

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, October 16, 1968

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

BOOT TRADE APPRENTICES

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government representing the Minister of Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: In September last year I received an invitation to inspect the facilities available for the training of apprentices in the boot trade, but I have not yet accepted that invitation because I have been waiting for the school to have some machinery installed or some facilities provided for training apprentices, other than merely theoretical training. However, I was approached yesterday by the father of an apprentice who is most incensed about the lack of facilities at the trade school for boot trade apprentices. It appears that more than seven weeks ago an order was placed for 20 hammers to be provided for the school. I understand that 8 hammers arrived at the school yesterday but that six of them were suitable only for use in the building industry. The other two could have been used in the boot trade, but they were not otherwise satisfactory. I also understand that there is an outstanding order for the supply of benches for the school but that these benches have not yet come to light.

In view of the fact that the final examination is coming up at the end of the year and that these things are required before then, will the Minister ask the Minister of Education to call for a report regarding the supply or lack of supply of suitable hammers, to make every endeavour to have these hammers replaced, and to see that the other equipment is installed at the school in time for the examination?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will obtain a full report on the matter for the honourable member as soon as possible.

AIRPORT TAX

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The Commonwealth has announced its intention to implement a passenger head tax for airline passengers using Commonwealth airports. This was foreshadowed in the 1967 Budget. The tax, which is designed to raise between \$4,000,000 and \$5,000,000 a year, involves a charge of 50c for each passenger embarking or disembarking at a Commonwealth airport; in other words, an extra \$2 for each round trip per passenger to Government-owned airports, which most of the airports in South Australia at the present time are. The Australian air navigation charges are already the highest in the world, having risen 400 per cent in the last 8 years and having returned \$9,800,000 last year.

Air transport plays a vital role in our communications and transport throughout the far-flung centres of this State, and Eyre Peninsula, because of Spencer Gulf, has a particular problem and a particular disadvantage with regard to both mail and passenger services. An extra \$2 a trip would probably mean a drop in passengers and a curtailment of services to the detriment of development and decentralization. Will the Chief Secretary draw the Premier's attention to this extremely important matter?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I will draw it to the attention of the Premier, but I do not know exactly what he can do about it. We appreciate that air navigation charges in Australia are high but, by the same token, we also appreciate that our standard of safety is the best in the world.

TOXIC AGENTS

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I ask leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: All countries that become industrialized, as we are becoming in this country, have problems of toxic agents in the production of by-products in the industrial processes concerned. They include vapours, gases, liquids and solids. The effects vary between causing allergic conditions, poisoning, both acute and chronic, and disturbances of bodily systems, including the digestive tract and renal system; even in some cases causing cancer. In view of the ever increasing host of hazardous agents and the increasing complexity of these processes, can the Minister tell us what steps, both routine and special, are being taken to keep this problem under review and up to date? Are there adequate

follow-up studies to ascertain the incidence of any diseases that may be attributable to industrial processes?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: This matter is constantly under review, both in the State Public Health Department and at a national level. Many committees are continually working on this problem. I believe, too, that in the National Health Research Council and recently at the conference of Health Ministers many of these matters were raised. However, I will get a full report from the department on the present position.

LAND TAX

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: On June 26 of this year I asked the Chief Secretary a question about land tax and certain specific aspects of it affecting some people fairly close to Adelaide, who are not, so far, covered by section 12 (c) (I think it is) of the Act, which affords some relief. At the time, I referred the Chief Secretary to the fact that the New South Wales Government had decided to phase out land tax over a period of three or four years, and I stated that I realized that the State Government was not in a position to do that at the time. I have in front of me now a communication to the effect that the first part of the phasing-out programme in New South Wales is being carried out under its current Budget. I also know that in Victoria there has been an announcement about phasing out some parts of the land tax. I believe that even in highly taxed New Zealand there is little or no land tax. As a long-term measure after we have overcome our present financial problems, can the Chief Secretary say whether the Government will look at this matter with a view to at least easing, or possibly generally phasing out, land tax in this State as soon as possible?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I appreciate what the honourable member has said regarding land tax in other States. It is being phased out in New South Wales, alterations are being made in Victoria, and New Zealand is taking certain action in this regard. However, as this is a matter of Government policy I will refer it to my Cabinet colleagues and bring down a considered reply.

GRAIN CROPS

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Serious concern has been expressed in many quarters that farmers may be forced to hold excessively large amounts of grain on their properties in the coming harvest, particularly those farmers in the Port Pirie area and on Eyre Peninsula, in spite of the emergency plans that have been carried out by South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. Will the Minister therefore discuss this matter with the company and ascertain whether a voluntary system of zoning of wheat deliveries similar to that practised in New South Wales can be implemented here in order that farmers may have a reasonable opportunity of delivering a percentage of their grain to silos during the harvest season?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The honourable member has raised an interesting point, because it is conceivable that 100,000,000 or more bushels of grain could be produced this year. South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. has done a very good job in providing silos wherever possible within its financial structure. However, it will be necessary, if that large amount of grain finally arrives this year, for some wheat to be held on farms. The honourable member has suggested that I discuss this matter with the company, which I am prepared to do. New South Wales has implemented zoning but in this State the company and the farmers that support the company have not been enamoured of the idea of implementing such a system here. However, I shall be happy to discuss this matter with South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. and I suggest to the honourable member and other members that they, too, discuss it with their representatives on the company to see what is their reaction. This matter is outside the scope of the Minister, who deals only with the materials in the installation of silos. However, in the interests of the industry I will try to have the matter discussed, although it is actually a matter for our wheat industry, the members of which can discuss it with their properly elected members of the bulk handling co-operative.

MURRAY RIVER

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Will the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Works, obtain for me the quantity of water

that has flowed through the Murray mouth since autumn?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes.

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Some time ago the previous Government appointed a committee on agricultural education, an action which, I believe, should have received the commendation of all members. As I remember it, the representation on that committee was fairly widely based, although some delay was caused when the appointed chairman was transferred to another State and it took a little while before a new chairman could be appointed. Can the Minister of Agriculture say what progress the committee has made and when it will present its report?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The honourable member is quite correct in saying that the committee was set up prior to my taking office as Minister of Agriculture. When I came to office the committee was without a chairman (Sir Henry Basten was the original chairman). The committee had done no work up to this time: it was just getting started. I appointed Mr. A. M. Ramsay, B.Ec., chairman and broadened the committee's terms of reference to include secondary courses in agriculture. The committee's object is to study fully the needs of agricultural education for the next 15 or 20 years. It will deal not only with graduate courses in agriculture but also with the Roseworthy Agricultural College and the important two-year courses for sons of farmers. When the committee was reconstituted last May I asked it to let me have its report within nine months. It has taken much evidence and is continuing to do so. I will obtain a detailed report on the stage reached by the committee.

UNDERGROUND WATER

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Can the Minister of Mines say whether the reports are yet available on the underground water supply position in respect of the northern Adelaide Plains and Langhorne Creek?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Mines Department's report on the underground water supply position in the northern Adelaide Plains has been made to me. Technical information was referred to a private consultant, who has also made a report. This information is at present in the hands of the advisory committee.

After this committee has studied the matter, a policy will be formulated on it. As yet, there is insufficient evidence in regard to the underground water supply position at Langhorne Creek to enable any prediction to be made regarding the situation there.

