

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.**

Tuesday, August 16, 1960.

The SPEAKER (Hon. B. H. Teusner) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**QUESTIONS.****PARKING BAYS.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—The recent convention of the Labor Party discussed the provision of parking bays at suitable intervals on the main highways where heavy transport could park if it so desired. It was suggested that I ask the Minister of Roads to provide suitable parking bays and to have more attention given to the shoulders of sealed highways. This matter has also been discussed by local government conferences. Has the matter been considered by the department and can the Premier, as Acting Minister of Roads, say whether steps could be taken to give effect to these desires, which I think are worth considering?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—This problem, fortunately, is not nearly so difficult in South Australia as in many other countries. It has been considered, and in some places where the traffic is congested opportunity has been taken from time to time to see that suitable land is available for road parking. The real question that ultimately arises, of course, is the use of these areas. I know that in one place where suitable areas are already available I frequently see vehicles parked on the main highways close to them but not using them. The question arises whether parking bays would be used if provided, because if they are not going to be used it is not much good providing them. I will have that matter referred to the State Traffic Committee for report and, if necessary, amendments can be made to the Act.

**LOCAL COURT JUDGE.**

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Has the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General, an answer to the question I asked last week regarding the return of Judge Gillespie to the Adelaide Local Court?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes. The Attorney-General (Hon. C. D. Rowe) has informed me that His Honor Judge Gillespie is expected to return to duty at the Adelaide Local Court towards the end of this month. Immediately following his departure some cases which had been listed for trial had to be adjourned. However, the position is now that cases listed for trial in any week

are heard during that week except where the parties, for substantial reasons, request an adjournment. Since August 1, 1960, Mr. Newman, S.M., has been sitting as an additional magistrate in the Adelaide Local Court, which will avoid delay in the hearing of cases during the remainder of Judge Gillespie's absence.

**SOUTH ROAD PRIMARY SCHOOL.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH—My question concerns the important South Road primary school, which is attended by about 1,000. The school committee has developed about 4½ acres of land with the assistance of the department. When will a solid construction school be provided in lieu of the present temporary buildings?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—It is a very important school and district. We are endeavouring as soon as possible to convert it to a solid construction building, but at the moment I cannot indicate when that happy event will take place.

**CALLINGTON-STRATHALBYN ROAD.**

Mr. JENKINS—My question concerns the road from Callington to Strathalbyn on which an excellent new bridge has been built this side of Callington. Much traffic uses that road these days. Just before entering Woodchester there is a very narrow bridge on which two cars cannot pass each other. Will the Treasurer, representing the Minister of Roads, take up with the Highways Commissioner the building of a new bridge there, subject to when the road is bituminized from Callington onwards?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes.

**RAILWAY CROSSINGS.**

Mr. HUTCHENS—Under section 33 of the Road Traffic Act it is necessary for a vehicle on approaching a railway crossing where there is a "Stop" sign to stop at least 10ft. from the crossing and not more than 40ft. before crossing the railway line. I have had some complaints from locomotive drivers that frequently vehicle drivers and pedestrians approach the crossing to a point much closer than 10ft., thus creating a hazard. Accidents have occurred recently because of this. I notice that many people stop far too close to the railway line, and I often wonder whether they are going to be hit by an oncoming train. The police at intervals, for the purpose of educating the public, make a blitz on certain types of traffic offences. Will the

Premier take up with the Chief Secretary the request that the police, for the purpose of educating the public, make a blitz on people approaching railway lines too closely?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will take up the suggestion, but I think probably another suggestion would give very much better results in this matter. I have noticed what the honourable member has mentioned, that frequently motorists stop far too close to the railway line at a "Stop" sign. I think it would probably be useful if a line were drawn across the road at the "Stop" sign, because I notice that in other places where there are "Stop" signs and a line is drawn it is almost invariably effective. I will take that up with the Commissioner of Highways at the same time. I do not think we want to conduct a blitz on motorists if we can do a better job otherwise.

#### FILM ON FARMING.

Mr. HARDING—Reports have been received that the Minister for Primary Industry, Mr. Adermann, has approved the production of a coloured film on animal nutrition and pasture utilization, the cost of which will be met by the Commonwealth Government. The farming methods shown in the film are apparently applicable to wide areas of eastern Australia and to South Australia. Will the Minister of Agriculture ascertain whether the film is applicable to South Australia and, if so, whether it will be available for use by agriculturists and other interested persons?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I will inquire and obtain a reply for the honourable member.

#### BURDETT, ETRICK AND SEYMOUR WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. BYWATERS—Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week about a water scheme for the hundreds of Burdett, Etrick and Seymour?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I inquired and found that the department has, in anticipation of the scheme going ahead soon, arranged to procure the necessary pipes. The work of laying them on the approved portion of the main will be commenced immediately.

#### LEFEVRE PENINSULA FIRE PROTECTION.

Mr. TAPPING—In the past two years there has been an agitation from residents of LeFevre Peninsula for more fire protection in that area and the Fire Brigades Board is conversant with their desires. In fairness to the board I should say that it has carefully

considered this matter and although it believes there are sufficient fire appliances and fire alarms in the area, it says there is a lack of public telephones. In 1958 the board made overtures to have more public telephones installed as a means of communicating with the board in the event of a fire. However, only one public telephone serves an area one mile in radius. Will the Premier ascertain from the board what the Postmaster-General's Department plans to do about installing more public telephone booths there, and what it has done up to the present?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—At present the Fire Brigades Board is preparing for me a complete report on extensions proposed for the metropolitan area, and I have no doubt that report will include reference to the honourable member's question. I will refer the question to the board so that it can be dealt with in the report, and when the report is to hand I will see that the honourable member gets a copy.

#### SIREX WASP.

Mr. RALSTON—Has the Minister of Forests a reply to the question I asked last week concerning signs of siren wasp infestation in timber which came to South Australia from Portland, Victoria?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I was written to by the Honourable Mr. Densley about this matter, and I should like to quote from my reply to him. In my letter I included a report from the Conservator of Forests, which was as follows:—

This is a question of very great importance to the forest industry in South Australia, and quarantine authorities are constantly examining imported crates and other wooden material, and insisting on fumigation or destruction if any signs of harmful insects are present. I think the incident to which Mr. Densley refers occurred when a shipment of machinery destined for the Australian Particle Board Company's factory at Mount Gambier was unloaded at Portland and sent to Mount Gambier without adequate inspection. The Quarantine Officer of the Agriculture Department informed me of this and stated that he was taking urgent measures to have the timber inspected.

I also arranged for Dr. Morgan of the Waite Institute to visit the area and also for our Regional Forester to be actively associated in these inspections. As a result, the situation was adequately covered and it is considered that there is no danger of any further development. I repeat that every possible effort must be made to prevent Sirex establishing itself in our forests, and that the department is in constant touch with the quarantine authorities to ensure that as much as possible is being done.

To that report I added the following comments:—

I might supplement this information by saying that the machinery, which was in wooden crates, came from Germany and the ship called in at Portland at short notice. As soon as the South Australian authorities heard of the inadequate inspection, they took urgent measures to correct the situation. In this instance, the timber had been attacked by Sirex wasps, but no live infestation was present. Since this incident the Commonwealth quarantine authorities have been approached to ensure against a repetition. As a general comment, I should add that Sirex wasp is the worst-known insect pest in planted forests, and the gravest view is taken of any possibility of it becoming established in South Australia.

#### WIRE MESH MACHINES.

Mr. HUGHES—Is the Premier aware that an advertisement appeared in the press under the heading “Opportunity knocks—£25 weekly?” I understand that a similar advertisement appeared in the city press in New South Wales, causing concern to some members in that State. Will the Premier ascertain whether the operations of the firm mentioned in the article are based on the sale of a wire mesh manufacturing machine for £325 to applicants, with an undertaking to supply the necessary wire and to purchase the finished product? Is it a fact that a number of people have invested their savings in what appeared to be an attractive proposition to earn £25 a week in their spare time, only to find that the firm’s undertaking was not carried out? Will the Premier have the matter investigated, firstly, to ascertain the value of the machine—which, I understand, is about £125—and, secondly, to determine the *bona fides* of the organization and those associated with it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—If the honourable member will give me a copy of the advertisement I will have the matter examined.

#### LAND FOR SCHOOLS.

Mr. QUIRKE—For some time I have been aware of the extremely high prices paid for land for schools. Gepps Cross is an instance. Will the Minister of Education ascertain whether it would be possible to use some land now under semi-governmental control in some areas for school purposes, particularly if there is a surplus of such land, because the cost of land today is adding tremendously to the cost of our school buildings?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I am also painfully aware of the extremely high prices the Government is obliged to pay for sites for

proposed new schools or additions to existing schools, and the land for the school at Gepps Cross, to which the honourable member referred, was extremely highly priced, but circumstances forced us into securing the site. For some years it had been considered necessary to establish a girls technical high school in the Gepps Cross area to provide for secondary education in a rapidly growing area and to enable Nailsworth girls technical high school to be relieved of its seriously overcrowded condition. The ideal site was a portion of the land vested in the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board. In 1957 the Education Department requested the board to sell a portion of its land for this purpose, but the board refused to do so. In 1958 I approached the board, through the then Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Pearson), but the request was again declined. Later in 1958, through the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Brookman) I requested the board to sell, but met with a refusal. In 1959 I further repeated my request to the board, but it was firm in reiterating its need for all the land at present held. The board claimed that it would be actually short of land in the future.

As the honourable member is aware, the board was established under the authority of Parliament, it is an autonomous or semi-autonomous body, and I do not consider that it would be proper, even if lawful, to force or endeavour to force its hand. In the meantime, negotiations had been in progress with various owners in endeavours to acquire alternative sites, but they met with no success until the present property became available. Urgent action was required to enable this property to be purchased in view of its suitability for industrial purposes, and also because the time was due, or overdue, for the commencement of the preliminary planning of the school. I can only express my regret, with that of the honourable member and members of the Public Works Committee who investigated the site, that it was necessary to go outside and pay a high price for land when more suitable land was available, but not available to the Education Department.

#### MOUNT BURR SEWERAGE.

Mr. CORCORAN—Recently, the secretary of the Mount Burr branch of the South Australian Country Women’s Association wrote the following letter to the District Council of Beachport:—

I have been instructed to write to you regarding the unsatisfactory state of the

sanitary disposal in this settlement. Gastro-enteritis is rife among the people of Mount Burr caused by, as one of the local doctors explained to a patient recently, the primitive methods of sanitation. Our members are alarmed at the rate with which infection spreads through the settlement. Some years ago the people of this settlement were promised septic tanks; the only tanks installed were at a few of the houses. We feel that money should be spent in improving the sanitary arrangements in the settlement. The Country Women's Association, Mount Burr branch, is appealing to you for immediate help in this matter.

This letter was forwarded to me by the district clerk of the district council of Beachport with the following letter:—

Enclosed is a letter from the Country Women's Association, Mount Burr branch, asking if assistance could be given them in their endeavours to obtain their much-needed septic systems. Any assistance that you can give would be greatly appreciated.

Can the Minister of Forests comment on this matter?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—As I said the other day, Mount Burr is one town in which it is intended to put a sewerage system. However, if the honourable member will let me have the letters I will obtain a report for him on the present situation.

#### HANSBOROUGH LIGHTING.

Mr. NICHOLSON—Will the Acting Minister of Railways take up with the Railways Commissioner the possibility of having a light installed at the Hansborough siding for the convenience of railway users? I point out that electric power is connected to residences nearby.

The Hon. Sir. THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes.

#### IRON BARON DEVIATION ROAD.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question relating to the Iron Baron Deviation Road?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The District Engineer at Port Lincoln, in whose district the proposed roadworks are situated, has not yet been able to report fully on the request due to heavy pressure of other work. The department has been heavily involved in preparing Loan Estimates and in matters associated directly with water schemes. However, at the earliest possible moment the district engineer will inspect the area and make as full a report as possible.

#### PORT LINCOLN BERTH.

Mr. RYAN—Has the Minister of Works been able to ascertain how much was spent on the Minnipa Berth at Port Lincoln?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The General Manager of the Harbors Board has set out as well as he was able the costs associated with this project. As I intimated to the honourable member when he asked the question, the accounts in connection with the rehabilitation of the harbor at Port Lincoln generally are somewhat interwoven and it is not possible to give a precise figure for the part of the work he mentioned. The whole of the area reclaimed—indeed, the whole of the new area that has been created in order to provide the berth for coastal shipping—cost £310,000. That has created not one but two berths, and it would be fair, therefore, to apportion just over one-half of that figure—namely, about £190,000—as the cost of the berth mentioned. Also, the berth provided for this expenditure is being converted at a very modest cost to meet the requirements of the new vessel *Troubridge*, which we expect will be operating by the middle of next year. Although that berth is not now being used by the *Minnipa* it is being used by other coastal shipping and will be the berth for the new trailer ship when it operates.

#### STUDENT TEACHERS' SALARIES.

Mr. CLARK—Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week concerning allowances for Teachers College students?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes. Before authority can be given for cheques to be released to new entrants to the Teachers Colleges, several steps have to be taken. The students' academic qualifications for entry to any particular courses must be assessed and this, of course, cannot be done until the examination results are available. As the honourable member knows, the Intermediate results upon which entry sometimes depends are not available until late January. Secondly, the applicants must be declared medically fit by the Principal Medical Officer for Schools in the Department of Health. As many as possible of the likely entrants are examined in October, but the majority must still be done in January. Forms of agreement between the Minister of Education, the student and the guarantor must be completed. There is considerable clerical work involved in all these steps, and this is done as expeditiously as

possible. However, for late applicants and some others whose official acceptance is delayed because of medical queries, it is not possible to issue the normal allowance cheques soon after the opening day of the colleges. However, in all cases of hardship through lack of funds, this year an immediate and substantial advance has been made to the students. At the present time a method to enable students to be paid before all conditions of acceptance for the colleges have been met and which yet safeguard public funds is under consideration. As far as is known, there has never been a request for weekly payment of Teachers College students. Fortnightly payments to teachers and students is standard practice. Weekly payment could not be made without a substantial increase in staff. It is considered that this expense is not warranted.

#### PORT AUGUSTA HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. RICHES—Delays have been taking place in the work to be carried out at the Port Augusta high school. The Minister of Works will remember that, in association with his colleague the Minister of Education, representations that the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline should be lowered were heard and agreed upon, and the work was carried out at the beginning of the winter. It was requested that the necessary levelling of the land should be carried out at the same time because of a very serious dust nuisance and erosion that could develop if the work were carried out in the late winter or during September. I understand that much negotiation has taken place in an effort to speed up this work, and that the Minister has had some investigations made following representations to him. Can he say when approval is likely to be given for this work to be put in hand?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The matter governing this proposal was, firstly, that the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline, which passes through the middle of the high school grounds, had to be lowered before work on the oval could take place. I asked the Engineer-in-Chief to have this work done as soon as he possibly could, subject to the water requirements of Port Augusta and Whyalla and, of course, Woomera, the water for which passes through that pipeline, and until the draw fell somewhat to more modest dimensions it was impossible to shut down the pipeline to do the work. This work was completed several weeks ago, and it is therefore now possible to grade and cover the oval. The Corporation of Port Augusta has made an offer to the Government to carry out

the work at cost, and I expect to take that offer to Cabinet for consideration on Monday, whereupon I expect that the offer will be accepted and the work commenced immediately.

#### MANNUM TEMPORARY HOMES.

Mr. BYWATERS—The Premier will recall that the Government recently offered to replace temporary homes with permanent structures, and that he promised to consider any application by a tenant of a temporary home for transfer to a permanent one. Some temporary homes were built at Mannum, originally for the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and they are now occupied by residents, mostly people working at Shearer's. Can the Premier say whether those people will be considered for transfer to permanent structures, so that they can vacate the temporary homes for permanent ones?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I do not believe the Mannum area has a very high priority, although the Government intends to dispense with all the temporary houses in due course.

#### MAIN NORTH ROAD DRAINAGE.

Mr. LAUCKE—A low-lying stretch of the Main North Road just south of Templers is subjected to flooding after heavy rains. The topography of the surrounding land is such that this water lodges and stays across the roadway for some time after heavy rain. Some time ago a life was lost at this point, and with the wet season this year attention has again been drawn to the danger of this particular location. Can the Premier say whether action will be taken at that point to ensure effective drainage of these floodwaters?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will have the matter examined.

#### JERVOIS BRIDGE.

Mr. TAPPING—About two months ago the Highways Department and the Port Adelaide Corporation agreed that as the Jervois Bridge was in a bad state of repair traffic exceeding five tons (which would, of course, include Tramways Trust buses) would be diverted over Birkenhead Bridge, and the light traffic using Jervois Bridge would be restricted to 15 m.p.h. This method was working very satisfactorily, but about a fortnight ago the Highways Department announced that for the next three or four months the buses from Semaphore to Adelaide would be restored to the Jervois Bridge because a sewerage contract would be undertaken in Carlisle Street costing about

£65,000. This decision has confused people using the Jervois Bridge because today, although a limit of five tons is imposed on lorries, the Tramways Trust buses can use it although they exceed 10 or 12 tons. Will the Acting Minister of Roads take up this matter with the respective departments to ensure that, where such a circumstance obtains, there will be co-ordination between those two departments rather than have this situation repeated?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Tramways Trust asked permission to use the bridge for a short period, because that was the only available and practicable route open to it, but the route was subsequently dislocated because of work by another Government department. A certificate was obtained from the Highways Department, which dealt with the question of safety, and the buses are allowed to use the Jervois Bridge in a restricted way for a very short period. Personally, I do not believe it would be desirable for all traffic to be allowed on that bridge again because I am certain that it would not then be used in the restricted way that the Tramways Trust is at present using it. However, I will have the matter examined.

#### ELECTRICITY FOR TARPEENA.

Mr. HARDING—I have before me a letter from the Electricity Trust of South Australia signed by Mr. R. W. Sanders, Resident Engineer for the South-East, in which he replies satisfactorily to many questions I asked him. As regards one question I asked about electricity for the school at Tarpeena, he says:—

We have not received an application for supply to the school, and two school houses, and, as far as we know, no attempt has been made to wire it for our supply.

Will the Minister of Education inquire into this matter to ascertain whether there is some difficulty and, if there is not, whether those houses and the school will shortly be wired for electricity?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—This is a matter with which I do not ordinarily deal but, as it has been called to my attention, I shall be pleased to inquire and let the honourable member know the result in due course.

#### HEALTH NUISANCE.

Mr. FRED WALSH—At the corner of Westminster Street and Grange Road in Fulham Gardens is a group of five new shops. The area is residential, not zoned for industrial purposes. These shops have been taken

over by a firm engaged in preparing kangaroo meat. The carcasses are brought to the shops in lorries some time after being killed. These carcasses are then dumped in the shops, and later cut up, the meat being packed for export and some sold to butchers for human consumption. This process is producing a very real nuisance to the local residents, the smell being odious. Refuse of an offensive nature is being dumped in the open outside the shops, despite warnings by the local health inspector. Flies and vermin have been seen collecting on this matter. A petition signed by 36 residents in the locality has been presented to the Woodville Council. Will the Premier, through the Minister of Health, refer this matter to the Central Board of Health with a view to early action being taken to have the complaints remedied?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes.

#### WATER ASSESSMENTS.

Mr. RALSTON—Great resentment has been expressed in Mount Gambier by many property owners at the substantial increases in water rates, due no doubt to the increases in assessments, some of which have been about 100 per cent. This is a typical example—and I quote from *The Border Watch* dated Saturday August 13, 1960:—

The Secretary of the Returned Servicemen's League (Mr. G. W. King) said yesterday morning he was "staggered" to learn the water rates of the club building had increased overall by 80 per cent since last year . . . Rates payable by the R.S.L. in the past five years are:—1956, £43 5s.; 1957, £155 1s. 5d. This can be explained by the fact that the R.S.L. rebuilt in those years, and the amount of £155 1s. 5d. was probably justified. In 1958 and 1959 the amount remained the same as in 1957. This year it has increased to £283 7s. The article also says:—

The assessment for one of the club's tenants had increased by as much as 111 per cent.

