

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, August 18, 1960.

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

LAW OF PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT ACT.

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Act.

QUESTIONS.**BROKEN HILL ROAD.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I have received the following letter from the secretary of the Barrier District Assembly of the Australian Labor Party:—

I have been directed by the assembly to request that you again make representations to the Minister of Highways to expedite the work of widening the narrow bridges on the Adelaide Road and to have the section between Cockburn and Mingary bituminized. As the holiday season is fast approaching it is felt that this much needed work should be commenced as soon as possible. Thanking you for your past efforts in regard to this matter.

In amplification of the letter, I point out that this matter has been the subject of discussion for a considerable time. Not only does the Barrier District Assembly of the Labor Party desire an improvement to this road, but it has also been requested for many years by other responsible bodies in Broken Hill. Whilst they desire the whole road to be sealed they would be happy at the moment if the improvements suggested in the letter were carried out. The Mingary-Cockburn section is rendered impassable by comparatively light rains, but this problem would be overcome by sealing. The narrow bridges that were quite suitable when constructed about 20 years ago have become dangerous to modern traffic. A number of accidents, including at least two fatal accidents to my knowledge, have occurred. Will the Premier, as Acting Minister of Roads, have this matter investigated to see whether it is possible to expedite this desirable work on a highway of great importance not only to Broken Hill but to South Australia?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I am quite sure everyone in South Australia appreciates the importance of Broken Hill to this State. We have many commercial ties with that centre and, as a matter of policy, the Government intends to connect it with South Australia by a good quality all-weather road. However, I point out that the total amount of money available to the Highways Department

this year is about £10,000,000, and we have many urgent works where the present traffic count is very much higher than on the particular sections the Leader has mentioned. Indeed, on a number of our main highways with heavy traffic counts we have bridges that need to be renewed or improved, and under those circumstances I do not believe the Highways Commissioner could state how quickly he could do the work the Leader requests. However, I will take up the matter, and, subject to our commitments in other areas, will see what can be done about it.

LEAVING HONOURS CLASSES.

Mr. KING—Announcements have been made recently concerning the need in the country for Leaving Honours classes, and Leaving classes in particular, and also the question of qualifications for matriculation. Parents and parent-teacher bodies in my district have to make decisions regarding the future of their children's education, and particularly when they are going on to the University, and they would like some clarification of the position. Can the Minister of Education tell the House what he has in mind?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes. Among several competing claims, the Glossop high school has strong claims for the establishment of a Leaving Honours class, if only because of its close proximity to Renmark, Berri, Barmera and other upper Murray towns. However, since I have been Minister of Education the problem of Leaving Honours classes in country districts has caused me considerable concern. Every encouragement has been given to students wishing to take a University course to spend a year in the Leaving Honours, but these Leaving Honours classes require highly qualified and expert teachers, and each school taking Leaving Honours work must be prepared to offer a fairly wide spread of subjects at this level. These subjects include English, Latin or French, History, Geography, Mathematics I and II, Physics, Chemistry, Botany and Biology. A class of even 40 students soon breaks up into smaller groups of less than 20 in any particular subject, and these small groups make exacting demands on the relatively few expert specialist teachers who can be made available for this limited purpose. For these reasons, only a small number of high schools, and all of them in the metropolitan area, have Leaving Honours classes at present. However, in view of the outstanding success of our teacher recruiting campaign in recent years, large numbers of highly qualified young

teachers will become available for service in our country secondary schools in the foreseeable future.

In my opinion it is incumbent upon us to ensure that boys and girls of the finest mental calibre, no matter from what homes—country or city—they may come, are thoroughly trained for the highest research, technical and executive positions, and for the professions. Consequently there is need for extensive revision of the secondary curricula. Again, in my opinion, there should be a change in the standard of examination for entry to the University. But it is a complex problem which is not capable of easy solution, and after consultation with the Premier and at his suggestion I have had discussions on the subject with leading educationists, including the Vice-Chancellor of the Adelaide University (Mr. Basten), and the Council of the University has recently appointed a subcommittee to investigate this matter, because ultimately the decision will be made on the recommendations of the University Council. This subcommittee consists of University professors, representatives of the Education Department schools, and representatives of the independent schools and colleges. If I may have the temerity at this stage to express my own purely personal and tentative opinion it is that the standard of the present Leaving examination course of one year after the Intermediate is too high for many thousands of boys and girls who have no intention of undertaking any form of tertiary education, but that it is too low as a matriculation examination for entry to the University. I think that the Leaving examination at the end of a fourth year of secondary education at a slightly lower standard than at present could be retained as a basis for entry to the State and Commonwealth Public Services, the armed forces, and trade and commerce, and that at the end of the fifth year at secondary school there could be a matriculation examination at a somewhat lower standard than Leaving Honours for entry to the University or other institutions supplying tertiary education. I have publicly expressed these personal and tentative opinions so that the final determination of the standards and procedures for matriculation will be made after widespread and adequate discussion.

Mr. RICHES—I was most interested to hear the statement by the Minister of Education when he gave us the benefit of his personal opinion. Does he envisage that if his suggestion is adopted country high schools will be equipped to teach the fifth year subjects that he mentioned?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Of course, the whole investigation is purely experimental and exploratory and, when any recommendations are made, an appreciable time will elapse before they are carried into effect. However, in the meantime, because of the outstanding success of our teacher recruiting campaign, not only shall we have many young teachers coming into the service but they will be highly qualified. By that time, I consider that most of the large country high schools will be sufficiently staffed as to both the quantity and quality of the teachers, to enable a fifth year to be established.

SCHOOL BUILDINGS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—In reply to a question by me yesterday in regard to concrete floors in portable school buildings, the Minister of Works mentioned that slabs of concrete measuring 12 feet 6 inches by 6 feet weighed about one and a half tons. I am not disputing that, but I question the necessity of the thickness of six inches for slabs in this type of construction. I also question the necessity of having slabs of the dimension mentioned and the contention that the bitumen suggested for jointing is combustible. I desire that there should be a further estimate and that consideration should be given to the question of having the slabs 3in. thick. If there is any doubt regarding the combustible jointing, I consider that the jointing should be of light cement mortar and that the slabs should measure 8ft. by 3ft. or 8ft. by 4ft.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will refer this matter to the Director of Public Buildings and the Chief Architect for further inquiry.

SCHOOL RECREATION GROUNDS.

Mr. DUNNAGE—The Recreation Grounds (Joint Schemes) Act has had much publicity in the press following on a speech made by the Minister of Education, with which we all agree, but it caused a controversy in the Unley Council. We are concerned about the size of the land required and the land that we have available in our district for such a scheme. We took it that the scheme envisaged broad acres for such purposes as football grounds, playing fields, etc., but in our area we have not enough land available for these purposes. Can the scheme be modified, or is it necessary to have a certain area of land in order to apply for consideration under the scheme? Will an ordinary block of land used in conjunction with a school or playground come under the scheme?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—That is a hypothetical question, but I can say broadly that under the Act there is no minimum or maximum limitation of area. The Recreation Grounds (Joint Schemes) Act provides a method by which the Minister of Education can co-operate with any municipal or district council in acquiring land to be used for the dual purpose of a school playground and a public recreation ground. The policy on land purchased or acquired under the provisions of this Act is as follows:—

- (a) Land can be purchased or acquired for the purposes of the Act either by the Minister of Education or the local government body or by both.
- (b) When the land has been secured a "scheme" is prepared which provides for the monetary contribution payable by each party, the terms and conditions under which each shall use the land, and the construction, maintenance and repair of any improvements made to or erected on the land.

There is no minimum or maximum limitation of area. There is no standard agreement for such joint schemes, because the provisions of each scheme vary with the local requirements. However, in general, the Government purchases or acquires the land and pays the initial cost of the land. The local council undertakes to repay at least 50 per cent of this cost over a period of years at the current rate of bank interest, subject to review of the rate at specified periods during the term of the loan. The council undertakes to hold free of encumbrance the whole or such portion of the land as is vested in it unless the Minister's consent is given to sell, lease or mortgage it. The council undertakes the construction and maintenance of an oval or other recreation ground and necessary structures during the operation of the scheme. Children attending the school specified in the scheme have the use of the area until 5 p.m. on school days and on Saturdays until noon. In some cases an extension of these hours is granted by arrangement with the council. In the event of a scheme being no longer required a further scheme is prepared to determine the disposition of the land and improvements.

The general effect of the Recreation Grounds (Joint Schemes) Act has been to secure for councils and departmental schools an adequate area for physical recreation. The department's subsidy ensures the use of these grounds in school hours and the council is able to secure the land at a reasonable cost.

It seems to me that the operation of this Act is having a very beneficial effect. It avoids unnecessary duplication of effort, both in capital outlay and maintenance costs, and it serves the dual purpose of recreation areas for juveniles and adults. As Unley is a heavily populated and built-up area it may be possible to consider a small scheme for a comparatively small area of land to serve several schools in the district, as well as adults.

POSTS AND SLEEPERS.

Mr. HARDING—Firstly, has the Minister of Forests any information regarding the suggested transfer to a new site of the post office at Nangwarry? Secondly, has the Minister any information regarding the suggested 20,000 *pinus* posts and the 20,000 sleepers from the forest area which are to be impregnated this year? Are they to be used by any Government department and, if so, which department?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—As regards pine posts, the Woods and Forests Department advises that it has about 30,000 treated pine posts available for sale. Few sales have been made as yet but the department proposes to advertise shortly, after which increased sales can be expected. Prices are in accordance with the attached schedules, which I can give the honourable member. As regards *pinus* sleepers, the South Australian Railways has placed an order for 10,000 sleepers, and a small quantity has already been delivered. I have not a report on the post office question yet but will bring that along as soon as I can.

PORT ROAD RAILWAY CROSSING.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I have received some requests recently from employees of General Motors-Holden's to approach the Minister of Railways to see if it is possible and practicable to install automatic gates at the Port Road railway crossing near Holden's, which is the one place on the Port Road where the train to and from Grange crosses. The people who have approached me explain that, although there are flashing lights, frequently at peak periods, because of the number of heavy transports on the road, the lights are obscured and there are many near-accidents there. They feel that the only solution to the problem is the installation of automatic gates. Will the Premier, as Acting Minister of Railways, have investigations made to see whether it is advisable, practicable and possible to install such gates?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I shall be pleased to do that.

HAMPDEN WATER SCHEME.

