasurer has given the most widely varied estimates of the Budget situation in South Australia. They have gone from as much as \$36 000 000 deficit to what currently is being proposed, a \$25 300 000 surplus. They have gone up and down like a yo-yo. Various reasons have been given for these variations, such as the following: "If we keep the railways we will be worse off." "If we sell the railways we will be better off." "If we do this and that. . ." All these things have been brought in over that 12-month period, but we have not at any time had a consistent figure on which we could pin our estimates and from which we could work up and down. That is just not good enough.

In the present statement the Treasurer admits that his estimates were \$30 000 000 out. I know that it is difficult to bring forward a Loan Estimates document that is entirely accurate, but it seems to me that \$30 000 000 is a fair difference. Even the largest company could not put up with that sort of percentage inaccuracy, and one wonders just how accurate is this document. The proposed spending (and I emphasise "proposed", because whether that will bear any relation to the actual spending is in doubt) is increased by 14 per cent on the \$211 200 000 actual payments for last year. However, the inflation rate in South Australia is now running at about 18.2 per cent, and it seems that it will go higher. The rate for Australia generally is 16.9 per cent, and it is going higher; the rate in Japan is 12 to 15 per cent and is going down; and the rate in West Germany is much lower still. In other words, it seems that Australia is falling well behind the field in recovery from and control of inflation. Even in the United States the situation is much better than it was 12 months ago, but that cannot be said for the position in South Australia and certainly in Australia generally. With this in mind, the real effect of this 14 per cent increase in spending over actual expenditure last year is that the effective level of spending this year will be lower than it was last year. This has been caused entirely by the inflationary situation.

If we want to be more specific about this, we can say that the building costs for capital works will be increased by 20 to 25 per cent. This is a specific result of inflation. Obviously the moneys expended cannot achieve the same results as they achieved last year. From the Treasurer's own document we find that last year he allowed for a 20 per cent increase in wages when he introduced the Loan Estimates. Obviously soon afterwards he found that this was not enough, and it is a startling comment again on the rate of inflation and the Commonwealth Government's inability to control it, and on the Treasurer's own lack of ability to face the facts and to make the obvious allowances he should have done, unpalatable as they may be. He has now increased that allowance to 25 per cent, which I suggest indicates that this Government is allowing for a further increase in inflation. A 25 per cent allowance for increases in wages during the forthcoming 12 months is appalling. As I have said, the Treasurer frequently refers to the satisfactory state of the Revenue Account as evidence of his own ability to manage financial affairs, but

the unusual circumstances I have mentioned bear closer examination. The State has received \$10 000 000 from the Commonwealth for railways and is expecting to receive \$25 000 000 for Medibank. Also, other cash benefits will flow from the railways agreement. In other words, at what cost has his so-called satisfactory budgeting ability been achieved? I refer again to the position of almost complete dependence of this State on the Commonwealth Government. South Australia's Loan programme is virtually in the hands of the Commonwealth. This is demonstrated time and time again throughout the Treasurer's statement. On page 6 of his statement he said:

. . . we have not received firm advice of many major expected grants and loans. In view of the difficult Budget situation which the Australian Government faces, it is possible that some of the special contributions may be held to lower limits than have been adopted for purposes of these papers. This matter will be kept under close review to ensure that commitments actually made are in line with funds available.

Once again, I suggest that the Government could well introduce amended Estimates or Supplementary Estimates in this regard. It is obvious, of course, when we look at the details that we are no longer our own masters. The terms attached to the moneys that will be forthcoming from the Commonwealth are also not at all definite, and certainly are not in our control. We do not know whether we are to have loans or grants, and I refer particularly to the promises regarding sewerage, which first of all came as promises of specific grants and then, after the election, were found to be a mixture of grants and special repayable loans.

Special purpose grants in 1974-75 for this purpose were \$3 000 000. The special purpose loans turned out to be \$3 500 000 of the \$6 500 000 we were told we were to be given for sewerage works. So much for the Prime Minister and his promises. Special purpose (that is, section 96 grants) have helped bring about and added to our financial dependence on the Commonwealth. This was not the reason why they were first contemplated and introduced. Originally, these special purpose funds were for exactly what they are called, for "special purposes". They were intended to supplement, with additional funds over and above the State's fair share of Loan funds, for specific purposes which were non-recurring and for which the State needed the facilities. They were not intended to be given instead of revenue to be allocated by the States themselves.

Our specific purpose grants have gradually come to represent a far greater percentage of our total funds that we have received from Canberra than ever before, and once again this is a deliberate change. It is due to a Labor Party policy directed, as I have said before, to the eventual control and abolition of the States. Our priorities, which we saw projected in the last Budget, have been markedly affected. South Australia has no real or precise control over its own works programme. It is obvious, in relation to specific purpose funds, that this Government, even now, does not know precisely what funds will be available, how they will be made available, and for what purposes they will be made available.

We do not know whether the funds mentioned for hospitals, water treatment plants and urban public transport will be available now, and in many respects we can have serious doubts about it. Those doubts have been confirmed by the Commonwealth Budget that came down last Tuesday. In the present inflationary situation, which is almost out of control, neither this Government nor any other Government can commit expenditure if it has not actually got the money. Certainly, it is not responsible of the Government to commit expenditure if it has not got the money.

It seems that many projects are likely to be delayed. The ultimate total cost of many other projects will be increased, and it is a matter of some query where those funds are coming from. Some matters are to be deferred indefinitely, and I think probably put off altogether. Some of the promises made by the Government at the time of the last election will obviously have to be deferred. We have seen this happen before, and indeed we are getting to the stage now where the people of South Australia almost expect the Government's election promises not to be honoured.

We only have to look at Redcliff. We look at water filtration and sewerage works, which obviously will be delayed. We look at a scaled down Monarto, for which the Commonwealth Government has seen fit to give a grant of only \$500 000 instead of the \$10 000 000 originally asked for, and the \$4 500 000 that was then expected. What a difference, what a change! These are not small variations, they are marked variations, and it is quite clear that this Government will have to change its whole attitude to Monarto. It cannot continually shut its eyes to the facts. It must face up to the facts and realise that the Commonwealth Government is just not interested in Monarto any more.

One wonders whether the Christie Downs railway electrification will proceed or not. We have heard stories: "Yes, it will be covered one way or another" (vague statements have been made) "if the funds can be made available": great expectations. But there is a considerable body of informed opinion that believes now the Christie Downs electrification will be indefinitely deferred, and once it is indefinitely deferred it is likely to be deferred for a considerable time. From the tone running throughout the Treasurer's statement, I think it is highly unlikely that it will proceed. As I have said, people are getting to be quite used to the extravagant pie-in-the-sky promises which are being made by the Dunstan Government before elections and which are conveniently shrugged off and forgotten once the election is over.

I think the track record is very poor, and I do not think the Government will be able to get away with it much longer. There are many other specific areas of doubt; welfare housing is a matter in point. In the matter of welfare housing, the Treasurer in his statement said that it was not yet known. He said:

As to the special funds for welfare housing in 1975-76, it is not yet known what amount the Australian Government intends to allocate to the State for this purpose.