This, of course, is a matter of some concern. Can the Minister of Works inform the House what percentage, if any, is allowed for main tenance, rates, taxes and outgoings on a house or business property in arriving at the assessed value for rating purposes; and what is the percentage used to determine the annual rental value?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The information the honourable member has given to the House is, if correct—and I am not suggesting that it is not correct—a reflection of the very steep increases in property values that have taken place all over the State, particularly in a town

like Mount Gambier, which has enjoyed an unprecedented degree of prosperity due, no doubt, to the Government's activities in that area. After all is said and done, the increase in values, particularly in the part of Mount Gambier which the honourable member has mentioned and which is in the centre of the town, is in respect of a very desirable property, one which does credit to the R.S.L. sub-branch at Mount Gambier because of the fine building it has erected there. Nevertheless, it creates a very high value for that particular property. Indeed, as one travels around such salubrious townships as Mount Gambier, one is impressed with the fine buildings erected and the obvious air of prosperity reflected there. In those circumstances, the assessor, when he visits such a town, must have regard to the actual value of the property in assessing its annual value. That, no doubt, is responsible for the apparently steep increases in assessments which have occurred. That, of course, has taken place in other parts as well. Property values all over the State, particularly in the larger country towns, have increased substantially. That must reflect in the annual assessment. The full details of the assessments will be dealt with, no doubt, by the Treasurer in his Budget speech later on, but that is, broadly speaking, a factual answer to the honourable member's question.

Mr. RALSTON—I thank the Minister for his courteous reply, but I feel that he missed the point of the question. Can the Minister inform me what percentage, if any, is allowed for maintenance, rates and taxes and other outgoings in respect of a house or business property, in arriving at its assessed value for rating purposes, and what percentage is used to then determine the annual rental value?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I am afraid I do not get the drift of the question. The honourable member is apparently suggesting that the assessed annual value determined by an assessor be reduced by an amount equivalent to certain outgoings.

Mr. Ralston—I asked whether it was reduced?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I do not think that is the basis of assessing, although I do not speak with complete authority on this matter because I have not inquired into it. It has never occurred to me that such a contra should be placed against the assessed annual value in determining the ratable assessment. I will ascertain whether any allowance is made, but as far as I am aware no allowance is made for

outgoings such as rates, taxes, and maintenance.

Mr. Ralston—When you obtain a reply will you also set out the formula that is used?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Yes. I will ask the Chief Assessor to outline the methods used by assessors in determining values.

#### MANNUM SHEET PILING.

Mr. BYWATERS—The Minister of Works will recall that I have made representations about sheet piling work for the Mannum recreation area and I know that preparation work has been undertaken. Can the Minister make a progress report on the position?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—From memory, a plan was prepared and a method devised for recovery work along the river frontage at Mannum. I think it was agreed between the council and the engineer for the Harbors Board, who went to inspect the area, that the stone-work would be effective, and a price was estimated for the work. It was slightly less than the amount estimated for the work if done in timber. In a deputation to me, at which the honourable member was present, the council agreed to meet half the cost of the work, but it desired that the full capital cost be borne by the Government and that the council repay its share over a period of years. The matter has been considered and I think the Director of the Tourist Bureau has recommended—and I believe the Minister of Immigration has also agreed—that half the cost should be borne by the Government, but it has yet to be determined whether the Government will finance the whole capital cost of the work. That is being considered at present.

#### MELBOURNE EXPRESS STOPPING PLACES.

Mr. NANKIVELL—I understand that as from August 15 the Melbourne express will not make any scheduled stops between Taillem Bend and Keith. I have received a letter from the Coonalpyn Progress Committee, portion of which reads:

There are no secondary schools in this area and children desiring to attend such must board away in Murray Bridge and Adelaide. The parents of these children have depended on the Melbourne express to bring their children home for weekends, etc. Many working people who have no cars depend on the express for day trips to Adelaide for shopping, medical and optical treatment, and for business reasons. Even now with the express this makes a long day, particularly for mothers with children and for old folk; but if the express service is curtailed these people will find the trip impossible.

Will the Premier, as Acting Minister of Railways, have this matter investigated to ascertain whether in the revised schedule Coonalpyn could be made a permanent stopping place?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes.

#### VENDING MACHINE COMPANIES.

Mr. RICHES—On April 21 I asked the Premier a question about the operations of vending machine companies in South Australia, and whether the Government would consider introducing legislation to control the raising of money by vending machine companies to see that the interests of investors were protected under satisfactory agreements. The Premier gave two instances of unsatisfactory dealings by vending machine companies and said that the Attorney-General had recommended prosecutions. Can the Premier say whether any action was taken against those two companies; whether further investigations have been made into the operations of vending machine companies; and whether the Government intends to introduce legislation to control the raising of money by these companies?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—An investigation was made of vending machine companies but there was no recommendation for any prosecution. The Government decided it would not require vending machines to be registered as shops, and I think that was a reasonable decision because it would be rather fantastic to require such registration. With regard to the question whether legislation will be introduced, I ask the honourable member to put that question on notice and I will have a reply by next Tuesday.

#### LOCAL COURT DISTRICTS.

Mr. BYWATERS—My attention has been drawn to the present local court districts. There may be some reason for this, but apparently the districts surrounding Murray Bridge are to be in the Murray Bridge district (which, incidentally, will also include Whyalla) except Meningie, which is still included in the Mount Gambier district, and Mannum which is in the north-eastern district. Will the Minister of Education inquire from the Attorney-General whether the local court districts could be made more compact and whether Meningie and Mannum could be included in the Murray Bridge district? It must be more costly to operate a district so far flung than a compact district.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have no doubt there is a good reason for the present arrange-

ment but I shall be pleased to comply with the request to ask my colleague to investigate the matter.

#### WINKIE SCHOOL.

Mr. KING—Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent inquiry concerning the changes of staff for the Grade I class at the Winkie school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—A certificated teacher, who was in charge of the infant grades at Winkie school, resigned on July 15. She had been absent because of illness for some time before her resignation. It was not possible to fill the vacancy until it was known for sure that she would not be returning, and in the meantime several local temporary relieving teachers were called upon to serve at the school. An infant trained classified teacher has now been appointed to the Winkie school and commenced duty yesterday. It is expected that she will remain at Winkie in a permanent capacity and there will therefore be continuity of teaching by a permanently appointed staff.

#### APPOINTMENT OF GOVERNOR.

Mr. Hutchens for Mr. LAWN (on notice)—

1. What is causing the delay in the appointment of a Governor of South Australia?

2. Are Australian born citizens eligible for appointment as Governor?

3. Is it the intention to appoint an Australian?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. No official intimation has been received by the Government.

2. Yes.

3. *Vide* No. 1.

#### WATER ASSESSMENT.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (on notice)—

1. Has a new assessment applying to all water districts in the State been made recently?

2. If so, is it anticipated that this will result in an increase of revenue?

3. What is the estimated amount that will be received as the result of such re-assessment?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The replies are:—

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. £495,000, compared with a loss last year totalling £2,211,435.



## LOAN ESTIMATES.

In Committee.

(Continued from August 9. Page 538.)

Grand total, £30,772,000.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—Before embarking on a detailed examination of the Estimates I shall say a few words about the Treasurer's speech. In some respects he gave members a wealth of information but in other respects information that would have been valuable to the Committee was not provided. I do not altogether blame the Treasurer for that because, judging by the time he took to deliver his speech, all members realize that much time must have been spent in compiling the Estimates. Indeed, his speech might truly be described as a herculean effort, but I have certain suggestions to make for consideration by the Treasurer.

Last year, during the discussion on the Budget, I drew attention to the fact that we should have the Auditor-General's Report before we are asked to pass the Loan Estimates, because the Loan Estimates are most vital when we consider the amounts being spent annually, and the way the public debt is increasing. I have made this request for many years and I had hoped that this year the Treasurer would have acceded to my request, and would have had steps taken to present the Auditor-General's Report to Parliament prior to the discussion of either the Loan Estimates or the Budget. In saying that, I do not reflect on the Auditor-General or his department. We know that department has a mighty job to assemble the great mass of figures following the end of the financial year on June 30, and then the printing is no inconsequential matter. The Government, and probably the Treasurer, is responsible for the business of Parliament, and I therefore maintain that the debates on the Loan Estimates and the Budget could be postponed a short time to enable the Auditor-General's Report to be available.

The second major suggestion relates to the presentation of expenditure estimates relating to projects which extend over more than one year and, in some cases, take many years to complete. For example in regard to the construction of various wharves by the Harbors Board, the Treasurer made the following bald statements:—

£42,000 is required for the completion of the roll-on roll-off facilities at Kingscote for the new trailer ship *Troubridge*; £17,000 is provided for final payments in respect to a major project to provide additional shipping

accommodation and a bulk loading installation at Port Lincoln. The work was virtually completed in 1958-59 but final payments under contracts for mechanical equipment are to be made this year; £24,000 is proposed for the completion of a new berth at Kirton Point, Port Lincoln, to isolate tanker traffic from the general shipping berths. Four mooring dolphins were practically completed last year; £40,000 is required to complete a roll-on roll-off terminal at Port Lincoln for the trailer ship *Troubridge*.

This type of sketchy information is useless for providing members with an appreciation of the value we are obtaining for our money, and I referred back to the Loan Estimates debate for last year in order to obtain information on these items. In regard to the first item, namely, the roll-on roll-off berth at Kingscote, I read on page 428 of 1959 *Hansard*:—

£75,000 is proposed for the commencement of the work at Kingscote where accommodation for a roll-on roll-off vessel is to be provided at a total cost of £170,000.

With the £42,000 proposed expenditure for this year, does this mean that we are to complete this project for £117,000 instead of £170,000? In regard to the second item, namely, the £17,000 proposed this year for the bulk loading installation at Port Lincoln, I read on page 428 of 1959 *Hansard*:—

£18,000 is required to meet final payments in respect of the Port Lincoln bulk handling plant, which I have referred to as physically completed.

Will the £17,000 this year be the final of the final payments or will there be a similar line next year? Now for the next item, namely, the £24,000 proposed for the completion of the oil berth at Kirton Point, Port Lincoln, the Treasurer stated last year, *vide Hansard* at page 428:—

The sum of £120,000 is proposed to be spent on further work at Kirton Point oil berth. This new berth, which is required to isolate tanker traffic from the general shipping berths at Port Lincoln, is estimated to cost £185,000.

As the project was being referred to the Public Works Standing Committee in 1958 (*vide* 1958 *Hansard* at page 489) but no authorization for expenditure was sought during that year, it would appear that we are to obtain this berth for £144,000 instead of the £185,000 estimated. The final example I examined was the roll-on roll-off berth at Port Lincoln on which it is proposed to spend £20,000 this year. On looking at *Hansard* for last year I found that it was proposed to spend £20,000 of an estimated cost of £50,000 last year so that it would appear that this berth is to cost £40,000 when completed, instead of the estimated £50,000.

The sole point I have been trying to make in choosing these examples is that the information submitted by the Treasurer in the Loan Estimates does not permit us to critically examine the Estimates in their proper perspective. The Estimates should show the original estimated cost, the Loan expenditure to date, the proportion of the project completed, and the proposed expenditure for the current year. It is only in this way that members, on both sides of the House, will be able to carry out their financial function in Parliament, which is to control the Revenue and Loan expenditure of this Government in the most efficient manner and thereby obtain the best value for the Government moneys expended. It is no value to anybody to be told that the Government is spending so much here and so much there unless the Government is able to convince us that we are obtaining true value for the money that the present Government is so liberally splashing around. I say splashing around because these Estimates, to me, are only stop gap Estimates which have been prepared on the basis of attempting to stop the rot where it is occurring, and the rot is particularly evident in housing, education and water supplies. However, I shall have more to say on these matters a little later on; I first want to deal with the Treasurer's overall survey of his grand scheme for the coming year.

I listened with a great deal of interest whilst the Treasurer delivered his great oration on the Loan Estimates and was greatly intrigued by the figure of £51,000,000 that he blandly rolled off his tongue in an effort to bewilder the members of the House with his financial wizardry and to convince the public of South Australia of the great job he is doing for this State. The true facts of the case are that the Loan Council in June this year approved of a Loan programme for the whole of Australia of £230,000,000, which is a £10,000,000 increase on that approved for last year. The only additional funds were those for semi-governmental authorities which were authorized by the Loan Council to borrow £106,000,000 on the open market, and this is an increase of £2,000,000 on that authorized last year. South Australia's share of the £10,000,000 is £1,382,000, and of the £2,000,000 the semi-governmental authorities in South Australia were only authorized to borrow an additional £236,000. Throughout his speech the Treasurer made vague references to the use of internal funds of the semi-governmental bodies. What he would be referring to would be the depreciation reserves of these bodies

and, as the expenditure in this field has been occurring for years, it should be no revelation to members to know that these bodies will be continuing to spend these funds on capital replacement during the present year.

Therefore, in my opinion, the Treasurer can pad his expenditure by any method he chooses, but the additional Loan funds either allocated or authorized by the Loan Council for governmental and semi-governmental pursuits for the year 1960-61 only total approximately £1,600,000. The only other source of Loan funds open to the Government is the repayments of existing borrowings and the estimate for this year is only £550,000 more than it was last year.

I am open to correction on the following, but the latest information I have is that this State was allocated only £5,000,000 under the Commonwealth State Housing Agreement this year whereas the figure shown in the Loan Estimates is £5,800,000. My information is based on the report of the Loan Council apportionment for 1960-61 as set out in the *Advertiser* of June 25, 1960, and I would appreciate an explanation from the Treasurer as to where the additional £800,000 is coming from. I am not criticizing the amount, as I think that insufficient has been provided for housing this year because I have had electors come to me and request advice as to how they can obtain a home in which to live. Before approaching me they had already tried for private accommodation, but the rents being asked were exorbitant and beyond their means. They had already approached the Housing Trust for rental accommodation but had been informed that the Trust was still dealing with 1955 applications. This does not reconcile with the statement of the Treasurer in the Loan Estimates; namely:—

Over the past 20 years South Australia has achieved an enviable record among the Australian States for the well balanced progress which it has fostered.

Whilst on this topic of housing I turn now to the first item referred to in the review of the main works in the Loan Estimates; namely, Advances for Homes, £2,850,000. This is one example of where a grand announcement of the Treasurer will not stand close scrutiny. Last month he decided to give the general public a preview of the Loan Estimates for this year, before discussing them with his fellow members of Parliament or with the Opposition. To me, this reflects a most arrogant and dictatorial attitude as well as a flagrant disregard for proper Parliamentary

procedure. It is for the members of this House as a full Parliamentary body to say how the Loan funds of the Government are to be spent and it is not for Sir Thomas Playford to curry political favour by grand announcements in the press or over the air of schemes which have not been sanctioned by Parliament.

In his preview of the Loan Estimates the Treasurer is reported as saying, *vide Advertiser*, July 14, 1960:—

The Government proposes to make more than £4,000,000 available to the State Bank this financial year towards home advances.

From an examination of the Loan Estimates I find that the actual figure is £4,190,000. From this announcement the inference is that the Government is making an additional effort to improve the inadequate housing position in South Australia but when we examine the Loan Estimates for last year we find that that is not the case. I quote the following statement by the Treasurer, as recorded in *Hansard* on August, 12, 1959:—

This year (he was referring to the financial year 1959-60 which has just concluded) the bank will have available £2,750,000 under the Advances for Homes Schemes, £1,100,000 of Housing Agreement moneys, and £850,000 which was specially provided by the Public Purposes Loan Act passed in June, making a total of £4,700,000.

On this matter of housing the Treasurer stated, according to the *Advertiser* report, that the amount provided last year proved to be inadequate. The inference I draw from this remark is that the amount provided last year was examined and that when it was found to be inadequate provision was made for the correct amount to be provided this year, but when we examine the amount provided on the Loan Estimates last year and compare it with the amount provided this year we find that £500,000 less is to be provided this year than was provided last year. After a perusal of these figures only an idiot would accept the Treasurer's statement as a genuine attempt by the present Government to overcome the lack of finance for housing in South Australia. The statement is purely a political trick given out in the hope of influencing some people to think that £4,000,000 is a colossal amount and will remedy the shortage of finance for building homes, but it should influence only people who have no background knowledge of the subject. The bald statement that the Government proposes to provide more than £4,000,000 to the State Bank towards home advances during the coming year sounds very good until it is compared with what was provided last year and found to be £500,000 less.

In his speech on the Loan Estimates the Treasurer did not make any reference to the fact that the State Bank has not been accepting applications for home advances for some time. The actual fact is that the State Bank has not been accepting applications since August last year because of inadequate finance. Therefore, at present, there is approximately a 12 months' lag of applications to be overtaken. The present Government in its Loan Estimates has made no provision for this. The inadequacy of the State Bank finance is borne out by the fact that as soon as it became known that the State Bank was again accepting applications for housing finance there was an immediate rush of applicants to have their cases considered. On the first day of business more than 2,000 people queued for hours to make applications, whereas it has been estimated that the amount proposed would only provide sufficient advances to cater for approximately 1,400 home seekers. Only 805 applicants were able to be interviewed by the end of the first day, and this was in spite of the fact that additional staff was engaged on interviewing in an attempt to cope with the rush. It can only be assumed that the other 1,200 people either realized the hopelessness of the position or, similarly, after many hours of thoughtful consideration realized that here was another promise of the Treasurer's that collapsed like a punctured balloon as soon as it had served its political significance of portraying to the public what a grand job the present Government was doing for the people of South Australia. On the second day of application 300 people were waiting at the bank's doors to apply for finance in order to build or buy their own homes. Even if no more applications are received the full amount of finance promised will have been committed for the coming year. The present position is that the State Bank will continue to accept applications for housing advances but it will be many months before applicants will know whether they have been successful or not.

In my opinion, instead of the provision made for housing advances from the State Bank and its related announcements showing what a grand job the present Government is doing for the people of South Australia, the action by the public in scrambling for the promised finance, and that is the only appropriate way to describe a situation where people are prepared to queue, even overnight, at a bank as a step towards obtaining their own home, has brought into bold relief the announcements that the members of the Labor Party have

been making for many years, and it is that the present Liberal Government has not an efficient plan for overtaking the serious lack of housing accommodation available in South Australia.

I now turn to the Education provision, £4,700,000, because that is the second major field where lack of adequate planning by the present Government is manifesting itself. It is idle for the Government to boast of proposed increased expenditure as an excuse for its earlier lethargy in not proceeding with an efficient plan for education. In addition to this, however, I am not satisfied that we are receiving the full value for the substantial increases in education expenses which have been occurring over recent years, and my views are substantiated by the estimated cost of new school buildings. For example, with the presentation of the Loan Estimates last year, the construction of several primary schools of pre-cast concrete design with 23 classrooms was provided for. At that time I drew the attention of the Government to the differences in the proposed costs of construction of similar schools, which were not explained by the Treasurer, yet should have been.

Mr. Clark—Did you get a reply?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Not yet. I am hoping for an explanation after this year's efforts. Even though the Treasurer gave us a wealth of information this year the comparison of cost with similar types and sizes of school buildings was missing so that I have been unable to make further comparisons and offer advice to the Government where I consider that economies could be made. However, the schools I selected last year still have a great bearing on the subject. They were all put forward as primary schools of 23 classrooms and of pre-cast concrete construction and the estimated costs submitted last year were as follows:—Elizabeth Grove £130,000; Elizabeth East £188,000; Clapham £229,000. The position now is:—Elizabeth Grove—completed at a final cost of £119,000; Elizabeth East—new estimated cost £205,000 and still under construction; Clapham—new estimated cost £226,000 and still under construction.

