

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, August 23, 1960.

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

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL.

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for the appropriation of such amounts of the revenue and other moneys of the State as were required for the following purposes:—

- (a) The repayment with interest of the sum of £25,967,000 to be borrowed for the purposes mentioned in the Loan Estimates for the financial year 1960-1961, and of any other sums to be borrowed pursuant to the Public Purposes Loan Bill, 1960.
- (b) To make payment from the Loan Fund of repaid Loan money and surplus revenue for purposes mentioned in the Loan Estimates for the financial year 1960-1961.
- (c) Any other purposes mentioned in the Public Purposes Loan Bill, 1960.

COUNTRY HOUSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

QUESTIONS.**HOUSING FINANCE.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—The Treasurer, when introducing the Loan Estimates, said:—

For 1960-61 the £2,850,000 proposed to be allocated under the Advances for Homes Act will be supplemented by advances from the Home Builders' Fund and other moneys held at the Treasury so that in total the State Bank will have available to it £4,795,000 to be allocated for the building and purchasing of new homes.

Can the Treasurer say whether these advances are restricted entirely to the purchase or building of new houses, and whether any other conditions apply to these advances?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—There is a definite commitment that the State Bank money is to be used for the erection or purchase of new houses: it is not to be used to purchase houses previously occupied. The only way of overcoming a housing shortage is to see that the money available to the State

is spent on new houses and not merely on the change of ownership, which quite frequently does not result in additional houses, but frequently means the financing of all sorts of other activities, because the sale is often arranged for the purpose of getting money from the bank to divert into some other activity. As I have repeatedly stated in the House, the money allotted to the State Bank is to be used entirely for the purchase or erection of new houses.

Mr. O'Halloran—Does that apply to the whole amount?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes; no money is made available under that heading for used houses. Some money is made available in other directions for used houses, but I reiterate that the Government's policy is very firmly to advance this money for the purchase and erection of new houses, because that is the only way that anything can be done to meet the great necessity for additional houses.

COMMONWEALTH AID FOR EDUCATION.

Mr. KING—Commonwealth aid for education has recently been a topic of considerable interest both in this House and outside. As a guide to what may happen in the future, can the Premier say whether the Commonwealth Government attaches any terms and conditions as to the way in which the money will be spent in connection with the grant through the Universities Commission?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Commonwealth Grants Commission receives submissions from the universities as to the amount they require for two purposes, namely (a) the maintenance of the university, and (b) the expansion of the university. The proposals are submitted to the Universities Commission, which gives decisions in the matter. The decisions this year amount in all to a total for all universities of about £11,000,000. Other conditions attached to the proposals are that as far as the money used for the maintenance of the university is concerned the States shall match the Commonwealth grant by £185 for every £100 that the Commonwealth grants, which means that for every £100 the Commonwealth grants the State has to provide £185 out of its own resources. For new buildings the matching grant is pound for pound, so that if the schedule of new buildings for the Adelaide University is approved and the cost is to be £500,000, the matching grant will be £250,000 and the grant by the Commonwealth will be £250,000.

SCHOOL BLINDS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Following my question of August 11 about outside blinds for schools, can the Minister of Works say what is the position as regards Marion high school?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I think the honourable member in his original question referred to the Mitchell Park primary school and did not include Marion high school, unless my memory is at fault in this matter. I have not inquired about the position at Marion but will do so for the honourable member if he so desires.

LIFT SLAB BUILDING CONSTRUCTION METHOD.

Mr. COUMBE—Last year I asked a question of the Minister of Works regarding the possibility of the use of the lift slab type of construction for multi-storey buildings at the Teachers Training College at Kintore Avenue. I was advised then that the design of the building was such that that type of construction would not be suitable. As the Government intends to erect several large buildings, such as the police building, the Royal Adelaide Hospital and, later, a Government building, will the Minister investigate the possibility of using this type of construction in those buildings to cut down either costs or time of erection? I point out that this method, used for the first time in North Adelaide in the construction of the Hotel Australia, whilst it may not have saved much in cost has the great advantage that the whole building was completed within 10 months, a record for South Australia. This method, if used in Government buildings, would be of great advantage to the State.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—If the impression was created by any previous information I gave to the House on this matter that the Public Buildings Department was averse from considering any new methods of construction, that impression should be corrected. I know the honourable member did not take it that way but I refer to that fact because the Public Buildings Department does not intend to disregard any developments in building methods. Indeed, the building at North Adelaide to which the honourable member refers was closely observed by the architects of the department to see how it worked out. That is the case with any new method of construction that may present itself or come to notice.

The department is most anxious to adopt any method that will assist either on the score of the time required to complete the building or

in relation to its final cost. I assure the honourable member that the department is watching very closely all such new developments, including the lift slab method to which he refers, that may offer any advantage to the department and the State generally.