Well, we know now. We have got the news, we have got the message, and the message is that, although the same amount in actual funds will be available, the actual spending power, the actual value of those funds will seriously restrict the availability of housing in this State. There will be a cut-back in effective use of about 25 per cent in housing construction because of increased costs and increased inflation. There will be a cut-back in the effective lending value, of the money advanced to the State Bank, of some 40 per cent. This will make funds equally as difficult to get. The overall effect on young people wishing to own their own homes will be quite dramatic. The fact that there is a housing crisis will not worry the Government unduly, because it is not the policy of the Labor Government to support home ownership. It is quite significant to see that the specific requirements set down in the grants for housing allow for the bulk of the funds to be used for welfare rental housing, not for home ownership. There has been no mention whatever of any scheme for rental purchase, or

for any suggestion that people should be allowed to buy their own houses. Since this is directly against Australian Labor Party policy I am not surprised, but I think to hamstring young couples who do not necessarily agree with this policy and whose desire it is to own their own house as soon as they possibly can is a miserable way of controlling finances. It does both the Commonwealth Government and the State Government little credit.

The sum of \$6 500 000 is expected to be recovered from the Australian National Railways Commission, but two-thirds of the expenditure on urban public transport also is to be recovered. It is expected that it will be recovered. The facts in the Commonwealth Budget speak for themselves. In waterworks and sewerage, 40 other projects are under construction. New schemes are to be started to the total value of \$59 300 000. The sum of \$13 000 000 is expected from the Commonwealth Government in the form of specific purpose assistance. Once again, we have this total vagueness about the whole business. Specific purpose assistance—we do not know whether it is to be by way of specific loan or grant, whether we have to repay or whether we get the money outright. Nowhere is there any indication of exactly how that money will be made available. I think it important to know whether we must pay this money back.

Mr. Mathwin: It's just like trying to work out X-Lotto, isn't it?

Dr. TONKIN: I am referring specifically to the waterworks and sewerage grant, and we are to receive \$13 000 000 by way of specific purpose assistance. We should know whether it will be a special loan or a special grant.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: If you had been following the thing since its inception, you would know it's a loan.

Dr. TONKIN: Then I do not think the Government should have dodged the issue by calling it specific purpose assistance.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It's a part of both; 75 per cent loan and 25 per cent grant. It's been said 1 000 times.

Dr. TONKIN: It is not fair to refer to it in the document as specific purpose assistance. It should have been spelt out, because it has been everywhere else. In specific projects, for the Lock-Kimba main, two-thirds of the expenditure is covered by financial assistance, and the same criticism applies. It seems to apply only in the area of waterworks and sewerage.

Our share on Dartmouth this year is \$6 800 000, and half of this is expected from the Commonwealth Government. A sum is allocated in the Commonwealth Budget documents that is stated to be the State's share, but will we get the whole \$6 800 000? I expect to hear later what the Minister of Works says about that. I hope we do get it, but is there doubt about it? There certainly is no clear breakdown in the figures in the Commonwealth Budget. Is the money coming? For hospital buildings, there are some hardy annuals, and they are very worth while. I cannot commend too highly the work that is being done at Flinders Medical Centre, but once again redevelopment of Northfield wards is mentioned. Of a cost of \$33 000 000 we expect to receive \$12 300 000 from the Commonwealth Government.

In education, we at least recognise that there will be reduced support from the Commonwealth Government in capital expenditure. The total for 1974-75 was \$46 800 000, of which the Commonwealth Government provided \$19 600 000. For 1975-76 the total will be \$48 000 000, of which the Commonwealth will pay

\$14 000 000. It was expected that this \$14 000 000 would be made up of \$12 500 000 for primary and secondary education and \$1 500 000 for further education, but now we know the true situation, and it seems very much as though what we are getting instead will be \$11 100 000 for primary and secondary education and \$1 200 000 for further education. These are what the actual amounts of money will be.

This is typical of the variations that have occurred throughout this document since the Commonwealth Budget was brought down. Certainly, the Treasurer has mentioned the reduction in the amount for schools construction. He is now, and has been, well aware of the difficulties that have faced this State and the Commonwealth Government ever since he received the letter from the Prime Minister which I have referred to in this House previously and which warned him not to depend on Commonwealth Government funds. I suggest that the Treasurer was well aware of the situation a long time before that and, indeed, was well aware of it when he decided to hold an election.

Mr. Mathwin: You're not suggesting that that had something to do with it, surely! Do you think he was trying to beat the gun?

Dr. TONKIN: I can draw only my own conclusion, and I think the people of South Australia can draw their conclusion, too. For the Public Health Department, sums provided for dental clinics and for the Principal School of Dental Therapy are to total \$2 000 000, and there are expected grants from the Commonwealth Government to cover the total cost of these projects. The Municipal Tramways Trust will be financed from the Commonwealth Government under grants under the urban public transport arrangements to the extent of two-thirds of the cost of approved projects, but the amount for 1975-76 is not known, according to the document. The document states that it is hoped that up to \$10 000 000 will be available, but in fact we received \$7 900 000.

Just what will suffer? What will be cut back? What part of urban public transport will be cut back as a result of this? When will the Government know? When will the Government decide its own priorities? Will it have to go to the Commonwealth Government and say, "Please, Sir, what can we do next?"

Mr. Mathwin: That's the tie-up.

Dr. TONKIN: That is the tie-up. What will happen if orders for the various items of plant and equipment, such as buses, must be cancelled? How much will this cost the State? In community health, the amount expected from the Commonwealth Government was \$1 800 000 towards the \$2 500 000 total, but it seems that the actual amount to be received will be only \$1 300 000. Once again, that is a definite cut-back. I must be honest and say that I am much less concerned that the Commonwealth Government cannot meet its commitments to the Land Commission. I do not very much like the Land Commission and its operations, and it does not worry me much if that authority does not get the support that it has expected.

Nevertheless, this is just another example of the way in which funds are being cut back. Last year the commission received \$20 500 000 from the Commonwealth Government and it seems very much as though it will receive only \$19 500 000 this year, but the assistance sought this year was \$24 000 000. The Monarto Development Commission is mentioned last but one in the list of authorities set out in the document. It comes just before reference

to the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Sport. I think it is worth putting on record what the Treasurer has said about the Monarto Development Commission. The document states:

For 1975-76 the commission's programme cannot be drawn up in detail because of uncertainty about the extent of support to be received from the Australian Government. My goodness, the uncertainty was well justified! The document also states:

At this stage, the State allocations proposed are \$1 200 000 from Loan Account and \$2 000 000 of semi-government borrowing authority. We expect to receive from the Australian Government a contribution sufficient to finance a suitable programme.

What the Commonwealth Government regards as a suitable programme for Monarto is obvious. It seems very much as though the Commonwealth Government regards Monarto as being nearly finished.

Mr. Goldsworthy: A dead duck.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes. What other construction can be placed on it, after that specific reference to the Australian Government's proposed assessment of Monarto? I have said many times previously that, in granting only \$500 000, the Commonwealth Government clearly has lost all interest in Monarto. Seldom has there been a more tentative and uncertain document masquerading as a financial statement. The proposals and intentions are definite enough, but there is no firm commitment, because of the financial uncertainty, and the uncertainty has not been cleared up much by the Commonwealth Budget.

The document before us is more significant for what it does not say than for what it does say. I repeat the two major points that come through clearly. The Treasurer is not the financial wizard he would have us believe he is. His credibility must inevitably have reached an all-time low. The promises that he makes so freely are not kept, and the people of South Australia will see through him more and more in the next few months. The second point is that we are now completely and utterly at the mercy of the Commonwealth for our continued existence as a State. The most appalling feature of this is that this is just where the Treasurer and his partner in crime, the Prime Minister, want us to be: they want the States to be destroyed. This document represents their current progress towards achieving this goal.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): Two things emerge from the Loan Estimates: first, the obvious inaccuracy with which these forecasts are made, and secondly, the increasing dependence that the State Government must place on the whim of an unstable Commonwealth Government. In introducing last year's Loan Estimates, the Treasurer said:

The expenditure proposals in that schedule aggregate \$181 185 000.

