

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, September 16, 1976

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

## QUESTIONS

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

## DRUG INSPECTIONS

In reply to Mr. RODDA (August 5).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The matter relates to a recent visit to the South-East by a pharmaceutical inspector of the Public Health Department. The visit was a routine drug inspection of authorised persons, including medical practitioners, pharmacists, veterinary surgeons, and hospitals. It has been found after many years' experience that it is not practical to make appointments for routine visits when the period extends to a week, as in the case of the South-East. Appointments are generally made for special visits when time is likely to be a problem. It is departmental policy to assist authorised persons in the matter of drug control and not, as stated, "to catch them out". It is not unusual for words of this nature to be exchanged by both parties in the preliminary pleasantries that take place at the time of a visit by an officer. Because of a number of incidents of drug diversions in hospitals by nursing staff, officers of the department are promoting a check system from one sister to another when there is a staff change. Comments are being sought from hospitals on the proposed system, and it has been found that it has been welcomed by those hospitals where drug incidents have occurred. Providing only the essential current stock of narcotics is kept in the sister's drug cupboard, the check takes not more than five minutes. No firm recommendation has yet been made for an amendment to the regulations to provide for regular drug checks in hospitals, and comments such as the one from the Naracoorte Hospital would be brought to the notice of the Central Board of Health when any proposed amendments were considered.

## GENETIC RESEARCH

In reply to the Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (August 10).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The views expressed by His Excellency were put forward in opening the recent very successful centenary scientific symposium on genetically determined disease at the Adelaide Children's Hospital. It was made very clear at the symposium that throughout Australia there are new developments in diagnosis and counselling in genetic diseases which are preventing and relieving a great deal of distress in families, and helping in giving the best possible chance to children with genetic handicaps. No attempts are being made in Australia at human genetic engineering. While fundamental scientific studies are being pursued in many places into the chemical and physical nature of inheritance, these studies are designed to discover basic processes rather than to produce new types of bacteria or other organisms with potentially dangerous properties. There is substantial planning aimed

at avoiding the accidental creation of dangerous species, and elaborate precautions for dealing with these should they occur.

## HEALTH FUNDS

In reply to Mr. SLATER (August 12).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The information on the quantum of current true reserves held by the funds is not available. However, there are some misconceptions in relation to the nature and extent of the so-called reserves held by health funds. Each of the funds works on a community rating system and determines its contribution levels on past experience in order to obtain sufficient funds to cover operating costs, provide working capital, and to cover all claims. Obviously, at any point of time, there will be outstanding claims not yet paid to contributors and potential claims not yet lodged by contributors. The funds must therefore have reserve funds to meet these payments, which relate to a period from which there will be no further contributions. The matter of choice of health fund should be appropriately left to the individual.

## DRUGS

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Premier say whether the committee of inquiry into all aspects of marihuana recommended by the State Australian Labor Party Convention this year has now been set up, and whether the Government will include other forms of drug abuse within its terms of reference? This question follows one by the Deputy Leader on August 11, 1976, when he asked whether the Government was considering holding an inquiry into legalising the use of marihuana. The original convention resolution called for the consideration of medical problems, availability, purity, standards of safe use, legal penalties for unsafe use, and marketing, and the emphasis very much suggested that marihuana use would prove to be safe. The Premier answered the Deputy Leader by saying that the Government had been considering a public inquiry, but nothing further has been heard. Further concern has now been expressed in the community about the increased abuse of heroin, and suggestions have been made about increasing penalties for drug peddlers. A full inquiry is urgently needed now—not at some time in the future. The community is concerned that the Government is going quiet because marihuana is a contentious subject, and the Government does not want to rock the electoral boat at present. There is evidence to support this view in the Government's similar public back-off on matters which it had previously raised, such as age of consent and incest, compulsory unionism, worker participation, weekend bread baking and drinking, and, most recently, workmen's compensation changes.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This is this week's funny story. From time to time the Leader seems to get bemused by his own propaganda. The Government has said that it is examining the proposals for the establishment of a commission of inquiry into the question of the present laws relating to drugs in South Australia. The questions that we are considering were outlined quite fully in the reply which I gave previously in the House and which the Leader has carefully not quoted.

Dr. Tonkin: There wasn't much that I could quote.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There was a great deal in it to quote, because the question was whether the present laws in South Australia were the best way of coping with

drug abuses and whether there were not better ways of achieving a lessening of drug abuse in this State.

Dr. Tonkin: Go on! You're backing off because it's contentious; you know perfectly well that that is what's happened.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader does not know anything of the kind, nor is it the case. The Government has—

Dr. Tonkin: You hope you can have a committee that will report in two years, after the election.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The entire motion at the Labor Party conference related to the establishment of a commission of inquiry. Obviously a commission of inquiry in a matter of this kind will require some time to investigate and report.

Dr. Tonkin: You're going to delay it for as long as you can.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I am not delaying this matter, as the Leader's Party is carefully delaying electoral redistribution in South Australia. If ever a Party wanted to back off from an election, it is the Leader's Party.

*Members interjecting:*

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Members opposite are obviously trying to find any way they can to delay the electoral redistribution for which they voted in this House. This Government is not backing off from an election at any time, and it is not backing off from this matter. The Leader will hear an announcement in due season from the Government because I do make decisions about matters of this kind. The Leader has had a word or two to say about this subject in the past day or so to the effect that some unnamed members of my department on Ministerial staff make decisions on my behalf. He has not cited a single decision that anyone has made, though. Anyone who knows the South Australian Government, including my colleagues, would not suggest for a moment that I do not make decisions. The Leader cannot cite a single example to support his theories. I hope that he will go on saying the kinds of thing that he is saying, because the public does not give much credence to them.

MONARTO

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: My question is directed to the Special Minister of State for Monarto and Redcliff. Can he say what is the Government's attitude to the development of Monarto in the light of the recently published figures indicating that the national population growth rate is the lowest for 30 years, and the rate in South Australia is well below the national average? The population growth rate during the past year to June 30 was 1.04 per cent for Australia and 0.9 per cent for South Australia—well down on the previous year. We are approaching zero population growth in South Australia with only a trickle of migration to the State, and a decline in the birth rate. The Opposition's attitude is well known that public expenditure on Monarto should be wound down in recognition of the reality of the present situation. How does the Government view these figures, and does it still believe it will have houses in Monarto in 1978?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I would have thought that the honourable member might at least make a mental adjustment to those figures on account of the effect of Cyclone Tracy.

Dr. Tonkin: Oh?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the Leader is not interested in any factual reply, perhaps he could contain himself, because others may be interested.

Dr. Tonkin: Is that consistent with what you said the other day?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The other evening the Leader referred specifically to Cyclone Tracy. If the effect of Cyclone Tracy is considered, the increase in South Australia's population for the year ended June, 1975, was greater than the Australian average. The total increase in population given by the honourable member was 0.9 per cent, as against an Australian average of a little more than 1 per cent. That was for the year just completed, and I am pointing out to the honourable member—

Mr. Dean Brown: You should have—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: We on this side wish that the member for Davenport would follow the example of the member for Flinders. If he did that, some of his otherwise uncontainable exuberance and stupidity might cease to annoy other members. For the 12 months ended June, 1975, there was a bigger than usual increase in South Australia's population, because of the effect of Cyclone Tracy. With the adjustment for that event—

Mr. Goldsworthy: And they come in—

The SPEAKER: Order! This incessant questioning is delaying Question Time unnecessarily and is definitely detracting from the answers that Ministers are expected to give.

Mr. Gunn: The Minister doesn't know the answer.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He doesn't know what he's talking about.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not mind taking the necessary time to say what I want to say, but I insist on my right to say it and nothing that the Deputy Leader tries to do will stop me; I assure him of that. With the movement of population from Darwin, particularly to Adelaide, in the 1974-75 period there was a further consequential movement away or adjustment back again in the year just concluded. Consequently, over the two-year period one would find that, in the first part of the period, South Australia's increase in population was above the Australian average and, in the second part of the period, it was below it. I should think that, if the two-year period as a whole is taken as a guide (and I suggest that, in the circumstances, that would be the more reliable guide), South Australia's population increase would be close to the Australian average, or a little above it, in current circumstances. At an average rate of increase in population of about 1 per cent per annum, there will be a substantial increase in the total population of South Australia and, without Monarto, most of that increase will be concentrated in Adelaide. One can expect that, with the current forecasts that we have (and they have been accepted by the Government), the increase in population in the Adelaide region, without Monarto, will be about 10 000 a year, so that by the mid-1990's the increase that can be expected in the Adelaide region, again without Monarto, is about 200 000. That is a slower rate of increase than has been experienced in Adelaide since the Second World War, but nevertheless it would mean a significant extension in the size of the Adelaide metropolitan area, and that would be a matter of considerable concern. Furthermore, I suggest to members opposite that they probably would support the proposals of the Federal Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs that the immigration rate should be stepped up, and it is not possible to forecast future population movements with any precision, because of the immigration

factor being an unknown element. At lower than average rates of immigration, a rate of increase in the population of the Adelaide region of 10 000 a year can be expected. If there is a step up in the immigration rate, the rate of increase will be somewhat greater than that.

The question whether or not Monarto is needed fundamentally comes down to a matter of judgment that one makes about the extent to which one can permit Adelaide to grow in total area, without detracting significantly from the quality of life that exists in our community. That is a matter of judgment, and the kind of judgment that the Government would make on it is different from that of the Opposition. We are still awaiting a reply from the Commonwealth Government. Indeed, we have been waiting for that reply since last November, and any determination of an attitude on Monarto, or on when it might commence, must await the Commonwealth Government's decision on whether or not any kind of support is to be given.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Will there be any houses there in 1978?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have just answered that question. The honourable member, having been a teacher, is supposed to be capable of exercising some logic. If the date on which any work can commence depends on when the Commonwealth Government gives an answer, obviously the question whether there will be people or houses at Monarto in 1978 depends on the same thing, and any fool could see that.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

#### SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. WHITTEN: Because of the likelihood of the discontinuation of the Australian Assistance Plan, will the Minister of Community Welfare say whether the Community Welfare Department is considering setting up some form of regional councils for social development similar to those that now exist under the Australian Assistance Plan and, if it is, whether the employment of community development officers concerned will be funded by the Community Welfare Department, and under whose jurisdiction such officers will be employed? It is apparent that the Liberal and Country Party coalition Government in Canberra is intent on destroying the Australian Assistance Plan, which will place a further burden on State resources. I believe it is necessary for the community to have this service, which was contemplated under the Labor Party programme, and that this sort of service should continue. I should appreciate receiving any information that the Minister could give me.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Officers of my department and I are examining the whole question of continuing regional councils in South Australia. The honourable member is probably aware that different ideas prevail in the various States regarding State organisations for community councils as distinct from the Federal organisations that were set up. In South Australia, an agreement was negotiated between the then Federal Minister and the State Minister in relation to these organisations; this State's Act was amended, and the community councils were continued, each having representation on the other's controlling executive.

I think the honourable member would be the first to agree that, in order to be able successfully to make any plans in this area, it is necessary to be able to decide what

will happen about future financing. A couple of months ago, at a meeting held in Darwin which was attended by Ministers from all States and by the Commonwealth Minister, Senator Guilfoyle, we had an early example of the new federalism, that is, the consultation that is supposed to occur between the States and the Commonwealth on these matters: without any consultation whatsoever, the Commonwealth Minister told all State Ministers present at that meeting that the funding would continue for one year, and that that would be the end of that. There was no consultation whatsoever, and attempts around the table by the Ministers from the Labor States and also the Victorian Minister (Mr. Brian Dixon) to elucidate from the Senator any consideration that the Federal Government might be willing to give to getting around the table and consulting on this matter had little success. I was also unsuccessful in attempting to get some kind of statement from Senator Guilfoyle with respect to any future funding.

Roughly, the statement issued by her was that funding with respect to salaries and some committed moneys on projects would apply for the next 12 months, to date from June 30 this year, and that was to be that: the States could like it or lump it. However, since then there has been a slight change in the area, in that the Bailey committee has been set up by the Federal Government and sent to South Australia and other States to interview departmental officers and ascertain what might be described as the width of welfare services and funding generally in which the Commonwealth is involved in each State, and also to collect information and data to be taken back to the Federal Government. When the Bailey committee was here about eight or 10 days ago, information was given to it with respect to this matter and other matters concerning the future of certain welfare services in South Australia, and we now await the results of what was said to that committee.