ELECTORAL ACT

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: After the last State election considerable difficulties arose in connection with counting postal votes received after the close of the count. I think all Parties agreed that some action should be taken to tidy up the Electoral Act in this respect. Will the Minister of Roads and Transport ascertain from the Attorney-General whether anything has been done toward bringing the Act up to date in this respect?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Attorney-General has been very busy in dealing with a number of Acts. He has told me that he is investigating some Acts and that there are several Acts that he proposes to amend this session. I cannot, however, recall his mentioning the Electoral Act, but I will obtain the information the honourable member seeks.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 9. Page 1734.)

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): I support this Bill, which was introduced last week. That the bicameral system must remain is paramount. The history of the vast majority of free countries that believe in and live under the bicameral system is proof in the free world of the correctness and the necessity of a two-House system in order that the people may receive just representation. It is not a Parliamentary system that has become out of date, nor is it a Parliamentary system in need of any major reform. One of the most ridiculous planks of the Australian Labor Party platform is that relating to the abolition or discontinuance of the bicameral system of Parliament. If only the members of the Australian Labor Party would lift their heads out of the sand and realize the importance of a two-House system of Parliament, and were willing to get together in debate and endeavour to speak together in support of the continuation of this system of Parliament, then this would be in the best interests of the continuity of Parliament. Almost every major free country in the world today has a bicameral system of Parliament.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: What about New Zealand?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: And what about Victoria?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: There are exceptions, and I did not say "every country"; I said "almost every country". I think the most interesting example of a reversion to the two-House system of Parliament is that which took place in France in 1959 when General De Gaulle came to power. Honourable members will remember that France went through many difficulties with its Parliamentary structure because of the splinter groups responsible for bringing about the fall of Government after Government—at times many Governments fell during a month.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: There is an unsatisfactory system of proportional representation in France.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: In 1959 France's constitution was altered and the election of members of the Senate was arranged in such a way as to be entirely different from the system used in electing members to the House of Deputies. France is a powerful and large nation in world affairs, and it is a country that has realized the need for a bicameral system of Parliament. However, it does not use the same system for the election of both Houses of Parliament. We know from newspaper statements that an amendment in some form or another can be expected from the A.L.P. for adult franchise with the idea not so much of effecting electoral reform for the people to vote for the Legislative Council but with the sole idea of the A.L.P. gaining control by numbers in this Council and the ultimate elimination of it.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That does not necessarily follow. Western Australia did not give it away, and that is the latest example. Your argument is all "up a wattle"!

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: In reply to the criticism, there is a difference in the method of electing members to the Upper Houses in Western Australia and Victoria, but let it be clearly understood—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They have full adult franchise.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I am not arguing adult franchise; I am speaking in support of the Bill.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We said that Western Australia and Victoria had adult franchise, and you said it was different.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: One wonders how one can explain clearly enough; one almost

needs a blackboard and chalk. A Liberal believes that the scope of human action can be enlarged by social re-organization and by co-operation, provided that the machinery created does not smother individual initiative or diminish personal responsibility. To abolish the bicameral system in this State would be nothing but catastrophic. It would be intolerable if the initiative and personal responsibility of the citizens were lost for all time.

It is only fair that the spouses of the people who are eligible today to vote for this Council in elections should also have the same privilege and right. It is not new legislation, because I understand that it was introduced in about 1963—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: With a big tag on it.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The people have had ample opportunity to consider this particular type of legislation, and there has not been adverse criticism of it. This State has had responsible Government for 111 years, during which this Council has proved its constructive ability. I support the Bill.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ABORIGINAL CHILDREN

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. H. K. Kemp:

(For wording of motion, see page 1733.)

(Continued from October 10. Page 1811.)

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern): In speaking to this motion, the first thing that comes to one's mind is the realization that today Australia is a white man's country, yet historically it is a black man's country. All of us whose skins are not black and whose forebears cannot go back very far in this land of ours are recently arrived migrants.

We are dealing in this motion with the original historic dwellers of Australia, and because we are a white man's country with a black minority it is inevitable that to a certain extent we have to deal with men of two worlds; first, with people who have inherited, grown up with, and continued to embrace tribal traditions and customs which have served them generation after generation, however inadequately by our standard. On the other hand, we have things which to them are new habits but which to us are old customs brought with us or by our forebears from across the seas. Many of our customs and our habits are not welcomed by the older inhabitants; they are not understood, and they are not capable of acceptance in the

way in which we accept them freely and naturally because we have grown with them.

We assume and expect a degree of uniformity (I use that word in its broad and loose sense) towards our standards and our method of living, and we judge all people by our own yardstick. The problem with a people such as the Aborigines in this country and other racial minorities in other countries is that too much change is offered them too quickly and with it they are expected to undertake too much responsibility, for which they are not prepared. In other words, we remove their old landmarks and leave a vacuum in its place.

One of the problems associated with the Aboriginal race lately (in latter months, particularly) is that of licensing hours and drinking rights. Freedom and loosening of certain laws in this direction may be acceptable to advanced cultures, but even with them there are difficulties. We talk about equal rights for all. A statement like that is very attractive, but it is first necessary to have a common denominator from which to work. Equal rights must be preceded by an equal sense of responsibility—not an equal stage of development but an equal sense of responsibility. If we lack this, then we have no foundation upon which to build.

Lacking a common appreciation of these fundamental issues, the net result must be always moral anarchy. I regard this situation as akin to a sharp knife, which in the hands of a mature adult is a very valuable and useful instrument but which in the hands of a child becomes a dangerous weapon.

Therefore, we are facing the problem today of a group of people who have been put in circumstances and situations for which they are not yet always prepared. We take the very best of that race's intellect and use it as a yardstick by which to legislate for the masses who have not reached that degree of development, and we take the less advanced part of our white population and compare the two, the best of one with the worst of the other. The result is that we throw confusion into chaos. Therefore, I support the motion.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE secured the adjournment of the debate.

FLUORIDATION

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. R. A. Geddes:

That this Council considers that before fluoride is added to our water supplies, Parliamentary approval should be sought for such action,

which the Hon. V. G. Springett had moved to amend by striking out all words after "that" second occurring with a view to inserting in lieu thereof the following words "while the procedure adopted by the Government for introducing fluoride to the water supplies without reference to Parliament may be open to criticism, nevertheless the Government is to be commended for its wise decision to safeguard the dental health of the community by so adding fluoride".

(Continued from October 15. Page 1855.)

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): I rise to support the motion of the Hon. Mr. Geddes because I believe that it is the first step to bring the matter of fluoridation back to Parliamentary discussion, the notified Government action apparently being something which does not come under any enabling Act or legislation. My attitude is that powers which are not specified anywhere should not be taken by a Government unto itself, but in the matter under discussion I want to make it perfectly clear that my attitude is not one of being for fluoridation or against it as a technical question.

I am neither a dental practitioner who understands the chemical effect of fluoride upon teeth nor a medical practitioner who understands its effects, if any, on any part of the human body. I consider that all honourable members are indebted to the Hon. Mr. Springett for his lucid explanation of the matter during his speech last week.

However, I would point out that in South Australia there has been a considerable difference of opinion upon the desirability of fluoride's use. It is a big public question for which there has been no technical committee set up by the Government on behalf of the people of South Australia to ascertain the true value or desirability of having fluoride in our water supply. Therefore, the Government may be presumed to be acting without either the advice of Parliament or that of any public authority.