One phrase that keeps recurring in the Treasurer's speech this year is "in the event". In the event, most of the things that were predicted last year did not come to fruition. The first couple of sentences in this year's Estimates indicate that the expenditure payments in the schedule last year aggregated \$211 200 000 when, in fact, the Loan Estimates predicted an expenditure of \$181 000 000. If one looks at what was estimated then and at what actually came to pass, one sees that, owing to the sporadic infusion of funds from the Commonwealth Government as it lurched from crisis to crisis, the actual expenditure was considerably above that predicted, so we cannot place much reliance on the expenditure predicted this year of \$241 500 000.

If one studies that sum and compares it with the actual expenditure last year, it does not even come to terms with inflation, which is running in this State at one of the highest averages in the Commonwealth, at about 18.2 per cent. In view of what we have heard from the Government's colleagues in Canberra in the last couple of days, I think that the estimate of the Government that the expenditure will be \$241 000 000 this year would be an optimistic estimate. When compared to expenditure last year, it does not keep pace with this State's rate of inflation, which is one of the highest in the Commonwealth. One can see the kind of dilemma that must have faced the Treasurer in submitting these Estimates to the House when one takes into account the statements he has made. These Estimates are put before the House in conjunction with the Budget: the two go hand in hand. The Treasurer, as is his normal practice, has again given a summary of the situation with regard to the Revenue Account. Literally, the mind boggles at the way in which the predictions on Revenue Account have gone up and down like a yo-yo during the course of a year.

Last year, the Treasurer said that the deficit in the Revenue Account, from memory, would be about \$12 000 000; then it slid down to \$4 000 000; and then it went up during the year to about \$20 000 000. As a result of quitting the non-metropolitan railways, we have about \$22 000 000 in surplus, and even that sum varied from day to day during the course of the election campaign. How the Treasurer keeps track of what he is saying from day to day, I do not know, let alone honourable members and the long-suffering public of the State. If one looks at what the Treasurer said about the Revenue Budget last year and the kind of statements he is making this year, one comes to realise that one cannot place much reliance on any of the statements that emanate from the front bench. The fact of life is that it was confidently predicted at one stage last year that we would have a special purpose grant of \$6 000 000 from the Commonwealth Government, and this was referred to by the Treasurer during last year's Budget debate. As I have already said, the amount of the deficit fluctuated like a yo-yo. During the course of last year's Budget debate, the Treasurer said:

My reason for showing the special unspecified addition as only \$6 000 000 is that this is my rough estimate of the maximum amount we could reasonably expect to raise this year from a new levy such as a consumption franchise tax in the unlikely event of the Australian Government's declining to approve further support.

That unlikely event proved to be the event.

Dr. Eastick: A fairly rough one, too.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, but when the Government is dealing with people in Canberra who, in the Treasurer's words, he cannot trust what hope has the public of South Australia of getting any accurate information regarding this State's finances? The Treasurer said that, in the unlikely event of our receiving this minimum of \$6 000 000, he would have to impose some more substantial taxes. The unlikely event proved to be the event and, in the phraseology of this year's explanation of the Loan Estimates, in that event the \$6 000 000 was not forthcoming. We all know the sorry story of what eventuated: we saw the most savage taxes introduced in this State (tobacco and petrol taxes), taxes which no other State Treasurer was forced to levy. We saw the kind of hand-to-mouth financial decisions this Government had to make, finally culminating in the necessity as it saw it of selling off for short-term financial expediency the non-metropolitan railways. That sale, and that sale alone, has brought some semblance of short-term stability to the Revenue Account. These extreme tax

measures are only peanuts when compared to what the Commonwealth Government has done in its Budget.

The Commonwealth Budget will have a great impact and will add, I suggest, to the inaccuracy of these Loan Estimates. It will add tremendously to the difficulty of our Treasury officers, who I believe are among the most competent in Australia. They enjoy a reputation second to none in Australia but, when they are faced with the kinds of spendthrift policy the State Government wants to espouse, and this is allied to the unpredictable almost day-to-day desperate moves made by this Government's Commonwealth colleagues, we realise what a difficult task those first-class officers are faced with.

I do not blame the Treasury officers for the inaccuracies in the Estimates, or for the major changes that I am sure will occur in the various statements which the Treasurer has made to the House. We saw such changes last year, and I suggest that, as our dependence on Big Brother in Canberra increases, because of the political philosophy of the Labor Government in this State and of its more influential colleagues in Canberra, and as our dependence on the whim of a centralist philosophy increases, so will the inaccuracy and unpredictability of documents such as the Loan Estimates increase. This is one of the tragedies of the policies being worked out in Australia. The fact is that decisions being made in Canberra on an *ad hoc* basis should rightfully be made in this State. Our dependence in the whole area of Government expenditure is now firmly based in Canberra, and it will be to an increasing extent the longer the Labor Government remains in office there and the longer their colleagues remain in office here.

There are a number of specific recommendations to which I would like briefly to allude in the Loan Estimates. The Treasurer acknowledges that we will be entering a period of crisis in housing in South Australia. We are all familiar with the campaign waged in this State in the area of education when, according to the then Opposition Labor Party spokesman at all events, we were in a crisis situation in education in South Australia. Under close questioning in the House, it emerged that the crisis was a crisis of morale. When we consider now what was happening in education around Australia and what was happening in South Australia, the only thing that the then member for Glenelg (Hon. Hugh Hudson) and the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) could come up with was that there was a crisis in morale, a crisis contributed to very largely by the efforts of an irresponsible Labor Opposition as it then was, which stirred, to the best of its ability, discontent among people involved in education.

We are entering a very real crisis in the area of housing. It is part of the Labor Party's philosophy that we become more and more dependent (whether it admits this openly or not) on the Government for our daily sustenance. Indeed, the average citizen in this country finishes up earning less and less himself and having less and less of his own pay packet to spend as he wants to. That situation will certainly apply with regard to housing. It is the policy of the Liberal Party to maximise (to use an American word) the opportunity for people, particularly young people, to own their own house. Those possibilities have diminished spectacularly under the Labor Party regime both in this State and in Canberra.

If we look at the statement in the Loan Estimates, the whole tenor of the statement is that the emphasis with regard to Commonwealth funds, via loans, is on what is called welfare housing. Unfortunately, under Labor Governments more and more people fall into the low-rental welfare housing category for the simple reason that they

are priced right out of the market. Look at the increase in the cost of housing that has occurred in this State during the five years of the Labor administration, and more particularly since it has been wedded to an administration of similar ilk in Canberra. The opportunities for young people, for husband and wife, to work for some years, save the necessary deposit, borrow the remainder, and own their home have diminished rapidly. I suggest that, as a result of the decisions taken in Canberra this week, those opportunities will shrink even more markedly. That is completely foreign to the policy that the Opposition espouses.

There is a very pertinent comment in this afternoon's *News* on the effects of this new taxation deal, which is being offered by Mr. Hayden, the latest member to assume the role of Treasurer. We do not know how long he will last, but he is the latest to acquire that office.