I note, according to the information supplied this year, that the school erected at Elizabeth Grove is of brick construction, but I assume that we still obtained a primary school of 23 classrooms for the £119,000 expended. Therefore, my criticism of last year is still valid, namely, if we can obtain a primary school in one area of 23 classrooms for £119,000 why can-

not we obtain the same size school in another area for approximately the same cost?

The Treasurer, when speaking of the amount of Loan money being made available to the State Bank, laid great emphasis on the following statement:—

It is clear that within the present limit of funds an increased allocation to one vital need can only be at the expense of another vital need.

It is because of my dissatisfaction with the way the Loan Estimates have been presented on education needs that I consider that there is scope here for additional funds to be made available for housing needs. My reason for saying this is that I consider that the estimates presented for educational requirements have been inflated. Naturally I have not had time in the week allowed by the Treasurer for my perusal of the Loan Estimates to fully analyse the Education Estimates, and therefore I have concentrated my attention on new primary schools and additions thereto, and made comparisons where possible.

On the Loan Estimates last year for new primary schools and additions completed during 1959-60 £1,563,000 was provided. This relates to 17 primary schools, and all that was required to complete the work envisaged was £1,394,000, i.e., on primary school work the estimates were overstated by approximately 10 per cent.

I notice with the primary schools in Elizabeth that the estimates of the total cost have moved as follows:—

	Total estimated cost. 1959-60.	1960-61.
	£	£
Elizabeth East . . . . .	188,000	205,000
Elizabeth Park . . . . .	134,000	141,000
Elizabeth Vale . . . . .	133,000	154,000
Total . . . . .	455,000	500,000
Per cent increase . . . . .		10 per cent.

I assume that these estimates were overstated in the same manner as the primary schools which were completed during 1959-60, and which were overstated by 10 per cent. Therefore, the above estimates are still 10 per cent too high this year because they have also been increased to take care of increased wages and materials prices.

I also had a brief look at the high schools completed during 1959/60, and found that they were completed at costs approximately 25 per cent less than their estimated total costs. If this over-estimating is common throughout the provisions for the Education Department, I say that there is a line where we can obtain at least £470,000 additional finance for advances for housing requirements. Another question

which should be investigated is whether we receive full value for the ordinary annual running costs of education. From the last report of the Minister of Education, which is for the year ended December 1958, I find that, over a period of four years, and after excluding capital expenditure, such as the building of new schools, the average cost per pupil instructed increased by approximately 30 per cent. Over the same period the general level of prices increased by only approximately 10 per cent. We still have over-crowded classrooms and lack of teachers and with the unsatisfactory conditions still continuing I am of the opinion that we are not receiving value for the increased expenditure being made. What we require is a proper plan for the expansion of education in this State, and not just the present Government's policy of pouring a colossal sum of money into a neglected education system, which is the result of the present Government's lack of planning in the past, in the hope that by the quantity of money used its problems will be solved. I return the Treasurer's own words, namely:—

It is clear that within the present limit of funds an increased allocation to one vital need can only be at the expense of another vital need.

Seeing that the Treasurer intends to spend a further £9,000,000 on waterworks and sewers this year, I must have a few words to say on this topic. The point that hits one first and foremost is that £5,342,000 of the £9,000,000 is to be spent in the metropolitan area. This colossal expenditure in the metropolitan area is forced on the Engineering and Water Supply Department by the policy of the present Government in fostering the uneconomic growth of a densely populated metropolitan area. I understand from the *Government Gazette*s of July 14 and July 28, 1960, that there will be substantial increases in assessments in an attempt to lessen the deficiencies which have been occurring, probably more substantial than would have been required had the matter been tackled several years ago as it should have been. What relation is there between the cost of the service and the revenue derived? There has not been any relation for many years, and although members on this side of the House pointed out that the financial position of the Engineering and Water Supply Department was gradually deteriorating, our remarks fell on deaf ears. Today, even the metropolitan water schemes are making a loss, and one wonders whether, as a result of the new assess-

ments, they will again be profitable, or whether the tempo of Government expenditure will continue at such a rate that it will outstrip the increased revenue from the increased assessments. The Mannum-Adelaide pipeline and the South Para reservoir are an expression of the Treasurer's determination that the metropolitan population should increase, and I see that the Myponga reservoir is already consuming a large proportion of the total Loan funds of the Engineering and Water Supply Department for this year, as it is proposed to spend another £1,712,000 on that project this year. I sincerely hope that this scheme will be able to be completed at somewhere near its estimated cost.

The big omission from the Estimates for water supply was the proposed duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline, which has received very scant mention. All we are told is that it has been referred to the Public Works Standing Committee for inquiry and that £264,000 is proposed for booster pumps on the existing pipeline to give immediate assistance. I am sure I read in the press recently that this proposed duplication was practically an accomplished fact at an estimated cost of £12,000,000. Has the Treasurer at long last been bitten often enough to make him hasten slowly in the consideration of a further pipeline costing millions of pounds? For many years I have been trying to get the Government to agree to the matter of providing reticulated water for Terowie being referred to the Public Works Committee for inquiry and report, but the Government has flatly refused to do this. Much reference has been made recently to the duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline being rendered necessary by the proposed expansion at Whyalla and the necessity to provide water for the beneficiation plant proposed to be established at Iron Knob to improve the quality of the low-grade iron ores that abound in such quantities in that area. One would have thought that an opportunity would have been taken to fetch the route of this alleged duplication further north, so that the problems of Booleroo Centre, Quorn, Terowie and various other dry districts in that area could be solved. But what do we find? We find that a very large sum is to be spent, some time in the future, but that the alleged duplication is going to keep mighty close to the existing line.

Mr. Shannon—Who told you that?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I read it in the press. The *Advertiser* is apparently the Treasurer's

vehicle for all kinds of announcements on public policy and public expenditure. I do not think the Treasurer's Wednesday night broadcasts are kite-flying, and I do not think their publication in full in the *Advertiser* the following day is an accident or anything the member for Onkaparinga would challenge. The question of duplication has been referred to the Public Works Standing Committee, and will the honourable member deny that it is intended to follow the existing route?

Mr. Shannon—The honourable member denies nothing. The department has not yet told us anything about where it is to go.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—One reads in the press, amongst other things, that certain arrangements made to take it a little further north have been cancelled because it is intended to submit a new scheme to follow the route of the existing line.

Mr. Shannon—That has not been suggested.

Mr. Quirke—A much bigger pipeline.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Well, we shall wait and see. All I can suggest to the committee is that it look at another route.

Mr. Shannon—When such a reference comes before us we always do that, as the Leader well knows.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Even at this late stage consideration should be given to extending the line on a more northerly route to meet the problems of the towns I have referred to. If the sole object of the pipeline is to provide additional water at Whyalla and Iron Knob, with the resultant heavy cost due to having to convey water by pipeline over a great distance, I think we should have our eyes more to the future and consider the economics of establishing a desalination plant to meet the water requirements of the area with the object of conversion to atomic power in the near future, and the reason for this view is that I have recently seen repeated references to this method for water treatment in Israel, where the cost of water at the plant was stated to be 18 cents per 1,000 gallons, which would be equivalent to approximately 1s. 6d. per thousand gallons in Australian currency. That would be so if the currency used in Israel were equivalent to the American currency, and I presume that it is for the plant is being established by a very large American firm. I make that suggestion for what it is worth. Perhaps it has already been considered by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, which is a very efficient department; it has been well handled down the years and is being well handled today by the officers in charge of

the various sections. If we could convert salt water into potable water by the expenditure of 1s. 6d. per thousand gallons it ought to be cheaper than pumping it from the River Murray to Whyalla or Iron Knob.

Mr. Shannon—I think you can say that it would be cheaper.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I am glad the honourable member agrees with my suggestion, and I hope that before we spend many more millions on a scheme of this nature we will at least have this matter properly investigated. I would have no objection to the chairman of the committee going to Israel to conduct an on-the-spot investigation.

I should like the Committee to consider the overall picture which is added to by the Estimates we are now considering. We hear that South Australia is the most prosperous State in the Commonwealth, and that our population increase is the greatest in the Commonwealth on a *pro rata* basis. In fact, according to one recently published statement by the Treasurer, South Australia is literally bursting at the seams.

Mr. Jennings—It must be prosperous, as the cost of living recently went up by 7s. a week!

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Of course, I am sure that Mr. Bolte from Victoria would not agree with the Treasurer's statement. Much progress which this State has made in recent years is due to the expenditure of Loan money. According to my school of economics, when a person has an annual revenue from a certain type of production and he borrows something, the additional borrowed amount is added to the sum he has available to spend in that period. I have looked at the Public Debt figures for 1959 compared with 1949. South Australia's public debt in 1949 was £127,000,000, but the latest official figure available, which is for the year ended June 30, 1959, shows the amount as £348,000,000, an increase of £221,000,000 in 10 years and that increase is almost twice as much as the total public debt which had accrued against the State in the period of a little over 100 years before. I am concerned as to whether we are getting full value. I do not make any charges against any of the officials concerned with the expenditure of Loan money because I realize that a great deal of this money has to be spent on non-profitable items, such as education, police, and court houses, and hospitals can almost be placed in that category too. I have a table showing the percentage increases in the dead weight of the public debt charges

since 1948-49. The "dead weight" of public debt charges represents the public debt charges not recovered from undertakings and services financed from loan funds. I do not propose to read the whole table and ask leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

"DEAD WEIGHT" STATE PUBLIC DEBT.

Year	"Dead Weight."	Percentage Increase since 1948-49. per cent.
1948-49 . . . . .	3,490,000	—
1949-50 . . . . .	3,800,000	8.9
1950-51 . . . . .	3,860,000	10.6
1951-52 . . . . .	4,050,000	16.0
1952-53 . . . . .	4,150,000	18.9
1953-54 . . . . .	4,950,000	41.8
1954-55 . . . . .	4,880,000	39.8
1955-56 . . . . .	5,080,000	45.6
1956-57 . . . . .	5,410,000	55.0
1957-58 . . . . .	5,890,000	68.8
1958-59 . . . . .	6,330,000	81.3

Mr. O'HALLORAN—In 1948-49, according to the audit reports, the dead weight of public debt—that is that portion which does not earn interest—was £3,490,000 and that item had in 1958-59 increased to £6,330,000. That is a very substantial increase. It means that those works that are profitable and which do return the cost of their service have to earn more in order to meet the dead weight mentioned in this schedule.

Mr. Shannon—We have a lot more people to carry that dead weight now.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—That is problematical because the public debt has increased. The interest and sinking fund payments may be a better gauge of that. The interest and sinking fund payments in 1948-49 amounted to £5,342,000 and in 1958-59 the figure was £16,076,000. That figure had more than trebled in the 10-year period, but the population did not more than treble in that time.

Mr. Shannon—I am not suggesting that it did, but it has increased greatly.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Yes, by about half. What I am concerned about is what contribution the additional population—and members must realize that much of the additional population comprises our young folk who will not have the capacity to earn for a long time yet—will be able to make in future towards meeting this debt. The position as I see it, despite what we hear to the contrary, is that the State's primary production has declined. There has certainly been a decline in the numbers of people actively engaged in

primary production. It is true that we have had an increase in secondary industries, but I sometimes wonder whether we are not paying too great a price to make our secondary industries competitive with those in Victoria. We allow road hauliers without let or hindrance to knock to pieces the roads we construct at great cost, and we allow them to take traffic from the railways—traffic which the railways are well equipped to handle—so that railway losses have become tremendous in recent years.

Mr. Millhouse—If you had your way would you ban interstate road hauliers altogether?  
Mr. O'HALLORAN—No. I believe they have a place in the scheme of things.

Mr. Millhouse—It seems to be a very little place from what you have said.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—No, the road haulier has his place just as the railways have their place. The railways have to provide rolling-stock and I maintain that if the road haulier made a fair contribution for the road he drives over he could be allowed to continue without let or hindrance. Does that satisfy the honourable member?

Mr. Millhouse—Yes, but I would like you to say how we could do that.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—The honourable member is a lawyer and surely he can find some way for South Australia to do that because the other States have done it and they set the pattern. All that the honourable member has to do is to take their law and apply it to South Australian conditions.

Mr. Millhouse—What State has the Leader in mind in particular?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Victoria. I have purposely been very moderate this afternoon in my criticism of the Government. I could find much more to say, but in the main I am concerned more with the end pattern than with the immediate result. The end pattern does worry me. Almost weekly we hear stories about the prosperity of South Australia, how it is bursting at the seams, how it is making more rapid progress than any other State, and all the rest of it. One thing that is never told to us by the Treasurer, though the member for Mitcham may tell us, is why the public debt in South Australia at June 30, 1959, was the highest per head of population of any of the mainland States. The lowest was in Victoria at £197, followed by Queensland at £211, while Western Australia, which is a developing State and one more difficult to develop than South Australia because of its

vast area, had a State public debt of £323 per head of population.

Mr. Hall—Do those figures include semi-governmental undertakings?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—No.

Mr. Hall—They would have an impact.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—If the honourable member would like to look at my last speech on the Loan Estimates he would see in *Hansard* that I gave both the State figures and the semi-governmental figures, and South Australia on those figures is in the same position. It is the second highest in Australia and the highest of any mainland State with a debt of £342 per head of population.

Mr. Millhouse—What are the Tasmanian figures?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—£449 per head of population. I do think that we should have the Auditor-General's report before we are asked to deal with the Loan Estimates because when we are asked to vote an amount of £30,000,000 new money we should have before us the balance-sheets of the undertakings that the money is to be spent on and secondly, while I did commend the Treasurer previously, I think he should give us more information on how the continuing works are progressing. For instance, if something authorized years ago was estimated to cost £300,000 we should know how much has been spent on it and how much has to be spent on it to bring it to completion. I support the first line.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham)—I support wholeheartedly the adoption of the first line, unlike the Leader of the Opposition who, I feel, would have liked to say that his support for the adoption of the first line was fairly slight. I had been going to say that the Leader had done his best to attack the Loan Estimates, but later he admitted that he had not done his best because, he said, he was being "very moderate". One cannot blame him for being moderate because it is extremely difficult to attack the Estimates. Certainly the Estimates we have had laid before us represent a magnificent job when we consider that they come before this House at the end of the worst drought this State has ever experienced. I admire the Leader's self-admitted moderation in what he said. One of my colleagues said that the Leader was roaring like a dove in his comments this afternoon and I think that is a very good description of what we have heard from him, though he did make one or two criticisms this afternoon. He did his best to

find some weaknesses in the Loan Estimates, but they were pin-pricks which got nowhere and did not leave one dent in the Estimates placed before us.

There was only one thing on which I did agree with him and that was in regard to the Auditor-General's report. I do not think that many members in the Chamber would disagree with him on that. It would be a very great advantage to me personally to have the Auditor-General's report before the Loan Estimates were introduced, just as it is an advantage to have the report before the Budget is introduced. There are two matters on which I wish to speak briefly this afternoon. Normally I feel that the debate on the Loan Estimates could be more conveniently carried out on the items themselves and not on the first line, but there are two items which I consider are of such great importance that I should like this opportunity to deal with them.

The first item is that of the Harbors Board—£1,275,000. In common with a number of members—and I think most members of the House have done this at some time—in the last few months I have had the pleasure as the guest of Mr. Sidney Crawford (Chairman of the Harbors Board) to see the development of the Greater Port Adelaide Scheme and I thoroughly enjoyed my trip into the electorates represented by the members for Port Adelaide and Semaphore. I was amazed at the amount of land that is available down there for reclamation and development for industry and housing.

Mr. Ryan—Especially for housing.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Yes. I have visited the Dean Rifle Range which we all hope will be incorporated in the Greater Port Adelaide Scheme if the State is able to purchase it from the Commonwealth, for which authority has been given by Parliament. Before this trip I had never had the opportunity to examine this part of the metropolitan area in detail. I was very impressed with what I saw and with the plans for the future. In spite of the brochure published by the Harbors Board last year and in spite of the Treasurer's broadcast, which no doubt was listened to intently by every member of the Opposition, if there is one criticism I should like to make of the board it is that it does not give sufficient publicity to what it is doing under the Greater Port Adelaide plan. I think that this plan would compare very favourably with what the Housing Trust has done at Elizabeth. The following is



taken from the foreword by the Minister of Marine to the brochure on this plan:—

When all the existing low-lying and swampy areas contiguous to the port area are made available for occupation in fulfilment of the board's plans, Port Adelaide will be outstanding amongst the world's ports for the opportunities it will afford for the establishment of large industrial and commercial undertakings in close proximity to the waterfront.

What is happening there could very well be compared with what has been done at Elizabeth, and yet when it comes to publicity there is no doubt that the Housing Trust leaves the Harbors Board for dead.

Mr. Jennings—The Minister of Marine did not know anything about that until after the Treasurer's broadcast!

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I do not know whether he is right, but probably the honourable member knew nothing about it. That is what I am complaining about. This is a magnificent scheme, but it seems to me that it has not received the publicity it deserves. I do not raise the matter simply to say that, but because I am frankly disappointed to see the small amount allowed on the Estimates for this particular scheme. The Estimates reveal that for the reconstruction of wharves, which is part of the Greater Port Adelaide Plan, £55,000 has been allotted for the North Parade wharf and the only other amount set aside for developmental work at Port Adelaide is £75,000 for sundries, a total of £130,000 out of a grand total of £1,275,000 for the Harbors Board. However, £123,000 is set aside for Kingscote and Port Lincoln, a further £365,000 for dredging at Port Pirie, £152,000 for wharf reconstruction at Port Pirie, and £186,000 for bulk handling installations at Thevenard. I mention these figures as a comparison with what is proposed to be spent on the Greater Port Adelaide Plan. The vast bulk of the money to be spent by the Harbors Board will be at places away from Port Adelaide. In October, 1959, the Minister of Marine estimated that the Greater Port Adelaide Plan would cost £45,000,000 so the £130,000 to be spent in the present financial year will really not get us very far. We know the Government's views about the benefits of the plan and the Treasurer is reported in the *Advertiser* of July 30, 1959, as follows:—

He said no capital port in the Commonwealth would be able to equal Port Adelaide's attractions for industry when the project was finished. It will be appreciated that improvement of this large area will be of great advantage in connection with Adelaide's housing as it will make available desirable residential

areas within easy distance of the city. In terms of housing alone it would provide good homes in attractive areas for 25,000 people. The area it is now proposed to develop was close to the city and adjacent to the port, and was already near the necessary services for both industry and houses.

We have had the opportunity to see just how magnificent the proposed plan is and yet on the Loan Estimates this year provision is made for only a meagre sum for its implementation. There are three considerations in connection with this matter. One relates to the work to be done in preparation of sites for industry. We were told at that time that a number of these sites had already been sold to private industry. I should like to know how many have been sold, to whom, and, if it is not confidential, at what price and whether a sum equivalent to the proceeds of the sales is in fact being applied to further developmental work at Port Adelaide.

The second consideration relates to housing. We were shown the developmental work being carried out by the Housing Trust, especially on LeFevre Peninsula and at Semaphore South. One of these areas is along the Lady Gowrie Drive on the way to Outer Harbor and the other at Semaphore South, near the projected tidal basin. I think that both of these areas could be made into most attractive housing estates, and that is what is planned under the Harbors Board scheme. We were told in the brochure that sufficient land would be available to supply the needs of an additional 6,250 houses at LeFevre Peninsula, Semaphore South and the Grange. I assume that each would be on a separate block and if we assumed that each block was worth on an average £1,000 (and I suggest that would not be out of the way) the value of the land would be £6,250,000, representing capital now locked up within a few miles of the Adelaide General Post Office. Even if we say the land is worth £5,000,000 or half my original total—between £2,000,000 and £3,000,000—which would be absurdly cheap after the developmental work had been carried out—we have money which this State could have if the developmental work was done.