In addition, in order to try to get some kind of finality on future financing, I wrote to the Senator some time ago and pointed out that in May (as shown in the Commonwealth *Hansard* of that month) she had undertaken to look further at the possible financing of A.A.P. I reminded her of this undertaking in my letter and asked whether this still applied, but I have not received a reply to that letter or to a subsequent letter. I can only assume, being an optimist, that it means that some consideration is being given to what I put forward in that letter. I hope so, for the sake of the future of people in South Australia. If that seems to be a somewhat long-winded reply, it is the only kind of reply I can give to the question, for the reasons I have outlined. The matter is still contingent on some ultimate decision by the Commonwealth, under the guise of the new federalism, and if we can get this answer the necessary plans may be able to be formulated. Regarding that part of the honourable member's question dealing with community development officers, and with the matter of by whom they may be employed and with whom they may be placed, I think he can see that that matter is contingent on the information I have been trying to obtain from the Commonwealth.

#### MEDICAL SERVICES

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether and when the State Government intends to seek reimbursement from Medibank for medical services rendered to children under the Minister's care, including those in children's training and residential care centres and

persons in Government and other correctional institutions? If the Government does intend to seek reimbursement, will the Minister's colleague the Minister of Health reply to the Federal Minister's letter of July 31 on this matter? I referred in the House last evening to an article in the *News* of September 9, under the heading "Children lose health cover." I understand that the article is misleading and that the argument is whether the State Government wants to be reimbursed for medical services supplied by its salaried doctors. I believe that up to three days ago none of the State Health Ministers had replied to the Federal Minister's letter. I believe that the Medibank legislation provides for the Federal Minister's direction in this matter, but he cannot act without representations from the State to consider any proposal. I have been assured that in no way will any of these under-privileged or unfortunate people be deprived of first-class medical services in the future that are now provided by the State Government salaried doctors. I have also been informed that foster children and those in non-Government religious and charitable homes are not affected, as they are covered by Medibank.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Most of the matters raised by the honourable member should properly be answered by my colleague the Minister of Health, and I will certainly bring the points raised to his attention. Regarding the article, I have no reason to doubt that Mr. Jackson, the New South Wales Minister, was sincere, nor have I any reason to doubt that he possessed information that caused him to make the statement. I am sure that the member for Hanson would agree, because of the obvious concern he showed in raising the matter. If what Mr. Jackson stated to be the case in New South Wales applied throughout Australia, it would be a disgraceful situation that ought to be fixed up by the Federal Government immediately. To leave the children in such circumstances would be absolutely reprehensible, and I am sure the honourable member would agree that it should not be allowed to continue. I will bring the detail of the honourable member's question to the attention of my colleague.

#### TEA TREE GULLY INTERSECTION

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Transport supply me with a report on the latest position and present priority in relation to the installation of traffic signals at the intersection of North-East Road and Hancock Road, Tea Tree Gully? The Minister is aware that I have raised this subject many times by letter, questions in this House, and speeches, the latest being on September 7 during the adjournment debate. On all previous occasions I have explained why this intersection is dangerous and, thus, why the work should have a high priority.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: When the Highways Department was considering the programme for the current financial year, the intersection to which the honourable member referred was considered, along with many other intersections. Regrettably, there are many intersections and school crossings where we ought to have traffic signals but unfortunately we do not have them. With this thought in mind, last year we took a conscious decision to double expenditure in this area, in the hope of catching up. I do not know why this intersection may not have been included in the programme this financial year, but I will certainly talk to the Commissioner of Highways to see where it ranked. I will bring down whatever information I can get for the honourable member.

#### WATER RESOURCES ACT

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Works say how many advisory committees have been established, and where they will be established, under section 16 of the Water Resources Act, and will he provide the names of the persons so far appointed? The Act does not specify the number of advisory committees to be established, but undoubtedly the committees will have an important role to play in relation to the overall Water Resources Advisory Council.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Up to date, four regional advisory committees have been appointed, one in connection with the Murray River, another for the Northern Adelaide Plains, one at Padthaway in the South-East, and one for arid regions (the whole of the pastoral areas of the State). It is not intended to appoint regional advisory committees in other areas unless a problem becomes apparent and needs attention and we require the advice of a regional advisory committee. From memory, I cannot state the names and locations of the people on the committees, but I shall be happy to get the information for the honourable member as soon as possible. He would know that the Water Resources Advisory Council has been appointed; that body covers the whole State, and it may refer problems to regional advisory committees, consider problems in other parts of the State where there is no regional advisory committee and, in fact, do anything that I direct it to do.

#### HENLEY BEACH REDEVELOPMENT

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Will the Minister for the Environment outline the attitude of the Coast Protection Board in relation to funding of the coastal redevelopment programme? The Minister and the Government were good enough to agree to the request from the Corporation of the City of Henley and Grange for a substantial and badly needed redevelopment programme for Henley Square. I believe that the council should provide for a redevelopment programme of a general nature, rather than doing it piecemeal. It is something that is badly needed in several areas along our metropolitan coast. It would be useful if the Minister could outline the attitude of the board to other applications that it may receive concerning similar redevelopment programmes.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The board has done a valuable job in the past four years since it was set up for the protection of our metropolitan beaches, and the operation of physically stabilising dunes and protecting the sea wall against the sea has gone almost as far as we can go.

Mr. Mathwin: Except the erection of a groyne, which was a bad thing.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The experts believe, and I subscribe to their belief, that there are more effective ways of protecting the beach than by the erection of costly and unaesthetic groynes. However, it may be that the processes which the board has undertaken in the metropolitan area have been largely completed. Consequently, funds are available to upgrade coastline areas, and positions in which those would be beneficial were set out in the report commissioned from Pak-Poy & Associates. The Henley corporation had taken the initiative in this matter possibly because a member of the board, the local government representative, is the Mayor of Henley and Grange, and this corporation has asked the Government to upgrade the main square at Henley Beach. Everyone will agree that this should be done, because it is a run-down area, and the

corporation's proposal is an exciting one and will do much to restore Henley and Grange to its former eminence. The board recommended to me that we support a scheme costing about \$650 000, of which the board will find half, provided that the council finds its half of the cost. The board would welcome any further applications from seaside councils that wished to proceed with a similar scheme, and funds would be available for any reasonable proposition. The sum of \$325 000 will be spread over three financial years: that means that it can be completed in about 20 months from now. Funds are available to assist other councils that wish to take advantage of this scheme, and I hope they do. This is not restricted to the metropolitan area: the board is spending much money in country areas, and Wallaroo is one example of where a subsidy of about \$70 000 is being provided for a new swimming pool, and so on. Money is available for any worthwhile scheme which a council may propose if it undertakes to meet its 50 per cent of the cost, as in the type of project to which I have referred.

#### TRUCK LOAD LIMITS

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Transport say what the situation is to be during the coming harvest (if one eventuates) regarding the legal weight carrying capacity of motor trucks? The Minister will recall that at last harvest time the owners of trucks delivering grain were permitted to load their vehicles to the maker's specified load limit plus 40 per cent. It is understood to have been said that, in following years, that 40 per cent may be reduced. I therefore ask what is to be the position this year, bearing in mind that the growers wish the *status quo* to remain.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Let me put the record quite straight. The United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated and other grower organisations were notified that the decision of the Road Traffic Board was that the 40 per cent would be (not could be or may be) reviewed each year with a view to achieving the provisions which are in the Act and which apply to other people. I understand, from a report I recently received from the Chairman of the Road Traffic Board, that the matter is currently being considered by the board and that it is taking into account that the coming harvest, regrettably, will not be bountiful. I understand that the board will be making a report shortly and, presumably, they will be notifying the grower representatives or the grower organisations of that report. I will ask the Chairman whether he can provide me with the information so that I can let the honourable member know, because I know that he has a real personal interest in this matter.

#### FIRE BANS

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Works clarify the position regarding fire-bans in the metropolitan area, because summer is fast approaching? I refer to a report in today's *Advertiser* that refers to fire ban days. The member for Davenport is quoted as saying that on fire ban days residents in parts of the city cannot light fires whereas residents in neighbouring suburbs are free to do so. People read reports so ably put each morning in the media and given on the radio to ensure that they comply

with the law. It seems, after reading this article, that many people want this position clarified.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I saw the article to which the member for Unley has referred. I do not know whether the member for Davenport said what he is reported to have said, and I have not had a chance to look at the *Hansard* pull, but it could be construed from the article that on a total fire ban day over the whole State residents in certain suburbs could light fires while others could not. That is not so. The Bureau of Meteorology, with the authority of the Minister of Agriculture, declares fire ban days. The bureau can declare a fire ban over some parts of the State and not others, depending on circumstances. The bureau can declare, and quite often does, a ban over the whole of the State except for the inner city fire ban area; that is to say, within that fire ban district one can light a fire but in any other part of the State one cannot. That can also be varied in many different ways. A false impression may have been gained from the article, an impression which should be corrected because it is important—

Mr. Dean Brown: You are referring just to the headline at the top.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, I am referring to a later part of the article, which reads:

While residents of completely built up areas such as Erindale and Kensington Gardens could not light fires on fire ban days, residents in neighbouring suburbs of equal density were free to do so.

I am not saying that the honourable member said that, but I think that is the part that could be misconstrued, and it is important that the record be put straight, because it is common practice to place a ban on certain parts of the State and not others, but on total fire ban days no fires can be lit anywhere in the State, including inside the metropolitan district.

#### SCHOOL-LEAVERS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Education say how the Government (perhaps I should say "the Minister") squares its apparent policy on autonomy for schools with the apparent imposition on schools willy-nilly of the new bright orange-covered school-leaver statements? Like the Minister of Works, I have read this morning's paper and I see, on the front page, a report headed "Graded reports for school-leavers". The report, under the byline of Miss Blieschke, reads:

Every school-leaver in South Australia will get a bright, orange-covered school-leaver statement this year.

The article goes on to say that there are several authorised versions. Generally, it praises the idea, which leads me to think it must have emanated from the Minister's office. However, I have heard today that there is at least one school in which the authorities are very cross about this. They have their own system of giving reports for school-leavers, they think it is satisfactory, and they do not want to have it altered. As I understand the policy of the present Government (and, by and large, I agree with it), schools are given nowadays far more autonomy in all sorts of matters than they were before, and yet this seems to be an imposition by the department on schools, whether or not they want it. I do not pretend to judge whether the idea is good or bad. Obviously, opinions vary on that, but the point of my question is this: if schools are to be given autonomy, or if that is the policy, why is it being taken away from them in this matter?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The school's autonomy is not absolute, nor is it the intention of this Government that the schools' autonomy should ever be absolute.

Mr. Millhouse: You are modifying your policy.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am certainly not modifying our policy. For example, in this Chamber only three weeks ago, I think it was, I answered a question asked of me by the member for Mallee about the appointment or selection of teachers for schools. I think I made it perfectly clear that it is not this Government's intention, nor has it ever been, that the right of schools to hire or fire staff should ever be accepted. It has never been our intention that autonomy in schools should run to that extent. The honourable member may like to adopt an attitude on that, too, but I make it clear what our attitude happens to be. In relation to the teaching of core subjects, schools do not have absolute freedom of choice of curriculum. High schools are told the sorts of core subjects that must be placed before the students, and that is something that is uniform throughout the system. Beyond those core subjects they have freedom to choose. School-leaver statements have been discussed thoroughly for at least two years; there was considerable consultation with the schools, with the institute, with employers, and with other people, when I first came into the portfolio. So far as I am aware, there is widespread support for this system.

Mr. Millhouse: It is by no means universal.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: That is quite possible. In any sort of lively system, naturally differences of opinion will occur. If certain schools have systems which they would like me to examine, I am happy to examine them. The concept of a school-leaver statement, or the generation of such a statement, is in part a reaction to the reduced emphasis that educational authorities now place on external examination of people at the point of leaving school. Members will be aware that the Matriculation examination and its antecedents have been very much directed towards the requirements of university entry. These antecedents have been done away with. We still have Matriculation, and employers in the past have taken the standards set by Matriculation as some sort of standards for entry to the work force, even though these may be quite unrealistic, academically biased as they are. We believe that the employing community generally welcomes this sort of concept as a guide to the possible abilities of their future employees. The department is prepared to examine sympathetically any system at present in operation, to see whether it meets the general sort of agreement reached between my department, employers, and people in education generally. It has never been the intention of this Government that the autonomy of schools should be absolute, nor will it be, for the reasons I have outlined.