Mr. NICHOLSON—It is some time since the people of Hampden asked for a water scheme for their district. Has the Minister of Works any information on this?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Yes. I will have to refresh my memory on the precise details, but I think that the first proposal was for a shorter but much more difficult route over high ground. That was not a satisfactory proposal and it did not adequately meet the wishes of the landholders concerned, who subsequently asked for the pipeline to follow another route, which, although somewhat longer, would serve more people. That has been considered and I think the prospects are favourable and that some action may be taken on that scheme soon. I will check the details and give the honourable member a firm reply, probably on Tuesday.

STUDENT TEACHERS' ALLOWANCES.

Mr. CLARK—I am informed that there is some variance in the standard of travelling allowances paid to country students and metropolitan area students attending the Teachers College. Will the Minister of Education obtain for me details of how the travelling allowances are determined for these students?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes. I have a mass of detail on the subject which I will bring down on Tuesday for the honourable member.

LIQUOR PERMITS.

Mr. TAPPING—I desire to refer to a court case heard by Mr. Downey, S.M., recently. An article in the *Advertiser*, headed "Hotel Prosecution Dismissed," stated:—

A charge under the Licensing Act against Clifton Cecil Richardson, of the Hotel Finsbury, Woodville North, was dismissed, with £21 costs against the Crown. Richardson was charged with having made a charge for refreshments supplied at a dance at the hotel on March 25 for which a permit had been obtained under section 199 of the Licensing Act. Mr. Downey said it raised important questions of law affecting all licensed premises.

In referring to a contention of the prosecution, Mr. Downey said that it would be unlawful for the licensee to charge even for the meal itself, or for any soft drinks supplied. He said, "I am very loth to attribute such a farcical intention to Parliament." In view of possible embarrassment to the police and to

those seeking a permit under section 199 of the Licensing Act, will the Premier ascertain if there are any legal doubts about it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—During the war, legislation was passed by this House making it an offence for liquor to be provided at any place of entertainment where a dance is being held, or within 300 yards of a dance. That law is still effective. Some question as to whether it should apply to hotels arose. Before this case was heard the Government had been examining some proposed amendments to the Licensing Act, and it is the Government's intention this year to introduce one or two amendments which, I believe, will be accepted by the House as some improvement on the present position. One matter to be dealt with is that mentioned by the honourable member. The Government has no intention of altering the law about drinking at dances in public halls, which we believe has been good legislation and which has strong public support generally. As a result of that legislation, public dances held in South Australia have been much more desirable functions than they could have been had liquor been associated with them, particularly when attended by many young people. On the other hand, in a hotel, where adults attend and where there is, after all, a totally different atmosphere, the Government does not believe that the present restrictions should apply. The amendments we will introduce will liberalize the present restrictions on licensed premises. There are one or two other amendments that I shall not deal with today, but the chief one is that liquor will be permitted to be served with meals up to 10 p.m. instead of 9 p.m., which is the time under the present law. A reasonable time will be allowed for liquor served before 10 o'clock to be consumed before the glass is taken from the table, whereas under the present law precisely at 9 o'clock, irrespective of whether the glass is full or empty, it has to be removed forthwith from the table. That law is not understood, particularly by our visitors, and I do not believe that it effects much good for the community as a whole.

I assure the honourable member that, prior to the hearing of the case he referred to, the Government had taken steps to have this matter examined because there was a conflict and some ambiguity on whether the legislation concerning dances applied to hotels. That question will be submitted to Parliament for consideration this session.

LOCAL COURT DISTRICTS.

Mr. BYWATERS—Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of Tuesday last concerning the new local court district and how it affects Murray Bridge and nearby towns?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Following upon the recent appointment of an additional special magistrate in the Country and Suburban Courts Department, a new district (Murray Bridge Local Court District) has been created and the remaining districts varied to enable magistrates to cope with the increased volume of business in the various courts. In re-arranging the districts, attention has been given to convenience of travel, a proper balance of work between magistrates, and the time necessarily spent in travelling to the more distant courts. Although Whyalla is in close proximity to Port Augusta, in recent years owing to the expansion of business at Whyalla the magistrate has not been able to attend there following his visits to Port Augusta and separate trips have been made to Whyalla by air. There is, therefore, no additional cost or loss in efficiency by having the Whyalla Court attached to the Murray Bridge District. The Meningie Local Court is on the route of travel to Robe and Kingston and therefore, more appropriately, remains in the Mount Gambier District. In regard to Mannum, a visit to that court by a magistrate necessitates a special journey from Adelaide and, having regard to a balance of work, is more appropriately linked to the North-Eastern District.

DEBT COLLECTION VAN.

Mr. LOVEDAY—The *Mail* newspaper recently published an article about a debt collection van that travels around Australia. The van had printed in big letters on each of its sides the words "Debt Collection" and the article was headed "Shock Tactics on Debt Defaulters". The methods adopted by the debt-collecting firm were described as a "psychological weapon". The article states:—

The firm writes to the debtor telling him that if he does not pay up by a certain date the van will call at his home. A picture of the van is on the letter. Most debtors receive the letter with horror because they fear the neighbours' gossip should the van be seen outside their home. . . . The managing director of the firm, Mr. J. H. Carter, said the van was the crux of the business.

Under a subheading of "Threats of Violence," the article continues:—

But the van, which also operated in Tasmania, was a most unwelcome and

embarrassing sight in suburban areas where people were "putting up a front." Mr. Carter said that since the van began operating dozens of anonymous phone calls and letters had been received threatening violence and even shooting. The van drivers were often fearful when they were required to make calls in areas because they had received threats that they would be beaten up if they called again. In almost every instance when the van called the debtor hurled abuse at the driver. Mr. Carter said the van always caused a stir when it visited a country town. Locals were provided with an item of gossip when they found out on whom the van called. The van driver was told at one country hotel that he could not have accommodation if he left the van outside the hotel. . . . The van often parks outside business premises until the proprietor, fearful of his future credit, comes out and pays up. In Tasmania, some people smeared one of the vans with blasphemous words in coloured paint, and the driver was abused and threatened he would be shot if he showed up again.

This van has been in South Australia and will probably come again. I point out that it could, by mistake or for some other reason, be left outside the homes of people who were not defaulting debtors and therefore give rise to false rumours concerning those residents. Since the presence of this van is nothing less than psychological blackmail and provocation that could easily lead to a serious disturbance of the peace, will the Government consider having its use in South Australia made an offence?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Although I did not see the report the honourable member read, I saw some report and gave some little consideration to the matter, but I must confess that my views are not sufficiently far advanced for me to give a pronouncement today. I will obtain a report from the Attorney-General on the matter. Subject to the limitation that I do not pretend to be able to expound the law, I think that the people using the van would run a certain risk in its use and that they would have to take care that they did not leave the van in any place or use it in any way that would endanger the reputation of any citizen, particularly if that citizen were not in any way indebted to the people for whom they were collecting. I think that they would run a considerable risk of incurring damages if any one suffered as a result of their calling at a place where they had no business to call. However, I shall have a complete investigation made of the extent to which it is necessary by law to prohibit this practice, because use of this type of van could easily endanger the peace of the community.

ADELAIDE TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. KING—Last year I asked a question regarding the ultimate fate of the Adelaide technical high school which was then being conducted as a branch of the School of Mines and Industries. Subsequently, in conjunction with the Honourable F. J. Potter, I met the Minister of Education, the Director of Education and some of his principal officers, and I understand that it was subsequently decided to find a site for this school to keep it intact. I understand that this site will probably be in the electorate of Burnside, and I should like to have the name of the member for Burnside associated with mine in this question. Will the Minister of Education tell the House the present position regarding this school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—As the honourable member and others know, last year the status of the School of Mines was raised to that of the South Australian Institute of Technology and, consequently, some of its functions were transferred to the Education Department. One of these was the proposal to establish the Adelaide technical high school on some appropriate site in the near metropolitan area, and several representations were made to me by the honourable member and his colleague in another House (Mr. Potter), the member for Torrens, and numerous other interested parties. We had a conference as a result of which it was decided to continue the existence of this school, which has had for a long time an honoured reputation in South Australia. The difficulty was to find some other building or site on which to erect a suitable building. After very considerable investigation and inquiry into a number of possible sites, we were unable to secure any site in the city area except at fantastically high prices and involving the demolition of existing buildings. Fortunately, however, we were able to secure from the Mines Department an area of vacant land of about five acres on the eastern side of Conyngham Street near the Parkside Mental Hospital. This area is quite sufficient for the erection of the various school buildings and there will also be room for a few tennis and basketball courts. It will be somewhat different from our standard type of school buildings so that the best use will be made of the fairly limited area. The Public Buildings Department has been asked to draw up plans for a new co-educational school to be erected on this property to accommodate an enrolment of up to 700. The proposal will be referred, as soon as possible, to the Public Works Committee for investigation and report

because the matter is considered by the Institute of Technology and the Education Department to be urgent. With the co-operation of the Mayor of Burnside (Mr. T. A. Philips) and the members of his corporation, I am pleased to say that we have been able to agree in principle to the new school having the use of the Glenunga Oval and its facilities on week days until 5 p.m. and on Saturday mornings until 12 noon.

Mr. Jennings—Is that close to the school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes. I very much appreciate this further evidence of the helpful attitude adopted by the Burnside Corporation to the Education Department. Again, I think that is a very economic arrangement whereby the Education Department and the local council will co-operate in joint use of an existing ground.

MITCHELL PARK SCHOOL TELEPHONE.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Will the Minister of Education state whether a telephone service can be provided in the Mitchell Park primary school, one of the most modern primary schools in this State?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I am glad that the honourable member is so pleased with this modern and spacious school, but the present policy in respect of telephones in departmental schools is that the department pays the cost of installation and rental in:—(1) metropolitan secondary schools; (2) class I and II primary schools; (3) some new class III primary schools likely to become class II within a reasonable time; and in (4) special circumstances where large schools are situated outside of town and no other telephone is available. As the Mitchell Park primary school, which was opened a few weeks ago, is at present a class III school and appears unlikely to increase sufficiently to warrant re-classification to a class II school for quite some time, the application for a telephone has had to be declined. There would be no objection from the Education Department if the school committee desired to install a telephone at its own expense. In such circumstances the Education Department refunds the cost of local and trunk line calls made on official school business and school committee business.