In these circumstances, when so many people in the State have been demanding the right for their representatives to speak on their behalf in the absence of any other advisory body to the Government, there should, I firmly believe, be a Parliamentary debate on the matter. It would appear to me that the first step in this direction (namely, to have a Parliamentary debate) is to assure the Government that Parliament does not believe that action of this kind should be taken without the advice of this Council.

It is not only with the object that the Government should take the advice of this Council but also with the object of recommending that the voice of the representatives elected by the people of this State should be heard on occasions such as this, when there is doubt regarding people's rights, that this motion has been brought in this way, I believe very properly, by the Hon. Mr. Geddes. I would support this motion without in any way forecasting an attitude for or against the use of fluoride, but I would add that all honourable members have been bombarded with submissions, letters, articles and so on in connection with this matter. Honourable members will all be well aware by now that there are fanatics on both sides of this argument, and they, I am afraid, have not made it any easier to reach a true assessment of the virtue of this proposition.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 15. Page 1849.)

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): First, I refer to two recent deaths, the first being that of Mr. Harry Eric White, who passed away two days ago. He was well known both in this Chamber and in another place as a *Hansard* Reporter for many years. It was with regret that we heard of his death. We extend our sympathy to his loved ones. Mr. White, who was born on August 31, 1893, joined the Public Service on May 3, 1909, as a junior clerk in the Lands Department. He was appointed Assistant Reporter in the Government Reporting Department on February 1, 1924, and a Reporter on August 1, 1924. He continued in service as a Reporter until he was promoted to the position of Acting Assistant Leader on November 23, 1949. He was appointed Assistant Leader of the *Hansard* Staff on April 20, 1950, and retained that position until his retirement on August 30, 1958. I did not know Mr. White, because I entered this Chamber some time after his retirement, but I have heard from other members of this Chamber and Parliament generally that he was well respected and a very good *Hansard* Reporter.

The other person, who died at the weekend, was Mr. William Anthony Brown who, when he passed away, was the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council. It is to people of this gentleman's calibre that we owe so much for what we are proud of in this State

(it has been referred to by people both in this Chamber and outside it)—the good industrial relations that exist in this State. Bill Brown (as he was affectionately known to us who came up through the trade union movement) was a member of that movement and worked for it for the greater part of his life. He eventually rose to the position of Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council, and people on the employers' side told me, when I was Minister of Labour and Industry, what a reasonable man he was to negotiate with. I discovered, too, that when he brought deputations to me during my three years as Minister he was courteous, co-operative and reasonable. The trade union movement in this State cannot afford to lose men of the calibre of Bill Brown. We extend to his loved ones our sincere sympathy.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: I support the honourable member in what he says in these matters.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Recently, when talking in the debate on the Loan Estimates, I said that I spoke with little enthusiasm; now I find myself speaking again reluctantly and certainly not in support of this year's Budget. I do not know how anybody can enthuse over it. I noticed that Government members in this Chamber, too, were hard put to it to say anything good about it. In fact, they said it was not a good Budget and then tried to blame the previous Labor Government for it. When the Labor Government was in office these members did not recognize that the serious drought had resulted in considerably increased costs and reduced revenue. An indication of this is that \$1,000,000 less is provided for pumping this year than last year. Last year, too, railway earnings on the freighting of wheat, wool and barley were \$1,801,052 less than the earnings for the previous year.

We were told, when in Government, by the people who are now occupying the Treasury benches that we were not spending enough on certain things, but we were then denied the opportunity of raising additional revenue when our succession duties legislation was negated in this Council. That Bill was designed to plug the present loopholes in the Act whereby much of the revenue that could rightly be expected to flow from the Act has now been lost to the Treasury by various tax evasions. If that legislation had passed, the Treasurer would have been better able to derive revenue from that source than he is

now, for the burden of that tax would have fallen more upon those able to pay it.

The Hon. C. R. Story: What do you mean by "evasions"?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Evasions regarding gifts, etc.

The Hon. C. R. Story: But evasion is an illegal act.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: A colleague of mine in another place has suggested he may produce a paper outlining these things.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I hope he is a little more accurate than he was with the last one.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The succession duties tax should not fall on people of moderate means; we should place the burden on those who can more comfortably afford to pay it. The people who benefit most from the present succession duties are those, generally speaking, in commerce and industry who have shares, which they can allot or pass on to other people, so that they can get rid of their assets before they pass away. We tried to introduce a policy of aggregation so that we could catch up with those people, but we were prevented.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: How would aggregation affect the matter?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: If the honourable member does not know that, he did not read the Bill when it was in this Council. He is showing his ignorance here, yet he voted against the Bill.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I think you may have been too interested in the road and railway transport legislation to know what was in the Bill.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: That is not so. On that occasion, Cabinet was a team and each member knew what was in the others' Bills—not as at present when the members of Cabinet say they do not have anything to do with Ministers from another place. Our legislation would have affected people interested in industry and commerce rather than the farmers. Our Bill would have helped people with only moderate means and, if one believes what one hears in this Chamber, one would think that the farmer was now on the bread-line or in straitened circumstances and, therefore, that our Succession Duties Bill would have had little effect on the farming community.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Then it was strange that every primary producing organization was perturbed about it.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: That is because of the propaganda spread around by

your people in the country areas. That legislation would have affected people who own shares, and the farming community does not go in for this to a great extent.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: The honourable member should say "avoid" instead of "evade". There is a great difference.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: We use that word regarding income tax.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The result is the same; they do not pay.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Perhaps I should say they are using loopholes in the Act that should be closed. We tried to close those loopholes.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What are those loopholes?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: We believe that taxation should be based on the ability to pay. In this debate, the Hon. Mr. Hart said that taxation was being introduced on the basis of taxing everyone evenly.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: According to ability to pay.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: No, he ridiculed this and said it was Labor's policy.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: I said the people who received the benefits should help to pay for them.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The honourable member also said he believed that taxation should be spread evenly, but that would mean that a man on the basic wage would pay \$1 when a millionaire would pay only \$1. Paying \$1 could mean that the man on the basic wage would go hungry, but to a millionaire it would only mean going without a couple of extra whiskies or cigars.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: But he is paying much more. He is already paying on a higher rate, so he is paying more.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Which tax is the honourable member talking about at the moment?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I am being sidetracked, Sir.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Either they do not see the point or they do not want to.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Our succession duties policy was bandied around the countryside, and the farmers were scared by what they were told, but they had no need to be scared because not all farmers are rich people; indeed, some are only moderately endowed. The Bill provided that those people would pay less than they are paying at present. However, the provisions of the Bill were misrepresented, and this sort of thing has always

happened. This Party, which calls itself the Liberal and Country League, has been able to create the illusion with country people that it is concerned about the welfare of country people.

The Hon. C. R. Story: You grizzled about it, too.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: That Party has been in power in this State for the major part of its history, yet I can say without fear of contradiction that South Australia would be the least decentralized State in Australia.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: And the driest State, too.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes, but it is still the least decentralized. Years ago people used to point to Elizabeth as an example of decentralization, yet today that city is well within the metropolitan area. It could not by any stretch of the imagination be called decentralization. The Hon. Mr. Bevan spoke about what the Labor Government had done regarding country roads in the last three years. Compare this with what has happened in the past and what will happen in future if the suggestions contained in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study recommendations are implemented. Certainly, centralization rather than decentralization will result from that.