#### INSURANCE CLAIMS

Mr. WELLS: Is there anything the Attorney-General can do or has done to prevent or control the practice of many insurance companies of sending, as a matter of form, letters of demand to people who have been involved in traffic accidents, especially if the people concerned are not insured with the company sending the letter? I was approached recently by a constituent who said that he had been involved in an accident that had involved three cars. His car had been damaged only slightly by one of the other cars, and he was in no way held responsible

for the accident. However, a prominent insurance company soon after the accident sent him a letter of demand stating that it held him entirely responsible for the damage done to its client's car. On my advice, he wrote to the insurance company in blunt terms and said that he would have nothing to do with such a claim. About a fortnight later he received a letter from yet another insurance company, which had covered the third car involved in the accident, demanding that he pay promptly \$200 towards the repair of its client's car, as it held him entirely responsible. He ignored that letter, but subsequently received a threatening letter stating that the insurance company would take legal action against him if he did not promptly pay about \$200. If this is a widespread practice (and my information is that it is), something should be done quickly to curb the insurance companies which are using intimidatory and blackmailing methods against motorists who may be involved in accidents, without responsibility.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: This kind of undesirable practice is, on my information, fairly widespread. I must agree that accusations of the type mentioned are undesirable and that this practice should be stamped out, if possible. I will certainly notify the Australian Government, which Government has the basic responsibility for matters involving insurance, that this practice is extensive, particularly in South Australia. I will also write to the Insurance Institute in this State to bring the matter to its attention and invite comments and suggestions about how the practice could be brought under control. The honourable member has raised a matter of considerable concern to the community. I issue a strong warning to everyone in South Australia about the unwarranted and intimidatory letters that are being sent out demanding money from people who have been involved in accidents. No-one can be forced to pay a sum for which he or she is not responsible. Threatening letters from insurance companies that are sent, particularly after motor vehicle accidents, demanding money where there is no guilt on the part of the people concerned should be duly ignored by those people. I would suggest to people who receive such letters that they should reply in strong terms indicating that they do not intend to be intimidated in this fashion, ignore them or, if they are in any doubt, they should refer the matter to the Consumer Affairs Branch or to a private solicitor.

#### DUKES HIGHWAY

Mr. NANKIVELL: Is the Minister of Transport aware of the rapidly deteriorating state of the pavement of Dukes Highway between Moorlands and the Victorian border? I understand that the section of the highway between Moorlands and Tailem Bend is being hot-sealed now. Can the Minister therefore indicate what action, if any, is being taken to assess the extent of this deterioration and whether an alternative route could be surveyed for a dual carriageway? I understand that the volume of traffic on this road is now 4 000 vehicles a day, and it should therefore be considered whether a dual carriageway should be built. If the survey to which I refer is being undertaken, which I believe it is, on behalf of the Commonwealth Government, can the Minister say when it is expected that the committee set up to undertake the survey is likely to report? I believe the Minister is aware of the situation, but I quote from *South Australian Motor* of July, 1976, an article headed "Road Survey: S.A.," which states:

Narrow pavement width of S.A. sections compared with Victorian sections was the most significant feature revealed by road surveys of the Dukes, Western and Princes Highway conducted by a joint R.A.A.-R.A.C.V. survey team. The party found that a high percentage of the highway distance in S.A. has a width of 6.2 metres or less, whereas 6.8 metres was virtually the minimum width found in Victoria. It continued to state that because of broken roadway edges and corrugated shoulders a considerable amount of maintenance work has since been carried out, but the maintenance gangs could be fighting a losing battle. I support that statement, because they are fighting a losing battle, according to what they have said to me, when asking for support.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Who?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Highways gangs, who realise that the situation is getting beyond their control. I should therefore like the Minister to report on what, if anything, is happening and what future action is planned.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The only satisfactory way to handle the question asked would be to ask the Commissioner of Highways to supply a detailed reply. As the honourable member has said, we are aware of the shortcomings of that section of our highway. I do not want to get involved in a controversy about whether that section of road is better or worse than the section from the border through to Victoria, because it is only a parochial State argument that does not really achieve much other than to show that generally in South Australia the road system is far better than that in other States. The honourable member, I believe, would be the first to acknowledge that, and I do not believe he is rubbishing the efforts of the Highways Department in building roads. I will ask the Commissioner to supply me with a detailed reply to the points raised by the honourable member, and I will bring it down as soon as possible.

#### OUTER HARBOR TERMINAL

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Marine say whether he saw a recent press report relating to the Outer Harbor container terminal in which rather serious and startling allegations were made about the future operation of that terminal, suggesting that there could well be no business operating out of it? As this matter gives not only me but also other members grave concern, and as more than \$7 000 000 has been spent on the project already, I ask the Minister what is the position regarding trade into and out of that port when the facility is completed, and I ask the Minister whether he can indicate any companies which are prepared to trade into and out of the terminal when it is built.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I saw the report, which was ill-informed. No-one contacted my office to check what were stated in the report as facts. I do not know the purpose for which the report was written, other than to knock the development. Certainly, it does not help the State and us to have that sort of thing said on such flimsy grounds, and I think the honourable member would have appreciated that if he had read the report closely. It was phrased in such a way that it had no foundation in fact. I issued a press release refuting what was stated in the report and, as usual, not one word was printed. I think I stated recently that, so far as the operation of the terminal work was concerned, it was somewhat of a chicken and egg situation, in that it was a matter of whether the trade or the terminal came first. The honourable member is old enough and has had enough experience to know that we could not attract trade to this State without having the facilities. I think the next few months will show the

position. I cannot tell the honourable member what we have in mind, other than that we certainly have in mind a promotion campaign, and that will be launched at the right time. That is just talk, but, apart from that, there have been firm inquiries to the department in the past few months, and only this morning the Director of Marine and Harbors (Mr. John Griffiths) told me of two other commitments that may be made soon in relation to use of this facility, which is nearing completion. I would welcome the support of the honourable member and other honourable members opposite in getting the full use out of this terminal. As the honourable member has said, it is an extremely costly one, as any port facility is: they always are costly. I hope that in the next few days we shall be able to finalise the matter. I think I stated in the House that on September 15 or soon after then we expected to hear from Terminals Proprietary Limited, the people who were going to operate the facility.

Mr. Coumbe: That was yesterday.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, I realise that. I said, "on September 15 or soon after". I expect to have the operation side of the terminal sewn up. Following that, I can start, in a concrete way, to do something about getting it used. I do not for a moment believe that it will be over-used in the initial stages, but the future holds all sorts of possibilities and, without the terminal, we would have no hope of achieving those possibilities. I think the report was most unfair. As I have said, there was no foundation to it, and the people who wrote it and those who published it did not do us the courtesy of asking whether it was a fair report. There was no contact and, as I have also said, the press release that I issued was not published in the newspapers, and I do not think it was mentioned on radio or television either.

#### PORT PIRIE

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I wanted to direct my question to the Premier. I am sorry that he is not in the Chamber, as my question is asked subsequent to a reply that the Premier gave earlier this week. However, I will ask my question, which concerns your district, Mr. Speaker, of the Deputy Premier. What are the likely future developments that the Premier claims will boost employment opportunities in Port Pirie to such an astounding extent that the population decline will be halted and, in fact, reversed? The figures given by the Premier last Tuesday in reply to a Question on Notice clearly indicate that for the last two five-year periods the population of Port Pirie has actually declined. The decline was—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Very small.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The population dropped by 133 persons between 1966 and 1971, and the decline in the second five-year period was 574 persons. In giving the reply to which I have referred, the Premier said:

However, taking into account likely future development, it is expected that this trend will be reversed.

Of course, that is the matter about which I am asking my question. What are those major developments that the Premier is offering? The Premier raised in his reply the pay-roll tax rebate being offered by the Government, and went on to say:

This generous incentive—

of course, it is not generous at all—

is available to firms locating in Port Pirie, as that city is part of the iron triangle growth centre. In addition, Port Pirie is eligible for the previously existing incentives of financial assistance.

The Liberal Party is concerned about Port Pirie. It is obvious from current projections that Port Pirie is likely to have its employment opportunities greatly reduced. I am sure that you, too, Sir, as the member for that district, are concerned. I have heard some rather startling figures regarding what could happen to Port Pirie unless new employment is created urgently. The Government has said much but has done absolutely nothing. It has made some rather bold claims, and in this respect I return to actual facts (this is not comment but facts). I refer to the sort of promises made by the State Government just before the 1973 State election, before the 1974 Federal election, and before the 1975 State election. None of those promises has come to fruition. For these reasons, I ask what are these major developments about which the Premier openly boasts but which I believe unfortunately do not exist?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member may have to contain himself in patience for just a little while. I hope that, when the people of Port Pirie get the good news, the honourable member will not show his disappointment to the extent that he normally tends to show it.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He won't show his nose.

Mr. Dean Brown: I suppose you'll announce these just before the next election.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member suggests that the Government has broken a promise to Port Pirie about carrying out projects, perhaps he would be precise about it, because the Government was quite precise about what it said it would do in relation to Port Pirie, and it has carried out every one of the things it said it would do.

Mr. Dean Brown: Absolute rubbish!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government said that a number of facilities would be provided at Port Pirie, and so they have been.

Mr. Dean Brown: What are they?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member was there when I opened the facility which provides natural gas to Port Pirie. That was a promise which the Government made, and it was not dishonoured but was carried out. The honourable member no doubt thinks that that was absolute rubbish, but it cost the Government much money, and the people of Port Pirie have greatly appreciated it.

Mr. Dean Brown: What are these major new developments?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member will have to contain himself until the announcements are ready to be made. They will be made and, when the honourable member hears them, I suppose he will try to take out his frustrations in some other way.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 3)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 15. Page 1061.)

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I join with other members in commending the honourable member who was making such a notable contribution to this debate when his time ran out last evening and so, encouraged by this general

support, I intend to continue. The one thing that has come through loud and clear in this debate, particularly from the Opposition, is that the State Budget is a good one. If that were not so, why should it concentrate all its comments on the Federal Government's Budget and completely ignore our State Budget? One almost had the feeling that one was in the House of Representatives as Opposition member after Opposition member concentrated his comments on the Federal Budget. Perhaps they felt that the Federal Budget needed some defending, and I do not think that there would be much argument about that. Because of Opposition comments, I will say several things about the Federal Budget, then do something that members opposite sometimes find it difficult to do: sit down.

At least two Opposition members spent their whole time talking about a list of promises the present Prime Minister made before his election. I point out that, in the main, in the so-called honouring of these promises, the Federal Government has a three-year term; it has a three-year programme. This financial year, very little money has been voted to honouring these promises, so I do not know from where the enthusiastic response from the Opposition has come. Very little money has been voted to the promises to assist the States. Whether or not the Prime Minister or the Federal Treasurer will vote more money in the next two financial years is open to doubt, particularly as we know how untrustworthy those two gentlemen are. It is interesting to note that the Prime Minister wants three years in which to carry out his programme: that is the term, members may recall, that neither he nor his colleagues were willing to give to the previous Government.

We have heard only little from the Opposition about the twin problems Australia faces: unemployment and inflation. If the Prime Minister and his Treasurer are so successful in their economic philosophy, one would think that this would be transmitted into some definite results regarding unemployment and inflation. Recent consumer price index figures show that inflation is not diminishing but increasing, and this increase will be even greater when Medibank costs are included in the index. Unemployment is certainly not reducing, but increasing. So, I am unable to understand how the Opposition can obtain solace from a Federal Budget that does nothing to solve these twin problems.