It seems to me that we have locked up down there much capital which the State could be using to great profit if this developmental work was undertaken. I may be off the beam in that respect, and, if so, should like to be put right. It seems to me that we are wasting a valuable asset at a time when the member for Enfield, Mr. Jennings, is worried about

the sprawl and spread of the city to outer areas such as Tea Tree Gully and along the South Road. Here at Port Adelaide we have, according to the Treasurer, land within five miles of the General Post Office, sufficient for 6,250 houses. I cannot understand why the developmental work is not being undertaken. I may be told that the Housing Trust should develop this area, but I cannot see why its development should have to wait on the trust, thus holding up its release for private sale and the building of private houses. I suggest in good faith to the Government that it should consider whether the time has not arrived to do this.

Before the tour referred to ended, the party was addressed by Mr. Sainsbury, the Chief Engineer of the Harbors Board, who gave a very interesting outline of the whole scheme. I remember in particular what he said about the proposed tidal basin at Semaphore South. Of course, honourable members opposite may not like this but I am prepared to acknowledge freely what he said, and that was that no sooner had the Treasurer seen the plan drawn up by the Harbors Board for that tidal basin than he drew on the plan a channel linking the basin with the open sea, turning what would have been simply a tidal basin into a boat haven.

Mr. Ryan—That is only a Playford dream, though.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—If the honourable member opposite survives long enough, he will see who is right and who is wrong, but I think he will find that it is more than a dream.

Mr. Shannon—The Treasurer has brought many dreams to fruition.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—He has. In fact, Mr. Sainsbury told us that there was no reason why that particular dream should not come to fruition within six years. Let the honourable member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan), if he lasts long enough, see what happens.

The question I should like to have answered is: when is this work to be done? The sooner the better. To sum up what I have been saying about the Harbors Board and the Greater Port Adelaide Plan, it seems to me that we have an opportunity to do three things there: (1) to attract industry, (2) to provide for housing, and (3) to beautify an area which is at present quite unlovely. Everybody is enthusiastic about the scheme. All I am saying is that we are disappointed that we do not see more than a mere £130,000 on the Loan Estimates this year to carry it out. I shall not say any more about that, but will

await my opportunity, when we debate the individual items, to try to get the information I have already referred to. I hope the Minister will be kind enough to supply it to me then.

I should like to mention another matter—and again, Mr. Deputy Chairman, so that you will not pull me up, I shall found my remarks on the item “Public Buildings, £7,700,000,” and refer to the line “School buildings, £4,700,000.” When you say that quickly, it does not sound much but, if you like to think about it, you have there nearly £5,000,000 to be spent in this financial year upon school buildings in this State. I hasten to say that I have no complaints about the programme here so far as it affects my district. I am glad to see that my district comes first alphabetically in three groups. There is a new primary school and infant school at Clapham; we are having another Blackwood primary school and a new high school at Blackwood; and there is to be a craftwork and domestic art centre at Mitcham girls technical high school. I have no complaints at all on that score. The matter I should like to discuss, arising out of what I consider to be an absolutely justified but quite enormous expenditure on school buildings, is Commonwealth aid for education. There has been going on in Australia over the last few years (and it has become more active in the last few months) an agitation for Commonwealth aid for education. So far, nothing seems to have come of it. It was reported in the *Advertiser* of last Thursday that the Prime Minister said that:—

The Commonwealth has no intention of departing from established financial relationships with the States in the field of education. Mr. Menzies continued:—

Established relationships make express provision for growth and development and thus for increased expenditure on education by the States. The field of primary, secondary and technical education is one in which States exercise complete responsibility. It is for them to institute any inquiries in this field.

So far as that goes, I respectfully agree with what the Prime Minister has said, but the whole question of education is so important to Australia that we who bear the primary responsibility for it in this State ought not to ignore the agitation for Commonwealth aid for education but should examine the motives of those behind the agitation and consider whether or not what they are suggesting is sound. That is the reason why I take this opportunity of raising this important matter in this House.

Mr. Shannon—It would be better if we had a little more money voted to us from the pool of taxation to let us run our own show.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I could not agree more with the honourable member; he is quite right. Our educational system—and I hope that other honourable members will agree with me—is by no means perfect, and much could be done to improve it. Nobody knows that better than the Minister of Education, for he has said so on many occasions. However, I believe that the Government has done a good job in coping with the terrific expansion in our State educational needs over the last few years. I was delighted, contrary to what the Leader of the Opposition said, to find in the Treasurer's speech that he says:—

The present school building programme, which is not only keeping pace with current enrolments, but is also continually improving the ratio of pupils to classrooms, is now so large and complex . . .

and he goes on to say that he cannot do justice to it in this particular speech.

Mr. Jennings—But you cannot believe it!

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I do, and I venture to say that in his heart of hearts the honourable member for Enfield believes it too, in spite of what he may say. In fairness to them, I should say that the people behind the agitation for Commonwealth aid for education do not criticize the expenditure of the State Government or the Minister of Education for what he has done. Firstly, I believe that the Government has done a magnificent job in coping with our expanding needs. Secondly, I believe that our general level of education, both primary and secondary, in Australia will bear comparison with the standard of education in any country overseas, certainly with that of any country overseas that I have visited. However, it is not perfect and we have a duty to try constantly to improve our system, to get nearer to that ideal of perfection. It is our duty to try to raise our educational standards but, when we compare our standards with those overseas, we realize we are not doing too badly. Those are a couple of preliminary points I make.

Further, I do not believe, in spite of what I have said about our duty to raise our standards, that education can be regarded as the panacea for all ills. The aim of education has been variously described, but I do not think it has ever been improved upon since Plato described it as "training to goodness from youth." It was a peculiar nineteenth century view that education alone was the

hope of the world. That, I suggest, is unfounded in view of our experience during this century. We have learnt, rather to our sorrow and especially from the actions of our enemies in two world wars, that sometimes the more highly educated a nation may be, the greater is its potential for evil; so I do not believe, as apparently those behind Commonwealth aid for education believe, that education is the answer to all our ills.

With those general thoughts in mind, I now come to the particular problem of aid for education.

Here I should like to mention a point raised by the honourable member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) that the ideal solution would be for the States to regain their independent taxing powers, and then it would be up to them to levy whatever taxation they felt was required to cover our needs for education. Alas, that has not happened in nearly 20 years now. If it is not to happen, the next best thing is for the Commonwealth Government to grant to the States sufficient sums for them to be able to meet their needs. Every time we go cap in hand to the Commonwealth or people suggest that the States should have grants for special purposes, we weaken our federal system of government. I am a strong supporter of that system. We know that honourable members opposite are not, that it is part of their platform to abolish it. Perhaps if the need were great enough, the loss of our federal system of government would be justified. I personally doubt whether the need is great enough in this particular context. That is something to be borne in mind. I mention it now simply to leave it on one side for the moment, and to examine what has taken place during the last few months of this agitation for Commonwealth aid for education.

I did not attend the meeting, but I have seen the letter of invitation that was sent out by the Parent-Teacher Council of South Australia to a meeting held on December 9, 1959. I suggest to you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that the terms of this invitation are sufficient to show the aims and objectives of the people sponsoring this move. This letter comes from Mr. Kiek, secretary of the Parent-Teacher Council of South Australia. This is what he said:—

Almost every organization in this State has expressed a desire for the provision of greater educational facilities of one sort or another. Employers' organizations and trades unions are specially concerned with trades schools and

technical and adult education and also have an interest in secondary schools. Sporting bodies have long shown concern at inadequate sports facilities in our schools and in the teaching of ball skills and other aspects of physical education. Women's bodies have sought adequate hostel accommodation and provision of Leaving Honours classes in the country. In the wider context as citizens, many thinking folk have been dismayed at the relatively meagre gains, and in some respects losses, made in educational standards in the past decade. This year, it appears that we will do well to maintain services at the present level of effectiveness, having regard to increased population in the age group chiefly affected. I am afraid I cannot agree with all that, but the next paragraph goes on in this way:—

It is clearly impossible for any State Government, however well intentioned, to match the educational progress of many overseas countries without devoting so much of its resources to education that other important community services will suffer severely. If progress is to be made towards fulfilling the aims of all sections of the community funds must come from another source: the Commonwealth; the prime tax collector.

That was part of the letter of invitation to that first meeting.

Mr. Shannon—There is one major fallacy in that: money will not buy teachers of the classification needed for Leaving Honours classes. They must be trained, and we are doing it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—That is right. A meeting was held, which I did not attend. Subsequently, other meetings were held in the metropolitan area and the country, and then in May in Sydney was held a monster meeting which was addressed by Dr. Madgwick, Vice-Chancellor of the University of New South Wales. Honourable members will have noticed that a summary of his speech at that conference is published in the *South Australian Teachers' Journal* of July, 1960. It is quite a long article but well worth the effort of reading. I hope members will read it. However, there are one of two quotes I should make from his speech. He said:—

Thus, to summarize: the whole issue as I see it is that we must face up to the need for fully-trained and equipped scientists and technologists, and we must gear our education systems to modern concepts of science and technology. At the same time we must develop at all levels of the education system the love of truth and beauty, the essential human values out of which comes an understanding of human problems and of human beings. This implies a greater emphasis than ever before on humane studies and on the various social sciences.

I respectfully agree with him, except that I would reverse those two paragraphs and stress the humanities first. He continued:—

I have no idea what education as a whole costs in Australia. Nor have I any idea what it will cost to develop education in Australia to what I believe it must become.

Subsequently, at that meeting was launched what is referred to as a "monster petition" to be signed by people all over Australia for presentation to the House of Representatives praying for Commonwealth aid to education, and also for a national committee of inquiry patterned on the Murray Committee to investigate and report on the needs of education throughout Australia. The delegates—and possibly there were about 80 from South Australia—returned, and in the next few months a number of meetings were held all over the State publicizing this petition, which was then launched at a large meeting held on July 19 in the Australia Hall. I was invited to that meeting, as were, I think, all members of Parliament, and I attended. For those members who were not able to attend, a report is contained in the August edition of the *South Australian Teachers' Journal*. It was a big meeting and the theme again was the importance of education, although I felt—and I say this respectfully to those who spoke—that the aim and concept of education at that meeting were rather undefined. The slogan which was placed before everybody in bold letters on the stage was "Education is Everyone's Concern." With that part of the proceedings I would not disagree for a moment. However, there was one matter which was quite conspicuous by its absence: how the Commonwealth Government was to find the money which it was being asked to disperse with such prodigality to the States. Everybody agreed on the need for more money for education, but nobody was prepared to say how that money was to be raised, except that it was to come from the Commonwealth.

Mr. Shannon—I suppose they forgot that we are all Commonwealth taxpayers.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—They did, until late in the piece. It seemed from those who spoke—and I do not want this to be taken as a criticism of anyone who spoke at that meeting—that it was perfectly all right to spend more money on education so long as it came out of someone else's pocket. The question of where the money is to come from is, to my mind, of the greatest importance, and during one of the earlier meetings of a school welfare club in my own district (which I attended so that I could hear what a representative who had been to the Sydney conference had to say about it) with the greatest difficulty I coaxed out of him an estimate of how much money was required.

Frankly, I was absolutely staggered when he said that as an emergency grant to education throughout Australia the Commonwealth Government should provide £100,000,000 annually for five years. That was a staggering sum and the only suggestion he could make as to where it should come from was out of the Commonwealth defence vote. In all fairness I must admit that no estimate of the amount required was made at the Australia Hall meeting, and that is the only figure that has been given to me.

What the people at the Australia Hall meeting seemed to forget was that not only were they clamouring for more money for education, but that every Government in Australia—whether State or Commonwealth, Labor or Liberal—was all the time being approached by people clamouring for more money to be spent on some governmental activity or another. It is the duty of the Government, of course, to decide what priorities should be given: whether more money should be spent on education; whether more should be spent on the Greater Port Adelaide Plan; or whether more should be spent on roads. However, not everyone in this country can have all that he wants, and it is natural at a time when a country has been expanding as this has in the last 10 years that there are far more requirements than we can possibly meet at any given time, and there must be a system of priorities.

I was somewhat surprised, and I give this as an example of what was said at the meeting, when one speaker said, "Next time you go over a rut in a road think to yourself, 'I am prepared to put up with this road for a little while longer so that more money can be spent on education.'" That completely overlooks the attitude of those people who think that more money should be spent on roads rather than on education, and by coincidence in the last few weeks I received a brochure—and I assume other members did, too—from people who advocate a greater expenditure on roads and whose attitude is exactly the same as those who want more money for education except that it is in reverse. The brochure cover contains the following:—

When next you plan your own budget stop and consider that inadequate roads cost every Australian man, woman, and child an extra 8s. a week.

Inside the brochure is stated:—

Australians lose £200,000,000 in time, repairs, maintenance and accidents each year because of our inadequate roads. This works out at 8s. a week for every man, woman and

child in Australia. Our State Government road builders do a great job to the limit of the cash allotted to them but these funds are very far from sufficient for the needs of today—and tomorrow.

Mr. Quirke—If we saved that much on roads we would have twice as much for education.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—That may be so, but I have quoted that to show that the attitude of so many people in Australia is that their particular interest should be the one that is favoured. It is natural that that should be so at a time when our economy is expanding so rapidly, but it does make it tough on Governments, and I think it is incumbent upon every responsible Australian who asks the Government for more money for something to say, "All right, I will pay more in taxation," or "We suggest that the money comes from here or there," but not merely to say, as I am afraid was said at the Australia Hall meeting, "It is up to the Government to find the money. We do not care where it comes from so long as it comes from somewhere or other." I made notes of the meeting that night, having a good vantage point near the back where I could do so. A number of people spoke.

Mr. Riches—You weren't very sympathetic before you went.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I was entirely sympathetic and still am. All I say is that if people ask for vast sums of money they should be prepared to say where it is to come from.

Mr. Clark—They are saying.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—They did not on this occasion, and that is the point I am making. The member for Gawler spoke on that night.

Mr. Clark—I did not say anything different from what I have been saying for the last 10 years.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Absolutely. The honourable member said that he was very moved on that evening to hear the expression of approval for more money for education and that he was also rather elated because for 10 years he had preached the very thing he was supporting that evening. I give him full marks for that and do not criticize him. He also said, "Of recent years people have been starting to agree with me. Ten years ago I was a voice in the wilderness and now thousands all over Australia are joining in the plea." I do not criticize him for saying that, and I do not criticize anything that was said at the meeting, but I do criticize what was not said up to that stage.

The next speaker was Mr. K. C. Wilson, a member of the Federal Parliament, a Liberal member, and one of the best Liberals in South Australia.

Mr. Riches—Can't you say anything better of him than that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I also made notes of what he said, and I admired him tremendously for what he did say. He thanked them for the invitation to speak and said that there was no dispute among thinking Australians that we should spend as much as the economy could afford on education. He praised the chairman—as I do now—for the fairness of his approach to the problem and said that we could have more money for education if we were prepared to pay more in taxes for it.

Mr. Clark—The whole thing is that that is not so.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—The honourable member will have an opportunity to say why it is not so.

Mr. Clark—If we pay more in taxation it does not necessarily mean that we will get any more for education.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I was most depressed by the reception Mr. Wilson got because, although there was obviously much support for his courage in saying that, there was obviously much resentment that anybody should suggest that it was necessary to raise taxes from the taxpayers to spend more on education or anything else. So that no-one will say that I am now making criticisms in the House which I have not been prepared to make before, I must admit that after the meeting I wrote to Mr. Kiek, the secretary of the South Australian Parent-Teacher Council thanking him for the invitation to be there. I wrote:—

I was most interested in the proceedings, but surprised that it was not until Mr. K. C. Wilson, M.H.R., spoke that the important questions of how much money was required and how it was to be found were seriously raised. It seems to me that these two questions are of fundamental importance. When Mr. Wilson did speak I was profoundly depressed by the reception which his remarks, so much to the point and such common sense, received.

I most earnestly suggest that your most difficult task is not to convince people that more money is needed for education but to point out to them that the extra money must come from out of their pocket and to ask them to acknowledge their readiness to make a sacrifice in the cause of education. Anything which I can do to help do this I shall do readily.

Mr. Clark—You made that very obvious.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Thank you. I then received a reply dated July 29, signed by Mr. Kiek, in which he said:—

Our stated intention—  
and this is the only thing on which I have any criticism—

has been to leave it to the experts, namely, the Treasury officials and political leaders like yourself, to determine how the community may best meet the national need. Obviously, there will be many opinions about this and no doubt the Labor Party and the Liberal Party will advance different solutions.

That is the point I criticize. I suggest in all sincerity and without wanting in any way to give offence to anyone that it is quite irresponsible to go through the community and say that we need more money for education unless we are prepared to tell people where the money is to come from: the only place it can come from is our own pockets. I think it would be a good thing if it did, but that should be explained to people. Whether it will be provided directly by the Federal Government or by the State Government, it can come only from the pockets of the people of this State. When people are invited to sign a petition they should be told this.

Mr. Clark—They all know it is to come from their own pockets.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—No fear; they do not!

Mr. Clark—Where is it to come from?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—The honourable member may remember that an interjector at the meeting suggested that it should come out of politicians' pockets, another said it should be obtained by cutting out waste in Government expenditure, and another said it should come from the defence vote.

Mr. Clark—Even if it did, it would come from our own pockets. Everyone knows that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Every thinking person knows it, and it is up to us to be sure that everyone who signs the petition knows it. It is quite wrong for people to ask others to sign a petition unless the signatories have it explained to them very clearly where the money is coming from. I have raised this matter not to criticize the Parent-Teacher Council, but simply because it is of such importance. I agree wholeheartedly with the council in its endeavour to stress the importance of education, and I will do everything in my power to assist. I hope what I have said may stimulate discussion, and it is in this place that these matters should be discussed. I take it as a compliment that the honourable member said

I had helped the proponents of this agitation by raising this matter; that was my avowed intention.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I watched the member for Mitcham fall exhausted into his seat. I listened with great interest to his remarks and for a time thought he was politically hypnotized and politically sterilized, as it was not until late in his speech, aided by the member for Onkaparinga, that he brought forward one constructive suggestion, immediately to find himself in conflict with his own argument. At one stage I thought that the company coming to South Australia to put on the show *My Fair Lady* was wasting money in bringing a choir. I thought they sang "He Did It," but now I realize that they sing "We Did It." I suggest that we form a Parliamentary opera company and that the members of the Government stand forward in their usual vocal manner and sing, "He Did It." The Leader of the Opposition could come forward and, in his big baritone voice, sing "We Thought of It," because that seems to have been the way in South Australia for a good many years.

I listened with great interest to the Leader and at one stage found that the member for Onkaparinga became a little excited when he referred to the proposed Morgan-Whyalla pipeline duplication, which the member for Onkaparinga said had not been referred to the Public Works Committee. I do not think the honourable member had any need to fear because, in a report in the *Advertiser* of July 28 of the broadcast made by the Treasurer on the previous night, it was stated that the Treasurer had announced that the Government had abandoned its plans to duplicate the pipeline on the proposed northern route because of the enormous cost involved. The report went on to say:—

Instead, the pipeline would be duplicated by a much larger one along the same route with spur mains to serve areas to the north. Main centres to be served by three spur lines would include Burra and Booborowie, Appila and Booleroo Centre, and Wirrabara.

I want to put the member for Onkaparinga and members of the Public Works Committee at ease; the Treasurer in his usual style has determined this, and they will only have to approve.