PORT AUGUSTA PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. RICHES—Is the Minister of Education able to reply to a question I asked recently regarding staffing at the Port Augusta primary school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have a lengthy report from the Director of Education in reply to this question:—

The headmaster (Mr. Shrowder) has been at the school continuously from the beginning of this year and will continue to the end of this year at least in his present position. Mr. R. E. Mitchell, chief male assistant, has been at the school for many years and is a tower of strength. Ten other staff members, forming the full normal assistant staff for this school, have been unchanged throughout the year and are likely to remain unchanged so far as we know. The position of deputy headmaster was made vacant by the promotion of Mr. T. G. Corry to another school as from January 1 this year. The appointment of Mr. H. G. Howell as deputy headmaster was confirmed on June 21 this year and he will take up his duties as from the beginning of next year. Miss M. Spratt, who was chief lady assistant at the beginning of this year, was promoted to the position of chief assistant, Class I, Salisbury North school, and special approval was obtained for her to take up her duties at the end of May, in view of the special conditions pertaining at that school. To take her place, Miss Lavinia Herd, from Port Pirie, has been appointed and will begin duty at the beginning of next term on September 20.

Until Mr. Howell takes up his appointment as deputy headmaster at the beginning of next year, there is no doubt that Mr. R. E. Mitchell can discharge the duties of deputy headmaster with success. In the meantime, to strengthen the number of teachers actually taking classes, arrangements have been made for Mrs. Hickman, who is a fully qualified and certificated teacher, to resume duty at the school as from August 20.

At the conclusion of his report, the Director states:—

It will be seen from the above that the Port Augusta primary school will have the full number of teachers as from the beginning of next term.

COLOUR SLIDES FOR SCHOOLS.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Whereas the Education Department appears to have quite a good supply and variety of moving picture films, there seems to be very little variety or supply of colour slides suitable for infant and primary schools. Will the Minister of Education investigate this position to see whether colour slides suitable for these classes could be supplied in greater variety, particularly in view of the greater value in many instances of the colour slide itself which enables the student child to examine the slide for a longer period than when he is watching a film?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I am surprised to hear that there is a lack of quantity or variety of slides, but I shall be very pleased to have the matter investigated.

SUN BLINDS FOR SCHOOLS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Minister of Works a reply to a previous question I asked regarding sun blinds on the south side of the Mitchell Park primary school and the Marion high school?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—As far as I am aware the previous question referred only to the Mitchell Park school, and I am advised that all classrooms at that school face south and the Director of Public Buildings does not consider that sun blinds will be necessary for the classrooms. However, as to the administration block, which faces east, there may be some problem and the Director feels that in that case normal blinds would be quite satisfactory. The matter will be looked into with a view to minimizing any discomfort that may occur at the administration block.

LOAN ESTIMATES.

In Committee.

(Continued from August 17. Page 662.)

Grand total, £30,772,000.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—In addressing myself to this debate I propose to start with what might be considered a few random shots in the interest of good government. When the Leader of the Opposition addresses the House I always expect to hear real commonsense on matters of importance, and very rarely am I disappointed, and I will not say I was disappointed this time. However, he made one or two remarks that I thought were given without due reflection. He is not a new chum in public life, but he and I have grown grey in the service and therefore should know something about the ropes. Mr. O'Halloran said he was disappointed at the lack of information contained in the Treasurer's speech and thought that there were many things that Parliament should have been told regarding the expenditure of the Loan funds, but which were not covered in the Treasurer's statement. In order to get an idea of the position, I examined the speeches he delivered when presenting his Loan Estimates for the years 1940 and 1950 in order to get what I would call a fair spread. The amount involved in 1940 was about £2,286,000, but it will be remembered that that was during the war years. The Treasurer's speech that year occupied five and a half pages of *Hansard* in explaining what was to be done with the money and in 1950 his speech again occupied about five and a half

pages in explaining what was to be done with the £21,000,000 of Loan money involved. However, this year about £30,000,000 of Loan money is to be spent and the Treasurer's speech took 12½ pages of *Hansard*. A close examination of that speech is enlightening as to the additional information given. If the Treasurer was to go further afield in itemizing, a book would be necessary and not 12 or 15 pages. After all, if he were to start itemizing, it would be a question of which department would be involved in the shortened explanation. Some people have interest in education, others in the Harbors Board's operations and others again in the operations of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Obviously, if he were to reduce his explanation on any one department, he would not get away with it. The first thing that would be said then would be that he had something to hide.

Mr. O'Halloran—But I did not suggest that.

Mr. SHANNON—I know, but you suggested that the information given by the Treasurer in his speech was not sufficiently explanatory.

Mr. O'Halloran—And I specified the items.

Mr. SHANNON—You specified a few. The honourable member deserves praise for his energy and research and I pay him a compliment. I know of no man who has held his office since I have been in Parliament who has more assiduously applied himself to public matters and to criticism of Government policy. It is good for Government procedure that we should have such a man in the position, and I mean that sincerely. The honourable member mentioned items of Loan expenditure that have a continuing impact over a period of years before they are brought to fruition, such as the construction of the Myponga dam, and that deserves some comments. I do not know whether he referred to that scheme specifically or not, as I read only a portion of his speech just to give me what I thought was an inkling of his general line of approach to the debate. This project, which will take a number of years to complete, will cost more than £5,500,000. It was referred back to the Public Works Standing Committee by the Government, and I think wisely, because of certain factors that arose as a result of the projected establishment of a refinery, which would create an extremely high demand for water in the vicinity of the reservoir.

It was at first thought that water from Myponga would augment the supply to the metropolitan area and afford some relief in

times of shortage. However, once we had the full picture regarding the proposed oil refinery and the other things that would happen as a result, it was obvious to the Engineering and Water Supply Department that it had to revise the whole plan. Larger outlet mains were required to deliver the volume of water needed, and the old idea of using the Clapham tanks as a balancing medium from the Myponga dam to satisfy Adelaide's needs had to be discarded because the water would not get there anyhow. The department very wisely reorientated its ideas. Its main leading from the Myponga dam was taken to Happy Valley, thus serving a very valuable dual purpose, because during the construction period and perhaps for a year or two afterwards until the dam has water in it Happy Valley and the Onkaparinga can supply the contractors building the oil refinery, the employees who will be housed in that area, and certain other vital needs on our foreshore areas at Aldinga and other places. The supplies for those needs will come not from Myponga but from Happy Valley.

That was a very wise plan, and I compliment Mr. Dridan and his officers and give them full marks for the move. It was a very forward look in the planning of water supplies. They have established what we call a two-way link. As a result, when we put the gates on the bank at Mount Bold and thereby increase its capacity to over 10,000,000,000 gallons, if we have years with a surplus of water from the Onkaparinga over and above that required to satisfy Adelaide's immediate need, that water can be reticulated back to satisfy the requirements in the area at present being served by this link from the new dam at Myponga. I cannot give the department too much credit for the policy it has pursued. Every time its officers come before my committee they disclose an overall pattern. The department can send water from Mannum right up to the north, or from Morgan right down to Adelaide. It is a grid system. Yorke Peninsula can be supplied either from the Warren system, if it suits the department so to do, or from our northern system. The new Warren trunk main which the Public Works Standing Committee has just approved will afford tremendous relief to the existing Morgan-Whyalla main. It will be a tremendous advantage to that system, because it can supply the whole of Yorke Peninsula and take that burden off the northern system. If in years to come we wish to reverse the order, the mains are so constructed and laid that that can be done.

I cannot see how the planning can be criticized. I pay this compliment to Mr. Dridan and his officers, and I can say that my committee has the utmost confidence in that department when it comes to major matters such as this.

The Morgan-Whyalla pipeline duplication will meet the needs of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's vastly expanding activities at the head of Spencer Gulf. The department at first came to the committee with a plan for a route northerly of the present Morgan-Whyalla main. At that time it was thought that the capacity required to augment the existing main was of such a nature that this project would have been financially sound, but the B.H.P. came to the Government and said it would need much more water in two fields. It has had a pilot plant working in Port Pirie for some years endeavouring to ascertain the correct treatment of what is sometimes called taconite and at other times jaspilite, but which most people, including myself, call low grade iron ore. That pilot plant has proved to the B.H.P.'s satisfaction that these low grade iron ore deposits can be economically treated, but a large quantity of water is required. The company has expanded its plans and is now of the opinion that it has almost unlimited supplies of iron ore available on Eyre Peninsula to satisfy any steel demands which can be foreseen at the moment. It will occupy almost a mile of territory running along the line almost down as far as the abattoirs, and I am told that the abattoirs might have to be moved. Obviously, it will be a very big undertaking.

Regarding the department's new planning, the Leader suggested the other day—although my committee has not heard of it—that the new main would follow the route of the existing one; the duplication would have a considerably larger capacity, and because of the increased volume of water to be lifted it would now be economical only if we followed the best possible gradients. The Leader will say that the best gradients available are those used by the present Morgan-Whyalla pipeline, otherwise that pipeline would not have been put there. There is some common-sense in that approach, but that may not be the only factor. We do not know—and I do not think the department knows—whether that will be the only factor considered when the duplication is designed. I am told that the committee will not have this information for some little time. In any event, I think it is unwise either to encourage or to discourage the people who reside in these northern areas whose tongues

must be hanging out for water. The Treasurer made what in my opinion was a very valuable promise to the people in that area, namely, that nobody who would have been served by the first proposed duplication would be denied water.

Mr. O'Halloran—He said the new main would follow the old route.

Mr. SHANNON—He did not.

Mr. O'Halloran—He did.

Mr. SHANNON—If he did, he must have been guessing a little on that occasion, for I do not think anyone knows what the department proposes. The Treasurer further promised that, if necessary, water would be supplied to these people by a branch main from the Murray pipeline.

Much has been said in this place about steelworks in South Australia. Mr. Riches has said plenty about it, and I have no doubt that he has a feeling of satisfaction, to put it politely, that at last we are on the way to having steelworks established at the head of Spencer Gulf. We should remember some of the statements made in the past and the policy pursued by Mr. Riches in this matter. On one occasion he suggested that we should cancel the B.H.P. leases over iron ore deposits in that area. That would have been a denial of a sacred contract and we would have had in our midst a Nasser. We would have taken away something that we had agreed should be available to the company on the payment of a royalty. Worse still, it would have been fatal to the development of South Australia. If the Labor Party had been in office and his plea for confiscation had been heeded the company would have got out and established its activities on the eastern seaboard. If it were not for the encouragement given to the company by the Government led by Tom Playford, and his energy in pursuing the matter, we would not have the company's proposal to establish steelworks at Whyalla.