Mr. Coumbe: Number 3.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We do not know whether number 3 is lucky, but it has been the quickest road to political oblivion in the Labor Party. If Gough has wished to kill off a rival, the quickest way to do it has been to make him his Treasurer because, of course, the Labor Party has given any Treasurer an impossible task. So I would suggest that Mr. Hayden will not be there very long.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: With the members behind you, how long will you be there?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I would suggest that the only people interested in my back are the Deputy Premier and others who do not like home truths being spoken in this House, of the type referred to last night.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: By producing a letter six months old?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It does not matter whether it is six months old; it is a fact of life. That letter was issued by the Deputy Premier, and if members do not like it they can lump it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the honourable member to come back to the debate.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If that letter was not right out of the gutter—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to return to the debate.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is very difficult to ignore interjections, although I realise they are out of order. The report in the *News* states:

The new income tax scheme discriminated heavily against working families seeking a better quality of life, the Secretary of the Federal Taxpayers' Association of Australia, Mr. Eric Ristrom, said today. "The new scheme means that income taxes for families paying life assurance, house rates, extra medical benefits and superannuation are going to increase tremendously."

What he is saying is that those people who are willing to look after themselves and take out extra cover for medical benefits, insurance schemes, and so on, will be discriminated against in this new tax scheme. The report continues:

Mr. Ristrom said under the new scheme a married man on \$7 000 a year paying none of these expenses would pay \$1 370 tax. A married man on \$7 000 a year paying \$1 350 expenses in medical benefits, insurance and rates paid exactly the same tax, \$1 370.

So there is positive discrimination against people who are interested in looking after themselves. I will not read all of the article but I think it is an excellent one. The final sentence I think is significant, because I for one agree with it. It states:

Mr. Ristrom said it was obvious the new income tax scheme was part of a socialist programme to make citizens more and more dependent on Government.

Of course, the people of this State are becoming more and more dependent on Government housing. The activities of the Housing Trust have had to be escalated, and the emphasis now has to be more and more on this welfare-type housing, as the Labor Government here and in Canberra push more and more people into the welfare category, making them more and more dependent on big brother, the Labor Government. We have made our position perfectly clear. The Commonwealth division of our Party has positive policies for increasing the incentives for young people, particularly, to embark on home ownership, probably the major purchase which they make in their lifetime, which gives them a stake in the country, and encourages them to do something for themselves, instead of sitting back and waiting more and more for the Government to do things for them. The effect of inflation on housing has been as disastrous as in any area.

We see reference in the Loan Estimates to waterworks and sewerage, which are areas of major expenditure. We have grounds for complaint. Particularly the member for Fisher has said in the House that from time to time certain areas in the State seem to receive preferential treatment in the expenditure of these funds. One other scheme which I would like to refer briefly is in relation to water filtration. The scheme was first mooted in the life of the Liberal and Country League Government in this State. We were the first to come out with a firm policy announcement that we would filter the Adelaide metropolitan water supply. The Labor Government has taken it up.

Dr. Eastick: They ridiculed it at the time when they were in Opposition.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I know. It was going to set up a water softener business, and sell every householder a water softener, or something or other. Those members ridiculed the policy announcement made by the L.C.L. Government that we would filter the metropolitan water supply. However, because of its expenditure of funds in other fields, it was beyond the capacity of the State Labor Government to finance this scheme. The State Government then prevailed on its Commonwealth colleagues, as it could not really come to terms with economic reality, to make massive grants available, but those grants were revised and are now loans. Nevertheless, the State Government depended on its Commonwealth colleagues for support for this scheme.

Mr. Mathwin: The Government thinks it's pretty good with water. The Treasurer thinks he can walk on it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will not comment on that; as usual, it is apt. I understand investigations have been extended to include Whyalla, because it has experienced trouble with its water supply. Of more parochial interest to me is the quality of the Barossa Valley water supply, which is totally inadequate. During the summer months when the consumption of water is at its highest it is usual for the water to be heavily discoloured. It is impossible for housewives to do the weekly washing with discoloured water, unless it is treated in some way. The water is most unattractive to visitors to the Barossa Valley during that time of the year and, after all, it is during that time of year that most tourists are attracted to that part of the State. Apparently the question of filtering the Barossa Valley water supply has not entered the Government's mind. Filtration seems the only logical means of removing the brown discolouration from the water.

I prevailed on the Minister of Works to undertake preliminary investigations relating to this area when it was investigating filtering water in an area that was more politically sensitive than my area. I hope the Government will see fit to complete those investigations and will include the Barossa Valley so that its supply can be improved. Many people coming into the Barossa Valley complain about the condition of the water. It is a most unattractive feature of their stay in the area. I realise the squeeze the Commonwealth Government is now applying gently will subsequently turn into a firm squeeze. However, I hope that that squeeze will not affect markedly the South Australian Government's building programme. It is a source of some pleasure and relief to me to know that a contract has been let to build a primary school at Nuriootpa. In fact, work has started on the project.

If South Australia had faced last year the economic situation that it is facing now, I would be less optimistic about seeing that school built, but a firm decision has been made in that regard. It would need a somewhat greater catastrophe than we are suffering now to reverse the decision to start that project. I hope the school-building programme will not be grossly affected by what is happening because of economic controls from Canberra. Under this measure, the Electricity Trust of South Australia will receive \$5 000 000. That organisation has had a remarkable success story in this State. That success is due largely to the foresight of the previous Liberal and Country League Governments that were led by the much maligned but nevertheless greatly respected Premier, Sir Thomas Playford. Even his detractors admit that the State made remarkable progress and developed greatly during the life of his Governments. South Australia has a system of water reticulation that is unique by world standards. Two of the fundamental ingredients for successful development are water and power, and this brings me back to the success story of the Electricity Trust.

It was with some regret to Opposition members that the State Government, because of a shortage of funds, had to lean on the profits of the trust. Last week I placed a Question on Notice to ascertain how heavily the Labor Government in South Australia was leaning on the successful operations of the trust and pushing up the price for electricity. The State Government has done the same in relation to the South Australian Gas Company. Unfortunately, that is the way the Government is forced to operate; it is its small contribution to the inflation rate, and it has made many of those contributions. The State Government looked at the Electricity Trust, saw it was a successful operation and was making money, so it put up its tariffs, which were the lowest in Australia at that time. The Government increased the levy on trust accounts two or three years ago and is still increasing that levy; it is siphoning off millions of dollars. The Government is not taxing the "tall poppies", as the Treasurer has said he would like to do. Even if the Government did siphon off all the money available from that area, it would not have all the money it needs for some of its schemes. The Government has to direct its taxing measures to the majority of people, an instance of such a tax being the levy placed on the Electricity Trust. When considering a measure such as this, one sees that the Commonwealth Government really initiated inflation: it lit the fire and cannot put it out. Inflation is the major problem confronting any Government when it introduces Loan Estimates.

The Municipal Tramways Trust is dear to the heart of the Government: it has a direct finger in that pie. The

trust is fairly expensive to operate. We all remember how the Government decided to squeeze out of existence in the metropolitan area private bus operators and how it refused to allow them to increase their charges, although those charges were competitive with those of the M.T.T. We knew that the trust could not operate without a massive influx of State Government subsidies. Although we all realise the necessity for adequate public transport, we on this side believe that private enterprise must make a profit. It must provide a service to the public or it would go out of business. However, that is not true of State Government instrumentalities. We all remember the confrontation between private bus proprietors (I think it was the Bowman company) and union representatives in Tea Tree Gully when the union was trying to control that industry. Nevertheless, the M.T.T. will receive \$5 000 000 this year.