Another point raised by the Opposition was that the Federal Government's plans to cut down on the public sector would somehow encourage the private sector to expand. Although it may be good philosophy, and I am uncertain about that, in practice it does not happen. I point out to the Opposition that no greater authority in its view than Senator Cotton (Minister for Industry and Commerce) is scathingly critical about the private sector in an article published in the *Industry News* of August, 1976. The article states:

The Minister for Industry and Commerce, Senator R. C. Cotton, delivered a scathing attack on private enterprise in an address earlier this month to a group of Brisbane businessmen. In a speech titled "private enterprise under challenge", the Minister said the greatest demonstrations of confidence in the future are coming from companies from overseas who show confidence where Australian companies don't . . . This can be observed very easily by simply examining the appalling extent to which the average Australian, both employer and employee, expects the Government to come to his aid when the going gets tough.

So, the Federal Minister for Industry and Commerce is talking about the sacred cow that members opposite continually talk about—the private enterprise ethic. According to the Minister, whenever the going gets tough, these people run to the Government for assistance. I wonder



whether, in the group of individuals to which he referred, he includes some of our rural producers. No-one criticises rural producers for requesting assistance in times of need, and at present we have a time of need, but at other times rural producers should be encouraged to stand on their own two feet. However, members opposite, particularly members representing rural districts, who are most vocal in criticising the socialist system, expect the socialist system to fly to their aid. Evidently, according to those members, it is good for the rural industries to benefit from the system, but no-one else must benefit from it. The article also reports Senator Cotton as saying:

Let's make no mistake about it, even following the verdict of December 13, 1975, I believe the people of Australia still have not fully accepted private enterprise for ever as the preferred method of achieving results.

Of course, they have not. Increasingly the people of this country, as do people in other countries, will expect Governments to take a greater part in the management of the affairs of the country. There is a paranoia about the involvement of the public sector in our gross national product. The percentage of gross national product generated in the public sector in America and Canada, those bastions of private enterprise, is greater than it is in Australia. The drastic reduction in the public sector in Australia is having an equal effect on the private sector, because the public sector is a large consumer, and the private sector needs markets. If the markets provided by the public sector dry up to the extent that the Federal Government is drying them up, how can the Federal Government expect the private sector to expand?

This whole debate has degenerated into discussion about the Federal Budget. It is a shame that the debate has not been directed to the State Budget, which is a good one. Because I have been absent from the State for some time, I did not see the comic performance of the Leader of the Opposition when he went to Whyalla and promised the people there that he would do something about the shipbuilding industry. He said, "I will talk to my good friend Mal in Canberra. We will fix it up, and get a couple of ships built in Whyalla." Actually, his so-called friend in Canberra had hardly even heard of him, and Mr. Fraser rejected his request out of hand. The policies of the Federal Liberal Government and the State Liberal Opposition in relation to the Whyalla shipyard go hand in hand.

I compliment the State Government on its efforts to do something for the people in Whyalla, and I cannot understand, for the life of me, why the Federal Government is so determined to destroy an industry that is so vital to this country. The shipbuilding industry is not something that should succeed or fail on market demands; it is a service industry as is the transport industry. Why does not the shipbuilding industry receive the same level of support as does the railways or road transport? Until the Federal Government is willing to consider the shipbuilding industry in that light, people in Whyalla and Newcastle, and the country generally, are going to suffer accordingly. In times when unemployment is so high it seems strange that the Federal Government should rush hell-bent into a programme that will increase it, particularly at Whyalla which is an industrial and decentralised area, and an area which could provide a great future for South Australia and industry generally. However, the Federal Government seems to be absolutely callous in its attitude towards these people.

I have said all I wish to say at this stage in this debate. It had nothing to do with the State Budget, but I was

encouraged to broaden my comments because of members opposite. I hope that the level of debate for those honourable members who are determined to take up the time of this House before we get on to the lines is far better than those who preceded them, except for Government members who are notable for the excellence of their contribution.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I was interested in the closing remarks of the honourable member for Stuart and, following his return to sunny South Australia, I thought he might have told us where he had been. When the Minister at the table returned from—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: He would be out of order.

Mr. RODDA: —his trip overseas, he, irrespective of points of order, gave us a run-down on where he had been. To make a charitable remark from this side of the House, I enjoyed what the Minister had to say, and we did not take any points of order on the Minister. The honourable member spoilt his speech by speaking of the shipbuilding industry, because, like so many people in industry and indeed in South Australia, we are all guilty, in that we want to take out more than we put in. If we examine that interpretation of what goes on in South Australia now, that is the crux of many of our problems. Last evening the Government Whip, the former Minister for the Environment, challenged my colleague, the member for Millicent, to say that it was a good Budget.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: He wouldn't tell us.

Mr. RODDA: This Budget is like the curate's egg: it has good parts in it and it has bad parts in it. If I were to give it a name, I would call it a "hoodwinking Budget". The Treasurer in his statement gave us a foretaste of some history. He states:

We have to go back only a few years for a precedent. When pay-roll tax was transferred to the States it was levied at the rate of 2½ per cent. In a very short space of time we were obliged to raise this to 5 per cent to offset the effects of the inadequate rate of growth in Commonwealth assistance. Should a similar pattern emerge with income tax I find it very hard to believe that the Commonwealth Government would not seek to interfere with the freedom of the States to determine the level of their surcharges. We would then have a situation in which the States would have neither the assurance of a formula-based share of Commonwealth revenues nor the freedom to determine their own taxation levels.

Unfortunately, this has been an attitude of the Labor-governed States, an attitude of domination over the new federalism policy. It was the member for Light who pointed out that for too long we have seen the cap-in-hand haggling and arguing that has gone on at Premiers' Conferences. The new policy of tax sharing is something we are going to hear a lot about in this Parliament, whether it is long or short. If an election follows the new redistribution, changes in the personnel of this House will occur. The Treasurer put the sting in the tail of his comments in the Budget. He states:

Unless there is a change of direction by the Commonwealth Government, I suspect that, by 1979-80, the States will be receiving no more than they would have received under the Financial Assistance Grants formula agreed to at the Premiers' Conference of June, 1975.

He thereby asserts that there will not be co-operation with the new federalism policy. He continues:

Thereafter, this guaranteed level of support will disappear and the States will be dependent for much of their revenues on the ebb and flow of Commonwealth income tax policy. Any sustained move to reduce the relative importance of this tax in the overall fiscal scene will have adverse effects on State revenues and force the States to rely more and

more heavily on their own taxation powers and, in particular, on the income tax surcharge. This will bring them into direct conflict with the Commonwealth Government and set the scene for Commonwealth intervention in the area of State taxation policy.

That is the hub of the fear that the Treasurer is putting into the people of this State. In his concluding paragraph, he states:

From time to time during our discussions with the Prime Minister, the Premiers have been assured that the longer term trends in regard to such matters as changes in the relative importance of personal income tax *vis-a-vis* other taxes will be kept under notice and that there will be a review of the new arrangements when there are changes in Commonwealth tax legislation, which have significant effects on the States' entitlements. It is also a condition of the arrangements that a review of the whole scheme will be made at some time before the end of 1980-81. If the dangers to which I have referred are to be avoided, it seems that the States will have to work hard over the next few years to convince the Commonwealth of the shortcomings of the new arrangements. To date they have had little success in this regard.

Those comments are pointing to the direction of the Treasurer's fears and philosophy to the federalism policy. As I stated a moment ago, the Budget, like the curate's egg, is good in parts and bad in others. The Government proposed coming up with a balanced Budget embracing \$1 171 000 000 in estimated receipts. The list of estimated receipts contains some interesting figures from interesting sources. Taxation receipts will be lower. Last year the estimated receipts from taxation were \$275 483 000. Owing to inflation (and perhaps there was over-estimating of the yield in some areas), the Government collected from the people of South Australia \$281 265 578 in this way. This year, the estimated receipts will be about \$271 457 000, a decrease of \$10 000 000, which is very good; it is ear-tickling to the good people of South Australia. The member for Whyalla got quickly into his stride last year, beat his breast and said, "Look what good boys we are!" He was like the fellow who pulled out a plum.

Under "Part II—Public Works and Services and Other Receipts", we see that the estimated receipts this year are \$417 516 000, and last year the actual receipts were \$363 770 755, which was well over the estimate. This year, the \$417 000 000 is an increase of \$54 000 000 on last year's actual receipts. Under "Part III—Territorial" the increase will be about \$150 000, at \$3 819 000. As regards "Part IV—Commonwealth", this is significant and, despite what we have just heard the member for Stuart say when berating the Federal Government, there is an increase of about \$100 000 000 in estimated receipts for 1976-77 compared with actual receipts for 1975-76.

Mr. Max Brown: It will improve, now that they have got rid of Killen and McLeay.

Mr. RODDA: Prognosticating music is never very yielding in practice. We shall receive from the Commonwealth this year \$478 208 000, whereas last year actual receipts were \$388 286 910, so there is about \$100 000 000 increase in receipts. On the receipts side, there is a drop in tax of \$10 000 000, and it will drop in areas that will benefit the State. I commend the Treasurer for that—that is the way to do it—but there are some stings in the tail. There is no such thing as a free lunch. The member for Millicent made that point last evening, and the member for Playford, in a well constructed speech the other night, said there was no such thing as a free lunch.

I turn again to the Treasurer's statement and those areas of tax cuts and land tax cuts. The Treasurer states:

While the recent actions of the Commonwealth Government have not allowed us to go as far as we would have liked, I am pleased to say that, by careful planning and a

firm control of expenditures, the Government believes it can offer some relief to the South Australian taxpayer and still achieve a balanced Budget in 1976-77.

That is what he set out to do; I have just recited the accounts. In relation to succession duties, certain reductions have been announced in relation to successions from spouse to spouse. The cost in a full year is expected to be between \$4 000 000 and \$5 000 000. The Auditor-General's Report states that succession duties yielded to the State last year about \$19 000 000.

This is an area of vexed taxation. I am sure everyone is grateful for the reductions announced. I commend the Government for that; it is good policy, and it is our policy. We appreciate that the Government has seen fit to make the reduction, although the reasons are known best to the Cabinet and the Government. With hindsight, members on this side find it rather strange, remembering the statements the Treasurer made about the matter when it was put forward as our policy. Nevertheless, it is good policy and it will be for the good of the people. It is especially good in some areas because, in these days of road accidents, it is not uncommon for the breadwinner to die early in life, and in such a case the widow does not now have to face an unwelcome account at what is a difficult time.

The revenue from succession duties last year was \$19 000 000, and that figure is expected to fall this year to \$4 000 000, so the Government will still get a good return. With inflation and increased valuations, the Treasury revenue probably will not fall to that extent. In the district I represent, some areas have been hard hit by land tax; as a result of the development of the wine industry, we have seen high values and high land sales. I have in mind the case of a Penola family. The breadwinner died about three years ago, and the family paid about \$250 000 on quite an extensive property. It took all their surplus cash to meet such a high bill. Beef cattle and sheep were run on the property, and it was caught up in the high inflationary spiral because of the ribbons of *terra rossa* soils in the property. The family has received bills for \$6 000, and the final one is \$8 500; that was the straw that broke the camel's back. Unfortunately, it has been necessary to conclude a sale which has broken up the property, and the family must make other arrangements.

In this case, the reductions have come a little too late. Nevertheless, I am grateful that the Government has been able to recognise that this tax was an imposition that was bad for the prosperity of the State. Capital is so necessary for expansion and must be ploughed back to keep the industry going. The Treasurer has made some welcome noises about pay-roll tax. I know of family industries where the entrepreneur has had to forgo his monthly salary because of the imposition of pay-roll tax. This has been a hard-hitting tax for small business. Senator Messner has made much of the effects of this tax on small business. The decision to introduce 15 per cent indexation is most welcome. Naracoorte meatworks has been battling hard to start up again in my district, and pay-roll tax has been one of the things militating against this. I am pleased to see an incentive being introduced to encourage industry.

Stamp duty reductions on modest transactions will cost the State about \$3 000 000. These concessions, however, will be offset to some extent by increases in motor vehicle registration, which amounted to \$32 100 000 last year and which, with a 38 per cent increase, will amount to \$45 000 000. I acknowledge, of course, that this includes fees for three-year drivers' licences, but I do not imagine that that will amount to much of the \$45 000 000. Increased harbor dues amounting to nearly \$2 500 000 must be passed on and will be inflationary.