Mr. O'Halloran—A few years ago you said they were not justified.

Mr. SHANNON—I did not say that. I said that anybody who invested much money in that area might be in difficulties when the high-grade iron ore ran out. That would still be the position if it were not for the insistence by the Treasurer on further investigations, and as a result it is known that there are unlimited quantities of low-grade iron ore that can be used profitably. This has made steelworks in our State a practical proposition. I cannot see how anyone can take that away from the Playford Government.

Mr. Hall—What about confiscation?

Mr. SHANNON—The honourable member will know when he has been here for a while that we do not talk about confiscation.

Mr. O'Halloran—What about the Adelaide Electric Supply Company?

Mr. SHANNON—That was not confiscation. I said at the time that the company was not being adequately compensated, and I still think so. I opposed the basis of acquisition because I thought share market values did not constitute a proper basis. I still stand by what I said then, and I am not ashamed of it. My conscience is clear and I do not shift from what I thought at the time was a matter of some importance. Recently there was a sort of minor complaint from Mr. Loveday, who always makes a thoughtful speech and for whom I have a high regard. He charged the Government with neglecting his electorate.

Mr. Loveday—No.

Mr. SHANNON—Perhaps it was that the Government had not given it all he thought it deserved in the way of assistance. I do not know what more he could ask for without being greedy. Of course, everybody wants a second helping of pudding when there is no pudding left. I will enumerate a few of the things that have been done in that electorate.

Mr. Loveday—Give us the details.

Mr. SHANNON—I will give the honourable member some details. Had it not been for the Playford Government there would be no need to extend the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline from the Lincoln Gap tanks to Iron Knob in order to augment the water supply at that town. The B.H.P. Company could still have continued to cart water by rail to Iron Knob in order to satisfy the needs of the workmen there and the various places under its control in that town. Because of the forward look of the Playford Government a steel plant will be established at Whyalla. The Public Works Committee had some evidence from Mr. Bennett, the manager of the company at Whyalla. I cannot tell members all he said, because some of it was in confidence, but he did say that the work force at Iron Knob would be doubled.

Mr. Loveday—He told me that earlier.

Mr. SHANNON—He said that it was a conservative estimate. I have no doubt that the company's policy will be to conserve its high-grade iron ore by using pelletized low-grade refractory iron ore. These things would not have come about but for the persistence of our Treasurer in pursuing investigations about low-grade iron ore deposits. Some people said that it was useless for the Mines Department

to undertake such investigations. There is something that Mr. Loveday can be pleased about. I do not say that he can thank the Government entirely for it, but it will be of inestimable value to him personally. Because the extension of the pipeline to Iron Knob and the duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline there will be a permanently expanded work force in his electorate. Probably that will be the greatest single increase in employment in any district in the State.

Mr. Loveday—We have argued about that for years.

Mr. SHANNON—The honourable member will get it, and he can thank Tom Playford for it. There is another matter in which Mr. Loveday's is unique in districts outside Adelaide. Can he guess what it is?

Mr. Loveday—Opals.

Mr. SHANNON—The honourable member is too mundane. It is something much more important than opals from the point of view of the people he represents, and it applies to all of them. At Whyalla there is a technical high school where secondary and tertiary education is given, and where apprentices who desire to improve their knowledge of industry can get instruction. Better still, those who have passed the previous stage can go almost as far along the road as I have done! If they still want to improve themselves, they can at the technical high school at Whyalla get expert instruction from those with the best teaching qualifications available for adult education in the State.

Mr. Loveday—It is an excellent type of school.

Mr. SHANNON—I think the honourable member should say a prayer tonight, thanking those responsible for looking after him so well. He is very well served.

Mr. Loveday—The honourable member has not yet told me where I complain. Give members details of where I complain!

Mr. SHANNON—That, I think, is the answer to the honourable member's approach to what has been done for him personally in his electorate. I read today's *Advertiser* with much interest. It makes familiar reading. I will quote briefly from an article because it contains such an excellent argument that it deserves to be republished in *Hansard* for the benefit of those people too far removed from the metropolis to get the *Advertiser*. I will quote one or two succulent passages for the benefit of the honourable member for

Whyalla. The article is headed "U.K. Labor In Doldrums." One of the early paragraphs reads:—

But no-one can agree on a new policy. A feud rages between Left and Right over Socialism, internal power, and the H-bomb.

The letters "S.A." could well have been substituted for the letters "U.K.": it would have read just as sensibly to me for, when I read it, I thought to myself, "This could have been in Australia." Further on the article says:—

In Britain the Right wing wants to jettison nationalization and take the bones out of the remaining skeleton of Socialism.

That is a job for a surgeon because, after all, I thought there was only bone left. Perhaps the man who made that comment in England meant to bury the bones and forget all about it. He happens to be a rather important member of the British Labor Party. I have no doubt that Mr. Richard Crossman speaks with some authority in the Labor Party in Britain. Later, the article continues:—

The fight for internal power has a familiar ring in Australia.

When I read that, I thought to myself "Why didn't he say so earlier?" because I had already woken up to that, but he did not wake up to it, apparently, until halfway through the article. The article continues:—

The Left wing claims the Parliamentary Labor Party must obey the annual conference and national executive. But the Parliamentary Party vigorously replies that it does not have to accept any conference decision. It argues that "We would not win an election" if the Parliamentary Party had to accept dictation from "an outside body."

That is useful advice if you have not won an election for a long time! I am giving it to the honourable member for Whyalla for his own good—he knows that!

Mr. Loveday—Yes, I know that!

Mr. SHANNON—The article continues later:—

Labor has not kept pace with the change. Again, that is a lesson that has not yet been learnt by some people. The article continues:—

Its tag as a working class party, in the sense of a manual workers' party, has become a liability. The Conservative Party has more of a "classless image."

It has been pointed out, of course, that with the advance of science and automation a man does not even have to take off his coat or roll up his sleeves these days: he can go to work respectably dressed and carry on his duties in such a way that the average person meeting him in a street would not recognize

him as a "good labouring man". He is not a labouring man in that sense at all; he is a skilled operative. It is his skills that entitle him to use his brain. He is using his brain today. Indeed, these extra skills have been attained only by use of his brain—he is doing his own thinking. You can't drag him around any more.

Mr. Loveday—They are competent people.

Mr. SHANNON—That is one of the things one has to learn. I return to the Leader because he always leaves me some meat. He said something about costs, the ever-rising costs of all projects in which Government departments are involved. I shall deal only with one aspect as it is something the Public Works Committee has recently been dealing with. For some time now I have been discussing with Mr. Pattinson, Minister of Education, something that the Public Works Committee has been concerned about: that is, as the Leader has mentioned, the cost of these almost countless school buildings referred from time to time to my committee. They are needed to keep pace with our growing population. Following that, the Treasurer called me in, together with the Minister of Works and Mr. Lees, the Principal Architect of the Public Buildings Department, and we discussed the matter. Firstly, the little deputation had to consider the amalgamation of classroom wings into a single wing with a central corridor with classrooms on either side. The honourable member for Semaphore (Mr. Tapping) was then a member of the committee examining this matter, and he will recall that the first school in respect of which this problem arose was at Croydon, an excellent school. That incorporated for the first time in school design this central corridor with classrooms on either side. According to Mr. Lees, that would effect the considerable saving of about 17 per cent overall.

My committee also thought that there was too much non-teaching space in school buildings and a minute was forwarded to the Minister of Education suggesting that his departmental officers confer with officers of the Public Buildings Department with a view to effecting all possible economies without affecting teaching efficiency. We do not seek to deny the staff proper facilities and amenities, but we do not want to provide, for instance, three staff rooms in a school. If the teaching staff hold a meeting, it is usually in school hours. We have co-education in South Australia and I do not see much harm in having

a similar approach to the teaching staff. If the male staff have a problem peculiar to the males they could no doubt meet in the office of the headmaster or deputy head master.

Unfortunately, because of the time factor, the Public Buildings Department was unable to do all the planning it desired, and the Public Works Committee had to approve the plans that were submitted to it. The Public Buildings Department lost 13 senior staff men who cannot be replaced from local sources, and I understand that Mr. Malkin, a senior officer, has been sent overseas to recruit staff to make up the deficiency. The lack of staff is not the fault of the Minister of Works or of the Director, Mr. Slade, who is an excellent officer performing a worthwhile job and working himself almost to the point of a breakdown. However, the work of my committee does not end with examining plans. School sites are always inspected before a report is forwarded to Parliament. If doubts about a site are expressed by local residents all members of my committee inspect the area. This year, through our investigations, site changes for the Blackwood primary school and Woodville high school proposals were recommended. We believe it is proper to have the school buildings and the school playing fields consolidated.

With regard to school costs, members will notice, from our interim report, that nine primary schools have the same estimated cost, £102,000. These schools are all of the Magill type. The report on the Magill primary school was tabled in Parliament on March 1, 1960, and the design of that school is the prototype for the other nine I have mentioned. The Magill school is estimated to cost £115,000, but, because we have restricted the non-teaching areas, the overall saving on the other nine primary schools is estimated at £122,400—sufficient to pay for a further school. This saving has not affected the teaching efficiency of the schools. One member of my committee, Mr. Clark, a former schoolteacher, examines these matters meticulously and I am sure that anything that would detrimentally affect the teaching profession would not pass his notice. I say that, not flatteringly, but because of his particular knowledge of the matter.

Mr. Millhouse—We would all agree with that.

Mr. SHANNON—This year, as I have already said, the Public Works Committee has had to accept the plans the Public Buildings Department could supply in the time available to meet the Education Department's needs. The Public Buildings Department has about

500 major Government projects to supervise as well as 9,000 minor jobs of various types—painting, repairs, maintenance and so on. I quote one case as an example of what is involved in the Public Buildings Department. Take a school costing £250,000. Plans are drawn, estimates prepared, the builder and the contractor are on the job and after a period—say, 18 months as the work proceeds—the contractor asks for a draw. An officer of the Public Buildings Department then has to inspect the work done, measure it up, estimate a reasonable amount for the progress payment and then report back to his own chief, Mr. Slade, who authorizes payment. That procedure is taking place on 500 jobs every day of the year and it would be flying in the face of everything that is possible and reasonable if the committee were to say, "All these schools are far too elaborate and you have to cut down on the library space and these ancillary rooms. Take the plans away and redraw them." If the committee were to adopt that attitude the State would find that next year it would not have enough schools, children would be sitting in corridors, and everyone would be complaining.