In conclusion, I believe the outstanding feature of the Loan Estimates is the apparent inaccuracy of them when viewed over a 12-month period. What stands out most markedly is how utterly dependent South Australia has become on the day-to-day peregrinations of the unstable Commonwealth Government. With those remarks, I have no option but to support the Bill.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): Invariably, the Government in this place attacks members of the Opposition and claims that we are continually making wild and untrue statements. No doubt in your short experience in this place, Mr. Speaker, you have heard almost daily Ministers making these sorts of accusation about members of the Opposition. Invariably history has proved that the Opposition rather than the Government was correct. It is interesting to look back over the history of Monarto to see who was correct. I have been subjected to probably the greatest ridicule and attack of any member on the Opposition benches by the Premier, the former Minister in charge of Monarto (Hon. D. J. Hopgood), and the present Minister in charge of Monarto (Hon. Hugh Hudson). They have claimed continually that my statements have been incorrect and untrue. I should like to go back over the previous 12 months and point out how inaccurate and how untrue have been the accusations of the Government. In the Loan Estimates speech for 1974-75 the Premier said:

This is a rough measure of the amount which the Government believes can be set aside to support Monarto. The planned development can proceed only with the full and continued support of the Australian Government.

I repeat the important sentence: "The planned development of Monarto can proceed only with the full and continued support of the Australian Government." One wonders what the attitude of the Government is now that it does not have even full support, let alone any promise of continued support in the future. The most recent study report released by the Monarto Development Commission states that the establishment of Monarto would be required to have about \$600 000 000 by the year 1984-85. It goes on to say that gross public sector expenditure will peak about \$85 000 000 in the year 1977-78 and then slowly decline. It also says that this early peak is due in large part to the need to bear a significant proportion of water and sewerage headworks costs at the outset. I think that statement indicates the finance for which the South Australian Government was looking for the continued development of Monarto: \$600 000 000 by 1984-85 and \$85 000 000 in the year 1977-78. The total Government expenditure on Monarto, including the allocation in the Commonwealth Budget, for the current year is only \$3 700 000. In a letter dated December 6, 1974, to the member for Murray, the Premier stated:

I indicated that the sum required from South Australian resources would depend on decisions by Commonwealth Government.

We have certainly seen that. It continued:

At a meeting held in Adelaide on November 29, 1974, of Australian and South Australian Government Ministers convened and chaired by me as a "Ministerial committee on Monarto", it was agreed that planning of Monarto would proceed on the basis that in its first stage of development the target would be a population of between 25 000 and 30 000 by 1983. Net expenditure over the period 1974-75 to 1978-79 (a period of five years) to achieve this would be approximately \$125 000 000 at March 1974 values.

The final paragraph stated:

Expenditure for subsequent financial years will be apportioned between the State and Australian Governments when the Ministerial committee meets again in April 1975. It is clear from the facts that at the meeting in April no agreement was reached between the Australian and South Australian Governments. When in the House I asked the former Minister of Development and Mines (Hon. D. J. Hopgood) what was required for Monarto, he replied that \$125 000 000 would be needed for the next five years and that agreement must be reached in April this year between the Australian Government and South Australian Government on that commitment. That set out what the South Australian Government was expecting from the Australian Government for Monarto, and the Monarto planning studies report clearly states that Monarto cannot proceed without the full and continued support of the Australian Government. In this financial year the Australian Government has sold us out.

The editorial in the *Advertiser* on January 20 this year clearly pointed out the two major new areas that now put a question mark over Monarto. It mentioned the population increase, asked whether or not there would be sufficient population for Monarto to proceed, and said that funds would be required for the disaster area at Darwin. I believe the editorial put a logical case on those two points why the South Australian Government should reassess its policy on Monarto. In reply to that editorial the Minister of Development and Mines wrote the following letter:

Your second criticism related to the Federal Government's commitment to the rebuilding of Darwin. While I accept that funds will have to be diverted to rebuilding that city, there has not been any indication from the Australian Government that this will come from the allocation to Monarto.

I think the Minister was being totally irresponsible in saying that without checking whether there was likely to be a transfer of funds from Monarto to Darwin, because in the Budget we can see that that has happened. His final paragraph states:

The assumption that capital works can be deferred to improve the revenue situation, to the full extent of the deferral, is commonly made by people who have little idea of how governmental financing takes place.

The Australian Government has deferred finance for capital works for Monarto to try to reduce the deficit in this year's Budget, so it seems that the Minister in this State who was responsible for Monarto had little idea of how his own Commonwealth colleagues would work their Budget. On February 27 the *Advertiser*, under the heading "Growth centre plan 'unchanged'", stated:

The Minister for Urban and Regional Development (Mr. Uren) said yesterday he would not change any of his programmes because of the Borrie report on population growth.

That article referred to all regional growth centres including Albury-Wodonga, Bathurst-Orange and Monarto. It is

interesting to see how the Commonwealth Government has changed its opinion on Monarto in the light of the population growth figures. On March 7, the day after I spoke in this House, the *Advertiser* carried an article that accurately reported the statement I had made. I said that the Monarto project was being scaled down because of a lack of finance and certain indications by the development commission as to how the scaling down was taking place. The article, referring to my statement, stated:

He said the Government had decided to reduce greatly the anticipated size of Monarto, but a public announcement of the policy change had not been made.

In that article the Minister of Development and Mines clearly indicated that the Government had not changed its policy on Monarto and that it was proceeding as expected. On March 8, in the *Advertiser* the Minister of Development and Mines put his case even more forcibly that Monarto would proceed unchanged. One paragraph states:

This would become obvious within the next few months, when the Government would announce plans for the first stage of the capital works on the site.

So, in March this year the Minister said that the South Australian Government would announce plans for the capital works. Yet this afternoon we have heard the new Minister, Hon. Hugh Hudson, say that capital works were not now likely to proceed until the end of next year. That is, I believe, a total change of face by the State Government and, therefore, I believe my accusations that the State Government would be scaling down plans for Monarto have proved to be accurate.

On August 12, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. Hugh Hudson) indicated that the South Australian Government was expecting to receive \$9 200 000 from the Australian Government. On August 9 he indicated to one of the *Advertiser* reporters, Greg Kelton, that Monarto would proceed as originally planned. I should like now to refer to a statement that the Minister made. He said that the Government had asked for \$9 200 000 but expected some sort of a cut-back from the Australian Government. He said:

It is understood that the Commonwealth Government will cut substantially the amount of money for Monarto this year to about half of what South Australia wanted.

That is significant, because on August 12 the Minister said he had asked the Australian Government for \$9 200 000, yet at about the same time he said that he expected the allocation to be cut by about half. That is about \$4 600 000. One finds now, after the Commonwealth Budget has been presented, that instead of giving us even half the Commonwealth Government has given this State only \$500 000. When one looks at the future of Monarto, one sees that the significant part of the recent announcement by the Commonwealth Government is not that our allocation for this financial year has been reduced from \$9 200 000 to \$500 000 (that sum of money, in the overall concept of Monarto, is insignificant) but that the Commonwealth Government is not willing to put finance into Monarto. It has not been willing to do so in the current financial year, and I have a grave suspicion that it will not be giving up any money for at least the next 10 years. Therefore, I believe the future of Monarto is fully in question and, for the sake of this State, I believe the Government is obliged completely to reassess the entire resources and work programme for the new city of Monarto.

This afternoon, the Minister said that the Monarto Development Commission might be involved in work on Darwin reconstruction. The commission now has much expertise in relation to urban planning and development.