Water charges will increase by 2c a kilolitre and will have an impact throughout the State. People will be facing excess water bills sooner than they expect. Recently the Minister of Works issued a friendly warning for people to watch their water use, or they may get a bill for excess water. Electricity charges will increase by 12½ per cent—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you agree that the Electricity Trust should cover its costs?

Mr. RODDA: Not necessarily, because it is a service—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The taxpayer should subsidise it?

Mr. RODDA: It is a service to the people. The Minister has much expertise in economic matters, but I am merely a simple farmer, so who am I to argue with him? So often experts are wrong in practice (and I do not say this applies to the Minister), and some are going to get back into the academic field. We do not have a run-down on what South Australian Housing Trust operations will yield but I believe there are anomalies in basing accommodation charges on earnings. Some trust tenants in flats have told me that they have been informed by trust officers that they must on no account discuss rents with their neighbours. I suppose it is a matter of achieving peace at any price, but it takes bureaucracy too far. Some trust tenants are fairly unhappy about this, although I am not knocking the trust, because it has done a good job, especially in the Naracoorte district, for which I am grateful. Perhaps I owe an apology to an honourable member for what I said last evening, when we were chiding him about the increases. I checked this morning and found that rents in Mount Gambier have been increased by \$3, a modest amount. We will check further, but it was reported that rents in Mount Gambier, Nangwarry and Mount Burr would not be increased, and we became suspicious.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: If it was reported correctly, it would be that in Nangwarry, Mount Burr, and Millicent, where the houses used to be Woods and Forests Department houses, they are subject to separate review.

Mr. RODDA: They should not be increased, anyway.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It depends on whether they have been upgraded and when the work was done.

Mr. RODDA: Unfortunately, the broadcast report I heard concerning Mount Gambier left me with the wrong impression, and I correct now the impression that I may have left last evening in regard to the member for Whyalla. In regard to taxation, it is interesting that South Australia is not alone. Tasmania has abolished rural land tax and given comparable concessions in succession duties. That State has eliminated the entertainment tax and has made a 10 per cent reduction in electricity charges, so the Government there does not agree with the Minister who chided me on the matter of increasing electricity charges.

It is interesting that the taxation areas follow a similar pattern. That doyen of Labor leaders, Gough Whitlam, was reported in the *Advertiser* on September 7 as saying that, if he got back into power, he would pick up where he left off. That sent a cold shiver up everyone's back. He said he accepted that the onset of unemployment in mid-1974 had caught his Government by surprise. That amazes me and people of my philosophy, because there were plenty of straws in the wind and perhaps the former Prime Minister was not on the ball in the assessments that he should have been making, as the Leader of this country. He said that the Regional Employment Development scheme and the *ad hoc* grants to places like the Electrolytic Zinc organisation at Risdon, in Tasmania, and Australian

Pulp and Paper Mills Limited at Burnie were far too limited.

He acknowledged that some things done by his Government did not go far enough. He vigorously defended his 25 per cent across-the-board tariff cut, and he kept away from mentioning the strong line that he took against investment in this country. We know the tragic effect that Mr. Whitlam's term of office had on the economy of this country, and the impact is felt in this Budget. Those of us who are present next year when the next Budget is debated will find that, irrespective of which Party is on the Treasury benches, more will have been yielded from this year's Budget than is at present thought.

I am sure that the member for Stuart, having just returned to this country, will agree that it is a fine country in which to live and that it has enormous potential. I am pleased that there are, among the supporters of the philosophy to which the Government subscribes, people who are taking a responsible line. These people are having difficulty with some of their colleagues, not in this Parliament but in certain areas of industry, but some people seem to be taking stock in a practical way.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. RODDA: That can happen in all circles: after a reshuffle, those involved get on with the job. It was a woman who got up on a truck at the Chrysler Australia Limited premises a few months ago and urged that a little more work and a little less talk would not go amiss. That sort of thing would get this country moving. We would be able to pay the 12½ per cent increase that the Minister now wants us to pay for our electricity, as well as the increased Housing Trust rents. It is not what one has to pay but what one has to pay it with that counts. None of us should shrink from paying taxes in a great country like Australia. Much more could be said about this Bill, and it will be said when the lines are being debated. The Bill has some good and some bad parts. However, I support the first line.

Mr. BECKER: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House. I think members should be present.

*A quorum having been formed:*

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I am delighted that the Minister of Mines and Energy is present to hear my speech. Perhaps the Treasurer would show the courtesy to stay here as well. The Government philosophy in this State Budget is simple: "Collect more taxes and spend the money, irrespective of the need for or effects of those additional taxes on the community." The Treasurer tried to create the impression that major tax deductions have been granted to the people of South Australia, but a close examination of the facts reveals just the opposite. As an example, I will take the four major areas of taxation in which the Treasurer has promised concessions. Land tax, the first such area, is an iniquitous, unjust form of taxation that is based on the hypothetical value of the land involved. No service whatsoever is received for this tax, which has caused the greatest hardship for those retired persons who are now living on fixed incomes. The Treasurer in his Budget speech made the following claim:

The Government has decided to give substantial concessions in land tax rates and exemptions.

Rural land tax was abolished, and some concessions were given for land valued at \$150 000 or more. However, that land is land on which there are major industrial complexes or retail stores; it is not land on which there are residential houses. The Treasurer in granting those concessions was not being really honest to the people of Adelaide. However,

the total revenue collected from land tax this year will be only marginally reduced from the amount collected last year. In 1975-76, \$19 800 000 was collected, whereas in 1976-77 the Government hopes to collect \$18 600 000. Such a small decrease of just over \$1 000 000 cannot honestly be referred to as "substantial concessions".

Even more important is the increased land tax burden that will be forced on residents in urban areas, particularly in Adelaide, whose taxes will be substantially increased to compensate for the loss of rural land tax and the reduction in tax from large commercial properties. Land tax on urban residential properties will increase by between 15 per cent and 25 per cent, or more, caused by an automatic increase in land valuations already approved by the Government.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You've got it wrong.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister says that that is not so. The Government has formally announced that land values have increased by 15 per cent so, automatically, if that is the case, land tax must increase by 15 per cent or more, because the rate in the dollar for land tax is an escalating rate. The Minister knows that, as land values increase, so the rate in the dollar increases.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: If you pay 5c in the dollar and—

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If the Minister wishes to speak in this debate (and I doubt whether he has the nerve to) and is sincere in interjecting, he will get up and speak. However, I challenge him to do so, and I guarantee that he will not accept the challenge.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: My concern is that, by making so many misstatements of fact, the honourable member is being unduly provocative and causing me to interject, thus contravening Standing Orders, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to tell him to cease provoking me.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I find it amazing that the Minister openly admits that he has no self-restraint, that he cannot sit in his seat and restrain himself.

The SPEAKER: Order! That remark is beyond the terms of discussion.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am referring to the Minister's point of order. It was in fact—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Davenport. I have ruled on the point of order, and the honourable member must confine his remarks to the debate on the Bill.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I return to the subject of land tax and say that I thank the Government for adopting that portion of the Liberal Party's policy on the abolition of rural land tax. The second major taxation area where concessions were offered was with stamp duty. In his Budget speech the Treasurer admitted that the stamp duty rates in South Australia were currently more severe than in the other States, and I suspect that that is putting it mildly. He promised "to reduce the rates of stamp duty now levied" and to provide "some modest concessions in this area".

However, the facts show that the Treasurer expects to collect an extra \$9 000 000 this year from stamp duty (\$65 000 000 in 1975-76 and \$74 000 000 in 1976-77). Again, the facts show that the concessions promised by the Treasurer are both hollow and dishonest. What the

Treasurer did not announce was that stamp duty will increase because of escalations in prices and valuations.

The third major taxation area is succession duties. The Treasurer implied major reductions in this tax revenue by offering to abolish succession duties between spouses. Again, he adopted only portion of the Liberal Party's policy in this area. The facts show that the revenue from succession duties this year will increase by \$400 000 to \$19 400 000. The fourth major area of taxation where reductions were announced was pay-roll tax, which has had such a devastating effect on industry; it discourages employers from employing more people. The Treasurer stated in his Budget speech that "exemption levels should be increased to take account of rising wage levels". The natural inference from that statement is that total revenue collected from pay-roll tax this year will be no greater than that for last year, because the Treasurer is taking account of increases in salaries. Again, the facts show the Treasurer's promises to be quite false. Actually, revenue from pay-roll tax will increase this year by \$16 500 000, representing an increase of 14 per cent. The revenue will increase from \$119 500 000 for 1975-76 to \$136 000 000 for 1976-77. From these four major areas of taxation (succession duties, land tax, stamp duties, and pay-roll tax) the Government will collect \$24 500 000 more this year than it collected last year, despite all the Treasurer's claims that major concessions have been granted. Total State tax revenue will be increased by \$35 000 000, representing 13 per cent.

The evidence presented from these Budget papers is contrary to what the Treasurer has tried to indicate to the public. The Treasurer's claims of major tax concessions and moderation of Government expenditure are obviously a well spun web of deceit and misrepresentation. The Treasurer has tried to fool the people because, I understand, an election is likely to be held. He is deliberately trying to create an impression that he is giving major tax concessions, but in the four areas where he has announced concessions he is really getting an increase in revenue. His total taxation is increasing by a staggering 13 per cent.

To get the true picture of what the Labor Government has cost South Australia, one needs to review the situation since 1971, when a Labor Government came to power. I shall quote some figures showing the increases in taxation that have occurred since then, taking 1970-71 as the base, at 100 per cent. In connection with revenue collected from licence fees, registration fees, and transport licences, \$15 600 000 was collected in 1970-71, while it is estimated that this year \$45 000 000 will be collected, an increase of 183 per cent. In connection with land tax, \$7 500 000 was collected in 1970-71, while it is estimated that this year \$18 600 000 will be collected, an increase of 146 per cent. In connection with stamp duties, \$20 500 000 was collected in 1970-71, while it is estimated that this year \$73 700 000 will be collected, an increase of 258 per cent. Obviously, the concessions offered in this area by the Treasurer are insignificant and insufficient, considering the savage increase of 258 per cent that has occurred since 1970-71. The amount collected for succession duties in 1970-71 was \$9 000 000, and it is expected that \$19 500 000 will be collected this year, an increase of 116 per cent. For gift tax, the amount collected in 1970-71 was \$733 000, and it is expected that \$1 500 000 will be collected this year, an increase of 105 per cent.

I turn now to pay-roll tax, the major area of State taxation. I cannot quote the figure for 1970-71, because in that year the tax was collected by the Federal Government. The first year in which it was collected by the State Government was 1971-72, when \$23 400 000 was collected.

The figure to be collected this year is \$136 000 000, an increase, in a much shorter period, of 480 per cent. One is able to see why pay-roll tax has had such a devastating effect on employment opportunities: it has become a tax to discourage people from employing more persons. The next major tax is the liquor tax. In 1970-71, the amount collected was \$3 200 000, and it is expected that \$8 600 000 will be collected this year, an increase of 164 per cent.

The amount collected for racing tax in 1970-71 was \$1 000 000, and it is expected that about \$3 000 000 will be collected this year, an increase of 200 per cent. Finally, taxation from other areas has increased from \$419 000 to \$2 600 000, an increase of 522 per cent. The total collected in 1970-71 was \$58 700 000, and it is expected that this year, from the same people and only six years later, \$316 000 000 will be collected. That is a figure of which any Government should be ashamed, and that is why in this State we have had a cost escalation far greater than has occurred in any other State for the last eight quarters. That is why the consumer price index in South Australia has been higher in the past 2½ years than it has been in any other State. That is why food costs have escalated in this State, and is one major reason why, in the past 12 months, the number of persons employed in the manufacturing industry in South Australia has declined by 2.5 per cent. That decline of 2.5 per cent is the greatest decline in the manufacturing workforce of any State.

It is obvious from those figures that South Australia has reached its pinnacle of industrial development. It has turned the corner and is on the decline, whereas every other State has a growing manufacturing workforce. This State has lost the momentum of the industrial development of the Playford era. The Government has ridden on it for the past five years: that is now lost, and it has slid underneath the Government. This State, unfortunately, faces a grim future for our employment opportunities and our industrial development. The facts as they stand are obvious. The Treasurer has tried to create the impression that he has granted major concessions in some taxation areas, but when one examines the facts, one will realise that he will collect from those four main areas an extra \$24 500 000 this year. In addition, he will collect, overall, an additional \$35 000 000 this year, an increase of 13 per cent.