The Minister of Education (Mr. Pattinson) has done an outstanding job in meeting the demands of this fast-growing population in a way that has drawn so little criticism from people whose children are going to school. His effort should be noted because I do not think that honourable members will find the same happy position elsewhere. The policy of some Governments in the eastern States is not to face up to the capital charge involved in school building, but to divert the available finance into other channels. I do not think that those States are as hard up as South Australia but when it comes to funds their policy is to erect a prefabricated part of the school and, as the population and the demand for more accommodation grows, up goes another prefabricated section. That practice is followed until it is decided that the school is big enough. This State has not yet descended to that level.

I pay a tribute to the Public Buildings Department's building division at Finsbury, which has helped meet the population growth in existing areas by erecting frame classrooms. These classrooms are of excellent construction, provide all that is desired in comfort, and no-one can quibble about them. They do not detract from teaching efficiency and they have taken up the slack for the State. Some members may think that the

policy of erecting frame classrooms is a short-sighted one, but that is not so as the classrooms are erected in areas where there have been sudden fluctuations in population. As the population grows older the children move away and there are not so many attending school in that area. The policy is to take classrooms away from such schools and re-erect them in another area where the increased school population requires them. They will be moved to towns like Elizabeth, Hallett's Cove, and other places. That practice of "taking up the slack" is the cheapest possible method of coping with fluctuations in school populations.

I commend the honourable member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) for his comments on Commonwealth aid in the field of education, but if there is one thing I oppose it is Commonwealth aid with strings attached, because I had a bitter experience with Commonwealth aid on health and was not satisfied with the regulation that pushed sufferers about because of the few shillings a day provided. My view is that, if the Commonwealth is to give aid to the States it should provide the money and let the States do the work. There is a principle involved in this matter. I maintain that, if a water table needs repairing in my district or if a street light needs repairing, that work, which is of a local government nature, should be attended to by the appropriate local government authority. I do not think it is right that the Government, through this Parliament, should tinker with work like that. I much prefer that the people on the site should deal with it and I apply that principle between the Commonwealth and the States. As the Federal Constitution is framed education is a State responsibility.

Mr. Clark—No one wants that altered.

Mr. SHANNON—If the State is to get Commonwealth aid there will be so many strings attached to it that members will wonder who is the boss.

Mr. King—Are any strings attached to the University grant?

Mr. SHANNON—We will have to wait and see. I am uneasy about that.

The Hon. B. Pattinson—There are.

Mr. SHANNON—I have not known anything to come from either a Liberal or Labor Commonwealth Government to the State without there being attached to it two or three little red tabs. We do not want that: it is nonsense, because the States are best qualified to say what should be done in those fields and

they do that work. What authority in Canberra will tell the Minister of Education in South Australia what he should do with aid if the aid is to be given from Canberra for education?

Mr. Quirke—It could be any one of 200 people.

Mr. SHANNON—Yes, and not one of them would be nearly as well qualified as the Minister of Education (the Hon. B. Pattinson).

Mr. Clark—Would you like some extra money?

Mr. SHANNON—Yes, I am all for money because money is a very useful commodity. I have no objection, if the Commonwealth has money available, to assistance being given to this State for education, but I say that the Commonwealth should add it to the tax reimbursement grant.

Mr. Clark—As long as the Commonwealth does not state that it is for education! That sounds a bit like quibbling.

Mr. SHANNON—The honourable member has entirely misconstrued what I am saying. If the Commonwealth wishes to give money to this State for educational purposes I will not have a bar of it because there will be so many strings attached to it and our Education Department will be tied up in Canberra.

Mr. Clark—Suppose it had no strings attached.

Mr. SHANNON—If the State got everything from Canberra it would amount to unification and I am as opposed to that as I would be to wiping out all local government authorities and administering their functions from this Parliament. After all there is not much difference in principle. If Canberra has additional funds available and it probably has—

Mr. Clark—Of course it has.

Mr. SHANNON—Then let the Commonwealth Treasurer return to the States a slightly greater share of the taxation he has collected from the taxpayers throughout the Commonwealth. We are all Commonwealth taxpayers, and, as this money will be spent on our children and grandchildren, why not let us spend it? It has been collected from us, so why should we accept it from Canberra on the basis of "We will do this for you if you give us such and such"? I will not have a bar of it; I think it is the road to ruin for self-government in South Australia.

Mr. O'Halloran—What do you mean by "self-government"?

Mr. SHANNON—This State is very efficient; it is very careful of the taxpayer's money; it gets a lot for what it spends; and it seems to be fairly prosperous. Everyone has a job, and everyone who wants a wireless or television set can have one. Conditions are fairly good. When I talk to some of my friends in Victoria or New South Wales they say, "Let us have Tom Playford: we want to get some answers." That has not been said to any Labor men.

I should now like to place a problem before the Minister of Agriculture that finally will have to be raised with his Treasury colleagues—that of getting comparatively small landholders on to an economic footing. It is hard to buy a living area in the Adelaide Hills of sufficiently productive land that will carry, for instance, 30 milking cows. Although a dairy farmer has to work seven days a week he will not get an adequate return from this number of cows, but he will earn a little more than the basic wage, which I think is a reasonable thing for a man to aim at. In my district, and in adjoining electorates including that of the Minister of Agriculture, are many holdings of 50 acres or less from which a living can be obtained if water is available for irrigation. On a small fertile property of just under 30 acres in the Meadows area, the owner obtained water, but soon afterwards he died and left his wife to carry on. Before he obtained water he was struggling to make his property carry 20 milking cows, but his widow is now able to make the property carry 30 cows comfortably, and is content to remain on the land. Although my suggestion may sound socialistic, I suggest that, as we subsidize soldier settlement, we subsidize a little in civilian settlement in these cases. The individual case should be examined by a competent officer of the Agriculture Department, and the Mines Department should say whether water could be secured at reasonable cost. If both answers were in the affirmative I suggest that the settlers should be given a long term loan—longer than is available from any present source—and that a charge could be made on the land to satisfy the Government that the money would be repaid some day.

Mr. O'Halloran—You want an interest holiday for the first few years?

Mr. SHANNON—I think that would be essential. If the interest were spread over a sufficiently long period the interest-free period need not be so long. The Leader's suggestion is a good one, as it takes a while

to get a pasture established before stock can be put on it.

Mr. Harding—How long do you suggest?

Mr. SHANNON—I suggest three years. I can speak only of the country I know. It may be different in the South-East, but in the hills a satisfactory pasture can be established in three years. The Leader pointed out, quite properly, that there could be an interest-free period. We would be getting something back from the additional wealth that would be brought into the country from the extra production and from the additional labour of the individual, and this would help put the settler on a firm footing. I do not want the settler to be made a millionaire, but I want him to be contented and happy and to have a little better than a bare living. This can be obtained on small areas, provided that water is available and intense cultivation is carried out. As the member for Chaffey knows, in dry areas north of the river a few acres of lucerne has almost doubled the carrying capacity on some properties.

I now wish to tidy up some local matters in case people come into my electorate and say, "What's gone wrong with Shannon?" Recently a letter was published in the daily press that I have not answered because I think press correspondence is an innocuous method of dealing with anyone. If you have an answer the correspondent will go off at a tangent entirely different from the matter he first raised. Recently Mr. E. A. Jenkins, councillor for the Mylor Ward of the Stirling District Council, wrote the following letter to the *Advertiser*:—

It was with great pleasure I read the statement of the Minister of Education (Mr. Pattinson) re sporting grounds. Yet his department is refusing to show any sign of reason and co-operation over the sports area at Heathfield Oval. This oval is on a recreation reserve and all that is asked of the Education Department in its building of a high school is that it keeps on the east side of a line.

I do not know where that would be. The letter continues:—

In so doing the future of this oval in regard to tennis and basketball courts, etc., would be assured. The answer would seem quite simple, especially as there are more than 20 acres on the east side and three or four good sites for a school. Last, but not least, this ground will be free of any charge to the Education Department. But the department is demanding two acres hard up against the oval. If this is done the oval will be mutilated for all time. The Stirling Council, of which I am a member, has taken this view, but we are being ignored. The council asked all interested parties to meet us on the site to consider this affair. The Education Department has not answered and

the Public Works Committee has also neglected to do so. The council is not holding up the building of a high school, but is only asking for justice.

Since he mentioned that the committee, of which I have the honour to be chairman, ignored the council, perhaps I had better read a letter addressed to the council and dated July 22, 1960. It was as follows:—

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor has referred the project of a high school at Heathfield to the Public Works Committee for inquiry and report. Should representatives of your council desire to tender evidence to this committee, I will be pleased to arrange for this on Thursday next, July 28, at 11.30 a.m. at Parliament House. This confirms my telephone conversation with you this morning. Please advise Mr. Deane, secretary to the committee, not later than Wednesday next, 27th inst., of the names of councillors who will be representing your council.

Should any honourable member think that I was trying to hurry the council into a decision, I point out that the committee was so busy considering other projects at this stage that it organized its affairs in such a way that it would give the council proper time, five full days to say whether it would come down and speak for Mr. E. A. Jenkins. The council took heed of the letter and after discussing the matter decided it would send Mr. Fisher, its solicitor, to represent it at the committee's hearing. Fair is fair. If the council did not want to come down to give evidence, obviously it was not very much concerned. The whole council could have appeared and the committee would not have objected.

I should like to have something to say about the Heathfield project and to put it in its right perspective as a warning to any "peeping toms." A Mr. Evans, who is not unknown to certain honourable members opposite, spoke to some of them on the telephone. They included the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters), the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Frank Walsh), the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) and also the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke), who had the great pleasure of paying for a 20-minute long-distance call to hear Mr. Evans weep on his shoulder. Mr. Evans, with the 11 members of the Heathfield Community Club, has, to my personal knowledge, held up the Heathfield high school project for five years. If he gets any satisfaction from that, he is entitled to it; and if he thinks that is not the truth, I invite him to contact the Property Officer of the Education Department, Mr. Lewis.

The Hon. B. Pattinson—He has done a great disservice to the cause of education and the district generally.