I congratulate the Minister on accepting the offer, if he does accept it (I do not think he clearly said this afternoon on what conditions it would be accepted). If the Monarto Development Commission is used in Darwin, it will be to the benefit of Australia as a whole and particularly to the people in Darwin. This is a commonsense move, and I congratulate those who thought of using the commission in this way. My fear, as I have said, is that the State Government will try to proceed with Monarto in some form or another, and that it will become a continual and major drain on this State's finances. I do not believe South Australia's financial resources can support Monarto, even for the next 10 years, in a scaled-down version, without major financial contributions coming from the Australian Government.

The other area on which I should like to touch is that of Redcliff. On page 14 of the document presented by the Treasurer it is stated that, despite the \$10 000 000 set aside in the 1974-75 Loan Estimates for the pipelines for the Redcliff petro-chemical complex, the work has not proceeded and that finance will now be used to construct a main to Port Pirie. I am sorry that the Speaker is not at present in the Chamber. I am sure he will be delighted that Port Pirie is now to have a natural gas supply. The significant part is that no allocation has been made in the current financial year for building a liquids pipeline from the Cooper Basin anywhere south to a port at Port Pirie, Redcliff or Adelaide.

Last week or the week before, the Minister said that the State Government was currently examining different proposals for using the liquids from the Cooper Basin. I believe it is essential, if we have any common sense regarding the use of our energy resources, that we use the liquids in the basin as quickly as possible. However, it seems that the Government has so little confidence (or a complete lack of confidence) regarding its future alternatives for the use of the liquids from the Cooper Basin that it is not willing to put aside any finance whatsoever for the construction of a pipeline to carry liquids from the basin. The significance of this transfer of money from the construction of a liquids pipeline to a gas main to Port Pirie, and of the failure to supply new funds for the current financial year to construct a pipeline, is particularly disturbing. The evidence that has been presented suggests that the chance of exporting liquids from the Cooper Basin in future is remote if it has not disappeared completely. I think it illustrates yet another major election promise that the State Government has failed to honour. I am pleased that the Minister has seen fit to return to the Chamber. He does not seem to be at all interested in a project like Redcliff. Indeed, he has failed to show any real appreciation of the importance of Cooper Basin liquids. As members can see, the Minister has now decided to leave the Chamber again.

Mr. Evans: Natural gas is his forte.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: True. This is particularly disturbing, and it now seems that even a suitable alternative for the use of liquids from Cooper Basin is, at the best, a remote possibility.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): This document is as significant as any other document that the Treasurer has introduced in this House. It is noteworthy that on page 6 the Treasurer has put the sting in the tail. This is the part of the document that he read to the House, after which he sought leave to have the references to specific appropriations inserted in *Hansard* without his reading them. In view of

the Commonwealth Budget that was presented on Tuesday evening, it is significant that I should begin with a reference to what the Treasurer had to say in his summing up of the appropriations for the current financial year. He said:

At this stage, I should add that we have not received firm advice on many major expected grants and loans. In view of the difficult Budget situation which the Australian Government faces, it is possible that some of the special contributions may be held to lower limits than have been adopted for the purpose of these papers. This matter will be kept under close review to ensure that commitments actually made are in line with funds available.

That was a distinct warning from an experienced Treasurer, who has had jumping-jack policies, which have been referred to by the Leader and the member for Davenport this afternoon, on the ramifications of the stop-go, up and down policies of financial juggling to which we were treated last year. Since making his comments on the Commonwealth Budget, the Treasurer has stated that he was privy to some of the decisions announced on Tuesday evening when those decisions were in the incubating period at the Premiers' Conference in June. Then, bolstering his whistling in the dark and his courage, the Treasurer stated:

Having regard to the favourable situation of Revenue Account, there is no requirement for the Government to set aside Loan Funds and, therefore, we propose to employ in the capital programme the whole of the new funds expected to become available. The total of payments proposed is thus \$241 500 000. The balance of \$1 900 000 held at June 30, 1975, will continue to be held for the moment as a small pool from which emergency payments may be financed if they arise.

Although the matter of the transfer of the country railways has been decided (and we could say much about that), the ghost of that transfer has not been laid to rest. The Treasurer, on page 5 of his statement, in paragraph 6, states:

At the meeting of the Australian Loan Council held in June, the Australian Government agreed to support a total programme of \$1 291 000 000 for State works and services. Allowing for certain offsets because of the proposals for transfer of railway services in South Australia and Tasmania, this was effectively an increase of 20 per cent. South Australia's share of this programme is \$169 400 000. In effect, we sold off about \$150 000 000 worth of the State's valuable assets for an increase in the increment of, as the Treasurer has said, 20 per cent this year. The Treasurer's several statements about the base that has been built into the formula lead one to wonder when this baffle-gab will cease. In his opening remarks last Thursday, the Treasurer stated:

The expenditure proposals in that schedule aggregate nearly \$241 500 000 compared with \$211 200 000 of actual payments in 1974-75.

The selling off of the back paddock has given us this increment this year. Statements and papers were presented to us in June, prior to that fateful sitting of Parliament, when the member for Gilles was likely to face the starter's hand and have a few weeks of anguish. It was an election that was to bring into the House the new members for Mount Gambier and Millicent. Similar changes have happened at each election.

The significant statement being made in that period was that there would be, amongst other things, built into the base of the formula an amount of \$25 000 000. There was discussion in a bafflegabish way (I cannot put it any other way) when we were looking at a figure of \$50 000 000 that had offsets of \$32 000 000, and we saw the net gain of \$18 000 000. My colleagues and I were chided by country people during the election campaign for not being specific enough about what was happening regarding the

railways account. There was an angry meeting at Bordertown last week. I am sorry some members are not present now to hear what I am saying.

Country people voted against this Government because of what was contained in the railways transfer Bill. Those people are still not pleased about the transfer, and the ghost has not been laid to rest. On August 6 in this House the Treasurer introduced what my colleagues regarded as new matter. I have looked at the position carefully this afternoon. The Treasurer suggested that \$50 000 000 was built into the base figures. He mentioned two rambling figures, stating that members of the Legislative Council gave up a \$600 000 000 gain for a loss of \$800 000 000.

I have asked people who are much more skilled in dealing with figures than I am about the matter, and we have arrived at a gain of about \$237 000 000 in the 10 years. Because of what has happened previously, we have been made chary about the future. I make those points in the light of the statement which has been made so tardily. It refers to confidence and to gains that we have had, but the explanation given of \$50 000 000, with an offset of \$32 000 000, giving a net gain of \$18 000 000, and the statement of August 6 that we had \$50 000 000, were entirely new information. There is little wonder that this increase of 20 per cent, which gives us \$169 400 000 this year, makes us look at this matter with a somewhat jaundiced eye. The Treasurer went on to say, in dealing with semi-Government loans:

For semi-Government borrowing proposals in 1975-76, Loan Council has determined an aggregate general programme 20 per cent above that of 1974-75 with special allocations to two States to take account of particular factors. Of the total programme of \$809 700 000, South Australia's share is \$38 100 000.