The Hon. C. R. Story: What is the solution?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Every effort should be made to decentralize.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Did the last Government make every effort to decentralize?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: We did not leave Wallaroo out on a limb like the Government Party is doing now. We tried to do something for it, but nothing has been done since.

The Hon. C. R. Story: By putting the gas pipeline on the wrong side of the hill.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Have you shifted it?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The present Government changed many things that we did. Why did it not alter the route of this pipeline if it thought we were wrong?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It was not started at that stage. The present Government let the contract.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: It is amazing that, although over the years practically all L.C.L. members in another place have been country members and that little has been done for the country areas while Liberal Governments have been in power, the country people are still blindly voting for the Party

opposite, except in a few areas. Prior to the last election L.C.L. members criticized the Labor Government because, they said, its taxation was high and it had transferred some items from the Revenue Account to the Loan Account, yet in this Government's first Budget we find a whole new series of taxation measures, further increased charges and a continuation and expansion of the action for which members opposite criticized the Labor Party.

The Premier has warned us that we can expect more taxation imposts in the future if the Commonwealth Government does not come to the party. There is not to be a Commonwealth election this year, so I cannot see that Government coming to the party, especially now that the Democratic Labor Party has told the Government what it shall do. Apparently the Government has taken notice of the D.L.P. We will not get money from it now, and if the sort of approach we have heard from the Premier on a couple of occasions and once from the Treasurer regarding taxation is not a softening up procedure, I do not know what is.

How disheartening it must be for the people who listened to L.C.P. propaganda before the last election and expected to see a reduction in taxation. That Party has been misnamed. The "country" part should be deleted and perhaps it should call itself the "Liberal City League" or the "Liberal Centralization League".

The Hon. C. R. Story: Why do you say that?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Liberal members get the country people in, and then the country people think they will get something from a Liberal Government, but all that happens is that something is taken away. Not only has the Liberal Government taxed people to a greater extent than did the Labor Government but there is a promise of more taxes to come.

The Hon. C. R. Story: It was a different tune when the road and railway legislation was going through.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: This is not the only thing the Liberal Government has done in respect of increasing taxes and charges. It has also decontrolled prices on a number of items. Of course, we should not expect anything else than this from a Government that represents big business. At one time all we used to hear from the Liberal members who opposed price control was the good old law of supply and demand. I was interested to hear the Hon. Mr. Geddes raise this point last week. As my colleagues know, the whole law

of supply and demand is designed to assist the employer, but when employees attempt to use the same law they are criticized and told they are disruptive and should not do such things: they are bad boys because they are withholding their labour in order to get something better.

The other theory that is also advanced in these times—and I believe the Hon. Mr. Geddes advanced this one last week in a time-honoured fashion—is that competition in a free enterprise system will take care of what is left after the law of supply and demand has had its go. The theory is that these influences will keep prices down. In these days, when takeovers are occurring daily and when bigger and better monopolies are being established, I cannot see how these influences can be effective any more. The only element of manufacturing costs that some people want to control is that concerned with wages and conditions.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: I did not say that supply and demand was the problem: I said there should be authority to stabilize wages and prices together.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The honourable member referred to the fact that prices and wages were chasing each other and that it was a case of the dog chasing its tail. He was not, however, able to make up his mind which was the tail. He said:

If we can achieve financial stability, we do not have violent rises in prices for commodities, and wages rising to cope with them.

So, the honourable member is saying here that wages are chasing prices. He continued:

If the Commonwealth authorities do not make some attempt in this matter, the process will be endless: we shall just go on having wage increases every year and the price of butter, building costs and costs incurred in making roads and providing schools and hospitals will increase, too.

The honourable member wants to have it both ways. The tail turns round and chases the dog at this point. Then the honourable member said he wanted to leave this point because it was born of his imagination. All I can say is: "What an imagination!" Some people say that the Labor Government caused a deficit by providing service pay, an over-award payment, for daily and weekly paid Government employees. Perhaps some Government members are not aware that, if Sir Thomas Playford's Government had been returned to office in 1965, service pay would have been provided. I was involved in the negotiations on this matter with Sir Thomas Playford, when he was Premier. Prior to the 1965 election Sir Thomas Playford had made a proposition on service

pay to the Trades and Labor Council for its acceptance.

This service pay proposal was certainly on a sliding scale: it gave the tradesmen something and unskilled employees something less. The proposal was less generous than that of the Labor Party, but who ever heard of a Liberal Government being generous to its own workers, let alone other workers? The Labor Government was also criticized in respect of the industrial legislation it introduced. It has been said that this legislation contributed to the deficit. The Industrial Code had not been improved since 1924, a long time ago—but it is not such a long time when we realize that a Liberal Government was in power for most of this time.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: You were in power from 1924 to 1927 and from 1930 to 1933.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The honourable member must not forget that Liberal members had the power in the Legislative Council.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Did you try?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes, repeatedly. The first attempt the previous Government made to improve the Industrial Code was defeated. An unsuccessful attempt was made in March, 1967. Later in the same year we were more successful. I do not know whether this was because we were getting close to an election, but the Liberal members in this Council were more co-operative on that occasion than they had been previously. Of course, we had to sit for long hours around the conference table before we managed to get it through.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Even then, we got only part of the improvements through.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes; we had to give away quite a bit. Let us consider the costs to the Government in regard to the Industrial Code. A new set-up was provided in regard to the Industrial Commission. Certainly costs were increased but they were not increased unnecessarily, because from the time President Williams (as he now is) was elevated from Deputy President to President of the court he had done the job on his own under a great deal of strain and under difficult conditions. The only reason that a Deputy President was not appointed at that time was that a proposal was before the Government to alter the set-up of the court. There would have been some increased cost to the Government as a result of the establishment of the Industrial Commission.

I now ask: what did the Builders Licensing Act do to increase the cost of Government? It must be remembered that the board was not appointed at the time our Government vacated office, and therefore there would have been no increased cost involved in that Act. The Bill on Long Service Leave had to be brought before this Chamber twice before eventually being passed in an amended form. That did not increase the cost of Government at all because it has not affected Government employees but people employed outside the Government service. The Government makes provision for its own long service leave allowances under the Public Service Act. That Act was amended and affected long service leave costs (or it will do so) but it did not affect costs at that point and it did not add to the deficit of the Labor Government to any great extent because the Act was not proclaimed until the eve of the election in March of this year. Therefore, the inclusion of *pro rata* long service leave after seven years' service (when previously there was no *pro rata* leave or any long service leave until after 10 years' service) would not have increased costs to the Government either.

The amendment to the Shearers Accommodation Act did not result in any increased costs to the Government or affect it in any way. As to the Country Factories Act and the Construction (Safety) Act, no additional cost was involved to the Government, although they meant more work for industrial inspectors. However, the Government did not appoint additional inspectors subsequent to these Acts being passed, so there is no additional cost involved there.