DOG REGISTRATION FEES.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I notice in today's *Advertiser* that last night the Marion Council discussed the possibility of increased registration fees for dogs. Has the Government considered increasing registration fees for dogs and, if so, will it consider increasing the fees in the metropolitan area above those operating in the country areas so that the people in the country areas could have the dogs whose services they require, whereas in the metropolitan area dogs are kept only for pedigree purposes in homes?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Minister of Local Government did refer this to Cabinet some time ago. Frankly, I forget the decision arrived at, but I will find out and advise the honourable member tomorrow.

EYRE PENINSULA RAIL SERVICE.

Mr. BOCKELBERG—In view of the excellent season being experienced in South Australia, particularly on Eyre Peninsula, can the Premier, representing the Minister of Railways, assure me that the railways will be capable of handling the crop to be produced on Eyre Peninsula this year?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—A particular problem arises in the honourable member's district because the use of the loading installations requires simultaneous complementary action by the railways to get the wheat up to the silos for loading, but so far as I know, there is no immediate problem and I have had no reports from the Commissioner of Railways to indicate any problem in keeping up with the work likely to be available. It is unlikely that with the present sales on overseas markets there would be any great rush at any given time, and that in itself smooths out some of the carting problems.

COST OF LIVING.

Mr. RICHES—Has the Treasurer obtained from the Prices Commissioner a report on the relative cost of living in country centres compared with the metropolitan area? Has he ever issued an order giving a lower price to any article or service in the country compared with the metropolitan area?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have a report from the Prices Commissioner upon this matter that I will make available to the honourable member. As he has stated, it is correct that the prices of certain commodities are higher in the country than they are in the metropolitan area, but it is equally true that the average person in the country has a very small amount, if anything at all, to pay for travelling today compared with the high charges made in the metropolitan area for travelling.

LOFTIA PARK SWIMMING POOL.

Mr. SHANNON—I have been approached by the Hills Schools Committees Association to inquire what progress has been made with the rehabilitation of the Loftia Park swimming pool, particularly for the use of school children in the "Learn to Swim" Campaign which the Minister of Education each year encourages and which I heartily support. The schools to be served in the Premier's district would be Crafers, Stirling East and Uraidla; in the district of Mitcham the one school would be Upper Sturt; and in my district, Scott's Creek, Aldgate and Bridgewater. From all of these schools, if this Loftia Park swimming pool is not rehabilitated, the scholars would have to go, I presume, to Mount Barker, which at the moment is hard pressed to meet the needs of the schools in that immediate neighbourhood. I understand that rather elaborate plans have been put before the Government on this Loftia Park proposal. We are not so insistent upon having a pool that would vie with the one to be used in Rome shortly; we should be happy to have one in which to swim. As long as it is of reasonable dimensions—

The SPEAKER—Order! The honourable member must not debate the question.

Mr. SHANNON—I am not debating it. We want only a little slice of the cake. Will the Premier take up this matter with the authorities concerned, because Loftia Park is at the moment a Government institution, to see what can be done?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Minister of Education has already provided a subsidy at the Stirling East school for a learners' pool for the school children. That has operated now for a year or 18 months. The Minister of Education would be able to give the exact details. A pool has been constructed at the Stirling East school to enable children to be taught how to swim. However, a request was made for the construction of a

pool of Olympic dimensions at Loftia Park. There were one or two variations of the proposal, but in the main it called for an expenditure of about £36,000, all to come from the Government. We have a policy for swimming pools under which we provide £1,500 a year against a like expenditure from local interests. The Loftia Park proposal, quite apart from the large sum involved, breaks down that policy, in that whereas in other areas local subscriptions must meet half the expenditure, in this area the Government is asked to provide it all. Under those circumstances the project has not been proceeded with, because it would create an invidious distinction if the Government met the entire cost. I have discussed the present policy with the Leader of the Opposition and it is to be liberalized, and in future, instead of requiring a local organization to spend £1,500 each year in order to get a subsidy, providing it spends £4,500 over three years we will provide in that time a subsidy of £4,500. The local people will not be tied to spending the money within a given period; they will have more freedom in spending the money and in collecting from the Government over that period.

LADY GOWRIE DRIVE.

Mr. TAPPING—When the Lady Gowrie Drive was constructed some years ago it was necessary, for defence reasons, to provide a deviation to the rear of the Largs fort. In the past 10 years the fort has been regarded as antiquated, which should now enable the drive to be continued in front of the fort as an advantage to tourists and in keeping with the Housing Trust's plans to erect many houses in that area. Does the Premier, as Acting Minister of Roads, know of any plans to continue the drive in front of the Largs fort?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The fort, of course, is Commonwealth property and previously when the Government has sought permission to construct the road in front of it, permission has been declined on the grounds that it was necessary to keep the fort in its present order for defence purposes. I believe that the fort has ceased to be a vital instrument for the protection of the honourable member's district and that the position has changed considerably. Under those circumstances I will ask the Prime Minister whether the Commonwealth would be willing to cede to the Government a strip of land so that the road could continue along the seafront. I agree that it would enhance the value of the road, and it would be of convenience to everyone if it

could be constructed where it should have been constructed—to follow a straight route along the shore. I will inquire and advise the honourable member in due course.