Mr. SHANNON—The district council gave Mr. Evans and what is known as the Heathfield Community Club a five year lease, with the right of renewal for a further five years, of what is known as the Heathfield Oval. He had some legal tenure in the lease. Possibly that could have been overridden, but it would have been harsh treatment by the Government. At that stage I did not know there were 11 members of the Heathfield Community Club, and that was elicited only when Mr. Evans appeared before the Public Works Committee to give evidence. These 11 men were formed into a community club when the Skyline Motor Racing Club was formed to operate at the oval. Each of the members had a paid job when Skyline was in operation, either selling or collecting tickets, or supervising the parking of cars. On one occasion 10,000 people attended a meeting, and yet Mr. Evans had the effrontery to suggest he was happy to establish a road for this oval in order that more money could be raised, ostensibly for charities in the district. Charity begins at home and we discovered where home was. When Mr. Evans was asked what he was paid for the sand carting for the racing track he said it was £500. I am tired of telling people to mind their own business. My advice to anyone is, irrespective of whether he is a member of Parliament or not, that a sound policy to follow is, "Know what you are talking about before you start to talk."

Mr. CLARK (Gawler)—I listened with interest to the honourable member's remarks, although I did not agree with everything he said. As to the multiplicity of schools being constructed, I could not agree with him more. I would be happier if the Department of Education refrained from building schools that were part timber-frame and part solid construction. We know that this arises because of necessity, but to a large extent such buildings detract from the harmonious appearance of the whole. Usually I do not speak on the Loan Estimates, because most speeches on this debate could just as well be given on the Budget. I speak on this occasion because I strongly disagree with one sentence used by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) when he referred to the line for £4,700,000 for education buildings, etc. He said:—

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.

I entirely agree with that, but I am rather doubtful whether the word "system" was quite

what the honourable member meant. If he meant "the system of financing education," I entirely agree with him, but I must say I entirely disagree with most of his other remarks. We heard more on this subject today from the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon), who said in effect that he did not want additional money from Commonwealth sources specifically for education, because he feared there would be strings attached to it. I would be quite happy to get additional money whether or not there were strings attached to it. However, I was pleased to hear him say that if any funds were available from Commonwealth sources—and I think he said he believed they were—he would be very happy to have them. The member for Mitcham did not quite feel that way at all, and I think his feelings were that the funds were not available unless certain imposts were put on all of us. I just could not appreciate the member for Mitcham's remarks at all. He appeared to be sitting on the fence.

Mr. Millhouse—Perhaps you will explain where the money is to come from?

Mr. CLARK—I do not think it is necessary for me to explain that, but as the honourable member has raised the point I will come to it in a few minutes. I am not sitting on the fence over Commonwealth aid for education. Everyone in this Chamber knows where I am sitting regarding this particular matter, and it is not on the fence on this or any other matter. As a matter of fact, I am not young enough to perform the athletic feat that I think the member for Mitcham did when he spoke on Tuesday. It appeared to me as though he mounted that fence with great alacrity and, as someone suggested during the course of his remarks, stayed there pretty safely with both ears to the ground. Astonishingly enough, he appeared to have one ear on the ground on one side of the fence listening to the voice of public opinion, and one ear on the ground on the other side of the fence listening to the voice of a Commonwealth colleague.

Mr. Fred Walsh—That is not gymnastics; it is contortionism.

Mr. CLARK—Yes, that describes it. It may be possible for the member for Mitcham to perform that gymnastic feat, for in the district of Mitcham it might be easier to do than it is elsewhere; he might even be able to retain his equilibrium while doing that, but I am too old for that and I would get giddy if I tried it. Regarding the meeting held at

the Australia Hall, the member for Mitcham said:—

I was most depressed by the reception Mr. Wilson got.

To be honest, I had rather mixed emotions when the member for Sturt spoke. I had a certain amount of sympathy for him because I realized that he had the courage of his convictions in saying what he thought he ought to say. I think he probably said it out of loyalty to his Prime Minister who, in my opinion, has adopted a completely wrong approach to this matter. Of course, Mr. Wilson may feel entirely differently. I could not feel it in my heart to feel depressed about it. If the member for Mitcham stops to think about this particular incident, I think he will realize that the emotion that was stirred up in many of the audience was only the sort of emotion that could have been expected at a meeting of that character. Let us imagine, for example, if at a Party meeting of the Liberal and Country League a motion was moved by a member advocating Socialism, or—and this may be more interesting to the member for Mitcham—if somebody at such a gathering moved a motion regarding electoral reform! I think the reaction would have been somewhat similar. This was a meeting in the main of people who are intensely interested in the cause they are fighting for—the cause of Commonwealth aid for education. Indeed, I would go so far as to say that quite a number of those people have devoted an enormous amount of their time to this cause. Amongst some of them there was a feeling of strong resentment that such a statement should have been made—a similar statement to the one that was made by the member for Mitcham in this House the other day. However, let me be fair and say that the member for Mitcham did, I think, make some show of supporting the idea of obtaining more money for education from Commonwealth sources.

Mr. Millhouse—You seem to have forgotten what the member for Sturt said at that meeting.

Mr. CLARK—He was not as explicit as the member for Mitcham was on Tuesday, and the member for Mitcham was not explicit at all! Perhaps "damned with faint praise" may be the best way of describing the member for Sturt's attitude.

Mr. Millhouse—He certainly wasn't against it, was he?

Mr. CLARK—I do not think he was, but I think the reaction of the audience was that

he was against it, and I think the member for Mitcham might agree that it was an inference that could have quite easily been drawn. The honourable member went on to say that apparently people at the meeting thought it was perfectly all right to spend more money on education so long as it came out of someone else's pocket. With great sincerity, I say that that statement is patently absurd. After all, even the humblest and most poorly-educated of us know that all Commonwealth taxes come out of our pockets in one way or another.

Mr. Quirke—Why did they prance around when Mr. Wilson told them that?

Mr. CLARK—As a matter of fact, I did not. I cannot very well understand the reactions of other people, although I have tried to do that, too. I am afraid the member for Mitcham—and I think the same applies to his Commonwealth colleague—really evades the issue. To be quite honest, I think they were both seeking an excuse to support the Prime Minister's peculiar stand on education over the years, while at the same time making some sort of a show of supporting Commonwealth aid for education because it could be regarded as becoming a popular theme, in some quarters at any rate.

Mr. Millhouse—Can you explain why the Premier of New South Wales did not ask specifically for a grant for education at the last Premiers' Conference?

Mr. CLARK—No, I cannot, but I can explain a few things. I am not worrying about New South Wales for the moment, although I think this matter is of Australia-wide importance. The Commonwealth member for Sturt and the member for Mitcham have surely heard of Government Budgets in which certain things are included and others are not included, and in which Commonwealth assistance for education (except for a few million pounds for a university grant) is never included. Do they imagine that when the South Australian Treasurer approaches Commonwealth authorities and attends meetings of the Loan Council and the like he tells them how to find the extra millions of money that he wants from Commonwealth sources? Does he set out his needs—he usually makes a good job of that—and tell them how to raise the money? Does he expect members here, in support of what they think their districts need, to say with colossal effrontery "We want so-and-so and this is how you will get the money we want." I

can imagine the answer that the Treasurer would give to that. Fence-sitting with ears to the ground on this subject is not so unusual as some people might think, because the Prime Minister has been doing it for years. In 1945, when Leader of the Opposition he said:—

The Commonwealth should make available to the States substantial sums in aid of educational reforms and development.

Probably he meant that. In 1955 he said:—

I may say that no kind of pressure will persuade my Government to make a decision which it considers to be basically wrong.

His latest statement on the matter, and it was referred to by Mr. Millhouse, was contained in a letter he wrote to a private member, some of which was published in the *Advertiser* of August 11. In it he said that the Commonwealth had no intention of departing from established relations with the States in the field of education.

Mr. Riches—Did he not say that he had had no direct approach from anyone?

Mr. CLARK—Yes, and that is correct. What are the established financial relations in the field of education? We know what the Commonwealth contribution is for education. It is a paltry £4,000,000 a year as a university grant to the whole of Australia. We know that the Commonwealth Government is capable of spending money. Over the last 10 years on the average £200,000,000 a year has been spent on defence. I do not know whether the money has been well spent or not, but it has been suggested that should there be a war and any real bombing we would be as defenceless as a rabbit in his burrow, and possibly not so safe. Apparently this amount satisfies our Treasurer and the Treasurers of other States. He must be satisfied because at a high school celebration in 1958 he said:—

The present Federal Government is probably the first that has taken any real interest in education.

What real interest has it taken? Possibly the Treasurer thought of the magnanimous contribution of £4,000,000 a year for all the universities in Australia. He has persistently refused even to attempt to obtain money from the Commonwealth authorities for education purposes, so he must be satisfied with what the Commonwealth Government is doing. Although he may be satisfied the Minister of Education is not, because he has said publicly that he believes we would find it difficult to supply adequately our education needs without Commonwealth assistance. I have an idea that Mr. Millhouse agrees with the statement that

we need Commonwealth aid, but he wants us to realize that we must pay for it. We do that now. For everything that we get from the Commonwealth people we pay, and pay for it through the nose where it hurts.

It appears that Mr. Millhouse has his mind concentrated on the money taken from us, quite fairly, by means of income tax. He forgets that there are other forms of taxation, such as customs, excise, sales tax, payroll and the like. These are a few of the other forms, but perhaps they are not so obvious as income tax. The State avenues of taxation are limited when compared with the Commonwealth avenues. I do not oppose uniform taxation. I do not think there is anything wrong with it, except that it is being administered by the wrong type of Commonwealth Government. We pay for everything that we get from the Commonwealth authorities. Everybody with only a modicum of common sense (and I include Mr. Millhouse in that) knows that we pay for everything that we get from them.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—Don't you think that the Commonwealth Government is raising enough money for the purpose?

Mr. CLARK—I am not sure what the Minister means.

Mr. Millhouse—The honourable member does not know.

Mr. CLARK—As the honourable member says, I do not know what the Minister means. I want to forget about it and go on with my speech. Mr. Millhouse must realize by this time—probably he did before he sat down the other day—that he has performed a gymnastic feat and fallen off the fence. He is now striving by interjection to get back on to it again. I do not think that it is possible or desirable to rob other States of money for educational purposes in this State. In 1957 I reminded the House of decisions and conclusions arrived at about that time by a Teachers' Federation meeting in Sydney. It was not a political show, but a meeting of teachers from all States. They discussed various matters and tried to do the best they could for education. After much discussion they decided that mostly the matters at fault in the Education Departments of all States at that time were inadequate school accommodation, occupation of uncompleted schools, shortage of trained staff, large classes and the impact of State finances on the Commonwealth migration scheme.