I appreciate that when we are dealing with the various lines we shall be able to discuss details concerning them, so I propose at this stage to deal only with the broad principles of the Estimates. The State's share of the total

Commonwealth Loan fund is to be £31,767,000 and of this £5,800,000 will be for housing, but with the addition of certain repayments to the Loan fund the expenditure on capital works will be £30,772,000. The sum of £4,060,000 will be provided for the Housing Trust, £1,340,000 for the State Bank, and £400,000 for building societies—a total of £5,800,000 for housing. In round figures, £23,000,000 will be used in providing direct assistance to primary and secondary industry and £7,000,000 to assist industry in an indirect way. It would be difficult for anyone to show that the latter expenditure could result in revenue production. This sum will be used on public buildings, education and non-revenue producing items. I draw attention to this because my remarks will be based on that theory. I admit that Australia in general, and South Australia in particular, must develop and that we must work for greater development. This State does not enjoy the natural advantages of some other States. I think it has the lowest rainfall in the Commonwealth, or that it has the greatest area with the lowest rainfall.

Mr. Millhouse—That may have something to do with the Leader's remarks about the public debt.

Mr. O'Halloran—People in the low rainfall areas have received little assistance from the Government.

Mr. Millhouse—That is not the point.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I assure the honourable member that I have not overlooked that point. Industrial development is most rapid at the moment because of world requirements, and that is why we have seen such economic and industrial development in this part of the Commonwealth in recent years.

Mr. Hall—Would you say our industry supplies world requirements? Is there a very great export trade?

Mr. HUTCHENS—It seems that something has come from the bird bath: I do not know what it is, but I will let it pass. If we are compelled to follow orthodox finance for public works I agree, and I think we all agree, that there has to be some Loan programme. I think the Leader of the Opposition acknowledged that, to continue our public works, we must have some Loan programme, though I do not oppose those who advocate the use of national credit to reduce our interest burden where possible. However, the powers that be are determined that we must continue with orthodox finance. I return to my remarks about

£23,000,000 being provided for direct assistance to industry and £7,000,000 for non-revenue producing advances. The latter amount must, of course, be limited because the larger amount must be spent in providing assistance to develop secondary and primary industry so that we may pay the interest charges and expenses created by both, particularly the non-revenue producing items. The former must provide for the development to return the revenue to which I refer.

The Government must spend its loans wisely, and I believe the purpose of this debate is to provide an opportunity to examine this spending. As so many have said today, we cannot criticize the amount; we get as much as we can. I believe it is the Opposition's function to give the Government and its supporters an opportunity to show that the money has been wisely spent. If they fail to show this, it is evidence that the Government has failed. I mention this because it is often said that when the Government is challenged, particularly by a Labor Opposition, the Opposition is writing down the State and the Commonwealth.

Mr. Millhouse—You would not write down this State's achievements, would you?

Mr. HUTCHENS—I never write down achievements, but I am prepared to point out failures, and I intend to do that this afternoon. The Opposition has the confidence of almost every section of this State's population. It is willing to exploit its many natural advantages in the interests of the State and it is firm in its determination to exercise tolerance and co-operation provided that it is told the truth. If the truth is not told about the failure to meet requirements in these days of rapid industrial and economic development the fault is with the Government and the press. At times I am most unhappy about the construction that the press puts on various matters. We have two daily newspapers in this State and they can be called "Standfirm" and "Go-getter." They could do much more in telling the truth about industrial and economic development. The country press has to write according to the impressions it gains. In his explanation of the Loan Estimates the Treasurer said that the fact that South Australia could from her internal funds finance such a large programme so successfully spoke great volumes indeed for the economic prowess of the State. We hear the Treasurer talk about economic bravery, valor, and daring accomplishments. An extract from the *West Coast Sentinel* of July 2, 1960, under the

heading "From the Poorest to the Richest State" said:—

In the past 20 years South Australia had developed from the poorest State in the Commonwealth to the richest. At a public meeting in the Minnipa hall last Friday night the Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, pointed out that 20 years ago the South Australian standard of living was the lowest in the Commonwealth's scale. Now it was the highest. South Australia now has the highest standard of primary and secondary production, lowest unemployment rate (over the past eight years), the most motor cars, and the most household electrical gadgets, pays the most income tax and has £25 more in the bank per head of population. . . . "One of the reasons for the change," the Premier said, "was that everyone had the right to exercise his initiative and get the reward. That is why Socialism and Communism will always fail. It is a system of levelling down, but I believe we will go ahead just as America has. If a person can do something he should be paid for it, and encouraged to do it."

"The richest State in the Commonwealth" is something we hear much about in South Australia, but it is ridiculous to make such a statement. What a State can carry in population is what has an important bearing on the economic position. From the *South Australian Pocket Year Book* I learn that New South Wales has a population of 12.04 to the square mile, Victoria 31.53, Queensland 2.13 and South Australia 2.39. It is amazing that South Australia with such a low figure can be regarded as the richest State in the Commonwealth. One member in this place says that the more we are in debt the richer we are. I will refer to this again later. According to the *Pocket Year Book* South Australia's public debt per head of population was £304 12s. in 1955, £321 16s. in 1956, £349 8s. in 1957, and £359 14s. in 1958. I had to go to the *Commonwealth Year Book* for the 1959 figure and it was £377 17s.—£56 1s. more than it was in 1956. I point out that the *Commonwealth Year Book* figures in this matter differ somewhat from the figures in the *South Australian Pocket Year Book*. The *Commonwealth Year Book* gives the following information:—

State.	Public debt. £	Per head of
		population. £ s. d.
New South Wales .	832,637,000	213 9 0
Victoria . . . . .	555,012,000	189 0 0
Queensland . . . . .	303,470,000	201 14 10
South Australia . . .	314,828,000	328 15 4

*Per capita* South Australia has the highest public debt of any mainland State, yet it is alleged that it is the richest State in the



Commonwealth. It gives me some satisfaction to know that the more we are in debt the richer we are! I am getting more into debt every day, and I am helped considerably by this statement. Earlier I said that we must have a Loan programme, but what we borrow should be used to enable industry to develop and make repayments of principal and to meet the interest bill. I am perturbed about the *Pocket Year Book* figures for value of factory output. It gives the following information for secondary industries:—

Year.	Per head of population.	
	£	s. d.
1955-56 .. . . .	379	16 9
1956-57 .. . . .	377	8 6
1957-58 .. . . .	374	16 10

In this last year the figure was £4 19s. 11d. less than it was in 1955-56. Over these years the public debt increased considerably *per capita*. All this does not indicate "economic bravery" and "daring achievements." There must be some doubt about the matter. I thought I would be told that secondary industry provided only a part of our total production. The *Pocket Year Book* gives £246,877,000 as the total value of production in 1955-56, £280,530,000 in 1956-57, and £245,806,000 in 1957-58 or £1,071,000 less than in 1955-56. We have an ever-declining value in production, yet an ever-increasing public debt. There is reason to be concerned in this matter and the figures I have quoted hardly justify the claim by Government members that the Treasurer is an economic wizard.

Mr. Hall—What about the huge profits made by the Broken Hill Proprietary Company and General Motors-Holdens?

Mr. HUTCHENS—Yes. It is good to know that someone on the other side is prepared to argue with the Auditor-General. When the honourable member has his turn in this debate no doubt he will tear the Auditor-General to pieces. I was interested to read some figures in the *Institute of Public Affairs Review*. The December, 1959, to January, 1960 issue, dealing with figures for the Commonwealth, shows that rural production has risen by about 30 per cent. and population by 46 per cent. We have been told that South Australia has gone from the poorest to the richest State through being financed with such economic bravery, valour, and daring accomplishment during the past 20 years, that there is freedom, and that everyone has the right to exercise his initiative and get his reward. We have been told much about our rural production, the

availability of world markets, and the great call to the land, and that South Australia has put more people on the land on its own account than has any other State. From all I had heard I was convinced in my own mind that that was the case and that it could not have been otherwise, if what is published in the *West Coast Sentinel* is a fact. However, the *Commonwealth Year Book* for 1959, Volume 45, Part X, gives details of rural holdings on the mainland States for the years 1938-39 and 1957-58, and discloses that in New South Wales there were 75,365 in 1938-39 and 78,120 in 1957-58, an increase of 2,755, in Victoria the number of holdings in 1938-39 was 72,452, and in 1957-58 it was 69,590, a decrease of 2,862; in Queensland there were 41,503 holdings in 1938-39, and this had increased to 43,457 in 1957-58, an increase of 1,954; South Australia in 1938-39 had 31,280 holdings, compared with 27,971 in 1957-58, a reduction of 3,309; Western Australia had 21,052 holdings in 1938-39 and 21,593 in 1957-58, an increase of 541. The biggest reduction in figures was in South Australia, and on a percentage basis it is an alarming and colossal reduction.

When we are told from morning to night, Sunday to Saturday, that this State under the leadership of the present Treasurer has gone from being the poorest to the richest State, we are naturally a little disappointed when we see figures such as those I have quoted. Why this decrease? Simply because the Government of today has not (and never has had) a satisfactory plan for the rural development of the State. Something must be done about it. The time is long overdue for setting up a proper authority to aid in the rural development of this country. I say without hesitation that we can have rural development only when we have more people interested in such development on their own account.

Mr. Hall—Do you wish to encourage them to go on the land, or to direct them.

Mr. HUTCHENS—We believe in encouraging them and allowing them to use their own initiative. That is Labor Party policy, and the honourable member must not, by insinuation, suggest anything to the contrary. I believe the only way to improve the position is by setting up a proper authority to assess our land values, the appointment of a court of appeal so that procedure would not be dictatorial, and by ensuring that land values are justly assessed. It would be a matter for the Government of the day to acquire the necessary land at 20 per cent above the assessed

value and to allot it to applicants approved by a Land Board. We cannot afford to fall for mistakes of the past and to put unqualified people on the land. I do not suggest that soldier settlement was mishandled, as I think that the proper people were selected in most cases and that they have done a mighty job.

Mr. Heaslip—Would the assessed value include the cost of developing that land?

Mr. HUTCHENS—Of course.

Mr. Harding—It costs £20,000,000 to settle 1,000 men on the land.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Exactly, and that amount was granted by the Commonwealth Government. With interest rates rising, something must be done in an effort to stabilize our economy.

Mr. Heaslip—Under your suggestion you could not develop any fresh land; it would be too expensive.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Of course, it is always convenient for the more conservative Government members to find reasons why we cannot do things; they never find reasons why we can do things. If there is a will there is a way, and that attitude is typical of the outlook of the decent Australian. I now turn to the ever-rising cost of money. I was interested to read a report of a broadcast by the Treasurer in the *Advertiser* of May 12, which stated:—

“Living beyond our income and borrowing to make up the deficit could store up economic trouble,” he said. “What we are doing in fact is living beyond our income and borrowing to make up the deficit.”

The article goes on to report the Treasurer as saying:—

You all know what happens to a person who consistently does this.

It was a remarkable broadcast, and in fact I found myself agreeing with almost every word of it. However, it is amazing that the very people who are appalled at this living beyond our means look upon the present Government as their protectors. Through the press, financial companies are offering unbelievable interest rates—8 per cent, 10 per cent, and 15 per cent on investment in hire-purchase companies. *The Institute of Public Affairs Review* that I previously quoted refers to the great increase over recent years in the outstanding hire-purchase debt, and points out that it is now 40 per cent of the total bank advances. Those hire-purchase companies operate in the State that makes it easiest for them. It is only reasonable that they will operate where they have most freedom,

where they get the greatest encouragement, and where they have the liberty and can use their initiative. I have figures to establish the claim that South Australia is that place.

The Treasurer is reported in the *West Coast Sentinel* as stating that we pay the most income tax in the Commonwealth *per capita*, and that remark gives weight to the opinion that the Government is the willing slave of financial interests. With secondary production *per capita* on the decline and primary production likewise, some people must be increasing their incomes above the average of the other States. It is not the workers who are doing so.

Mr. O'Halloran—Their wages are pegged.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Yes, severely pegged. When we look at figures of the average wage for each State, we find that the workers in this State, which has allegedly gone from being the poorest to the richest, do not seem to be enjoying any of the riches. The *Commonwealth Year Book* No. 48, Part II, page 415, shows the average wages in the respective States. It gives the New South Wales figure as £16 17s. 8d., Victoria £16 2s., Queensland £15 18s. 3d., South Australia £15 15s., Western Australia £16 8s. 8d., Tasmania £16 11s., and the Commonwealth figure as £16 7s. South Australia has the lowest average wage in the Commonwealth.

Mr. Jennings—And our price structure is the second highest!

Mr. HUTCHENS—That is so. The hire-purchase companies and the associated finance companies are no doubt exercising their initiative and getting their reward. I could not agree more with the Treasurer when he says that Communism as a political force is a system of lowering. We should have a look at ourselves, for in the uneven distribution of wealth the Treasurer and his supporters have nothing to learn. The full impact of this has yet to come. Hire-purchase trading is going to affect us in more ways than one. Secondary industry will slump, and if hire-purchase catches up on us it will be an economic tragedy. I feel it is the duty of every person in authority today to give some warning to our young people to treat hire-purchase with caution. I do not say that they should not have some items on hire-purchase, but they should treat it with caution.

Mr. Millhouse—What precisely does that mean?

Mr. HUTCHENS—I will tell the honourable member, for I think he should know. He may

occasionally practise in the places where this is proved beyond doubt. This business of competing with the Jones' is impracticable. The Treasurer rightly pointed out today that doing that as individuals could lead to a tragedy, and doing it as a State could certainly lead to a tragedy. All members can see what hire-purchase is doing to the economy of the State and to the economy of the people, if they examine the local court figures relating to the numbers of summonses issued.

Mr. Millhouse—How can you possibly get anything from the numbers of summonses issued in the local court?

Mr. HUTCHENS—The member for Mitcham gets very excited and lawyers will argue either way. If the figures relating to summonses issued in 1947 are examined we find that the number was 11,997 and the amount claimed was £225,830. The number of unsatisfied judgment summonses issued for that year was 3,770. In 1948 the number of summonses issued was 12,562, the amount claimed was £279,085 and the number of unsatisfied judgment summonses issued was 3,629. In 1956 the number of summonses was 48,519, which is an increase of 36,522 over the 1947 figures. That means that the number of summonses issued in 1956 was four times the number issued in 1947. That figure is amazing and almost unbelievable. The amount of claims in 1956 was £1,665,514 or an increase of £1,439,684 over the 1947 figures. That represents more than seven times the 1947 amount. Unsatisfied judgment summonses in 1956 totalled 22,858 which is an increase of 19,088 or more than six times the 1947 number.

Mr. Millhouse—What proportion is due to hire-purchase?

Mr. HUTCHENS—The best that can be gleaned from the reports is that it is substantial when compared with 1947, when the claims for hire-purchase were minute.

Mr. Millhouse—What report are you talking about?

Mr. HUTCHENS—The *Trade Journal Report*. This is something that every Australian Government has to do something about.

Mr. Millhouse—What should they do?

Mr. HUTCHENS—What can they do? That remark is typical of a lawyer. Members of my Party have made several statements to show what can be done but as usual "it is not the time" and we are "not in authority." At the moment we have a moderate form of control proposed on hire-purchase by this Government to protect the national economy. That is the

sole purpose of it—to protect the individual. This moderate Bill is introduced by the Government but alleged supporters of the Party represented by the Government are offering strong opposition in another place.

I turn now to housing. I read so often that in South Australia we are doing a better job than any other State. I appreciate the difficulties of providing housing in a rapidly developing period and I find little fault with the State's efforts in general terms over and above those mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition but I am concerned about the trend. I refer to the Treasurer's remarks in *Hansard* of last year when he was speaking on the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Bill. He said that in 1959, in addition to the applications already lodged with the Housing Trust, the Trust received 5,385 rental homes applications, 1,331 emergency homes applications and 3,418 purchase applications. Those added together make over 10,000 applications for housing received in one year. I acknowledge that some of those applications may be duplications. I refer now to the Housing Trust report dated July 1, 1960. It opens with this paragraph: "During the 12 months ended June 30, 1960, the trust completed 3,174 houses under all schemes including flats during the year ended June 30, 1959.

Mr. Jennings—That was fewer than the previous year.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Yes. That is 3,174 homes with 1,000 fresh applications. If we look at the figures quoted in the *Commonwealth Year Book* for 1945 at Part IV, they show that the number of houses built in South Australia (that is, new houses including owner-built houses) in 1955-56 was 8,377. The figure for 1956-57 was 6,832 and in 1957-58 it was 6,951, or 1,426 less than were built in 1955-56. The number of houses completed and including owner-built houses were: 1955-56, 7,721; 1956-57, 7,193 (528 less than for the previous year); 1957-58, 7,606 (115 less than 1955-56).

The figures reveal an ever-increasing public debt, an ever-increasing population and a State decline in the number of houses built. This is caused by the lack of a real policy on housing. I believe that the time and the events should convince members of this Committee that now is an opportune moment to establish a Department of Housing under the control of a Minister responsible to Parliament so that the people's representatives could point out and find the weaknesses in any progress. This is an emergency that demands the greatest

interest and co-operation and I believe that a commission should be set up comprising representatives of every section of the building industry to advise the Minister on the best ways and means of utilizing the material available. I believe that, in this way, a workers' homes co-operative could be established with a view to assisting in building homes.

I think, too, that it would be wise to embark on a policy to replace some sub-standard homes. In many older areas in the metropolitan area there are sub-standard homes in big blocks where roads and water and sewerage services are provided. The construction of multi-storey flats in those areas would provide homes at a considerably lower cost than we are getting homes for today. An endeavour should be made to secure the co-operation of all financial concerns to make homes available on low deposits because I believe (as did the late member, Mr. George Hambour, from whom we used to get much wisdom) that provision should be made for people to own their own homes.

If it is possible to get a man into his own home he will do much better and will look after it and show an interest in it. The provision of a low deposit on a simple interest basis would get far more homes and far more people working with the Government and co-operating with it to build more homes than we are building today. The Government should take steps to provide a means of insurance so that a person going into a home could, at a reasonable figure, insure his life so that in the event of the death of the breadwinner the home could become the freehold of the unfortunate widow.

Finally, I express to the Minister of Education my appreciation for the two new schools—the Croydon girls technical high school and the Croydon boys technical high school—that have been built in my district. The former is completed and will be officially opened on September 30 by the Minister of Education. I believe he is the right and proper person to open the school and I would be disappointed if any other person performed that task. He has applied himself conscientiously to his difficult task. Both these schools are doing a remarkable job. It would do people good, particularly honourable members, if they paid a visit to some of these technical schools where adult classes are conducted at night. At both the Croydon technical schools every evening one will find young men and women and middle-

aged people attending to advance their knowledge. It would do much good if this fact were made known and more attention drawn to the facilities available. This would encourage more young people to attend, and as a result there would be less vandalism. This is no time or place to talk about the Hindmarsh primary school, although there are many shocking aspects associated with it. Knowing that the Minister is sympathetic, I am convinced that he and his department will do everything possible to remedy the unfortunate conditions existing in old school buildings.

In his speech on the Estimates the Treasurer said that £4,700,000 would be spent on new school buildings, and this represents about one-sixth of the total amount in the Estimates. I do not suppose that this position has ever been bettered. Last week the Public Works Committee submitted reports recommending the construction of numerous new schools and this shows the Government's appreciation of the need for more buildings for educational purposes. Irrespective of who is Minister of Education, I will do my best to support such worthy projects. Mr. Millhouse had much to say about Commonwealth aid for education. I agree with him that no-one has told us precisely how much is wanted for this purpose, or where we are going to get the money, but it is time that someone had something to say about it. I realize that the money eventually must come from the taxpayers. I believe that Mr. King (Chairman of the South Australian Public Schools Association) when speaking at the National Conference on Education in Sydney on May 21 put the South Australian case very fairly when he said:—

The expansion of our education services has been considerable. Since 1946 provision has had to be made for increased school enrolments that have been proportionately greater than those of any other State and, indeed, greater than those of any other English speaking country for the same period. The total school population of South Australia in 1946 was 70,000. Today this total has reached 170,000, an increase of 140 per cent. Secondary school enrolments have shown an even greater increase from a total of 11,600 in 1946 to 37,900 in 1960, an increase of 226 per cent. With the great number of migrant children that are being absorbed into South Australian schools each year and a natural increase that shows no marked signs of diminishing, the school population is expected to reach a total of 206,000 by 1966.