We will discuss in greater detail how that money is to be spent as we go through the lines. Although I believe that the State Budget is not an important financial fiscal tool, it can contribute towards maintaining a balanced economy. It is important, however, in its effect on industry and on price escalations. That is the area on which I have deliberately concentrated, because that is where this State Government has failed miserably.

This Budget is a balanced one, but do not be fooled by that. It is an inflationary Budget and one which will directly contribute further to greater cost increases in South Australia and further disadvantage to the people of this State compared to the people in other States, particularly the Eastern States.

Mr. OLSON (Semaphore): If ever the present Federal Government has sown the seeds of panic over its present policy and performance, it has done so during the debate on this Bill. From the performance of honourable members opposite, it is patently plain that they have referred not to matters in the Budget affecting this State but to a stereotyped document in defence of their colleagues in the Federal sphere. It is plain to see that the sole purpose

of members opposite is to come to the rescue of the Prime Minister by trying to prop up his actions and his mismanagement of this country. The Prime Minister is a man who has broken practically every election promise he made: he is a man who considered that through divine right he had the method to cure all ills.

What do we find? Nothing has been cured. Inflation is still running at about 15 per cent. Unemployment has increased to 460 000, which represents 5 per cent of the work force. The greatest health scheme this country has ever had, Medibank, is currently in a shambles and we have the greatest discontent among voters that has ever existed in Australia. Matters have been discussed in recent weeks in relation to inflation. Members will recall that one present Federal Government member said that if inflation were cured the rest of the ills of this country would automatically be cured. I refer to a quotation in the *Herald* of Wednesday, August 25, 1976, headed "Jobs No. 1 Worry—not Inflation", as follows:

Last week's Federal Budget relies on faith in an idea promoted by the Government "with the supreme confidence of the religious fanatic", investment analyst Mr. Austin Donnelly said today. This was "the view that inflation is the root of all evil and that, when inflation is overcome, all other problems disappear", he said.

Later in the article it states:

Mr. Donnelly, Managing director of Capital Services Limited—  
I do not think one could say that that man would be a Labor man—

was addressing a Brisbane meeting of the Australian Institute of Management. He said even if inflation was cut substantially consumer spending would not rise significantly until unemployment was definitely falling. But, apart from some employment in mining development following the tax concessions for mining companies, the Budget did nothing to relieve unemployment.

It is clear that until people can be given some confidence that their employment will continue they will not be going out (as the Prime Minister suggests they should do) to spend what savings they have with a view to getting the economy working. We find at present that we have reached not a state of inflation but a state of stagflation, where it is possible, if someone has a couple of dollars in his hand, to buy any item nowadays. There is no scarcity of products, which shows there are no worries about a shortage of supply but, rather, there is a shortage of confidence in the community about purchasing the articles available.

Although members opposite say that everything in the garden is rosy, we have only to look at an article in today's *Advertiser* to assess the degree of discontent within the present Federal Government. That article states:

The Federal Government faced a new back-bench revolt yesterday over unemployment. In a heated Party room discussion, the Cabinet was warned that the Government could lose the next election unless action was taken. The Prime Minister (Mr. Fraser) retaliated by reprimanding back-bench Liberals over "leaks" and criticism of Government policies. But later it was revealed that the Cabinet will today consider new measures aimed at reducing unemployment among young people.

The sort of thing that is being peddled at present is that everybody is happy with the way in which the Federal Government is conducting its business and that we have no worries, yet the job situation has not been worse for a period of over 30 years. We hear:

Only under a Liberal Government will jobs be available for all who want to work.

At the present time, 420 000 people, representing 5 per cent of the work force, are unemployed. The Government has no policy in dealing with unemployment. As a matter of fact, it is encouraging unemployment. It is content to

let unemployment get worse so that employees can be made to toe the line. The cuts in Government expenditure, which are forcing up unemployment, as the Premiers testify (and that is, indeed, the purpose), have nothing to do with inflation. We hear much talk in this Chamber from time to time about industrial disputes, and we are told how many man-hours are lost as a result, but we do not hear anything of the number of man-hours lost because 450 000 people are out of work, and those people could be used to promote better living standards for the people of this community. It is a lot of hogwash to come in here and say that too much is being paid for workmen's compensation when, at the same time, we have a work force of 450 000 people who could be upgrading the standards of industry generally by improved mechanisation and safety standards in factories, and overcoming some of these positions by being able to increase productivity without the inflationary rate that members opposite seem to think this situation is contributing to.

The Fraser freeze will be much easier to impose if men fear for their jobs. We have heard in this Chamber many times before today from members opposite that the only way to control the workers is to starve them, and we have to repeat that time and again, because I have indicated before today that the ideas of some members opposite are still the same as they were years and years ago.

Mr. Harrison: In the depression, from 1926 onwards.

Mr. OLSON: That is so. That is the theme song of the member for Alexandra, but he wants to set it to different music. I am concerned about a statement made in this House last evening by the member for Heysen when he was applauding the Federal Government for its action in helping young people to buy homes by saving over a three-year period. From memory, I think they are required to save \$2 000 a year for three years in order to be eligible for this home savings grant. Unfortunately, many people are not aware that the saving must be done through the recognised banking system. If a couple operated a cheque account at the Commonwealth bank, they would not be eligible for the grant; if they contributed to a building society, I understand they would not be eligible for the grant. It is a rather poor situation if the Federal Government is not prepared to come out in the open and to explain adequately to the community the methods by which people are eligible for such grants.

Praise was also given to the upgrading of child endowment. I know, and I say without equivocation, that the present method of paying child endowment is causing more domestic problems than are any other six things put together. Repeatedly, women come to my electorate office complaining about the new system. Because child endowment has increased, taxation allowances have decreased, and husbands are systematically taking out of the pay packet an amount equal to that being paid for child endowment. Instead of the women being better off, they are now finding themselves in a worse situation. Less money is circulating in the community, because many people are having child endowment paid into bank accounts on a quarterly basis and, rather than withdraw the money at the end of the quarter to spend it in the way in which it was designed, to further the interests of the children, they are leaving the money in the bank because they are not sure what the future holds, so it is being kept there as a reserve.

The member for Davenport said this afternoon that the percentage of unemployment was now lower than ever it had been. The Bureau of Statistics conducted a survey

last May, and issued the results in August, showing that an unemployed person is taking, on average, four months to find a job. The average time taken in 1974 was only seven weeks, yet people opposite claim that the state of the economy, the unemployment position and everything else that goes with it are improving. Perhaps the claim being made that the Federal Government is four square illustrates clearly that it is not only dishonest but that it is also incompetent and disunited. If anyone in the community was to conduct his business or perform in a manner similar to that of the Prime Minister, he would resign from his position rather than continue to cause embarrassment, which is what the Prime Minister is doing. The actions of the Federal Government are creating so much dissatisfaction in the community that what members opposite proclaim they are here to defend—democracy—is being set back seriously and it could be defeated entirely by another form of government taking its place.

The way in which the Federal Government is performing is to stifle anything it does not wish people to contribute to or show an interest in. That is a fascist type of situation out of which a different system could arise. Although members opposite preach that they do not want any part of communism, they are, by their actions fostering that philosophy even more. The Treasurer of this State should not only be congratulated on this Budget but he should also be paid the highest commendation for the way in which he is considering all sections of the community in South Australia. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I have little to say about the Budget. I fail to see why it is necessary for members on either side, who have no real contribution to make, to while away the time of the House just to use up the time they are expected to take. I was amazed to hear the member for Semaphore say that many women have complained to him about the new method of child endowment payments, whereas no-one has complained to me about it. My own conviction is that it is an excellent method of giving to the responsible person in a household (who is so often the woman of the household) additional cash to spend on her family. Wives are not necessarily always the responsible person, but invariably they assume the greater responsibility and make most of the major decisions relating to the welfare of their family.

It is my experience that the present endowment method that was introduced by the Liberal and National Country Party Government recently is a splendid scheme. For the husband to penalise his wife by taking from the pay packet an equal amount to what she may be receiving now for additional cash for himself would be selfish and probably would indicate that the husband selfishly wanted to spend on himself much more money than he ought to be spending. Many habits that men have in spending much of the family budget are personal and selfish. It benefits no-one but themselves.

I suppose a man may say that he earns the money, so surely he has the privilege of having the first share, but a broader and wider attitude to family life should be taken, namely, that the breadwinner in the house has a responsibility to think about the shares of all of his family. That is more important than his personal share. I totally disagree with the member for Semaphore regarding child endowment, and the information that comes through my office shows that it is a distinct advantage and a wonderful thing for most houses where the wives make decisions about the family.

That honourable member also stated that Medibank was in a shambles. We will look back on Medibank 12 months hence and see that it was a splendid innovation, because it has given the people an option regarding medical cover. True, there is confusion now about schemes, things available, things that can be tacked on, and things to which a person can contribute but does not have to, and much literature has been distributed giving many and varied aspects of the total scheme. There are differences of a few cents here and there among the private groups and as between Medibank and schemes in that group.

I suppose we would say that, in regard to the motor car, a similar thing is ideal. We can have four on the floor, an automatic car, a standard car, a car with a large motor, a car with a middle-size motor, one with a motor that is less powerful than the others, and so many other options that I consider have made motoring more expensive than it should be. In future, we will have to have a reduction regarding models, parts and all the other things that make motoring so expensive.

When the confusion dies away about the number of options regarding Medibank, it will compete soundly with the private schemes. I would be pleased to see the day when the private scheme profits dry up, if those people who are conducting the schemes are ploughing profits of previous days back into giving better cover because they are reducing it on the basis that they have private funds, and the sooner those funds dry up because they are giving a cheaper scheme, the better. Then the operations will become entirely competitive and we will be able to see whether Medibank can compete with the private schemes, and whether those schemes can compete with Medibank. True, the whole thing is a little confusing because of the alternatives, although I believe that the basic principle is there, that it is sound, and that the Australian people will, in the long term, grow to appreciate it.

With my limited experience of economics (and I make no claim to have expertise in the economics field), and as an average layman, I know that certain basic things will come out of the Budget that will affect one. Representing a primary production area, I think it is probably more obvious that some of the important changes that are to be made will affect my area and other honourable members' areas.

The whole attack in this Budget debate has been rather interesting. The first few Government speakers rushed in heavily to condemn the Federal Government on what it did in its Budget. Then, we found the next few Opposition members rushing in rather heavily to defend the Federal Budget, which I believe has probably been used more in this debate than I have heard other Federal Budgets used in State Government Budget debates in the last nine years. It is my conviction that, because the Federal Government came out with such a sensible, soundly-based Budget, the State automatically had to follow—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Do you really believe that?

Mr. WARDLE: I most certainly do. The State Government had to follow suit because of this. I say now that I believe the Budget that the Treasurer has introduced is a sound, sensible, balanced Budget. It may be said that the State Premiers have no option. I think I would be prepared to go along with that, and to say that they had no option but to face up to the cold hard facts as they exist in this country at present. They had no option but to face up to the fact that all of them could expect less from Federal funds than they have received in previous years and that some of them will have to prune some of their public

works with which they would have liked to proceed had they had the money.

It seems to me that the matter of a Budget is closely likened to the management of one's own affairs, although a Government Budget is on a much bigger scale. The average member of Parliament receives a basic salary of \$18 500. That basically is his income from his Parliamentary duties. The State's income is about \$1 170 000 000, and the Government must balance its Budget in the same way as any member of the community, however small his income, must balance his budget.

Mr. Vandepuer: The same principles apply.

Mr. WARDLE: That is so. The quantities of money being handled are so totally different, yet the basic principles involved are so identical. Therefore, it is necessary for the State Government, if and when it is to receive less from the Commonwealth Government, to adjust its finances. I must confess that Government members have given us many statistics regarding the reduction in finance of so many Government departments. However, I question many of the statements that have been made. I am sure that the blackest possible picture has been painted by many Government speakers.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is so much audible conversation that it is difficult to hear the honourable member.