The Electrical Workers and Contractors Licensing Act came under the administration of the Electricity Trust of South Australia, and I cannot see any increased costs resulting to the Government as a result of it. The Workmen's Compensation Act could possibly have increased Government costs to some extent because the Government carries its own insurance in that section. The Apprentices Act resulted in some increased cost to the Government because a full time commission was set up with a full time commissioner at its head.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: He is worth every cent of it.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: That is what I was about to say. The new Acts were necessary and we endeavoured to introduce them during our short period of Government despite the fact that our numbers were small

in this Council. Because of that we could not do anything to improve industrial conditions until we were elected to Government, and from then on we bombarded this Council with our industrial legislation; so much so that the Opposition in this Council had to give way to some extent. This may have resulted in some small increase in cost to the Government because of the upgrading of the Acts associated with industry, but there had been such a long period of inaction that South Australia fell far behind other States in industrial safety provisions. After all, the majority of Acts to promote industrial safety were necessary, and surely all honourable members are interested in that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I cannot recall any opposition to industrial safety measures put forward at that time.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: We bombarded you to such an extent that at last we wore you down.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Only to a certain extent; they still obstructed us.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Who gave away in conference?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Only because you never had enough courage to reject it. There was too much public pressure.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: This is the point I am making: whenever we discussed electoral reforms and things of that nature what did we hear from the other side? Because we, as the Opposition, voted for an amendment in 1956 which improved that Act, we are now accused of being responsible for the gerrymander existing today. How about this: sufficient honourable members opposite voted for Bills that amended Acts that were brought here during our term of Government that they must be held responsible for that part of the deficit resulting from those Bills being passed. Honourable members opposite cannot have it both ways. They throw the Electoral Act at us and tell us we are responsible for the gerrymander. Therefore they must be responsible for some of the deficit, and in fact those honourable members are responsible for the better part of the deficit. That is a result of what they did with the Succession Duties Bill and other Bills; our Government may have balanced the Budget if the Bills I have mentioned had been passed.

I now refer to the section of the Budget dealing with the Department of Labour and Industry. I say there is a need to keep a full staff of inspectors employed in the interests of industrial productivity in this

State. When I became Minister of Labour and Industry and the department came under my administration, I found there were positions in the inspectorial staff not being filled. It is little use having industrial safety legislation on the Statutes if insufficient inspectors are available to visit working sites, factories, shops, steam boiler installations, and other places that need inspecting for breaches of the safety provisions in these Acts. When I found this out I immediately sought Cabinet approval to fill the vacant positions and create new ones. I am convinced that subsequent events justified my judgment in seeking such approval.

In this Council in November of last year I reported that for the second year in succession in South Australia there had been a reduction in the number of non-fatal accidents involving absence from work for a week or more; the figure of 10,453 for that year was a reduction of 70 on the figure for the previous year, notwithstanding that the work force increased by 3,000 during that year. Also, the figure was the lowest for five years, despite the fact that the work force increased by 14 per cent in that time. A rumour is current that departments have been told to economize regarding staff, and it is possible that there could be a return to the position that vacancies may not be filled. I hope this rumour proves to be false.

To allow the Department of Labour and Industry to become under-staffed again would be false economy, for it would result in an upward surge of industrial accidents, as unsafe working conditions would go unchecked. This State cannot afford the drain on manpower and production that is brought about by industrial accidents resulting from a complacent attitude towards accident-prevention procedures. An Industrial Safety Convention was held during my term of office, and preliminary planning took place for another convention to be held this year.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: They had been held before you came to office.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I realize that. I am pleased to see from the Estimates that a sum of money has been set aside to go ahead with the proposal. The convention was held with my blessing. It was well attended and many fine papers were given by knowledgeable people. It was a complete success, and I am sure that the one to be held this year will also be a success, because the planning has been done in the department, the Secretary of which (Mr. Bowes) has the

interests of industrial safety well before him. I am sure that with Mr. Bowes guiding the preparations for it, the safety convention will be a most successful one. Safety officers of the department do a fine job in giving industrial-safety training to people in industry. The industrial inspectors have their part to play in this regard also in seeing that unsafe and illegal working conditions are rectified before accidents occur. Safety officers train personnel to recognize unsafe conditions.

On looking through the Budget provisions for the Railways Department I can find no reference to an amount for the replacement of railway facilities affected by the Premier's decision regarding the festival hall. I understand that this proposal of his will eliminate the Railways Institute and several minor buildings used by railway employees for off-duty activities. In his usual airy fashion, the Premier has said that other facilities will be provided. It is to be hoped that these facilities will be provided in close proximity to the railway property so that they can be availed of by railway employees with as little inconvenience as possible.

While on the subject of railways, I wish to discuss the Minister's announcement regarding the curtailment of railway services. He has said that uneconomical services will be discontinued. It has always been my opinion that passenger services are a service to the public and should be continued wherever possible. It is well known that the area in which railways can most successfully compete with other forms of transport is the long haulage of heavy commodities. Passenger traffic, particularly the transport of commuters to and from work, has never been a profitable undertaking. For this type of traffic the need for adequate rolling stock to handle peak-hour traffic causes an expensive capital outlay. Most of the rolling stock is used at peak periods only.

If, as a result of a different policy in this State from that in any other State with regard to co-ordination of transport, the Railways Department has to face up to much steeper competition from road transport than in any other State and this results in less and less profitable freight traffic for our railways, then the answer is not to give away passenger traffic altogether. Every effort should be made to enable the department to continue passenger services. Other countries have found that bigger and better freeways have not been the complete answer, and these countries have had to return to rail to move passengers effectively.

For instance, the Federal Government in the United States of America had to come to the aid of States with vast sums of money to upgrade railway services in those States because of what they had found in regard to freeways. We have been told by people, including people in the Commonwealth railways, that the Commonwealth railways is a profitable undertaking. However, I think it is most unfair to compare the Commonwealth railways with the State railways system, because the majority of Commonwealth traffic is long-haul traffic, anyway, and it does not have to accommodate commuters, nor does it have peak periods every day.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: And no terminal overhead charges, either.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: No. For any railway system to pay its way, it must have long-haul profitable freight to counter-balance its unprofitable passenger traffic. This is the reason why our ore concentrate traffic from Broken Hill is so important to the South Australian Railways. This curtailment of country passenger —

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: We did not stop you going out to get the business.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: We were trying our hardest to get it, but we were getting very little assistance here. One reason why the railways cannot compete with some road transport operators is that some fly-by-nighters in the road transport industry come in and go broke in a very short time. Some of those people, without considering whether it is economical, go out to the farming community and offer to take commodities anywhere, whether it be wheat or wool or anything else, for the same rate as that charged by the railways. If the Railways Department reduces its rate, so does the road operator. How does a railway system compete with that sort of thing? The road operator can go broke, but what happens to the railways as a result of this unfair competition? We have to subsidize them.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: The railways are doing their share of price cutting at present, aren't they?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: That is the only way they have been able to retain the business. They have had to cut their freight rates to such an extent that they now have the lowest overall freight rate in Australia. I told this Council about that years ago, but honourable members did not listen. I know what happened regarding other proposals to curtail railway services in the country. The

people screamed to high heaven. The Wallaroo people, as the Hon. Mr. Hart and the Hon. Mr. Dawkins must know, were most upset to learn that their service was to be taken away.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The Hon. Mr. Hart would not know: he did not go to the public meeting.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Not all of them were upset.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: But a number of them were.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You were upset because you did not go to the public meeting.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: In the matter of country parcels and passenger services, the Government completely disregarded the wishes of the country people. When will the country people wake up to that?