In its earnest endeavours to meet the growing crisis in our education system the State Government has progressively increased, year by year, the allocation from consolidated

revenue and loan funds for education. For the year 1954 the allocation for education amounted to £6,250,000. In the current year there has been a record allocation of £17,500,000, representing 26½ per cent of the State Budget, a 180 per cent increase on 1954. This year's educational grant is equivalent to 69 per cent of the Commonwealth Tax Reimbursement Grant of £27,675,000. From loan funds there is also a record allocation this year of £4,250,000 from a total amount of loan funds available of £29,000,000. This is over three times the allocation made in 1954 of £1,122,000 from an available total of £27,000,000. The total funds available for education in South Australia this year are many times greater than those provided for other years, but it is still not sufficient to meet the need. The State has accepted education as its heaviest responsibility, but it cannot provide the greater allocation of funds that will be required to maintain even today's inadequate standards for future years without seriously impeding other vital State services such as communications, health and hospitalization and the utilities.

Mr. Clark—Nothing could be fairer than that.

Mr. HUTCHENS—That is so. Mr. King went on to say:—

We are confident that the machinery to administer and control education in South Australia is in a sound condition and well able to do the job required of it providing it receives sufficient fuel. Only the Commonwealth Government can provide this fuel in sufficient quantity.

I agree that we have to be taxed, but we should be told the amount required from the Commonwealth. I do not believe in anyone going to a Government department and asking for something without stating precisely what he wants. No-one can convince me that our Minister of Education does not subscribe to this view. Why have the State Treasurers not made some move?

Mr. Millhouse—Not even Labor Premiers.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I agree, but there may be some good reason, and I believe the time has arrived when that reason should be made known. No-one can truthfully say that we cannot afford to educate. It must be acknowledged that we cannot afford not to educate.

Mr. Millhouse—I said that.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I agree. The States have not the facilities for raising revenue in sufficient quantity to meet the needs of education and those who are advocating assistance from the Commonwealth are on the right lines. We know that the money from taxation comes from our pockets, and I would not be a party

to saying anything else when soliciting signatures for a petition. I am confident that we can become a greater nation than America will ever be. We are a race of people with courage, the great majority being loyal to the ideals of democracy appreciate the worth and rights of others and are ever ready to co-operate honestly; and wisely led we can go forward to be markers in the British Commonwealth of Nations in the march of progress for greater security for the people of the world. Those in responsible positions should be very careful to tell the people the true facts about our economic position and about the possibilities of this nation, and if that is done I am confident that they will receive the co-operation of the people and thus we shall be able to join together to solve all our problems whether they be economic or otherwise. I support the first line.

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

Mr. JENKINS (Stirling)—In supporting the first line of the Loan Estimates, I should like to say that the allocation of the various funds to each Department has been judged very well, and designed to do the most good and ensure employment for as many people as possible during the next financial year. I wish only to refer to two or three lines in the Loan Estimates concerned with my own district. Before proceeding to do so, I should like to mention that the honourable member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) referred a good deal to the increasing public debt. I cannot quite reconcile the attitude of the Opposition to the increase in the public debt when so many people are demanding so much more to be done for so much more capital expenditure within the State. I fully favour increasing the public debt if it provides funds for the necessary capital works that will ensure employment and production within the State.

The first thing I want to deal with in my district is the extension of electricity supplies, of which there is a good network throughout my electorate. This year, until the Loan Estimates came out, it was in the balance whether an extension of electricity costing about £100,000 would be made to the Inman Valley area. It has not gone our way but a recent letter from the General Manager of the Electricity Trust says that it will receive a high priority in the next Loan Estimates. I hope that is correct because the people there are disappointed that such extension is not contemplated for this financial year. That is all the more accentuated because other people

nearby having it increases their ardour to get it themselves, as they see the great benefits flowing from these country extensions.

As regards schools in my district, I was pleased to find provision in the Loan Estimates for a new area school at Mount Compass. That, together with the nearly completed primary school at Strathalbyn, will bring the school needs in my district well into line with requirements.

Water is one of the main problems in my district. Altogether, in the Loan Estimates this year, £125,000 has been provided—£20,000 for pumping plant from bores and for mains, etc., in the Strathalbyn water district, £4,000 to pump from the Murray into the town supply at Milang, and £101,000 for the Encounter Bay water scheme. I point out that the £101,000 would promote the new water scheme in the Encounter Bay water district, but not to the extent that it will come into operation by next summer, as we had hoped. I feel that the £9,000,000 allocated to the Minister of Works this year for a water supply would not do as much work as £8,000,000 did last year. Therefore, some things envisaged have to be cut by a certain amount. I imagine that the amount of £101,000 would go only to pay for the mains already in the depot at Port Elliot and laid along the route ready for trenching. It would probably be possible to build a 1,000,000 gallon storage tank without much construction work. I hope there will be sufficient in next year's Loan Estimates to complete that job because there is a great need for extension of water in that area. As I have pointed out before, many people on high ground are not able to get water at all and there are several sub-divisions where people are waiting to build as soon as water is supplied.

I think that the problem in the Strathalbyn district is different from that in the Encounter Bay water district. At Strathalbyn there seems to be more demand from the rural areas for stock water than there is in the town itself, because the town has been fairly adequately supplied with water over the past few years, except for the year before last when it was in short supply. I hope that, when the new pipeline from the Murray to duplicate the Mannum-Adelaide supply is completed, the Minister and his engineers will be able to devise some means whereby a spur line can be taken from that main to supply Callington, in the district of Murray, and the Woodchester and Hartley areas, and on to the Strathalbyn reservoir, which would then be used as an

equalizing basin. I hope that the Minister will consider that the mains from Strathalbyn to the racecourse can be replaced with larger mains and extended to the Milang area, where people suffer seriously from salt water in their bores.

As the Minister probably knows, when the summer weather comes on and the surface water runs out those people have to draw on bore water, which has a very high salt content. It is not possible to keep lambs if they are not ready for the export market; they cannot be kept for any period because of the salt water. When cows are in lactation and there is a change from surface to bore water, their milk drops off by at least 33 per cent. No-one can carry on with such water for their gardens during the summer, and this is serious. The £20,000 allocated for Strathalbyn would be for pumping from bores, and for mains, as the Loan Estimates say. I understand that the bores will be sunk in the Paris Creek area and they will supplement the reservoir supply by pumping into the Angas River. I foresee a pipeline that will divert water from running through the Angas River because much of it is used when the farmers pump it for the department, and some people along that river are using the water for irrigation purposes. It is hard to deny people on a watercourse or river, even if it is supplying a reservoir, the use of that water for irrigation purposes and dairy produce, but I think the Minister may, unless he can divert that water from the Paris Creek area through a pipeline, have to invoke the powers of the Control of Waters Act.

Last year, the pumping from the Macclesfield area indicated that whatever might be done to supplement the supply to this reservoir from bores could be only a temporary measure. One farmer pumping for the department only a week or so ago said he was pumping 15,000 gallons a day and, when he ceased pumping, it had reduced the stream he was pumping to 5,000 gallons a day. That was constant throughout the whole area from which water was being pumped and, more seriously, the water table had been reduced considerably over the whole area. That is a pointer, I think, to the future need for something more permanent than there is at present. That is why I ask the Minister to consider seriously when the new pipeline is envisaged, because great consideration must be given to this aspect of the water supply in Strathalbyn and district. I hope that the water can be extended from the racecourse to those people at Milang, because they are very anxious to get water to produce

more, which they undoubtedly can, and to be able to get a much better domestic supply. It would have a great bearing on production, and that would also be reflected in revenue.

I refer now to the road from Callington which comes from Murray Bridge and from Adelaide, goes through Callington, and then on to Strathalbyn. The honourable member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) and I have brought this matter before the Minister. It is a rough road and it is difficult to get over the bridge at Woodchester, about which I asked a question today and which is very narrow and about 100 years old. It is impossible for two cars to pass each other on it. I asked today if consideration could be given at least to the bridge being rebuilt, either there or in some other suitable place, which would eventually conform to the road when it is finally bituminized. I hope the Minister will consider the matters I have raised.

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore)—I support the first line of the Loan Estimates and make this comment early: I am disappointed at the lack of information supplied to private members during this very important debate. True, the Treasurer has all the details necessary, which he reads to the Committee and, in turn, the Leader of the Opposition has some information. But it is not until today when copies of *Hansard* appear that we are able to see the speech in printed form, except for a limited number of proof copies. I suggest that in future the Government might consider adopting the principle it adopts when the Budget is brought down annually, when each member has a copy of the speech made by the Treasurer at the time and has a chance to follow it through religiously. It is better to hear it first-hand from the Treasurer and to follow him through, as does the Leader of the Opposition. I hope that that matter will be rectified because, as we have the Loan Estimates, they are nothing but a maze of figures. It is hard to digest the significance of them and to do justice in a speech relating to them.

I suggest that one of the most important items in the Loan Estimates is housing. No doubt each member in turn will give his idea of the position as it affects the State. I notice that in the Loan Estimates programme for 1959-60 £3,500,000 was made available for the South Australian Housing Trust, and on this occasion, a year later, the figure is £4,060,000, an increase of £560,000 on the previous 12 months. When we consider the growth of the population and that the need for

homes is greater than ever before, the increase of £560,000 is minor. It means, in effect, that, with a house (including land) costing about £4,000 to build, only 140 extra homes will be built during the next financial year. There will be a great demand for homes in view of the Christies Beach oil refinery, which will be built in the next two years. According to the Treasurer's information, 400 homes will be built in this area—300 for the employees of the proposed refinery and 100 for people engaged on other work associated with the oil refinery. It appears to be that, because of this demand for housing in the metropolitan and country areas, a more extensive programme should be carried out than ever before. When one considers the extensive building programme at Elizabeth, one is forced to the conclusion that building in the metropolitan area this year will be less than in previous years. No doubt the many houses that have been built at Elizabeth are serving an excellent purpose, but some of the residents are obliged to travel about 25 miles to their employment, which costs them time and money.

Mr. Clark—They have been doing that at Gawler for years.

Mr. TAPPING—Yes, but past mistakes should not be repeated. Greater efforts should be made to utilize the valuable land on LeFevre Peninsula and at Semaphore South, where about 4,000 to 5,000 houses could be constructed.

Mr. Millhouse—The Harbors Board estimates 6,250.

Mr. TAPPING—I would agree, but modesty caused me to suggest a smaller number. The Government's proposal for disposing of temporary houses is a piecemeal measure. I believe it would be unfair to move families from temporary houses at Largs North and Ferryden Park to Elizabeth. The Government should press on with building houses at Semaphore South and on LeFevre Peninsula. Land, generally, in the metropolitan area is expensive, but some years ago the Harbors Board acquired many thousands of acres on LeFevre Peninsula for about £100 an allotment. Even with the cost of reclamation added, it would still be economic to build houses in the area.

I agree with other members that more should be done in building cottage homes for pensioners. According to the quarterly report of July 1, the Housing Trust, since the commencement of this scheme some years ago, has built 582 pensioner cottages, including about 60 for religious organizations. The occupants of these homes are most appreciative: the

rental is nominal (about £1 1s. a week) and they contain all essential amenities. I understand that the gardens are maintained by trust employees, because the tenants are considered physically incapable of carrying out beautification works. Although it is generally regarded that these flats are a losing proposition for the trust, it must be conceded that they are helping those persons who pioneered this State and, consequently, the loss is worthwhile. Man's life span is much greater now than 10 or 12 years ago. Modern drugs are responsible for this, but the increasing number of aged persons presents a problem to the Government. Statistics show that many people are over 80 years of age; whereas a few years ago 70 was regarded as a good age. The Government should be urged to increase the allocation for the building of pensioner cottages. It would gain the admiration of all for so doing.

An amount of £2,625,000 is provided for the railways. So often members express disappointment that the railways do not pay and have never paid. When we remember the heavy interest burden carried by our railway services we can realize the difficulty of making them pay.

Mr. Quirke—They can never pay.

Mr. TAPPING—And we should not expect them to. The railways have done much in developing this State and have been of immense benefit to the State. I commend the railways administration for having acquired so many diesel locomotives, particularly in the last five years. Since their innovation the services have improved immeasurably. The time taken on the Semaphore run has been reduced by eight or nine minutes, with a consequent winning back of passengers to the railways. A continuation of this policy will result in a reduction of railway losses. The railways have had to combat competition from road transport and in the last few years special trucks have been built to transport motor bodies and other merchandise to other States. These trucks are similar to fittings provided by shipowners in trying to move cargoes expeditiously, and by the use of these containers the goods are transported virtually from warehouse to warehouse.

I have received complaints from persons who have for many years been loyal patrons of the Port line. They complain that at times, instead of having eight or nine carriages on a train, only four or five are provided, and by the time the train reaches Woodville it is over-crowded and scholars travelling from Woodville to Semaphore find it difficult to board the train

and often are confronted with physical danger in so doing. If sufficient carriages were provided to adequately cope with the passengers the patronage of the service would improve. Some years ago it was departmental policy to provide excursion fares on Wednesdays and at week-ends, particularly on Sundays. That afforded people an opportunity to use the railways, which are economic, and which are the best means of transportation. However, that system was discontinued some years ago. I believe it should be reintroduced, particularly on Sundays, when many people would avail themselves of an opportunity to travel to the hills and to distant parts by cheap transport.

Last week the member for Port Adelaide, Mr. Ryan, asked a question about the urgent need for amenities for waterside workers at Port Adelaide and Outer Harbour. The problem is who should be responsible for the cost involved. It could be suggested that the washing amenities should be provided by the shipowners, but all our wharves are owned by the Harbors Board, and it may be suggested that as it is the board's obligation to provide all constructions on the wharves, the shipowners should not be responsible. I believe it should be the joint obligation of the shipowners and the board. Waterside workers frequently handle dirty cargo. They go before a board of reference for a special hourly payment when so occupied, but they are not provided with amenities to enable them to wash before they board trains or buses after finishing their work. Other passengers object to their dirty condition. I believe that baths and shower recesses would be a fair provision. Waterside workers elsewhere have held stopwork meetings in order to bring before the authorities the need for improving their amenities. The moment a stop-work meeting is held to consider a *bona fide* matter there is a hue and cry but, if members of this Chamber were expected to tolerate similar washing facilities, they would object. Surely, what applies here should apply to other workers? The Harbors Board should approach shipping owners who, I think, would be only too happy to make some contribution towards providing these amenities and thereby bring about peace on the waterfront. This would also help to get ships away quickly and avoid disputes by waterside workers who, in this matter, have a real grievance.

It has been the desire of the Labor Party for many years to give councils power to grant rebates in rates to pensioners. In Tasmania



and Victoria there is power under State legislation to make concessions to pensioners when their financial position makes it necessary.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Haven't councils in this State power to remit rates?

Mr. TAPPING—No, they have not the power. Last year's amendment provided that if a pensioner was unable to pay the current rates he could apply to the local government body for the rates to be deferred, but a number of pensioners would not accept such a position.

Mr. Fred Walsh—They can be made a charge against the estate.

Mr. TAPPING—Yes, on the death of the pensioner the rates become a first charge on the estate, but people who have worked hard to buy a house find it embarrassing to agree to this. They are generally proud and desire that their homes should be freehold on their death. However, the amendment last year defeated that, and we should amend this legislation and give councils power to grant concessions where necessary. Every year the rates are increasing in every municipality because of the heavy costs involved in local government, and this places an added burden on the pensioner who owns a home. This year the Port Adelaide council has adopted a minimum rate of £10. In the poorer sections of the district, such as the portion in which I live and Portland, the rate is normally between £4 and £6, but this year it will be £10. Under last year's amendment councils are permitted to fix a minimum rate, but in doing so they are putting a heavy imposition on people who cannot afford to pay, many of whom are pensioners receiving £4 15s. a week or, if a married couple, £9 10s. a week. They would have to be very good economists to be able to pay council and water rates and live decently. Once again I appeal to the Government to amend this legislation and give councils power to remit. I know that the Port Adelaide council is anxious to have this power. When this matter was discussed by the Municipal Association of South Australia some years ago, the voting was even, indicating that half the councils desire to have this power.

This afternoon the member for Mount Gambier asked the Minister of Works what he considered would be the increase in water rates for the coming year. Although the rate is still the same the assessment will increase considerably, and in some cases people will pay 40 per cent or 50 per cent more than in other years. Why has this position

developed in South Australia? It is only because this Government has failed to control land sales and prices. Because of the shortage of land in the metropolitan area and in most parts of the State terrific offers are made for land. When land is bought at a very high price the council concerned and the Engineering and Water Supply Department increase their assessments. This problem, which is bad enough today, will become worse unless the Government takes some steps to rectify the position. This afternoon the Minister of Education, in a reply to a question asked by the member for Burra, agreed that his department was obliged to pay exorbitant prices for land for school buildings. During the war the price of land was controlled by the Government and both seller and purchaser got a fair deal. In the *Advertiser* of July 27, under the heading "£5,000 for each acre," the following report appeared:—

Land prices in the Salisbury-Elizabeth district reached a record when six acres of farmland were sold for £33,000 last week. The land, adjacent to the Main North Road, is north of the Little Para River, near the southern boundary of Elizabeth. It is understood that capital from the United Kingdom has been used for the purchase and the site will be used for South Australia's biggest drive-in shopping centre. In 1946, the land was valued at only £40 an acre.

A seller naturally wants to obtain the best possible price, but these high prices bring about the repercussions I have mentioned. When assessments are made by the department and by councils of other properties, comparable sales are taken into account. I was a member of the Port Adelaide City Council many years ago and often sat on courts of revision to hear appeals against assessments. At these hearings the Town Clerk would often say that land close to the appellant's property had been sold recently and had realized twice as much as the assessment on his land. As a result, there was no hope of winning an appeal. This matter is getting worse, and it will get worse still as land becomes more scarce. Land that was bought for £200 a block now often brings between £1,200 and £1,400.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—Do you suggest imposing land sales control?

Mr. TAPPING—Indeed I do. I hoped that it would not be necessary, but the Labor Party has over the years sought control on prices when necessary. We have argued that when supply equals demand no control is necessary, but there is a terrific demand for land that has resulted in fictitious prices being paid.

If the Government did not have to pay four times as much for land as it was worth it would probably have enough money to build another school or two each year. I suggest that control of this nature is necessary.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—You would not try to hold land prices back always, would you?

Mr. TAPPING—It would regulate itself when the supply equalled the demand.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—But there is a big demand in such places as this.

Mr. TAPPING—It does not destroy my argument. It does not seem right that a person who has bought land for a few hundred pounds should sell it for thousands of pounds because someone wants to buy it for a new industry. Isn't it natural to assume that the company that bought that property at Elizabeth will set its prices after taking into account the capital outlay on land, and that the consumer will pay more for his commodity?

Mr. Millhouse—Once they have paid that price for the land they should be able to recoup themselves.

Mr. TAPPING—I do not think that anyone went bankrupt during the war because of control of land sales. During the war I was travelling for Silbert, Sharp and Bishop and most shop people I visited said they were happy with price control because it gave them a fair deal.

Mr. Millhouse—They were kidding to you.

Mr. TAPPING—No. They were sincere about it. Country members know of the exorbitant prices that have been paid in the acquisition of farms in good rainfall areas, but some people who bought land at such outrageous prices now regret having done so because, since they acquired the land, wool prices have eased. Some farmers have told me that although we might regard the wool prices as satisfactory they are unfair to them. Where a man has paid twice as much for land as he should have his future will be most difficult. I support the first line but shall have something to say later on the other lines.