Mr. WARDLE: I repeat that the Budget is a reasonably sound and balanced one. I know that some people have said (the member for Davenport, in particular, in his contribution earlier this afternoon) that the Treasurer will gain in the total amount of taxation. It would appear from the Treasurer's statement that several concessions are to be given in the Budget, and I will come to some of them later. First, the Treasurer said:

We all know that the Commonwealth Government is strenuously pursuing a policy of reduced public spending both in its own area and that of the States. I have said several times, both publicly and to the Prime Minister himself, that I believe this policy can only increase unemployment beyond the already high and unacceptable level, reduce consumer confidence, discourage private investment and generally lead to an overall economic decline.

I think it is worth going back about 18 months or two years before examining the statement the Treasurer says he made to the Prime Minister and publicly. I think it would be much fairer if the Treasurer had said that he realised that unemployment was increasing rapidly under the Federal Government we had prior to December, 1975, that there was already a lack of confidence in the community, that consumer confidence had already gone to a large degree, that private investment had almost dried up and that, generally speaking, the economic situation was declining rapidly. The Treasurer did not really have to wait until we had a new Prime Minister in order to tell him these things. The Treasurer would have had to say that, on the basis of the previous Labor Administration.

Many Government members, when speaking in this debate, tried to create the impression that these conditions had come into the Commonwealth and into society only since we have had a Liberal-National Party Government from December, 1975. The present plight of the building industry and many other industries has little to do with the administration of the Liberal-National Party Government but has everything to do with the three years of Labor Administration in Canberra from 1972 to 1975. In other words, the situation there had so deteriorated and confidence had so decreased that it was a matter of beginning again from the ground up in order to produce a viable economy throughout the Commonwealth.

Representing a rural area as I do, succession duties become a keen issue. Many people will be pleased to see in the Budget that the Treasurer has made adjustments commencing on July 1, 1976, as regards property passing to a surviving spouse. When a spouse dies, business, domestic, and emotional adjustments have to be made, amounting to a traumatic experience. In the past, when the problem of succession duties has had to be faced, the economic viability of the family unit has sometimes been put at risk. I can recall a couple of instances where it has been necessary to dispose of valuable parts of family properties, to enable a surviving spouse to meet succession duties.

The land tax concessions that the Treasurer has granted will provide distinct relief to people experiencing problems in this connection in the Nairne area, in the western portion of my district. I hope that in due course land tax will be eliminated altogether. The pay-roll tax concessions will certainly assist small industries, which are basic to our commercial life; these concessions will enthuse the businessmen involved.

In South Australia, we have not provided incentives to industry to any great degree, but they are widely provided in many parts of the world. Probably in Europe, and to some degree in Great Britain and America, there is a wide range of things that are done to attract industry. First, industries can be offered the possibility of renting land at a peppercorn rental. Also, assistance can be given in connection with the leasing of factory buildings in multiple units of 5 000 sq. ft., where one or more units can be leased. Cash grants can be made to employers; in one case I can recall in the Netherlands a grant was made of up to \$3 000 for each employee, provided that employee came into a new town, took up residence there, and worked in a factory in that town for at least three months. Removal expenses for workers in new areas provide an incentive that some employers have used.

I am delighted that the Treasurer has expressed his sympathy for those rural people who are experiencing the worst drought conditions faced by this State since the keeping of records began in 1913. The Budget is a very sound document. As I believe it gives, generally speaking, priority to those areas of development that need it most, I have pleasure in supporting it.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I support this Bill, which relates to the State Budget. I think it is normal practice for this Bill to be supported by the Opposition, and generally the opportunity is taken by Opposition members to comment on various aspects of it, and particularly Government policies and philosophies year by year.

This Budget is one of subtle vote-buying by the Government. The Government's actions over the last month and the number of increased charges introduced into the State (and perhaps, more seriously, the amount of legislation currently being introduced to provide for government by regulation) have enabled the Government to raise its revenues without directly making the announcements in the Budget explanation. Consequently, this document and the announcements ensuing from it relate to hand-outs and tax concessions, and are generally a buttering up of the electorate to create a "good guy" image.

One of the obvious implications of the Budget is political, and I am somewhat surprised that more has not been made of this political aspect of the Budget, when we have experienced politicians on both sides of the House who could take up this matter. This has been an oversight. Although

it has been mentioned briefly, nevertheless, in my opinion, it is the most important aspect of the debate.

Mr. Goldsworthy: We gave it a bit of a shake, Peter.

Mr. BLACKER: I acknowledge that nearly every member has mentioned that aspect, but I think this is the criterion of and the key to the debate. There is no getting around it, because the Treasurer is obviously trying to manoeuvre himself into a position where he can have an election. In previous State elections, the Treasurer has had a political issue—a conflict either between the two Houses or between political Parties, or over a particular project—but this no longer applies. At present, the Government does not have a major issue or something on which it can go to the people and say, "This is important to the State; we must have it." Therefore, to gain electoral support, the Treasurer must create a "good guy" image and say, "We are the right people; we are doing a good job; we have created certain concessions for the people." In this way, he can make the Government more acceptable.

This is a vote-buying Budget; it is an election gimmick, designed around the public purse, and therefore it is to be soundly condemned. These expenditures and other similar purely political ploys in various electorates indicate to us, anyway, that an election is imminent. When we add this impressive array of political vote-buying via the Budget and the other significant factor, the electoral redistribution, we must surely accept the fact that an election is imminent. Regarding the current activities of the political Parties, my own National Country Party has accepted the challenge that an election is imminent, and is gearing itself accordingly.

I believe that the press publicity on the day following the introduction of the Budget was significant. Most of the political reporters grasped the nettle of the imminence of an election. A significant quotation from the *Advertiser* is as follows:

It is not often that a State Budget makes concessions in four areas of taxation while imposing no new burdens. The easing of succession duties and land tax had been previously announced and yesterday Mr. Dunstan confirmed that there would be new exemptions from pay-roll tax and announced a lowering of stamp duty on conveyances.

Although this statement has been widely circulated through the State, I do not accept that the Budget was an announcement of concessions while at the same time it did not impose new burdens. True, they were not new burdens; they were two or three months old, and had been announced previously. Consequently, they were in the pipeline in the financial arrangements of the State. The *Australian*, on the following day, made similar comments in its editorial, as follows:

The implications of the Dunstan Budget handed down to the South Australian House of Assembly on Tuesday are really far more related to the Premier's election preparations than to principles of either conservative or progressive fiscal policy. In fact, it is a Budget that holds the line, keeps a low profile, goes out of its way to offend as few citizens as possible and, if there is no cake on the table, at least it leaves it cleared for an election.

Later, the same editorial states:

With redistribution appeals making a February election prediction possible—and all other matters remaining equal including the health of Government members in the knife-edged Lower House. . . .

There is a clearly emerging picture that this election is around the corner. The editorial continues:

Succession duties in matrimonial situations, land tax in rural areas, pay-roll tax for manufacturers and stamp duty reductions for land and house purchasers and small businesses are now all in the package of reductions.

That is a further buttering up, a further softening up to create the "good guy", good Government image. One



wonders, on looking at the Budget, whether it comes from a Labor Government; it would appear to come from a more conservative type of Government, one looking for the sympathy of the electorate and for the means of attracting votes when some political issue is not to hand.

The Government has announced that it will abolish rural land tax. I believe that what I will say applies not so much to rural land tax as to land tax in general. The land of a primary producer is his working asset, a part of his assets required to produce an income. In many cases, for a farmer the land value would amount to about 75 per cent or 80 per cent of the capital value of his income-earning capacity. In that way, the tax represents taxation on 75 per cent to 80 per cent of his income-earning capital. Applying the same land tax factor to a metropolitan enterprise, such as industry or a shop, the capital value of the land in that situation is about 10 per cent of the working capital. Thus, we have a parallel: in the country area the taxed part of the working asset represents 75 per cent of that asset, whereas in the metropolitan area 10 per cent of the working asset is taxed in the same manner.

I acknowledge that people in rural areas who were burdened with heavy and, in some cases, disastrous rural land tax have been relieved of that burden. I commend the Government for its action, and it is fair to say that about 3 800 people are involved. From the rural viewpoint, I do not know that this will win the Government many votes, but another real aspect must be considered. Metropolitan people's sympathy was drifting towards the man on the land because they were starting to believe that he was getting a raw deal. The Treasurer can now say that his Government has helped the man on the land by removing rural land tax. Metropolitan voters will therefore believe that the Government is a good Government because it was broad enough in its thinking to consider rural people and to help them overcome this problem. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I refer to the question of law reform. In so doing, I again congratulate members of the Law Reform Committee and the Chairman of that committee on their labours. It seems that there is a growing problem in the area of law reform. Judges of the Supreme Court have indicated recently that what might be termed a communication gap exists between ordinary people and those who make, interpret and enforce the law. A member of the bench was heard to say at a public function that Supreme Court judges were regarded by some members of the public as being ogres, arbitrary and all sorts of unpleasant things.

Mr. Millhouse: All of them untrue.

Mr. McRAE: Yes, but it is indicative of the communication gap between ordinary members of the community and the Judiciary (and I include the Legislature, because we cannot excuse ourselves, either). Regarding law reform, no time could be more opportune than now for something to be done to provide a lead because, at a time when budgets are stringent and money is so tight, movements in other areas of Statute revision are slow and fraught

with hazards. If we can do something to reform the law at a minimal or at no cost, so much the better.

Three types of law reform can be considered, all of which are important. The first might be termed "lawyers" law, which involves the *pros* and *quids* of Statute law and common law and which, on the face of it, is not too interesting to the community unless people are caught by the severity of the gaps in the law. That is when that type of law becomes interesting, albeit to only a few people. Next, there is what may be termed procedural reform. It is in this area that I believe some judges of the Supreme Court who have recently spoken were looking. Mr. Justice Wells said something about the image of the judges in the eyes of the community, and subsequently either the Chief Justice or Mr. Justice Hogarth said something about the provision of a communications officer at the law courts.

It is clear to me that one can make a comparison between the common law courts and other types of court and see the difficult positions into which the judges and officers are put. The problem is that the whole system of the common law jurisdiction is so technical and hidebound with rules that it loses contact with humanity and people. I have heard an eminent Sydney jurist in both industrial law and common law, in comparing the two jurisdictions, say that the common law principles were primitive in comparison with the industrial law principles. He made that statement not in relation to substantive law but purely on procedure, and he said that Registrars of the Industrial Court were servants of the people, ready, willing and able to take up problems from time to time, with determination to help, whereas, on the surface, if one went to the Master's office or the Registrar's office of the Supreme Court, or the Local and District Criminal Court, one would find not help but a pushing away of people and a frightening multiplicity of rules, regulations and procedure, much of which most lawyers do not understand, let alone lay people.

The third kind of law reform is substantive law reform, and that is the most important. It emanates from the community, either directly or from the various political Parties, representing sections of the community, which guide those sections or hopefully the whole community, towards the belief that what they are saying may be right. It is no part of my argument to look at the rights and wrongs of the various substantive law reforms being considered, but various important ones have been raised recently (raised only today, I believe)—matters of no fault in road accidents and matters of criminal law reform in regard to sexual offences, and so on.

What can be done to bridge the communication gap to which I have referred and to avail ourselves of the opportunity we have to achieve some basic law reform? First, I believe that the Law Reform Committee, which I understand was established by the member for Mitcham in 1968, when he was Attorney-General, is a good committee, but I believe that it is hampered by this communication gap. It simply cannot be an appropriate sounding board for the wants of the community, and I believe that, in the eight years during which the committee has been in existence, only on a few occasions have members of the community said that they would like the committee to investigate some matter. On other occasions, valid as the representations may have been, they have been from the Government, the Law Society, or some other professional or corporate body. We have in this House some committees that, to all intents and purposes, are defunct. For instance, the Committee on Consolidation Bills, of which I am a member, never meets.

Mr. Millhouse: I've been a member of it for nearly 20 years, and it's never met.