I notice that \$5 300 000 has been allocated to meet the requirements of local government, and I refer to the difficulty that local government is in at present. The Tatiara council, which is in my district, in the South-East faces a liquidity problem, like many other councils in the State. It has the difficulty of striking the rate and the difficulty of getting the money in. Many ratepayers will not be able to pay their rates. That council has declared a rate of 19c in the \$1 this year, and there will be a shortfall in necessary revenue. The council has stated the reasons for the difficulty. Representatives of the council met the Minister in a deputation last Monday, and the council has given information about the shortfall in productivity and the aggravation that has been brought about by the fall in returns in the area. The deputation made the following submission to the Minister of Local Government on council finances:

(a) Although the price of grain has increased over the last two years the production of grain in this district was considerably less than could be expected, thus resulting in a reduction in income for the farmers.

(b) During those two years the consumer price index has risen from 130.4 in March, 1973, to 174.1 in March, 1975, an increase of 43.7. This has resulted in corresponding increases in the cost of production for farmers.

(c) The position was aggravated by the discontinuance of the superphosphate bounty.

The superphosphate bounty was noticeable for its absence from the Commonwealth Budget. The submission continues:

(d) For the season 1972-1973 fine heavy bullocks were sold at approximately \$191. According to the *Stock Journal* of August 7, 1975, prime bullocks were sold at approximately \$90 each.

Those prices represent a slash of 100 per cent. The submission continues:

(e) A number of graziers converted from sheep to cattle on the advice of the advisers from the Agriculture Department and have as a result incurred considerable losses.

It will be seen from the above information that the farmers and graziers of the district have experienced two bad years and it would be difficult to collect any extra rate revenue; in fact, some are of the opinion that it will be difficult to meet their rates.

As a result of the Commonwealth Budget, all councils are faced with this kind of problem. The submission continues:

With the necessity to reduce the costs it was natural that retrenchment of staff should result and, in order to enable the council to effect substantial reductions in the overdraft, it was felt that the following retrenchments should be necessary:

- (a) one officer from the administration;
- (b) two from the engineering office;
- (c) ten from the outside work force.

So, the council certainly found itself in a difficult situation. I stress that the Minister was quite fair to the deputation, which asked him for a direct grant of \$220 000, but he was unable to meet the request. Of course, the Commonwealth Budget has worsened the situation.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Why are they waging a campaign against me in that area?

Mr. RODDA: I am not aware that they are doing that. Actually, the deputation was quite pleased with the manner in which the Minister received it last Monday. I am sure that the Minister would agree that what I am saying is correct. If we take into account not only the Tatiara council's request but also the problems of other councils, we realise that the Minister could be asked for grants totalling \$25 000 000. He said that that was not on. We must remember that we are considering the funds required to keep people employed. The Treasurer has said that we have to look at the State's overall financial situation. I am making these points not in criticism of the Minister; rather, I am relating the Tatiara council's situation, which is not very different from that of other organisations with financial worries.

Turning to housing, I point out that a happy community is one that is satisfactorily housed. At the present rate of construction, it would take the Housing Trust five years to catch up with applications on its waiting list, and the situation will not improve. Many newly-wed young people are renting flats because they cannot afford to buy a house and because the cost of land is astronomical. In order to attend sittings of Parliament, I have rented a flat; so, I know from personal experience that rents are continually increasing. So, there is no joy in the Loan Estimates for people needing housing, although we were heartened to hear the Treasurer's announcement of an increase. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

BUSINESS FRANCHISES (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): Today I received a copy of the twenty-third annual report and financial statement of the Surf Lifesaving Association of South Australia. If members read the report thoroughly, they will see that the association has saved 1 859 lives in this State. On the final pages of the publication is a statement of income and expenditure. In the financial year ending June, 1975, the

organisation was faced with a deficit of \$11 380. This organisation would be one of the most important in the community, particularly as in Australia many people use the beaches, thus requiring some kind of protection.

It is essential that the association receive sufficient financial support from the Government and from organisations that can give it, otherwise, obviously, the community as a whole will indirectly have to bear the cost of financing the movement. Obviously, the organisation cannot continue in this vein after suffering a loss of over \$11 000 last financial year. The association has an excellent record, and its members enjoy a reputation that is second to none. There has been no loss of life on Australian beaches, except loss of life that has taken place outside the areas patrolled by the association members. Last year, the Government grant to the association amounted to \$14 000. Some people may consider that this is a reasonable sum but, going back to the days of 1969-70 when I was President of the association, the grant from the Queensland Government (which many people opposite term a poor Government) was \$74 000 a year. I do not know what the Queensland Government's grant is nowadays.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It's a different situation.

Mr. MATHWIN: My word it is. In those days, this State's grant was only \$4 000, whereas in New South Wales, from memory, it was about \$30 000. This State is providing the least sum of all to the association. Western Australia, Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland all give great sums, and people there realise the colossal job which the association performs in the community. It is imperative that the association's members continue their good work because, if their work did not continue, many of our beaches would no longer be safe. If its work did not continue, obviously the responsibility would rest more with the Government, which sets priorities on safety whether on the road or elsewhere. The Government must realise that the association needs greater assistance. Last season, 145 rescues were carried out, 268 people were rendered first aid, and 42 shark sightings were made. The association now possesses a resuscitation unit which gives demonstrations to the public, and its system of beach protection covers all areas. The association operates beach craft and rescue craft that carry rescue equipment for the assistance of the general public. It has a radio network and beach towers, and performs beach patrols throughout the metropolitan area.

The association has 18 affiliated clubs, 10 of which are located in the metropolitan area. Unfortunately, a decrease in membership took place during the past year, but I believe that this loss could be more than made up if the Government was more generous. The Somerton club will soon be housed in new premises, for which they have been waiting for some years, and I hope that this move will attract additional members to the club and the organisation, because these young men are a credit not only to South Australia but also to the country as a whole. People throughout the world recognise the worth of this organisation. Many people overseas ask questions about our surf lifesavers. That is one of the first questions one is asked overseas when one says one comes from Australia. It would be a disaster if larger grants were not made to surf lifesavers in South Australia.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What is the situation in Britain?

Mr. MATHWIN: I do not know, but the Minister would have investigated that during his visit to Britain. He would realise that there would be few surf lifesaving

clubs in Britain, first, because there is little surf; secondly, because the beaches are poor, and thirdly, the weather does not help promote the sport. Obviously, the Minister was more involved in his studies of dial-a-bus, which he brought back to South Australia to create a fiasco in this State.

I ask the Government to give further consideration to this matter, especially in relation to financial assistance to this organisation. I was unhappy to see in the Loan Estimates that only \$900 000 has been allocated for sport, tourism and similar matters. No wonder there is a shortage of funds in this area. I hope that when the Government introduces its Budget a greater allocation will be given to this most worthy institution, involving all lifesavers in South Australia.

Mr. OLSON (Semaphore): I rise to support a group of citizens in my district who are earnestly endeavouring to bring about improvements through the establishment of a free public library in Port Adelaide. However, their efforts are doomed to failure unless urgent action is taken now, and this can be achieved only if grants from the State or Australian Governments are made available. Presently a petition is circulating throughout the district for presentation to Parliament, so far signed by over 1 700 people.

A campaign has been launched in the local press, through service organisations and radio stations to coincide with library week, which is to be held between September 13 and September 20. Part of the celebrations will include a "shop front" library display, which the Minister of Education has generously agreed to open. In addition to these direct moves, interest has been created by the Port Adelaide Community Council for Social Development under the guidance of Gerry Govier and Arthur Mortimer, who have motivated a group of final-year students in the Library Studies Department of the Institute of Technology to undertake a feasibility study into a community library for Port Adelaide. This report will be presented to the Port Adelaide City Council later this year.