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide)—The most important matter in these Loan Estimates is housing, for which an inadequate amount has been provided. What is taking place provides a good case for the appointment of a Minister of Housing who would be responsible to Parliament. In securing a home only two ways are open: one is to buy a home and the other is to rent one. The amount of money

advanced by the South Australian Government does not adequately cover housing requirements. There were long queues for hours on end at the State Bank for the purpose of applying for advances. In the first week the applications received used up the amount of money available, which proves conclusively that housing is No. 1 in importance. Last February the Savings Bank was receiving applications for advances for the year 1959-60. Applicants were told that there was a distinct possibility that money would be available in about four months' time. By the middle of May the waiting period had gone from four months to nine months, and I believe that it is now about 12 months.

The Treasurer tells members that the housing problem does not cause any worry, but that is not so. The Housing Trust should be a Government instrumentality and its activities should be under the control of a Minister responsible to Parliament. At present the activities of the trust are not subject to Parliamentary control. All we get are its reports. Also, the Electricity Trust should be a Government instrumentality, but here again the Government has shelved its obligations and says that it is only a trust, not a Government institution.

The Loan Estimates we are discussing falsify the housing position. Last year one gathered the false impression that about 5,800 houses would be built. This year the indication is that about 6,000 will be built for rental purposes. The Housing Trust report sets out the true picture in relation to housing, and it is different from the one set out in the Loan Estimates. The trust says that in the year ended June 30, 1960, 3,174 houses were completed. Last year I said, and I repeat it now, that in 1957 the trust received 5,368 applications for rental homes, 5,299 in 1958, and 5,595 in 1959. In 1957, 2,331 families were housed, 2,407 in 1958, and 2,624 in 1959. These figures do not disclose the number of people who are housed in Government-owned temporary dwellings. Because of Government policy in recent months the 2,200 houses occupied as temporary dwellings are included in the deficiency in the number of homes needed soon.

The figures I have quoted are alarming. There was a deficiency of 3,037 houses in 1957, 2,892 in 1958, and 2,971 in 1959, or a total of about 8,900 over the three years. This year, with the 2,200 temporary homes I have mentioned, there is a deficiency of

11,000 homes. Recently I waited on the Treasurer with a deputation in connection with housing and we were told that the housing problem was not great. I do not know what number the Treasurer needs to verify the statement that the housing problem is acute. I do not know how long the public will stand for the present position.

Mr. Hall—Isn't each year's deficiency included in the figure for the next year?

Mr. RYAN—No. I now refer to the case of an ex-serviceman who applied for a Housing Trust home on July 5, 1954. That was six years ago, and for a person in such dire circumstances they have been six long weary years of agony in waiting for something that should have been attended to more quickly. The applicant was told in 1954:—

It is therefore improbable that accommodation could be made available to you in the immediate future, but every consideration will be given to your case.

On August 11, 1960, after inquiries had been made as to what had happened to the application, the applicant was told:—

I am afraid, however, that there are so many pressing cases coming into line for consideration that it is not possible at present to indicate just when a house could be made available to you.

Mr. Hall—What priority did he have?

Mr. RYAN—None. I will give the facts because I do not want to hide behind anything. Twelve months ago when I entered this place the waiting time for a trust home was five years for a civilian and four years for an ex-serviceman. The period for an ex-serviceman is now six years, yet the Treasurer says that the housing problem will not cause any worry. It is apparent that the members who make such statements do not represent districts where the housing problem is acute, and most agonizing to people awaiting homes.

Mr. Millhouse—Under what conditions is the man now living?

Mr. RYAN—He and his wife and two children are living in one room, and they have been doing so for five years. When I waited on the Treasurer we were told that £1,000,000 extra would be available for the replacement of temporary homes. The other day Mr. Tapping asked in this place for the rate at which the homes would be replaced if the money were available. Incidentally, I cannot see in the Loan Estimates where an amount is made available for this purpose. Mr. Tapping was told that they would be replaced at the rate of 400 a year. That means that about five years

will be needed to replace all the present temporary homes. The policy of the trust is not to make these temporary homes available after they have been vacated to other people in emergency circumstances. Probably we would not object to such a policy if the houses were being replaced by permanent modern structures, but they are not being replaced. I know of no instance where a replacement has been made, yet some temporary homes are being demolished. This means that as each temporary home is demolished another home is lost, which must aggravate the waiting time. I am rather amazed that the Loan Estimates include an amount of £1,000 for expenditure on temporary homes. Apparently even if these temporary homes are replaced it would result, as stated by the Treasurer, in at least a five-year programme. However, there is absolutely no provision for the safety of these homes, because the people who will ultimately have to be housed have five years left to wait under terms and conditions which should not be applicable to homes that are owned solely by the Government. I believe that with an expenditure of about £15,000,000 we could at least expect the Government to have a Minister responsible for the solution of this all-important problem.

On occasions I can agree with some Government members when they make what I consider reasonable statements. This afternoon the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) referred to the Harbors Board. As the member representing a portion of the area involved in the Greater Port Adelaide Plan, I heartily agree that the amount shown on the Estimates for this project, as in the case of housing, is inadequate. When the members of this Parliament were conducted on the Cook's tour of the Greater Port Adelaide Plan, I raised this matter with the General Manager of the Housing Trust and pointed out that the opposite of what took place at Elizabeth was taking place at Port Adelaide. At Elizabeth the homes were built before industry was established, and eventually the Treasurer had to use his persuasive powers to substantiate his dream of a satellite town.

Mr. Jenkins—There are still not enough houses at Elizabeth.

Mr. RYAN—Far more are being built there than in the metropolitan area, where 61 per cent of the people live because of the Government's gerrymander. According to Government members, Elizabeth is in the country. Apparently, the honourable member has not studied the position.

Mr. Dunstan—Does the member for Stirling call Elizabeth an example of decentralization?

Mr. Jenkins—It is decentralization of the metropolitan area.

The CHAIRMAN—Order!

Mr. RYAN—In the Greater Port Adelaide Plan industry is being established without the necessary homes being built for the workers in those industries. When I raised this matter with the General Manager of the trust I was told that the homes would be built provided the necessary facilities were provided beforehand. The main essential in the area is sewerage, but that has not been provided. The trust has been caught previously in building homes, only to find that the necessary facilities are not available, and I am told that in future it will be the trust's policy not to build homes unless those facilities are made available. This definitely proves a lack of the co-operation that is so necessary between Government departments. It is futile to build big industries in an area that cannot provide what should be one of the first essentials of industry, namely, sewerage.

That is what is happening in the Greater Port Adelaide Plan. The member for Mitcham referred to this scheme. He had only looked at it personally within the last six months. As I said last year, one would have been led to believe by the Playford fantasy of the Wednesday evening 5AD sessions that it was a scheme that was just thought of and going to be implemented soon. However, when I raised this matter in a question on July 30 last year the Minister of Works said:—

I think the honourable member will appreciate that the proposals mentioned in this morning's press are of a long-range character and to some extent are speculative, although not wildly so. About 10 years ago the Harbors Board announced a policy for what was called at that time the "Greater Port Adelaide Plan."

That is a scheme that was born 10 years ago and, except for the industry that I have mentioned in the Gillman area, the Government has not done much of note in the fulfilment of that dream of 10 years ago. I believe that if the various Government departments co-operated in the establishment of this scheme it would be to the advantage of all concerned, both workers and industry in general.

Mr. Fall—Do you call that decentralization?

Mr. RYAN—It is decentralization because it creates industries where they are absolutely necessary. Of course, the industry in that area is necessarily in a small section of the State because it is absolutely vital to the area

in which it has grown, namely, the seafront itself.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—Hasn't anything been done in the past 10 years?

Mr. RYAN—In that scheme, no, except for the little bit of Gillman in which has been created industry, although the facilities I mentioned as essential were not provided. Except for the levelling of sandhills down at Semaphore South there is little to show. I visit Port Adelaide every day, and I say that as far as the wharves at Port Adelaide are concerned nothing much has been done in the last 10 years except the work at the North Parade wharf. Members can check on that. It is all right for members in the House to run down certain organizations when they go on strike for what they consider their just entitlement. The waterside industry is vastly different from other industries generally. In this industry the employees have only the facilities that are supplied by a Government instrumentality. A strike occurred in that area recently because 20 men were given only a bucket of water in which to wash after they had been handling carbon black, one of the worst products that men are required to handle. In fact, one bucket of hot soapy water for each man would not be sufficient. When the men asked for what they were justly entitled to in accordance with their award they were awarded 10 minutes' washing time, but the chairman of the board of reference drew the attention of employers and employees to the ridiculous situation whereby he could order washing time but could not order the provision of a washing facility, as the employer was not in a position to supply it even if the board ordered it.

As my colleague, the member for Semaphore, has said, what would members in this House do if they were offered a bucket of water amongst 20 members and told that that was the only washing facility they were going to get? They would be poor imitations of men if they did not at least stick up for what they considered to be their just entitlement. The point is that the employers in this industry are dodging their obligations because under the conditions pertaining to the industry the obligation is on the Government to provide the facilities. Some years ago, with the co-operation of the employers in this industry and the Stevedoring Industry Authority, we waited on the management of the South Australian Harbors Board on the question of the disgraceful amenities provided on the waterfront at Port Adelaide. As a result of those

representations the amenities improved by 100 per cent on what had existed previously. We have now reached the situation where there should be a further 100 per cent improvement in the amenities that should be supplied by the employers or by the Harbors Board. In another State where obnoxious cargoes are being handled the Marine Board has supplied what is known as a floating amenities block.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—Is it still being used?

Mr. RYAN—Yes. When a ship comes in with an obnoxious cargo to be handled, the floating amenities block is pulled up alongside the ship.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—I understand that two out of three are not being used because they are not successful.

Mr. RYAN—They have requested the installation of a permanent amenities block, and I believe that last week agreement was reached to a certain extent between the Maritime Board, the union, and the employers, but I understand that this matter is outside the ambit of the decision of the Port Authorities Conference. We have the ridiculous position where a judge of the Federal Arbitration Court openly states that the amenities are absolutely necessary but he could not order them because he had no power over the people that must supply them. He went on to say that he expected the co-operation of the Government port authorities in the ports of the Commonwealth at least to bring their standard of amenities up to what is required under present-day conditions.

Last Monday morning I visited a ship working at Port Adelaide with one of the worst types of obnoxious cargo it is possible for a human being to handle. That ship was unloading sulphur, and only people who have worked with bulk sulphur know what an obnoxious cargo it is. Once again, men were given the right to washing time, but there is still no compulsion on anybody to provide washing facilities. As Mr. Tapping said, these men are shunned when, covered with carbon black, they get on public transport and attempt to sit alongside passengers who have a better type of job and require better clothing to work in. They are shunned, but it is not their fault that facilities are not provided. People are amazed when the men demand what are at least modern equipment and amenities. They are shunned as "red ragers" because they have asked for something absolutely necessary.

I refer now to the conditions applying at the Dental Hospital section of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, for which £180,000 has been allotted. Recently I was amazed when approached by a constituent in my district, who told me that he had applied to the Dental Hospital for treatment. He was told that he would have to wait at least two years for treatment. This person told me that, owing to his age and condition, he did not know if he would be alive then to receive what he now considers is essential treatment. He was unable to obtain the treatment elsewhere because of his financial position. I checked his statement and found that there was a two-year waiting list at the Dental Hospital for people in poor circumstances. I bring that state of affairs to the notice of the Government because I believe it is essential to health that people should receive prompt treatment. A two-year wait should not be tolerated.

I am not criticizing the Public Works Committee when I bring forward these matters, but I believe that when many of the matters are submitted to this all-important committee, statements given and recommendations made they are manipulated by somebody else. I refer to the Port Adelaide girls technical high school which was recommended, and for which a sum was appropriated last year. That work is all-important to the area and to the children who must attend the school. I can go back to 1952 when the original recommendation of the committee was made. That report was dated May 29, 1952, and it was then considered that there was an urgent need for extra classroom accommodation. I shall not read the complete report, but I shall read what I consider important, without attempting to hide the rest of the report. One section of the report said, "These buildings, together with the primary and infant school, take up so much of the site that the playing area is hopelessly inadequate." In the 1958 report the committee stated, "The Committee has previously considered the question of new buildings at the Port Adelaide girls technical high school, and in a progress report of July 31, 1952, the committee recommended that a pre-fabricated building containing four classrooms and lavatory accommodation be constructed on the site acquired for the new technical high school."

I have been told that ever since 1952, at each speech night—last year was the first year that I have attended—those attending the function have had their hopes falsely raised that the

school would be built because of representations made to the parents and children that the children would be in the new school building in about 15 months from that night. That has been going on since 1952. The people were told in my presence in December last year that at the commencement of the 1962 school year some children at that speech night would be attending the new school. Last year's Loan Estimates appropriated an amount towards the initial cost of the school and during the year I asked several questions about it.

I raised the question of priorities and was informed by the Treasurer, who was the Acting Minister of Education at the time, that as far as school priorities were concerned each department with its Ministers and advisers worked out a priority. The general approach has been that when the total amount that can be submitted on the Loan Estimates is known to the Government, Cabinet makes an allocation between departments, taking into account their respective requirements. If, for example, the Education Department provision is £3,000,000, the Minister of Education, in consultation with the officers, puts down the schools he wants built and the priority he desires.

During the session commenced in the early part of this year I again mentioned the importance of these new buildings to the people attending the school and the staff working under those conditions. I raised the point on two or three occasions, and on the last occasion was told that the Director of Public Buildings had advised the Minister of Education that it was anticipated that tenders would be called in June of this year for the erection of the school. In view of that answer I wrote to the Minister of Works on July 7. The Treasurer first of all said that priority was decided by the officers of the Education Department, and I do not decry the general work done by the department. That was the final information I received on what has happened in connection with that school. At this stage I condemn the practice that exists when this Parliament, which is the supreme authority in this State, allocates certain money for certain work to be done and that work is not done. The authority of this Parliament is overridden when the money appropriated by it is not spent on the work for which it has been appropriated. That amounts to a falsification as far as voting on the Loan Estimates is concerned.

The children attending this school are forced, owing to the existing circumstances, to walk across the up and down tracks of the Port Road, which really constitute two roads, three

times a day. They have to travel about half a mile, and they are asked on most occasions to travel that distance during their recess time, and the trip from what is to be the new school to the old dilapidated school, which has been there ever since Port Adelaide has been Port Adelaide, occupies their full recess time. The students are also asked to cover that distance during the meal break and much of their time, which should be spent in leisure and play during recess time and lunch breaks, is taken up in travelling that distance from one school to the other.

Tenders were to be called not later than June 6 by the Public Buildings Department. On July 7 I wrote to the Minister of Works and the text of that letter was that during the last session I had on several occasions raised matters regarding the building of the new Port Adelaide girls technical high school. The initial finance was appropriated during the last financial year, and on receiving information as to the anticipated date of commencement I was informed by the Minister of Education that the Director of Public Buildings had advised him that tenders would be called in June this year. A statement to this effect appears in *Hansard* on May 4, 1960, at page 387. Following on the answer given by the Minister of Education I have vigilantly perused the *Government Gazette* and am able to say that tenders have not been called to indicate when this important work is to be commenced.

Included in last year's Estimates were major additions for schools for girls at Elizabeth, Port Adelaide and Vermont, for boys at Croydon, LeFevre and Mitchell Park, and for boys and girls at Mount Gambier and Whyalla. Unfortunately for me (or for the district I represent), but fortunately for some other members, most of the schools mentioned have been started and are well on the way to completion. I believe the technical high school at Elizabeth is practically completed, yet the reports of the Public Works Committee regarding both the Elizabeth technical high school and the Port Adelaide technical high school were delivered on the same day. One is practically completed and the other has not been started, nor can I get any information from any responsible department as to when there is any likelihood of the work being commenced.

It is common practice to pass the buck to the Public Works Committee but, if work is not intended by the department, why is the

question referred to the Public Works Committee? The committee recently had to rush through reports on something like 30 schools that were considered important to education. I say frankly that any expenditure on education is all-important but, if this all-important committee is to be asked to rush through and deliver reports on works that the departments have no intention of commencing for two or three years, it is a waste of time as far as the Public Works Committee is concerned. I draw the attention of the department concerned to that important matter. I agree with the statement made by the Minister of Education at Kadina on whether we can afford to spend the amount of money we do on education. The Minister said, "Can we afford not to?" I agree with the Minister's remarks on that occasion, but I bring before his notice, and that of the Minister of Works, the manipulation that is taking place with funds and the commencement of work authorized by the committee.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—It is improper for you to say that the department has no intention of carrying out the work, because that is completely wrong. It is a slander on the department concerned.

Mr. RYAN—Money was appropriated in last year's Estimates and I was assured in this House that tenders would be called not later than June 6, 1960, which actually is in the last financial year. The fact that the money was appropriated last year but not used shows that there was no intention to use it.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—That is not correct and you know it.

Mr. RYAN—Although the money was included in last year's Estimates, the school has not been started, and that is not an isolated case. If the Minister had attended school break-ups in the last eight years when parents and children were led to believe that schools would be provided he would know how they feel about it when they find that the work has not been commenced. I offer my criticisms honestly and hope that the matter will be brought to the notice of the responsible departments. I support the first line.

Mr. HALL (Gouger)—I also have much pleasure in supporting the first line and agree with Mr. Millhouse when he says that the Loan Estimates are an admirable presentation when one considers last year's drought. I also agree with the Leader of the Opposition's statement that the effect of last year's drought was not as severe as the 1914 drought. We came

through last year much better because of the application by farmers of the greater knowledge available. Secondary industries in the city benefited because of the big interstate market which kept many of them going at full capacity. However, that does not detract from our very fine financial position. I am pleased that my electorate received considerable attention in the allocation of Loan funds, particularly as to the amount set aside for the renewal of the Warren to Paskeville trunk main, although I am disappointed that a greater sum was not made available for this purpose. However, it is a step forward. Now that the rough construction close to the reservoir has been done the work will be going on in open country. This will result in more economical construction and we shall get many more miles of main for our money. I believe that about 27 miles is to be laid, which is in addition to the 25 miles already provided. However, the main will not be extended enough to alleviate the severe water position in the Nantawarra and Watchman areas north of Balaklava. The Minister of Works has inspected the scheme and promised to do his best, and we know that he will do that. The problem is almost desperate in the summer months. The existing main is so corroded that one could not stand on some stretches of it above ground level. I believe that in the next summer or two we may run into trying times in supplying water to people on the slopes of the hills in the Nantawarra and Watchman areas. Some of them have been without water for five days during heat waves. I hope that after the completion of the 27 miles this year another 30 or 40 miles will be undertaken next year because undoubtedly the position will arise where the pipeline will be so rotten that it will not be possible to repair it. I understand that in one stretch of a mile of the main there had been 70 breaks, and to attempt to repair it would be like repairing a sieve.

I am pleased to see the large sum allocated for area schools, one of which is to be at Mallala. I understand it will not be opened until the first school term in 1963. I express the gratitude of the people for many miles around Mallala that this school is to be established. They are particularly pleased regarding the promised standard of secondary education to be provided. At the moment there is no secondary school between Balaklava and Adelaide in a direct line. We have heard criticism from honourable members opposite, and I consider that none of it

was valid or could be substantiated. Some of the charges were quite wild. I was sorry to hear Mr. Tapping say that he would like to see some form of price control on land in the metropolitan area. Although the honourable member's motive is beyond question, he must remember that it has been found very difficult to control land prices. In some transactions money is required "on the side." This leads to great disrepute throughout the State. I admit that the problem exists and the best way to tackle it is to have such major schemes as those undertaken by the Housing Trust and the Reid Murray organization which have acquired large tracts of land, some at very high prices. At the building block level, with roads and services installed, they are only a fraction of the prices required here in the metropolitan area. Rather than an attempt to control by means that are mostly circumvented and lead to dishonesty in the community, I should like to see more of the schemes that have been initiated and maintained by the Housing Trust, to the great benefit of the house purchasers of this State.