Mr. McRAE: I am interested to hear that. I think we ought to have a committee of this Parliament representative of all Parties, having the power to co-opt people who would be truly representative of the community. That committee would act as a sort of sounding board, and its function would be to do the spade work and then refer the particular problem to the Law Reform Committee as we now know it. That ought not to cost any more, or at the least it ought to cost only a minimal amount more, and, when we look at the large sums being expended in the Budget, I do not think that would break anyone. I think that would help people in their valid search for law reform. Even if that is not acceptable, I now call on the Government to form such a committee. I believe that, unless such a committee is formed and is working well, the efforts of the Law Reform Committee, chaired at the moment by Mr. Justice Zelling, are being nullified. Even if I am unsuccessful in that call, I ask for some other sort of committee. I would prefer my primary objective but, if I cannot get that, I would like there to be some other committee that would achieve the same result. I believe that we can get results without tremendous expense.

New South Wales, which is a bigger State and has a larger population, has a permanent Law Reform Commission. However, I am not asking, in this economic climate, for our Government to embark on that. Indeed, I have my doubts that the New South Wales Law Reform Commission would achieve much more than I have suggested, or that it has achieved any more than what the member for Mitcham's committee, as originally set up, has already achieved. I ask, and hope that my call will be heeded, that such a committee of this Parliament be set up to do something concrete.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Last Thursday, I asked a question of the Minister of Works, who represents the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Health in this place, concerning the difficulty of farmers obtaining antibiotics themselves to treat sick farm animals rather than having to incur the expense, in the instance I cited equal to the value of the animal, of seeking a veterinary surgeon. My question and the Minister's reply appear on page 923 of *Hansard*. Immediately after the question was asked and the Minister's answer was given to me, the member for Light, in a most unpleasant way, saw fit to make what he termed a personal explanation. In the course of that explanation, he mentioned a Mr. David Vigor, sometimes of Sandy Creek, and went on to say:

I took the opportunity immediately afterwards to telephone one of the partners in this practice—

that is, the practice of Eastick and Partners at Gawler—and was told that the matter had not been discussed in the detail Mr. Vigor had tried to relate to me—

that is, when he spoke to him on the telephone—

but that there was a problem on the property because the property manager had not been paid for work done on the property and on stock by various service organisations in the district. I make this further explanation only because—

I then interjected to say that this was a scurrilous attack on someone who could not defend himself. I subsequently showed the *Hansard* report to Mr. Vigor—and the member for Light was correct in believing that it was he who had prompted me to ask this question. Mr. Vigor was understandably distressed by the attack that had been made on him. Mr. Vigor, having, he tells me, subsequently spoken to the member for Light on the telephone, at the invitation of the member for Light, wrote to him on September 14 and, as the member himself has not been prepared to say anything in the House this week on the matter, I intend to

read the letter that was sent to the member for Light, a copy of which was sent to me, as the member for Light was told. Dated September 14, the letter reads:

Dear Bruce,

Following our telephone conversation this morning, I am, at your request, putting in writing the facts, as I see them, concerning a question raised in the House of Assembly last Thursday by Mr. Robin Millhouse, M.P., on veterinary practice in South Australia. This question led to a personal explanation by yourself in which my name was raised and certain allegations made by yourself concerning the operation of my property at Sandy Creek. These allegations have no basis in fact, and can only have resulted from misunderstanding or misrepresentation. I wish to make the following points:

1. My property at Sandy Creek is operated by sharefarmers, not by a farm manager. These are independent farmers paid directly by the buyers of the produce of the farm.

2. They are separately responsible for their own business affairs, and I am in no way responsible for their debts and expenses if any exist.

3. I do not owe any money to any past or present dairy sharefarmer, and my accounting is in balance with my cereal sharefarmer, as this is an annual operation. My trading in the district is carried out on normal trading terms with normal financial arrangements with my suppliers.

4. I subsidise the farm to a large extent from my management and computing consultancy practice, and have lent money on occasions to the sharefarmers to equalise their income, especially in times such as these, when no dairy farmer can be making any profit, let alone a living wage.

5. I am disturbed and sorry that you should consider this matter as personal in any way, as the problem I raised with you, Robin Millhouse, and with a number of people in the State Agriculture and Health Departments last Thursday morning concerned the whole farming community. I can assure you that from my side the issue is not in any way personal. The problem is that the cost of services and materials to farmers exceeds their return from labour and investment, and this particular case illustrates the dangers to everybody in the State when farmers cannot afford to treat diseases in their stock, thus creating a health hazard.

I could not sell a dairy cow on the open market for the cost of a single veterinary call, whether it be \$10 or \$27. The return earned by that cow's milk in this year also would not cover the fee taking into account the current cost of fodder. It is not that vets. are overpaid; it is that farmers are being shamefully underpaid; I need hardly say this to you as a representative of the rural community and of a Party that claims to represent country interests.

6. My original concern was to ascertain whether it is possible to have a cheaper level of veterinary services, such as the farmer personally administering any treatment necessary where he has the experience to do so. The milk from freshly calved cows is not used for human consumption, nor is milk from sick cows or cows treated with antibiotics. A short visit from a vet. to administer a drug cannot affect the farmer's personal responsibility in these matters. As a farmer I have apparently the right not to treat a sick animal, but I appear to have only the expensive alternative of calling a vet. Surely another alternative is to provide adequate drugs to registered farmers, thus avoiding consultation costs where they are not necessary.

7. The opportunity of pursuing this matter with the Government was equally available to you and to Robin Millhouse. I applaud him for raising it in the interests of the whole State.

8. In order to illustrate the problem, I was willing to use my own example, and I came to you as my local Parliamentary representative. As you will recall, I in no way associated you, or the specific veterinary practice, with the issue. I am surprised that a public personal attack should have resulted from my approach to my elected representative with a community problem. I could not quote experience with any other veterinary practice, as I have always used the local services.

9. I pride myself on my integrity and honesty, and would appreciate a correction in the House of the statements made by you there concerning me.

As the *Hansard* proceedings were brought to my notice by Robin Millhouse, I have sent him a copy of this letter, and enclose for you a copy of the letter I have written to him. You may be able to fruitfully co-operate with him

in tackling what you both acknowledge to be an important problem.

Thank you for your advice on this matter, and for the assistance you have given in the past on matters of community interest I have raised with you.

Yours,

David Vigor

There has been no move by the honourable member in the House to do anything about this matter during this week, and I have waited patiently to see whether he would have the grace and courage to do so. The letter, which was sent to me, with a copy to the member for Light, is in part as follows; he thanks me for sending the letter, and says:

I was indeed surprised and shocked that Bruce Eastick had chosen to make personal remarks about a constituent, who had approached him, as the local member, for advice on a community matter.

He went on to say that he had telephoned Bruce and expressed his concern and that he was able to point out that the details given to me were an example and that he was not suggesting that the veterinary fees were not reasonable. He continues:

However, the farmer is being shockingly exploited in his devotion to his profession, and that in this matter his ability to afford veterinary fees should be a matter of public concern as it could constitute a health hazard . . .

I asked Bruce to correct the impression made in his personal explanation by a short statement to the House. He told me to write to him. I enclose a copy of the letter I wrote, and have sent a copy of this letter to Bruce Eastick.

I hope that this course of action will allow Bruce to retract his remarks gracefully, and that the important business of serving the interests of the people in this State in a period of rural crisis can be aided by co-operation between you on this matter.

I have heard not a word from him during the whole week. I have waited all this week for the member for Light to have the grace and the honesty, as I said before, to retract what he said, but he has done absolutely nothing, and I have waited in vain; that is why I have taken this opportunity to raise the matter in the House to defend one of the honourable member's constituents, who had been blackguarded in this place by his Parliamentary representative.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I would have thought that the affairs of State had risen far above the contribution we have just been forced to witness. It did not sound to me to be an attitude of fruitful co-operation or friendliness. What the honourable member did not say, of course, was that the member for Light might have written to the gentleman concerned. Actually, I have done so. I will read the letter in its entirety, because it would appear that there is one who looks on this as a matter of great moment. The letter states:

Dear David,

I acknowledge receipt of your hand delivered letter dated 14th September. I note that the designation of the dairyman at Sandy Creek is "Share Farmer" and not a "Property Manager".

I was in error. I said that he was a property manager, but I was corrected and told that he was a share farmer. In the general community, the terminology is often synonymous, but on this occasion I accepted that situation. There is no need for me to refer to all the matters to which the honourable member referred, because, as I understand it, he read the entire letter. I concluded the letter as follows:

Assuring you of my genuine interest in the welfare of the State's stock at all times and my preparedness to continue my assistance in matters of community (Parliamentary) interest.

Yours sincerely,

Let us come back to reality on this important issue. There was no need for the member for Mitcham to make even murkier the waters that he stirred last week. I could have much to say about the person he has indicated, the management of the property, the difficulties that one gets into when 12-month-old heifers try to calve, etc. I could also indicate that the honourable member's question of last week was completely contrary to the information that Mr. Vigor has given in his letter here today. He indicated that the \$27.50 was of great importance. What Mr. Vigor failed to indicate to the honourable member (that is obvious, because he failed to indicate it to me when he made the first contact with me, which I referred to last week) was that the figure of \$27.50 was \$27.75 and that it did not relate to the treatment of one animal; actually, it related to the treatment of three animals, and one of those three animals happened to be a cow with an emphysematous calf—a calf that had been dead inside the cow for a period sufficient for the calf to go bubbly and gassy. One would assume from that information that the animal's problem was considerable and that the amount of antibiotic necessary to save the animal's life would be necessarily expensive. But, notwithstanding the expense of that, the three animals were treated for that sum of money.

Next, I specifically asked Mr. Vigor to write to me on the Tuesday, after he had telephoned me at my home, because I wanted to be sure what it was that I was being asked to discuss and explain. I wanted to be certain that, if there was to be a follow-through by somebody in this place or elsewhere who was so small as to believe it was a matter of moment, at least we could have a document to which we could refer. Members present will have to accept the statement I now make, that the detail contained in that letter is somewhat different from the detail given to me in a half-hour's discussion that I had with the gentleman on the telephone on Tuesday of this week. In other words, I did not want to place myself in the position of coming to this place and saying, "But that is not what I was told."

The only matters I refer to as matters of substance are those contained in the letter that the member for Mitcham has read out. In due course, when investigations that I have undertaken are concluded, I will answer all those details contained in that letter of Mr. Vigor and point out to him that a number of his statements are not statements of fact and that there are a number of complete irrelevancies in the statements that purport to be statements of import at the present moment.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you going to do it in the House, so that we can all judge, or not?

Dr. EASTICK: Are you going to continue or shall I continue?

Mr. Millhouse: No; I have asked you a question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. EASTICK: It was indicated that the matter that was raised last week was important. In the brief time available to me and in the difficult circumstances of trying to give worthwhile information in a personal statement, it was necessarily brief. May I say, for the benefit of members present, that as a result of decisions by the Agriculture and Health Departments (I have invited Mr. Vigor to telephone the Agriculture Department; I did not report that to the House last week; I reported having invited him to speak to Mr. Rod McCarthy) after a number of experiences in this State and in the Commonwealth, and justified by evidence from overseas, it was agreed that drug over-use was having a serious effect on a number of vital industries. In fact, the cheese industry of

this State almost went out of existence in the early 1960's because of the amount of antibiotics transferring through the milk—penicillin in particular, and other antibiotics—which was interfering with the cheese manufacturing process.

The Victorian and New South Wales Governments in the early 1960's were called upon to foot a bill of over \$1 000 000 to put down an outbreak of swine fever. This fever was introduced into New South Wales, and it gradually moved down in piggeries into the northern part of Victoria. It was not immediately detected, because farmers in that area and in this State then had access to large quantities of antibiotics, particularly terramycin, which was used extensively in those piggeries. It "masked" the condition of swine fever and prevented a diagnosis being made until it was diagnosed in Victoria in an outbreak on a new property. So, that was \$1 000 000 of the farming community's money, augmented, of course, from State

Consolidated Revenue. We have the effect of milk on persons who are sensitive to antibiotic residues and other drug residues, and baby eczema is probably one of the most horrifying of those consequences. In my discussion with Mr. Vigor on Thursday last, he said, "I demand that I be able to obtain penicillin of larger dosage than we buy off the shelf for the treatment of mastitis." I indicated that penicillin of higher dosage was of no value. It has been proven time and time again that, the higher the dosage beyond a given point, the less effective the result and the greater the chance of the drug resistance problem passing to the human population.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.21 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 21, at 2 p.m.