Another matter to which I wish to refer briefly is something with which I was connected during the three years I was Minister of Railways (as the portfolio then was). The Railways Department has many houses not only in the metropolitan area but also in the country areas. For instance, there is a goodly number of houses at Peterborough. The department has a building committee, which ensures that, when railway people are seeking houses in moving from one job to another, they are provided with houses temporarily. When we were in Government, we were criticized strongly for our policy on railway houses. We kept some houses available to provide immediate accommodation for people either coming to the city for promotion or passing through the city before going to another country area. They were accommodated in these houses. On other occasions, on compassionate grounds people were allowed into them provided they stayed there for a short period. I always understood it was one year, but I saw a newspaper reference to the effect that it was two years. Irrespective of whether or not the house was needed, railway policy was to shift people out of houses after that period of time.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: The tenure varies according to circumstances.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The department shifts these people out. In fact, when I first became Minister of Railways I received some papers to sign for the eviction of people still employed by the Railways Department—not because no other empty houses were available and people wanted to use them, but because the people in the houses were told

that they could stay there for two years only and then would have to go. I clamped down on evictions and said, "No evictions of these people unless these are the only houses available and somebody wants them."

These complaints came to me when several houses had been empty for two years. If years. In my own district, where I have done some door-knocking at election time, I have visited these railway houses and have seen that they were empty and had been empty for a long time. I took action and said, "If you do not require these houses, why do you not get rid of some of them?" I pressed for some of them to be sold to the Housing Trust, for people who needed houses. In my three years of office, 19 houses were disposed of.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Nearly as bad as the railway lines!

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: No. These houses had been empty for two years. If a railway line has not been run for two years nobody objects to its being taken up. It is when a line is running that people object to its being closed. Some of these houses in the country are not up to standard. I know, because I have seen them. Why cannot the Railways Department get rid of the houses in the metropolitan area that it does not need and use the money to upgrade its country houses? With those few remarks, I have no alternative but to support the Bill.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I support this Bill and the Government's attempt to correct the position as we found it when we took office. I cannot feel happy that taxes have to be increased but I am glad that the Government has had the courage to do what had to be done. I congratulate the Treasurer upon his achievement. Any Government would have had to increase taxes in the financial situation in which we found ourselves. Had the Labor Government remained in office, it would have had to do likewise. In fact, the present Leader of the Opposition in another place in a talk in Maughan Church last November drew attention to the fact that taxes would have to be increased, and I believe he gained headlines in the press the following day for that.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That is more than your Premier ever said.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The Labor Government would have done it differently. I understand the present Leader of the Opposition in another place was reported in the daily press as saying that the whole of the extra money needed should be raised by increasing succession duties (or words to that effect)

and that we had the unused capacity of death duties. We need to raise an extra \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000. I am speaking from memory now but I think the total revenue raised by death duties at present is about \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000. If that is so, it means that a Labor Government would have doubled succession duties as its main effort to close the gap. If this had happened, it would have hit the small man, because there are not enough people described by our political opponents as big men to pay this large increase. Whether or not the Labor Party liked it, perforce it would have had to "get into" the people who it believed were its supporters. The present Government has endeavoured to raise the extra money as fairly and equitably as possible—and with some considerable success. For example, the receipts duty of 1c in \$10, which will be imposed so as not to apply to wages and salaries, is an instance of this. I believe the Treasurer's intention that this tax should not apply to wages and salaries is evidence of the fact that the Government wishes to be as fair as possible in raising extra money.

Some gift duty was forecast which, much as I personally regret it, had to come because of the limited field available for State taxation. Of course, the reason for the increased taxation (which, as I stated earlier, Mr. Dunstan foreshadowed last November) was the increased expenditure of the Labor Government. To be fair, we should add to that the effects of last year's drought—not that it was all due to the drought, because deficits occurred in one way or another throughout the Labor Party's period of office. The increased expenditure of the previous Government has resulted in these deficits, from which we must recover and which we have to make good. The Labor Government, at least in its early stages, did not consider the need to keep costs down. When it came to office it had been out of Government for a long time and it was inexperienced, as any Government would be after returning to the Government benches after a long period in Opposition.

That Government had its mind on other things, some of which the Hon. Mr. Kneebone has mentioned this afternoon, which things, although important in themselves, were by no means essential or of top priority. Members opposite had their minds on service pay, a polite name for over-award payments. They also had their minds on new offices and carpets, as well as social legislation, for which I do not criticize them. The Labor Government introduced T.A.B., lotteries and ten o'clock

closing. In other words, that Government concentrated on things that, although they might have had their place, were not top priority matters that should have engaged the attention of Government. I do not blame the Labor Government for that, because it had not been in office for many years and, therefore, was inexperienced. When the New Zealand National Party returned to power after a number of years in Opposition it did some foolish things, too. Indeed, it even abolished its **Legislative Council**.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: A fatal mistake!

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Yes, it was, but they needed to reconstruct it because it comprised its fair share of retired trade union secretaries, and it was not an efficient Council when it was operating. Although the National Government in New Zealand did some foolish things, the Labor Government here did some foolish things, too. It concentrated on things that were less important than matters which should have engaged its attention and, consequently, the enthusiasm of members opposite ran away with them. They had not been in control of anything like as much money before and, instead of controlling the Loan and the Revenue Accounts, those funds almost took control of them. In other words, things got out of hand to the extent of several million dollars.

The first Labor Budget showed an increase of about 8 per cent on the last Playford Budget, and its next Budget contained an increase of a similar nature. The gross national product was not increasing by anything like 8 per cent: I think 3 per cent would be nearer the correct figure, and the gap between the expenditure of the Government in power at that time and the State's revenue showed a similar discrepancy.

We must sell a large proportion of our products in Sydney and Melbourne: in other words, in the more populous States of New South Wales and Victoria, and probably in due course in Western Australia, as that State assumes more importance. The increased charges that were allowed to continue to an alarming extent during the regime of the Labor Party did not allow South Australia to remain on the same favourable competitive basis with the other States as previously. Sir Thomas Playford's Government tried to keep State taxes down, and I believe it succeeded in doing so by an average of about \$8 a head, compared with the Eastern States. It did so because South Australia had to have a bouyant economy and we had to be in a position to sell our goods in the markets of

those other States. While many charges rose during the term of office of the Labor Party, it is worthy of note that electricity costs did not rise. It is also significant that the Electricity Trust of South Australia was the only public instrumentality, or very nearly the only one, that was left as it was under the Playford Government. It was the only one that was not taken over by a Labor Minister.

The fundamental difference between the Liberal and the Labor Parties is that the Liberal Party believes in enterprise and initiative. Indeed, it believes that people should be able to build themselves up and that, if a person is successful, he creates opportunities not only for himself but he benefits the community as well. We do not believe in chopping down and levelling off or stultifying progress. Although I would not like to say that the Labor Government believes in doing that, its attitude of taking everything from the haves and giving it to the have-nots does this in practice. The policy of the Labor Party does not lend itself to enterprise and initiative by individuals, which, I believe, is fundamentally important to the development of this State.