Mr. Quirke—It has not changed very much.

Mr. CLARK—Despite all the hard work and the large spending by all States, for which I give them full credit, how many of these defects still remain? As the honourable member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) inferred, I fear many of them still remain.

Let us not hedge on this matter. The need is urgent—everybody must admit that. Surely also the remedy should be obvious. It is the only remedy I can see. If other honourable members have a more effective remedy (and if they can convince me that it is effective and will do the job), let them say so.

Mr. Quirke—How does the honourable member propose to raise money to spend on the education programme?

Mr. CLARK—I do not think there is any necessity for that at all. The money is to be obtained from the Commonwealth Government by grants, as anything is obtained from the Commonwealth Government. If any honourable member here suffers the delusion that the Commonwealth Government is in a state of dire insolvency, he has another think coming. In other words, the Commonwealth Government when making its Budget should budget so that it is possible to give to the individual States the moneys they need for education. Some adjustment must be made to its budget. I am not the Commonwealth Treasurer, and never shall be. I do not have the job of preparing the Budget, nor does the honourable member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse), but he suffers the incurable delusion apparently that the Commonwealth Budget is 100 per cent perfect, that not one tittle or jot can be altered in any direction, whereas it can be altered in the direction of millions of pounds.

Mr. Millhouse—Tell us how.

The CHAIRMAN—Order! To what line is the honourable member referring?

Mr. CLARK—I am speaking to the line granting £4,700,000 for education. I have tried to express my opinion for the benefit of the honourable member for Mitcham, to improve his wisdom—for I can see that he is anxious to learn. I have told him at least three times now that I am not the Commonwealth Treasurer. This may satisfy the honourable member.

Mr. Millhouse—I am waiting.

Mr. CLARK—If it is necessary for increased taxation of some sort to be made—and I am not prepared to grant that it is necessary—

Mr. Millhouse—Would you deny it?

Mr. CLARK—I will certainly deny it if that is what the honourable member wants. I have tried to tell him, but he is evidently a lot thicker than I thought he was; otherwise, he would not have asked that. I have tried to tell him over and over again that I believe adjustments can be made to the Commonwealth Budget so that these grants can be made without imposing additional taxation; but in he comes again, asking for the seventh time a question I have already answered seven times.

Mr. Millhouse—What are the adjustments?

Mr. CLARK—I have also tried to tell the honourable member that I am not the Commonwealth Treasurer. I am sure the honourable member for Mitcham would be able to assist him. I do not claim to be a financier. I was prepared to concede for the benefit of the honourable member—I am doing my best to help him—that, if it is necessary for increased taxation to be made—and I say it is—for this purpose, I think everybody in Australia would be happy to pay two or three more pounds for this purpose, and it would not cost even that much.

Mr. Millhouse—Even £100,000,000 a year for five years?

Mr. CLARK—I think the honourable member will have to come on to this subject again later in Committee. Let us not hedge on this matter. We have heard a peculiar backwards and sideways argument from the honourable member, a man who is in favour of Commonwealth aid for education. Well—is he? Let us not hedge. The need is urgent and we have to have some remedy. As I suggested earlier, I should be only too happy if a remedy were found. If it is better than the one I am supporting, I shall be happy to put my weight behind it. I do not think we should be arguing over trivialities on the mechanics of raising the money. That is not our pigeon. If we were entitled to the pleasure of fixing our own income tax rates, no doubt we should be pleased to do it, but we have not that privilege or right; it is in the hands of the Commonwealth Treasurer.

Mr. Millhouse—The honourable member will not even make a suggestion.

Mr. CLARK—As I have tried to say before, if it is going to cost us a few pounds a head more annually, then let us welcome it for the sake of our children. After all, they will be our leaders in the future, and possibly some of

them will be our followers. Surely the welfare of the State and Commonwealth is more important than quibbling backwards and forwards in this Chamber to show that one is an important or knowledgeable person. I cannot quote his precise words because they do not come readily to mind at the moment, but I believe I am correctly paraphrasing the words of the Minister of Education when he said recently, "We cannot afford not to give these children the best we can." I believe we should spare no pains to give it to them.

Now let us look at these Estimates. We can all appreciate the enormous sum of money being spent on schools: it is nearly £5,000,000. Although some projects have been slow in coming, they are coming. Some of them may still be coming for a while because sometimes Estimates cannot be completely relied on. However, we know that huge amounts are planned to be spent on new schools and additions to schools. I offer my thanks for the plans made for my own district. They are all necessary. It is a good list: five or six new primary schools, a couple of technical schools, new high schools at Elizabeth and Gawler, and an adult education centre at Gawler—this has been a bit slow, but it is coming. These are all proposed and the sooner they are completed the better. We know that a staggering list of new schools is planned and that many more are to come.

This morning in the recent Town Planning Committee Interim Report for the Metropolitan Area I noticed these words:—

Preliminary estimates show that a further 60 primary and 40 secondary schools will have to be provided by the State and private organizations during the next few years.

That is an estimate from an outside authority, and a fair estimate at that. We know—and I am expressing it this afternoon, and that is the reason why I am so keen on the idea of getting Commonwealth aid for education—that there is still so much to do in this regard. Every honourable member has a school in his area for which he wants something. In the last fortnight, since the resumption of Parliament, it has been striking to note the number of questions addressed to the Minister of Education. I should say that between 50 and 60 per cent of the questions asked in this House are now directed to the Minister of Education, for the very obvious reason that there is so much wanted. I shall not go into the list of deficiencies. I have done that before and honourable members are aware of them.

Much has been done for education, and much remains to be done, but I want for a few moments to dwell on one matter about which something should be done in the realm of education. It is one avenue where additional funds are required. I refer to the school leaving age. In South Australia children can leave school at the age of 14 years, although in 1946 legislation was passed through both Houses providing for the school leaving age to be raised to 15 years. What has happened to that legislation? It must have been thought necessary then. Indeed, speeches of Government members then recognized the need for it. That legislation has not been proclaimed. In explaining the Bill, a former Minister of Education, the late Hon. R. J. Rudall, said:—

I commend the Bill to the favourable attention of members as I believe it to be another step forward in the education of children in South Australia.

That step has not been taken. The late Hon. E. A. Oates, in supporting, as one would expect, the raising of the school leaving age, said:—

What is the Government's objective in not providing a definite date on which the Act will apply? Why is it necessary to wait for the issue of a proclamation? The Bill could be passed this year, but the proclamation need not be issued until 1956.

He could quite comfortably have said 1966, because we are nearing that time and it seems as though that legislation will not be proclaimed before then. Let us examine what happens in other countries—although I realize that it is not always fair to compare other countries. In England the school leaving age is 15 years; in the United States of America, in the States of Iowa and Maine, it is 15 years (and that is the lowest leaving age of all States), in 36 States it is 16 years, in five 17 years, and in four 18 years. I know the American education system is considerably different from ours, but no American child can leave school before 15 years of age. New South Wales has legislated for a school leaving age of 15 years, and Tasmania 16. Victoria and Western Australia, like South Australia, are waiting to proclaim a school leaving age of 15 years. Queensland has done nothing about it up to the present.

Why has this proclamation been delayed? I think the main reason is that we have not sufficient funds available to provide the accommodation that would be necessary if the leaving age were increased by 12 months. Recently I was at a gathering where an after dinner address was made by a former president of the Chamber of Manufactures, Mr. Arthur

Sewell, and I doubt whether he would be in the same political camp as I. He spoke pungently and expressively on this subject and contended that boys and girls should remain at school longer. He was speaking from the viewpoint of an employer. I believe it is a crime to permit our children to leave school at 14. So few of them are really mature and only a small percentage is capable of deciding on the most suitable vocation. Some members may suggest that psychiatrists and guidance officers can assist them, but these persons are faced with a difficult task, too. Girls and boys of that age often drift into the occupation handiest for them or handiest to their homes.

Mr. Fred Walsh—That has been brought about by the economic conditions of their parents.

Mr. CLARK—I am certain of that. Recently a man, who was a stipendiary magistrate in juvenile courts, suggested to me that the present school leaving age was a contributing cause to delinquency. He maintained that when girls and boys were at school they were with their own age group and under the supervision of teachers, but that when they went to work at an early age they associated, in the main, with older boys and girls, and frequently this association was not to their betterment and led them into bad habits. I have no personal knowledge of that, but there could be many grains of truth in his beliefs. I appeal to all members to throw their weight behind any move to obtain additional finance for our education system. If we advocate and assist that cause we are doing one of the finest works we can do and are working for a cause bigger than ourselves—the cause of our children. No other cause could be more important.

An amount of £4,000 is provided for the purchase of land under the Public Parks Act. I am most interested in this item because I represent a rapidly developing area. It is vital that recreational areas should be provided in areas such as Salisbury and Elizabeth while there is still time. In fact the Salisbury Council has been most active. It realizes that unless it acts now it will be impossible to purchase land for this most desirable purpose. Indeed, all the land will be used if the council does not act quickly. Attention has been drawn in this House to the grossly inflated prices at which land is being sold. Councils are having difficulty in financing purchases of land for recreational purposes; it is beyond their resources. This problem exists in other areas where expansion is taking place. The

district councils of Tea Tree Gully and Noarlunga are confronted with the problem and have had the good sense to get together with the Salisbury Council to discuss the best way to meet it. I pay a tribute to the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) who has worked with these councils and done his best to assist them. Recently the councils, with their members of Parliament, made representations to the Minister, seeking assistance to plan for future recreational facilities that are so sorely needed. I commend this desirable object to the Government and trust that the objects of that delegation will be sympathetically considered. I support the first line.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa)—Outstanding among the features in the Loan Estimates is the large sum being provided from internal sources. Of a total expenditure of £51,000,000, £12,255,000 is being derived from various Government instrumentalities. The Woods and Forests Department, which has a total outlay for the year of £3,161,000, is providing from its own funds £1,861,000. The Housing Trust is similarly providing £6,801,000 to augment capital funds; therefore out of a total provision of £11,800,000 for Housing Trust expenditure, about half is being provided from internal funds. The Electricity Trust is providing, from its own reserves, £3,250,000 and the Leigh Creek coalfield is providing £293,000, while the Metropolitan Abattoirs at Gepps Cross is providing from its own funds £50,000.