If areas such as Port Adelaide are ever to catch up with more developed areas, it will be only when people living there are given open access to ideas, inspiration and information. One of the best ways of achieving open access is through a network of free neighbourhood public libraries. Port Adelaide is not served at all with such amenities and, in fact, a free public library in areas along the coastline is not found until one gets to Brighton.

It is not good enough that the western region, which has 23 per cent of the State's population, received only 4 per cent of the subsidies provided by the State Library, whereas the eastern region, with 20 per cent of the State's population, received 36 per cent of the subsidies provided. It is once again the situation of the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer even in a literary sense. West Torrens council is the only council in the western region that provides library facilities. That library caters for a population of about 50 000 people and has 18 000 books. The council receives \$5 000 in subsidies from the State Government. There are 11 000 registered borrowers in that area. The least populated council area conducting a library in the State is at Kingscote, Kangaroo Island. The island has a population of only 2 700 people and its library survives only because a benefactor made a generous grant in co-operation with the State Library, which provides a subsidy.

It is not good enough that the 37 000 people in the Port Adelaide council area or the 100 000 people covered by the Commonwealth electoral district of Port Adelaide

are totally excluded from these facilities. Even in areas with public libraries there have been insufficient funds over the years and resources have therefore been stunted. Only eight out of 32 libraries in South Australia are staffed by qualified librarians. We need qualified, community-minded librarians to manage our libraries; they would form a hub of a whole range of services to improve facilities available for migrant groups, community study groups, aged people, people in hospital, backward young and old people from socially disadvantaged homes, service clubs and the rest of the community. Most members will agree that I have outlined a serious problem that is being experienced throughout the community. The libraries deserve support and I wholeheartedly wish to add my weight to try and bring about an improvement in the situation.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have an opportunity to take part in this debate. I am especially pleased that an honourable member in another place has seen fit, in a personal explanation, to reply to the comments I made recently in this House. It is obvious he is embarrassed. I sincerely hope he has apologised for his disgraceful conduct last week in that place. I look forward with interest to reading his comments next week. However, I have more important matters to talk about because I do not consider that honourable gentleman is very important.

The matter I wish to bring to the attention of the House relates to the problems capital taxation is having on family businesses, in particular the effect it is having on South Australian primary producers. The 1974 *South Australian Year Book* indicates there are about 29 000 rural holdings in South Australia, most of which are run by family businesses. Everyone is aware that a family farm or small family business is the most efficient way of conducting any enterprise: it is far more efficient than the socialist concept of State control or the operations of large commercial organisations. To emphasise the point I am making I refer to the rural policies green paper that was produced in 1974 at the instigation of the Prime Minister; however, he has failed to take any notice whatever of the matters discussed in that document. That is not unusual for the Prime Minister, because he does not take much notice of anyone. I believe the Australian people will deal with him appropriately at the correct time. However, paragraph 7.16 of the green paper, headed "The future of the family farm", states:

On the majority of Australian farms, members of a single family have ownership control of the productive assets, provide virtually all of the farm management input and also provide the bulk of the labour requirements. This form of business organisation largely avoids the conflicts of interests possible when the capital, management and labour inputs are provided by different individuals or groups.

I wish to quote now from the section dealing with the impact of death duties, and then to say what I think should be done about this problem. The document states:

In 1971-72, the federal estate duty assessments on primary producers amounted to about 29 per cent of the total duties assessed for persons in all industries. By contrast, primary producers constituted only 4.6 per cent of the income tax paying population and their income tax assessments amounted to 4 per cent of total income tax assessed in that year.

That clearly demonstrates the effect that this sort of taxation is having on primary producers. The document further states:

One important factor which contributes toward this divergence between the proportion of income tax and estate duties paid by primary producers is the relatively high value of the estates of primary producers compared with the estates of persons engaged in many other industries.

That refers to the fact that rural industries have large amounts of capital invested to bring a small return. The document continues:

This in turn reflects the family business type of organisation, which is predominant in the rural industries, and the capital value of rural properties.

Paragraph 7.32 states:

Death duties can result in substantial adverse effects on the efficiency of resource use in rural industries. In part, this is because of the close relationship between ownership and control of the productive assets of the business unit, with ownership and management normally passing from generation to generation within a family.

That clearly demonstrates that succession duties and other forms of capital taxation, if allowed to continue, will destroy the family farming unit. When the Treasurer introduces legislation to amend the Succession Duties Act he has a clear obligation regarding the future welfare of the people of this State. If the Government wants rural industry to continue to play such an important part in the welfare of this State and of the nation, he must reduce the effects of State succession duties across the board. I believe it is of paramount importance that the Commonwealth Government should abolish its estate duty altogether, because there is no logical argument why we should have two Governments taxing estates or why we should have double taxation in this way. The State Government, as a first step toward what I would like to see ultimately taking place, the abolition of this form of taxation, should allow people to inherit \$50 000 without any duty whatsoever.

This would clear up the problem of people being evicted from their homes and would allow people in rural industry to pass over some of their assets without duty. We should go even further in dealing with family business concerns, no matter what section of industry is involved. If a person inherits a business and maintains it for five years, he should receive a rebate of 40 per cent of the valuation, so that only 60 per cent of the valuation would be assessed for duty purposes. This was a recommendation of the Senate Select Committee into capital taxation. I believe the period before interest is attracted to the duty to be paid on an estate should be extended from six months to 18 months. People should be permitted to take out insurance policies and have them assigned to the Treasurer so that those policies could be used to pay the majority of the duty, if not all of it. It is absolutely essential that a course of action should be put in train to allow people to take action to avoid paying this discriminatory tax that we have in South Australia.

We are told by the Treasurer that the financial situation in South Australia is rosy. We have traded in the railways this year: what we will sell next year no-one knows. The Treasurer will have to think of something. We are supposed to have a surplus of \$22 000 000, so he must be in a financial position to do something about this form of taxation. It brings in more than \$12 000 000 a year to the Treasury, so if the Treasurer halved it he would not be eating greatly into the massive surplus he has been talking about over the past few weeks. If he does not do something about it, he will be taking the first step towards destroying the family farming unit and small business concerns, which are of paramount importance to the future welfare of the people of this State. This situation has been made far more difficult for people engaged in industry because of the drastic effects of inflation.

In 1971, the rates of duty were set and, since we have had the election of a socialist Government in Canberra, inflation has run at more than 20 per cent a year. One can imagine what effect that would have on the values of

properties that are assessed for succession duties purposes. Therefore, not only the rates of duty but also the exemptions are completely out of step with reality. I will give an example. Only a few weeks ago one of my constituents came to see me. She was up for \$50 000 in Commonwealth estate duty and State succession duties. In the 1930s she and her husband went on to a scrub block. They cleared it and put everything they had back into it. They had three sons who were home on the farm, one of whom wanted to get married. They were virtually placed in a position in which the lady was going to be forced out of their home to pay succession duties. It was not a big farm but, when a part of it had to be sold to meet succession duties, the property became uneconomic.

It is no use our having a rural reconstruction scheme if we are going to assist people to build up economic units

so that they can bring their sons on the properties in order to have an efficient farming unit if, because of State and Commonwealth estate duties, we destroy the concept that has been built up. It is absolutely paramount for the welfare of rural industries particularly and small business concerns that something be done about this form of taxation. I assure the House that Opposition members will, at the first opportunity, take positive action to rectify this situation. The Treasurer must accept his responsibility. The whole nation would be well served if this course of action was adopted.

Motion carried.

At 5.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 26, at 2 p.m.