One of the charges that were raised during the regime of the Labor Government was land tax. During its first year of office that Government introduced a Bill in this Council to raise land tax, and included in that Bill were the words "and in subsequent years", or words to that effect. As a quinquennial assessment was due the following year, this would have meant a second substantial increase in land tax had the Bill been passed in that form. The people of South Australia, not only those in the country but those in the city as well, should feel indebted to the Legislative Council, because that phrase was deleted from the Bill and because land tax, although it has risen, has not risen to the extent that it would have.

I believe that land tax is, in many areas of South Australia (although not all of them), a real burden on the community, and that is why I have been discussing the matter with the Government and seeking some lead from the Government as to its future policy in this regard. When speaking on this Bill yesterday, the Hon. Mr. Whyte raised a matter that I believe is of fundamental importance to country people, and, when referring to the advice of farm economists and advisers, he said:

Generally, an amalgamation of plant and an enlargement of properties is advised, yet during our last Parliament legislation restricting leases to 4,000 acres was passed. These

restrictions and anomalous rentals are impeding production and development in many areas of the State. The Government has promised to examine both these impositions, and I advise them to put away their binoculars and give both acreage limitations and the ridiculous rentals full and promised consideration.

I do not know about putting away the binoculars, but I endorse the rest of what the honourable member said. I have suggested before, as my colleagues have, too, that these things should be done. Indeed, these things have been suggested for two or three years, and it is high time that something was done. The Hon. Mr. Whyte continued:

The development of what for years was considered waste land can be economically achieved if the developer is given some encouragement, but it is no encouragement to find that, after several years of what has been described as a qualifying period to prove one's ability and intentions—

and, incidentally, a qualifying period to prove that one is a really hard worker—

a miscellaneous lease when transferred to a better tenure can carry an increased rental from less than \$100 to, in some cases, over \$1,200 a year.

I agree with what the honourable member is driving at. If, however, one goes into some parts of the honourable member's electoral district or, in particular, into some country area in his own parish (near Kimba or on Eyre Peninsula generally), or into the southern part of Yorke Peninsula, in my district, one sees an area that looks like the bed of the sea, with little shells. The country looks completely useless. If a man works in this country and by the sweat of his brow transforms it into property that will contribute not only to his own betterment but to this State's revenue for many years to come, he does not deserve a kick in the neck for doing it, and that is what he has been getting in some instances.

A gentleman from Warooka who called to see me not long ago wanted to transfer some land. He was feeling the burden of this limit of 4,000 acres. Such a limit may be generous in some parts of South Australia, but in other parts it restricts what a man can do. To set an arbitrary acreage limit in this way is quite wrong, because it takes no account of the quality of the land. The Government should do something about this problem as soon as possible.

The previous Government created increased expenditure in other ways, too, and this now has to be covered. When Sir Thomas Playford was Premier he handled administrative matters with the assistance of a secretary and

two typistes, but when the Labor Government came to power the Premier's Department grew to 21 or 24 people. This growth is questionable, especially if the State cannot afford it. The Playford Government placed top priority on development, and it is pleasing to know that development now is top priority again. The recently announced improved employment figures—and I have not heard Opposition members ask questions about them—show that the State is again back on the road to prosperity.

The Playford Government extended trunk water mains to large areas of the State; I think 8,000 miles of main were constructed. We developed water systems in the Wanilla and Polda areas of Eyre Peninsula and we increased the capacity of some of the city reservoirs. Furthermore, we constructed new reservoirs and constructed the Mannum-Adelaide and Morgan-Whyalla mains. We were in the process of duplicating those mains—

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It took you a long time to do it.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: At least we were doing it. I am not saying the previous Minister of Works did not do some work of this kind. However, if some projects were not stopped completely by the Labor Government, they were slowed down. The Playford Government was in a position to go ahead with the Kimba main three and a half years ago, but unfortunately it could not go much further with it. We are now starting on this job again, although we are three years behind. Whilst we may not be quite so far behind with the Keith main, that job had been slowed down, too, by the Labor Government.

When we consider South Australia's water resources as a whole, we must realize the absolute necessity for providing a large water storage on the Murray River. We are entirely dependent, particularly in a drought year, on Murray water. We also need sufficient good water for a flow for dilution purposes to get rid of salinity. During the last few years of the Playford Government's term of office, much preliminary work was done towards constructing the Chowilla dam. The Government was able to secure the agreement of Sir Robert Menzies, who finally overrode his Minister for National Development and authorized the construction of the dam. We also obtained the agreement of the New South Wales and Victorian Governments. If my memory serves me correctly, if a dispute arose, the whole agreement was subject to the arbitration of the Chief Justice of Tasmania.

We were set to go, and the Engineering and Water Supply Department was to be the constructing authority. We had the benefit of advice from the best engineers in our own department, and from officers from the United States of America, from the Snowy Mountains Authority and from India and Pakistan, where such officers had had much experience in constructing large dams. So, there we were, with the agreement signed and we were all set to go, and then we had a change of Government.

Over the next two years, however, the Labor Government looked at other things, instead of pushing ahead with the Chowilla dam. I do not say the work was entirely stopped: some work was going on, but it was not pushed ahead. Consequently, the other States began to get restive as the costs increased. We had not let a contract or reached the point of no return, as we should have done. As costs increased there was pressure, in August, 1967, for the project to be postponed. We had let the opportunity pass, through not proceeding fast enough with the project. Who let the opportunity pass? The Labor Government let it pass, and now it has the hide to claim that the Liberal Government is to blame.

Under the agreement we were going to receive one-third of the water available, instead of three-thirteenths, in a dry year. This was a considerable difference, and we were also going to get provision for dilution water. All these benefits would have accrued when the dam was completed. Because work on the Chowilla dam has been stopped, we are still receiving only three-thirteenths of the water available and we are still without sufficient water for dilution purposes. Consequently, we may still be in difficulties in countering saline water. On the average, 9,000,000 acre-feet of water comes down past Chowilla each year. The alternative site of Dartmouth on the Mitta Mitta River has less than 1,000,000 acre-feet—I think the figure is about 800,000 acre-feet. That storage would be six weeks away from South Australia. In the meantime, New South Wales and Victoria would be busily diverting water. All honourable members know that the Murrumbidgee River is extremely easy to divert, because water has only to be syphoned out or a hole punched in the bank and a pipe laid along for a reasonable distance for land lower than the river level to be reached; therefore, irrigation is not a problem. It is vital that we proceed with the Chowilla dam, and the Government needs all the support it can muster from both sides to ensure that this project proceeds.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Can the honourable member tell me why the present Government cancelled out the orders to the Commissioner?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: If we "go the whole hog", this could be taken to arbitration. The whole agreement is subject to arbitration by the Chief Justice of Tasmania. If the matter had gone to arbitration and an adverse decision was given, then South Australia would have lost everything. We cannot afford to do that at present without an alternative being available. At least four authorities consider that Chowilla is practicable. It is also said (and this comment has been used against the construction of this big dam) that evaporation could reach 25 per cent of the supply in unfavourable conditions. However, it is equally true that evaporation could amount to only 5 per cent under favourable conditions, and sufficient water would be available from that large 5,000,000 acre-foot dam to enable dilution water to be used to get rid of saline water.

Under the Chowilla agreement, even though it may cost another \$56,000,000, we were to have had the co-operation of the three States I mentioned, and South Australia was to receive one-third of the water instead of three-thirteenths in a dry year; that is an important provision. We must do all we can to see that this scheme goes ahead. I do not wish to delay the Council much longer.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Hear, hear!