We find that £12,250,000 is available to the State from properly directed public utilities and this money is assisting the State to meet the demands made by what we may call social services in the form of education, hospitalization, and so on. All those services are basic utilities which are so necessary, as a providing factor, for those requirements out of which individual enterprise can operate. Those basic utilities are assisting very definitely, through the moneys coming from them, to ensure further development in this State. Herein, I feel, lies a source of great credit to the Government because it has so purposefully and soundly based its capital expenditure in the past that now we have accruing to the State income money from past investments that will help augment our future program of capital development and the extension of services generally. That, in my opinion, is a meritorious achievement. The State now has a set-up in which it is going from strength to strength and that

set-up has followed from the purposeful application of expenditure.

The second feature that impressed me in regard to the Estimates is that the public does accept the semi-governmental loans. It supports them strongly and this year the Housing Trust intends to raise a loan of over £1,000,000, the Electricity Trust £2,750,000 by public subscription, and the Abattoirs Board £150,000 from lending institutions. These authorities hope to raise £3,900,000 and I do not doubt that the loans will be successfully floated because they always have been in the past. From that, one can sense the confidence the State has in the Government's expenditure generally.

The third impressive feature is that the Estimates are submitted to the House in a most comprehensive form and in complete detail, and I do not think that any member has any reason to complain of the manner in which they are submitted. They have been painstakingly prepared to ensure that members shall have complete information on the various lines of expenditure.

The fourth feature in respect of the overall Loan programme which impressed me was the undoubted widespread beneficial effect which the outlay of £51,000,000 must have generally within the State's economy. That sum expended within the State in a year provides much employment and, indeed, it keeps industry at a high level of movement. Government expenditure in this capital works programme (plus the expenditure of individuals collectively) makes up the State's economy, which is indeed a buoyant one today.

I have always felt that there is a close analogy between private business and State direction of finance and activity generally, and that the principles that apply to private industry similarly apply to State activity. This acceptance by the Government of that sound down-to-earth approach, which has meant that this State is rising in strength from year to year, is based entirely on a policy of progressive increase in the general productivity and the utilization of the resources of the State.

I was greatly impressed by, and took note of, the Treasurer's words in his speech on this Loan funds matter. He said that it was difficult to meet all the requirements that were appreciated and that to take from one vote to add to another presented a problem and a difficult task. I appreciate that. We cannot spend more money than we have to spend and

the allocation of the moneys as between many deserving causes in this State for capital expenditure must present to the Treasurer a big problem.

There are three ways open to the Government, which has continuous claims on it for more funds, to meet those demands. Members realize we have but a small say in the actual raising of money from taxation because that is a Commonwealth matter and in our own restricted field of taxation it has been the policy of the Government not to impose excessive taxation but to keep it as low as possible. To do that we must have in mind, perhaps as a means to that end, that we may cut expenditure, but cutting expenditure in a virile and progressive State is undesirable. We, as members, realize that we are continuously asking the Government for more money for this and for that, but we rarely suggest a means of obtaining moneys for allocation. Cutting money on Government expenditure is undesirable and raising taxation is a bad policy because it has a restrictive effect. I think that the drive for an increase in national income, which automatically swells the Government's share, is the only real and proper method of meeting the huge problems that confront us as a young and growing nation with an ever-growing demand made upon the State for services and basic utilities. It is through this drive for an increase in the overall national income, a drive that has been assisted by a wise apportionment of Loan moneys enabling the production of further wealth continuously, that we find that today we are enabled to have such a huge amount of money available for further development. The spending of Government instrumentalities, or Government spending generally, and capital investment by private individuals form the bases of our economy, and I am concerned at a recent announcement by the Reserve Bank of Australia that there should be an immediate and significant reduction in the rate of new lending. Bearing in mind that the State's economy is the collective economies of individuals plus the Government's interest, anything that tends to prohibit expansion by private enterprise is detrimental.

This direction for a big reduction in the rate of new lending could have a heavy influence on that section of the industry that needs support most—the small industrialist and the farmer. Big organizations have access to public money by flotations they can make but the small unit, be it primary producer or secondary industry businessman, relies on the

bank overdraft as the means of financing development and so on. Everyone is aware of the difficulties experienced in recent years by individual organizations in gaining access to sufficient capital to develop their interests efficiently and adequately, and in this credit restriction, which would have application to and implication for the small man in particular, I can see danger—a driving of the smaller men and smaller industrialists into hire-purchase finance at interest rates far above those charged by banks.

Mr. Quirke—Or into the arms of big organizations.

Mr. LAUCKE—Yes, the big organizations become bigger and the smaller concerns are either absorbed or go by the wayside. In a virile nation—and Australia is certainly young and full of drive and energy—we must have individuals operating in their own right to check tendencies that could be detrimental to the interests of the nation as a whole. I hope that this direction to curtail borrowing by businesses generally will not have too heavy an impact on the small unit. If it does, a permanent and harsh disability will be inflicted on the section whose interests should be protected; they need protection and assistance, unlike the mighty organizations which can fend for themselves through ways and means not accessible to the smaller man.

Mr. Loveday—Do you oppose monopolies?

Mr. LAUCKE—I always oppose monopolies where they exist, because monopolization is never a good thing for any people or any country. That is why I am stressing the dangers inherent in this direction from the Reserve Bank to curtail credit, which could have an influence on some people who could be forced out of business because of it. Monopolies would then flourish and grow because of conditions possibly engendered through a lack of consideration for that important number of our industrialists, primary or secondary, who need assistance through bank lending and not through hire-purchase, but who have no access by other means of money.

The supply of water in South Australia is a provision that has been done in a magnificent way. We must never forget that our State is vast and that we have disabilities possibly second to none in the Commonwealth in the cost of providing water to our people and our industrial towns over a widespread area.

It is good to note in these Estimates that country areas will receive a preponderance of moneys voted for water reticulation generally. The provision of water is, I think, the biggest single factor in the increased productivity in this State in recent decades, and I hope there will ever be the same interest shown and money devoted to the purpose of providing water more and more over a greater area of the State year by year, because there we have the facility to create wealth—and we cannot create wealth by way of agricultural produce in certain places unless we have an assured water supply in the critical summer period. I pay a tribute to the Engineering and Water Supply Department for its engineering skill, as mentioned earlier in this debate by the member for Onkaparinga. The engineering achievements of this department have been outstanding. At all times there has been a long range viewing of requirements rather than a short-term policy, and I think the £9,000,000 devoted to water reticulation is a wise allocation indeed.

We in rural areas are keenly sensible of the great assistance we have had through the single wire earth return systems that now provide power to so many farms over so great an area in this State. Last year over 9,000 consumers were added to the main grid in rural areas through the Electricity Trust's experimentation into this new system, which cuts costs terrifically compared with the old three-phase system and which is now giving farmers power. With the various allowances made in the first place against the capital cost of installation, power is now being avidly taken. In my electorate I have been delighted at the number of farms that have been linked with the power lines through this system. In my activities as a member I have yet to come across a body of men more keenly interested in their work than, and who so keenly apply themselves to the affairs of their department as, the members of the trust. They have been most helpful in every respect and through their energies have given the State an efficient system of power distribution.

A matter dear to my heart is the provision of open spaces for recreation. I pay a tribute to the Government for its recent decision to acquire about 1,200 acres near Humberg Scrub which no doubt in time will be a reserve providing pleasure and happiness for thousands of people. It is a beautiful tract of land in its natural condition, and it will serve those living in the northern part of the

city, including those who will be established at Teatree Gully, Modbury and Golden Grove. The nation's greatest asset is a healthy mind in a healthy body and no doubt the provision of these open spaces will give happiness and promote health, and will enable us to maintain that high degree of productivity in industry which follows relaxation in open spaces and fresh air.

This year £4,000 is allocated for the purchase of land for public parks. Since the Public Parks Act was passed in 1943 an amount of £17,064 has been used in the provision of parks. Because of the rapid growth of our metropolitan area there is a real and urgent need to ensure, whilst there is yet time, that sufficient money will be allocated for this purpose, so that the people will look on this era with satisfaction as we now look back upon the time when Colonel Light set aside the parklands in the city. If we provide sufficient open spaces now, posterity will pay a tribute to our judgment. The open space system to serve a large metropolitan area consists of areas of land of different sizes designed to cater for all age groups. There could be four different categories. The first would be regional open spaces, which are large areas outside the urban areas, such as our National Park, and such as I hope will ultimately be the case with the Humberg Scrub area. The second category would be metropolitan open spaces containing one or more major ovals with grandstands, etc., and these are generally 50 acres in extent. The third would be district recreation grounds of 15 to 30 acres, located in residential districts approximately one mile apart, with emphasis on active recreation. The usual standard is 2½ acres per thousand persons. The last category would be the local recreation grounds and small reserves located within a safe walking distance from every home for parks and gardens and children's play activities. The usual area is 2½ acres. The Teatree Gully Council is seized with the importance of there being sufficient open areas reserved, as Mr. Clark has already mentioned. The Salisbury, Teatree Gully and Noarlunga Councils have a common problem in this matter because the three districts are developing most rapidly, and unless steps are taken now to retain adequate open spaces the time will certainly and quickly come when there will not be sufficient land available to provide these all-important areas. To this end it would be most desirable to have a master plan providing for councils' desires. When areas of land came on the market provision should be

made for local councils to have the first option to buy these pinpointed areas. That would be orderly planning. It would be a great shame if these areas were sold for housing. If we could have some arrangement whereby better use could be made of the Government's present generous policy of subsidising councils pound for pound to pay for lands approved by the Government for recreational purposes, then I feel that we would get somewhere. At present the Government's generous offer in respect of a subsidy cannot be taken advantage of by those councils who urgently need these areas to be reserved because of the rapid development of their district. I suggest that the Govern-

ment provide a long-term loan to enable a council to meet its half share of the cost, the money to be repayable, say over a period of 42 years. The councils could then meet their share of the cost from current revenue and repay the capital over a period of years. I congratulate the Treasurer on his comprehensive and detailed presentation of the Estimates and have pleasure in supporting the first line.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.16 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 23, at 2 p.m.