Here, I should like to congratulate Reid Murray on their efforts at the Para Hills Estate, which happens to be in my electorate. I am proud that they have seen fit to launch out there and provide houses which undoubtedly, so far as the land is concerned, will be cheaper than could be provided in the metropolitan area. It is a great consideration when each house built there will be anything up to £1,000 cheaper than a house built in the metropolitan area, because of land costs alone.

Mr. Quirke—Does the honourable member know what their interest charges are?

Mr. HALL—I do not know their interest charges, but I believe the houses start off at about £4,100, land included, with two side fences, a rear fence, sewers, washing machines, and quite a few appointments.

Mr. Jennings—But it is on hire-purchase?

Mr. HALL—I understand the terms will be similar to those given by the Housing Trust, because the Loan money would possibly come from some of the State sources.

Mr. Quirke—In the case of a second mortgage, do they charge 7 per cent flat?

Mr. HALL—I do not know.

Mr. Quirke—I think you might be interested to look at that.

Mr. HALL—That may be so. Of course, if one has enough initial deposit, one does not need a second mortgage. Although some honourable members may have some doubts about the scheme, these houses go on to the open market.

Nobody has to go out there to buy them. It does not detract from the activities of the Housing Trust. These are extra houses provided, perhaps with a little more individuality. I think it is a move in the right direction that will provide more housing for our community.

I am sorry that the honourable member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) is not in the Chamber now because I wish to congratulate him on the melodious way in which he began his address on the Loan Estimates. He was telling us something about the *My Fair Lady* musical. I hoped he would continue and perhaps sing us a few bars, but I thought afterwards he left that tune in his bewilderment at the way we financed the State's Loan activities. He made some rather peculiar statements. He said that our industry here had to be expanded because of the demand of world requirements. As far as I know, he meant the world requirements in that industry. One reason why industry in Australia has prospered is the demand for our primary products. That has enabled us to build up our secondary industry, which is a great thing and provides by far the greatest employment for our people. I was rather perturbed and should like to know more of his plans for our rural community. I am sure that many people in the State have worked hard to maintain themselves through bad times, to come through quite good times, and now once again they are facing times necessitating economies. They would be pleased to know what the honourable member for Hindmarsh had in mind when he said that he would have some sort of new assessment which would be 20 per cent above the present assessment for taxes on land, and that the extra 20 per cent would be used to acquire considerable amounts of land for the purposes of subdivision. I cannot understand just what he means by "20 per cent above present assessment for tax purposes." Does he mean assessments for probate duties or council rates? Just what does he mean? If it is for probate duties, he may be sure it is well above its present value at auction today.

Mr. Bywaters—What does land bring in your area?

Mr. HALL—I cannot say dogmatically. The price paid is a risk that the purchaser takes. We should like to know just what is in store for the country if the honourable member for Hindmarsh has an opportunity to put his programme into effect. I think he owes it to this Chamber and to the people to explain more fully what his intentions are, because they are



something that we cannot at present quite grasp. That does not apply to me only; it applies also to my colleagues. They do not know what he has in store for us, but it is something about a widespread change in the rural community. We would be indebted to the honourable member if he would tell us so that the people would know what action to take when they went to the polls. It is a very important question because our land tenure has been admired throughout this country and the world for its stability and the assurance it has given to our settlers.

However, I am rather staggered by the opposition to our becoming indebted under the Loan programme. Some comparisons were made between the public debts of New South Wales and South Australia. Apart from the facts produced this afternoon by the honourable member for Hindmarsh, I understand that the figures at June 30, 1959, were £220 odd a head in New South Wales and £377 a head in South Australia. It must be realized that in New South Wales much money is raised for semi-governmental businesses. Also, in South Australia much Loan money is used by and allocated to types of semi-governmental businesses that are not users of Loan moneys in New South Wales. For instance, the Tramways Trust, the Electricity Trust and, I think, the Abattoirs Board do not add to the public debt as expressed in the figures of New South Wales.

Mr. Riches—Now that the honourable member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) is present will you repeat what you were saying about him?

Mr. HALL—I was not being personal. I was wondering what he was getting at when he was criticizing our debt of £377 a head. I ask him: what is wrong with that debt?

Mr. Quirke—Three hundred and seventy-seven pounds.

Mr. HALL—I think the honourable member will admit that this Government is engaged in one big business.

Mr. Hutchens—You mean "one big bad business."

Mr. HALL—Our Loan funds are our capital. What does a business do with the money it calls in? It erects buildings, installs machinery, buys motor trucks and all the materials that go to creating consumer goods and services. That is precisely what this State is doing. Our public debt is nothing

more to this State's economy than the share capital of a business, and we get our money at a reasonable rate. With it we get such services as the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline: a good buy! The member for Port Adelaide denies that anything has taken place at Port Adelaide in the last 10 years, but would he suggest that our harbour facilities are not a good buy? These services all add to the greater productivity of this State. Our trained citizens are our greatest asset. I am sure that we have nowhere near reached the limit of our borrowing and interest-paying capacity. If the member for Hindmarsh regards the public debt as a share capital he will realize that it is reasonable, and that we get full value from the resources it creates. The member for Port Adelaide, as I said, suggested that nothing has been done at Port Adelaide in the last decade, but the facts are not secret. He has a copy of the brochure from which the member for Mitcham quoted and which lists the work done there in the last 10 years. The work includes swinging basins for the inner and outer harbours, the widening of certain sections of the river channel, wharf and dock extensions, the planned construction of a new deep draught wharf, storage sheds, and so on. The work carried out in the last decade involved a total expenditure of about £1,142,000. Old timber wharves have been replaced and there have been notable additions to the port storage accommodation, one shed being lengthened by 270ft. to 774ft. The rehabilitation of the Harbors Board dockyard at Glanville cost £400,000 and the extension of the Osborne coal-handling installation completed in June, 1956, cost £600,000. It is utter nonsense for Mr. Ryan to say that very little has been done at Port Adelaide in the last 10 years.

We should stop opposing the public indebtedness, which we can easily bear. We have an economy that is growing apace each year. The tax reimbursements we get from the Commonwealth more than cover our public debt as compared with the New South Wales debt. Last year in tax reimbursement New South Wales got £22 2s. 9d. *per capita* compared with £30 4s. 2d. in South Australia. If the member for Hindmarsh works out the extra interest burden which we bear he will find we are better off by almost £1 a head than New South Wales.

Mr. Jennings—Do you suggest we are £1 a head better off? I think you may find it works the other way around.

Mr. HALL—I am sure of my figures. Mr. Hutchens promised us figures of bank balances and the ratio of motor vehicles to persons, but he sadly neglected to supply them. However, as they are articles coveted by all members of the community, they are a good yardstick of the prosperity of our economy. In South Australia we have one car to about five people compared with one to 6.3 people in New South Wales. Our citizens have £160 in the savings bank compared with £130 in New South Wales. That should finally convince even Mr. Hutchens. I support the first line.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla)—In speaking to the Loan Estimates I want firstly to examine them, bearing in mind how they fit into the general pattern of Australia's progress at present. I agree with our Leader that we have insufficient information as to how the proposed expenditure listed in these Estimates is related to work which has been done on the particular projects and work which has yet to be done. In examining the Loan Estimates I cannot help notice that the largest amounts listed refer to matters closely connected with our industrial expansion. For example, £2,850,000 is provided for advances for homes; £9,000,000 for waterworks and sewers; £7,700,000 for Government buildings and land; £2,000,000 for the Electricity Trust; and the Housing Trust, including the use of internal funds, has received over £12,000,000. A big portion of this expenditure will be used in establishing steelworks at Whyalla and for other secondary industries. I am concerned whether these Loan moneys are really adequate to meet the demands that will be placed upon the State in the coming years. I do not find any cause for satisfaction on examining the situation. At the meeting of the Australian Loan Council in June last the total programme was of £230,000,000 for State works and housing, which was an increase of £10,000,000 over the previous year's total. That is less than a five per cent increase on the previous year's figure. We have been suffering from an inflation of at least three per cent per annum for some time and at present it seems to be exceeding even that figure. If we make allowance for that inflation, which seems to be continuing, and continuing at an increasing rate, we have an actual increase of about two per cent in Loan moneys to meet the demand of new expansion in industry and improved public facilities required by all sections of the community. What is our future as a State?

At present we are boasting that we have a higher intake of migrants than any other State

and saying that the rate of expansion in our secondary industries exceeds that of other States but, when we look at our Commonwealth migration target of 125,000 a year and consider the greatly increased number of children who will be leaving school and requiring jobs in industry in the next few years, we find that the manufacturing industries in Australia will have to absorb 35,000 new workers every year in the next decade if we are to maintain full employment. The interesting thing about that figure of 35,000 is that it is double the rate of intake over the past few years. We have had much to say about the speed of our industrial expansion but, if we have to double the yearly intake into industry in the next decade, the demand on our public facilities will obviously be greatly increased and the comparatively small increase in Loan moneys made available this year will be insufficient to meet future demands. The figures I have quoted were taken from business reports published recently, including a special edition of the *Sydney Morning Herald* on business expansion in Australia, so I do not think members are likely to challenge these sources. They certainly cannot be described as Labor Party sources.

While speaking about expansion I emphasize that a large portion of the Loan expenditure proposed in these Estimates is to be used in developing a steelworks at Whyalla. It is interesting to reflect on the tremendous amount of work done by members on this side of the House to bring this about in the face of considerable opposition from some members opposite and a crying down of the whole proposal from some quarters. In fact, one or two members opposite even said it was impracticable, yet we now find that not only is that steelworks behind time insofar as the demand for steel in Australia is concerned, but that there is a great difficulty in getting public facilities for it. I am satisfied from what I have read that the Government will find itself put to great trouble to provide the necessary quantity of water by the time the steelworks is to be constructed or should be constructed.

I find it hard to explain the attitude towards public works in this country, particularly when I read statements by people who are supposed to be in responsible positions. A typical statement was that made recently by Sir Kenneth Coles, past president of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of Australia, reported recently in the *News*. Commenting on the

1960-61 Federal Budget, Sir Kenneth Coles said:—

On the expenditure side the Government must provide for heavy expenditures which are an accepted part of our national growth and development. Mainly, these are that migration must be continued and employment must be maintained at a high level—which in themselves demand that public works of a developmental nature cannot be curtailed. Also, it is imperative that expenditure on housing—with all its attendant services, such as water, light and power, and provision of schools and hospitals—cannot be diminished, in fact, must be stepped up.

Curiously enough, he went on to say:—

One of the most constructive steps the Commonwealth Government could take, if it feels that the economy is developing too quickly at this point and running into an inflationary period, would be to curb its own expenditure—especially that of a capital nature. If, for example, works expenditure were clipped by £50 million, the effect would flow right through the community.

This is typical of the approach of leaders of commerce in this country; they want all the public facilities, but they want expenditure checked. How they reconcile those two points of view I have never been able to understand, but this has been their constant approach for many years. They want things, but they do not want money spent on them. It is perfectly obvious that, if we are to maintain full employment and the migration programme that has already been outlined, we shall have to expand our secondary industries quickly and, as I said earlier, the rate of absorption of the work force during the next decade will have to be twice what it has been in the last few years. That will take some doing and, in my opinion, the Loan Estimates before us are not sufficient to meet that situation.

Many members have already spoken about housing, and I shall not go over the ground they have covered except to say that what I have said has made it clear that housing is not keeping pace even with present demands, let alone the increased demands that must flow from the migration programme and the extra children who will be leaving school in the next few years and will come into the work force of this country. We are already highly industrialized. I believe 33 or 34 per cent of our work force is engaged in secondary industries compared with about 16 per cent at the turn of the century, when we had a population of about 4,000,000; our population is now about 10,000,000. In fact, the percentage of our work force in secondary industry is higher than in the United States of America, where the figure is between 29 and 30 per cent, but

an interesting feature of our economy is that we are rather closely following the pattern of the United States and devoting too much of our rather limited resources to consumption ends. Over the last five years the United States has got itself into a position in which the percentage increase in industrial production is nil because so much of the economy is devoted to consumption and not to the production of capital goods. These might sound startling figures, but they also come from the business supplement of the *Sydney Morning Herald*, so I do not suppose members opposite will challenge them. At the same time, Australia has increased its industrial production by 33 per cent. This sounds particularly good, but most of the European countries have exceeded it by more than 50 per cent, with Russia topping the poll with 70 per cent. Although we have some reason for satisfaction there is no reason for complacency, particularly in view of the extra labour force to be absorbed. These Loan Estimates should be considered more particularly in relation to the way in which they fit into the overall pattern of the country. One of the weakest points in the present expansion is the fact that inflation is increasing. Unfortunately it seems that in the expansion some people see great opportunities for literally plundering the community. I use the word "plundering" advisedly because they will do nothing unless they can get a return of 10 to 12 per cent for their money. The wage earner is expected to be loyal and patriotic and to work hard, yet his quarterly cost of living adjustments are suspended. He is told that he must be a good boy and not go to the court because it will increase inflation. I do not know how these two attitudes can be reconciled.

Today Mr. Millhouse told us of the wonderful things to be done in the Greater Port Adelaide Plan. He said that blocks of land would fetch £1,000, because they would be valuable blocks. How is the wage earner to pay £1,000 for a building block and then about £4,000 to build a house on it? I have often said in this House that the problem of buying a house is becoming increasingly difficult for the wage earner, and that it not hard to prove. The percentage of his wage used in these days in making repayments on a loan is becoming greater. I have given the figures previously and have shown that in 1938 he used about 23 or 24 per cent of his wage in this way, whereas today it is about 33 to 35 per cent over the same term. That is why we have a long

term arrangement for the wage earner to buy a house. The arrangement now covers about 40 years instead of 20 years, which shows how increasingly difficult it is to buy a house. Mr. Millhouse thought it was all right to have a block costing £1,000 on which to build a house, but if the wage earner gets mixed up with that he will have a load of debt all his life. It is not a satisfactory arrangement. In the Greater Port Adelaide Plan will a man live in the area itself or will he live where land is cheaper? If Mr. Millhouse thinks that he will live in the area itself his approach to the matter is wrong. We should make it possible for a wage earner to buy land at a reasonable price and not have this load of debt around his neck.

I cannot see why we should get deeper into debt in order to achieve something. Year after year we have talked about the difficulties associated with the financial situation. We do nothing about it because we believe these things are orthodox and conventional, and that they cannot be altered. The person who talks about unorthodox matters in this House does not get much notoriety outside. If a member talks about bird baths he gets about six inches in the newspaper, but if he talks about a better approach to our economic problems he gets nothing. Our papers are full of advertisements about television sets and other consumer goods, and they state how easy it is to buy these things with no deposit. It is all designed to make the greatest possible profits in the shortest possible time. People who profess to have a responsible attitude towards the community and chide members on this side when they say anything out of place are regarded by me as some of the most irresponsible people in the community. Such a statement as that will not get much publicity in the press. I hope that one of these days consideration will be given to a wage earner being able to get a house he can afford. Often suggestions are put forward from this side but they are pool-pooled and are said to be too idealistic or socialistic as the case may be.

The development of Whyalla is an interesting example of the sort of thing that Mr. Millhouse dealt with. Much building expansion is taking place there and fortunately it is on Crown land. Although most of the houses being built by the trust are for rental purposes blocks of land are available for purchase at £70 to £90. That may be regarded as comparatively ideal when we compare it with the price that Mr. Millhouse suggested,

but we must remember that there is a tremendous turnover of labour in Whyalla. I do not know how we would get on if the wage earner there had to pay £1,000 for a block. If land were that price the rents of the trust homes would be much higher than they are now. It can be seen easily how industrial expansion can be affected by these high prices. The wage earners are dissatisfied with the inflationary trend in land prices, and the high prices are increasing the charges for local government and water purposes. The wage earner must pay those charges yet when he asks for the simple justice of having his wage adjusted from time to time to meet current price levels he meets considerable resistance, and he is urged not to do anything to increase inflation.

There are one or two matters I want to mention in regard to education and the Public Buildings Department. Recently I had occasion to deal with the matter of an extension at the Whyalla West primary school. It was planned to add a new wing but to the great surprise of the school committee the wing was to be placed in a position different from what was originally planned. The necessary protests were made through the Director of Education. When it was seen that the builder was going ahead with the job of placing the wing in what was regarded as an unsatisfactory position I was asked to approach the department about the matter. I found to my surprise that there had been an almost complete lack of co-ordination between the Education Department and the Public Buildings Department on the situation of this addition to the primary school. I am led to believe that the siting of this additional wing was done by the Public Buildings Department without taking the Education Department authorities into its full confidence. This is not a new complaint. I have heard similar complaints in this House, and there has been very strong criticism of the fact that the Education Department has insufficient control over what goes on in the designing and construction of additions to schools and the architecture of schools themselves. I feel that this matter should be examined with a view to either achieving far better co-ordination between these two departments or having something under the wing of the Education Department itself which deals with these matters.

I notice in the Estimates a reference to the duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline. Under the heading of "Morgan-Whyalla Water Main" £422,000 is provided, and only £150,000 for the Lincoln Gap to Iron Knob pipeline. I

noticed recently that details of a revised plan for supplying Iron Knob with River Murray water were outlined before the Public Works Committee. The Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. Dridan) and the Engineer for Water Supply submitted evidence that 105,000,000 gallons a year would be required by 1962, rising to 835,000,000 gallons yearly after 1970. This was considerably greater than earlier estimates of water required, and the design had to be altered. They went on to say that the water would be used for the recovery of low grade iron ore and for the town, which was expected to grow considerably when a steelworks operated at Whyalla. The 24-inch main to extend the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline from Lincoln Gap to Iron Knob, a distance of 27 miles, was estimated to cost £1,250,000, which included a pumping station and storage at Iron Knob.

I take it that this £150,000 is but a preliminary small amount, but I am still not quite sure who will be constructing this pipeline. In the Indenture legislation it was left optional as to whether the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited would be responsible for the construction of the line from Lincoln Gap to Iron Knob or whether the Government would undertake that work, and I would like further information on that when we go through the Estimates line by line.

This is a particularly urgent matter, because the use of the lower grade ore is essential if the life of the high grade ore is to be extended, and obviously from this report the demands on water are going to be much greater than were originally expected. Here again, I emphasize a point that relates to what I said earlier in relation to the inadequacy of the money available for Loan works. I refer particularly to water supplies. We are all aware of the difficulty of water supplies in this State and the tremendous expenditure that has to be made to provide sufficient water. It is an interesting point that Australia is the

driest continent in the world, and that our expenditure on water is proceeding at a rate far outstripping the increase in our national income because of that shortage of water. In fact, the cost of making water storage in Australia far exceeds that elsewhere because of our difficulties in that direction. That alone emphasizes, having regard to this item I mentioned, the inadequacy of Loan money for these purposes.

I am not at all satisfied about the way in which this Loan money is obtained and provided. I do not want to be misunderstood on this point. I think the methods whereby we obtain this Loan money and the interest rates we pay for much of it are wrong, but nevertheless I am not going to speak on that subject tonight. It has been dealt with repeatedly in this House. As things are—and we have to accept them for the time being—those methods are still hopelessly inadequate, in my opinion, to meet the tremendous industrial expansion with which we are faced. If we wish to maintain full employment and our migration policy, we have to absorb these people in secondary industry, because they cannot be absorbed anywhere else. We hope to absorb them and maintain a standard of living we regard as adequate. In fact, we are not prepared to accept anything else, because we cannot see that it is necessary. I close on that note by saying that, in my opinion, these Loan Estimates are inadequate to meet the future requirements not only of this State but of Australia.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### SOIL CONSERVATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.58 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 17, at 2 p.m.