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I hope the honourable member who interjected will not delay honourable members, either.

I appeal to the Government that as soon as possible (and I underline those words because I appreciate the position in which the Government finds itself) it try to obtain more money from the Commonwealth Government for education. In addition, I would like the Government to try, when stability has been restored, to allocate more State money for education. I have previously mentioned the conditions existing at the Western Teachers College, and I now wish to mention one or two matters connected with schools in my own district. I know that education buildings generally come under Loan funds and, to be fair, I could refer to a number of very good schools in my district. I have no doubt other members could do likewise.

I am glad to say that when the department builds new schools it does an excellent job and erects a good permanent school intended to last for at least 50 years. I believe that

is a proper approach. I have visited many new schools and during my visits in earlier years I have thought expenditure could have been cut down on some items, or that perhaps some installation was too elaborate. My thoughts at that time were that perhaps more schools could have been built for less money. However, on second thoughts, I am sure the department has done and is doing the right thing by building good schools that will be adequate and not subject to criticism in 10 years' time.

I know that in some other States more schools have been built for less money, but obviously many of them are not standing up to the job. I repeat that I am glad that, when we build schools, we build good ones. In the same way I say to the Minister of Roads and Transport that when we build roads we build good ones. In other States we may find greater areas of sealing but with a lot less under the sealing than would be found in roads constructed in South Australia.

While on the subject of education, I could refer to some situations crying out for remedial action. For instance, at the Brinkworth Area School, which is close to your home, Mr. President, the parents have done a splendid job in providing facilities—to be fair, I add that this has been done with Government assistance. Although these extra facilities are excellent the school buildings are in poor condition, and it is high time that that school was replaced. Another school on which temporary repairs have been carried out and which needs more repairs to help it hang together is the Yorketown Area School. My colleagues and I visited that school some time ago and I know that it is crying out for replacement. Recently, in company with the Minister of Education, I visited Nuriootpa, which has both a primary school and a high school needing replacement.

I believe other States devote a higher proportion of revenue to education. I have heard the previous Minister of Education suggest that we cannot devote more than the present 23 or 25 per cent of our revenue to education, and while I believe this is possibly true in the present circumstances I know other States have devoted a higher proportion of their revenue to this purpose. I ask the Government to examine this matter when it is able to do so. I should like to see a programme brought forward in education expansion in a manner similar to the recent announcement made by the Minister of Local Government concerning highways construction covering a period of years.

I look forward to the time when it will be possible for the Education Department to present a programme of works that must be effected. Honourable members opposite are concerned about the "haves" and the "have nots"; there are some "haves" in education, as some schools have every conceivable aid, but others are crying out for replacement. That is no reflection on the Government or on the Education Department: it is the result of an explosion in the number of students over the last 15 or 20 years.

I regret that it has been necessary for the Government to increase taxation, but I believe that such increased taxes must be imposed to pay for increases in costs that have occurred over the last three or four years. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATE BANK ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 15. Page 1843.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1): I oppose the Bill, and I intend to vote against it. The main provision to which I take exception is contained in clause 4, and it is around this clause that I centre all my opposition to the Bill. The remaining provisions deal mainly with the conversion of amounts to decimal currency and other minor matters. Of course, this Bill was foreshadowed in the Budget provisions. In introducing the Bill, the Chief Secretary said:

Its principal purpose is to give effect to the decision of the Government, as announced in the Budget proposals, to require the State Bank of South Australia to make a contribution to the revenue of the State out of its annual profits. The amount of this contribution will be generally in line with the amount it would pay in Commonwealth income tax if it were not exempt through being an authority of the State.

It seems to me that this is a very flimsy excuse for diverting 45 per cent of the bank's profits. We all know that State instrumentalities and Commonwealth instrumentalities are exempt from Commonwealth taxation. The Chief Secretary went on to say:

Of course, all private banks with whom the State Bank is in active competition pay Commonwealth income tax, which is currently at the rate of 45 per cent.

Although the private banks may pay tax at that rate, I submit that the State Bank, which is a State undertaking, is not in open competition with private banks; in fact, far from it.

Its activities in many matters are curtailed under this Act, and in fact the private banks carry out activities which the State Bank does not.

I consider that the Government in this State is running true to form with this policy of granting protection to a certain section of the community, namely, the private banks, by introducing this Bill to provide for the filching of 45 per cent of the profits of the State Bank into Consolidated Revenue, instead of using other methods open to it. I refer, for instance, to succession duties and other matters in which there are evasions of taxation at the moment.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You must not use the word "evasion"; they say it is bad.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I am using it because that is the truth, and I cannot think of any other appropriate word.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: "Evasion" is not quite right; when the Hon. Mr. Potter corrected me last year I looked it up and found that he was right.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I maintain that the Government would have obtained greater results from these other avenues I have referred to than it will obtain by this Bill. Another reason given for the introduction of this measure was that other States that have Government insurance offices require a contribution to revenue out of their profits in lieu of taxation, and that the previous Labor Government included a similar provision in its Bill to set up such an office in this State. However, I point out that the activities of an insurance organization are vastly different from those of the State Bank.

The Labor Government introduced a Bill to set up a State insurance office that would enter the same fields as and be in open competition with the other insurance companies, so there was no reason at all for an exception in that instance. However, I cannot see that that can be compared in any way with the State Bank. As we all know, the bank has a number of functions, including acting as agent for the Government in a variety of lending functions, which it carries out under State Legislation and the profits from which go to the Treasury. Its trading bank activities extend to financing rural industry and industrial and commercial undertakings, and to supplying long-term housing loans. We have heard much about the need to attract new industries to this State, to stimulate the building industry, and also to bring about decentralization, but instead of the State Bank being able to utilize its profits to extend and expand its activities it is being retarded by this Bill.

Rural industry is still suffering from the effects of the drought. I consider that it will continue to suffer until some return is obtained from the present crop, and it will be looking to the State Bank for further assistance to tide it over this period. As we know, the State Bank's activities in the rural industry and in loans to primary producers are centred in country areas, and I wonder what country members are going to say to their constituents when those people discover that they cannot be fully accommodated. Again, instead of attracting new industry to the State, the present industrial and commercial field will be retarded, and this will be reflected also in the retail field.

Another aspect of this legislation concerns the reduction of the money that will be available for house mortgages on a long-term basis. First, there was a reduction by the Treasurer in the Loan Estimates of \$1,150,000 in the money made available to the State Bank in this financial year, and now a further \$350,000 of its profits are to be taken away. These things must restrict the ability of the bank to lend on housing mortgages.

I think the more important impact of this legislation is its long-term effect. Over a period of 10 years, assuming the Treasurer is successful in diverting \$400,000 a year from the profits of the State Bank, there will be \$4,000,000 less available for lending on mortgage and lending to general customers of the bank. It is all very well to say that we must get revenue to balance our Budget and that this is a means of getting that revenue. However, this action of retaining 45 per cent of the bank's profits will curtail the bank's activities. I emphasize that this is especially so in the case of rural industry. We should not support that.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is just like robbing Peter to pay Paul.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: It is worse than that: it is robbing rural industry for the purpose of bolstering up the State's Revenue Account, when other methods are open to the Government to achieve the same result. For these reasons, I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES secured the adjournment of the debate.

TRUSTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.32 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, October 17, at 2.15 p.m.