NORWOOD BOYS TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL.

Mrs. STEELE—There has been some considerable delay in the completion of additions to the centre portion of the Norwood boys technical high school. In fact, until the end of last week there had been a complete cessation of building activities for some months. Can the Minister of Education say what is causing the delay in construction, when the building will be completed, and when it will be occupied?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—There has been an unfortunate delay, which is regretted by all interested parties. The Director of Public Buildings has advised that the contract for this new building was let to a company which went into liquidation before completion of the work. Arrangements are being made for the completion of the project by labour employed by the Public Buildings Department and by letting minor contracts for the specialist services. The Director further states that it is not possible at this stage for him to give a firm completion date. However, I can assure the honourable member that the work will proceed with all possible expedition.

MYPOLONGA IRRIGATION AREA.

Mr. BYWATERS—The Minister of Lands will remember that last year I introduced to him a Mr. Prosser from Mypolonga, who was inquiring about additional plantings in the Mypolonga area. I understand that there have since been requests from other settlers for additional areas for planting. Can the Minister of Irrigation indicate whether there has been any progress in this matter, and, if not, will he secure information and advise me later?

The Hon. Sir CECIL HINCKS—Yes.

COAL DEPOSITS.

Mr. HALL—In this morning's *Advertiser* is a report of a Mines Department investigation of coal deposits in the Balaklava, Wakefield, and Bowmans area. Can the Premier say whether, if sizable working coal deposits are established in that area, it would be the Electricity Trust's policy to establish a power station at a nearby point on the seaboard?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—We know that there is a fairly large coalfield in the honourable member's district, but the

coal is very wet and too deep for open-cut mining. The investigations are to determine whether coal can be located at shallower depths to enable open-cut mining. Unless there can be open-cut mining the proposition would be uneconomic and could only be launched by steeply increasing the cost of electricity. I have no doubt that if such coal is found, steps would be taken in due course, as in other cases, to develop it, but until it is found it is rather premature to consider plans for the location of a power station.

ESCAPE EXITS IN PREFABRICATED CLASSROOMS.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Can the Minister of Education say, firstly, how many portable school classrooms have been fitted with escape hatches and dropout windows; secondly, about how many have yet to be so fitted; and, thirdly, whether all new classrooms are fitted before erection?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The number of timber classrooms so far equipped with emergency exits is about 2,170, or nearly 75 per cent of the total number. The number still to be equipped is about 830. All new classrooms being erected are equipped with emergency exits.

HAMPDEN WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. NICHOLSON—Has the Minister of Works any information on the question I asked last week regarding a water supply for Hampden?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Yes. This morning I saw the docket on this matter, and the position is that the scheme has been planned and plotted, an estimate of revenue has been taken out, and a schedule of rating to obtain such revenue has been compiled. That information is available to the honourable member if he desires it—and I have no doubt he does—so that he can discuss the matter with the people concerned. If he finds general agreement with the scale of rates proposed to be applied in this case and if that agreement is signified to me, I shall be prepared to take the matter to Cabinet for consideration.

AUSTRALIAN JUNIOR ENCYCLOPEDIA.

Mr. JENNINGS—Has the Minister of Education a reply to a question I asked last week concerning the tactics of salesmen selling so-called educational books?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—A year ago, following numerous questions by members of

Parliament and other interested parties, I approved of a circular letter being sent to heads of schools. A relevant portion stated:—

During recent months a number of complaints have been received from members of Parliament, school committees and especially from parents that high pressure salesmen are again visiting many homes and are attempting to persuade parents to buy sets of encyclopaedias and similar reference books, alleging that if these books are not in the home the children are at a disadvantage in their school work.

The circular further stated:—

A particularly unfortunate aspect of this campaign is that the salesmen often urge a parent to sign an order form for the whole of an expensive set of books with a down payment, usually of only £1. Sometimes, too, the salesmen even produce letters purporting to have been written by the heads of schools praising the value of such books. The effect on many parents is often strong enough to influence them to sign an order form and to pay the small deposit required. It is particularly requested that heads of schools and members of their staffs should refrain from giving to these salesmen any statement, either in writing or verbally, which could in any way be used to influence parents to buy these sets of books. These travelling salesmen have not, in any instance, been authorized by the Education Department, and embarrassment has frequently been caused by their carefully worded hints that they have the endorsement of senior officers of the department, or of individual heads of schools.

Recently, the honourable member raised this matter again in the House, and I also received a letter from the member for Semaphore (Mr. Tapping), as well as other complaints. As a result I have approved of a further circular being sent to heads of schools by the Director of Education, reiterating some statements contained in the previous circular and adding a few more. In the circular appears the following:—

Heads of schools to inform parents, through their children, that any salesman attempting to sell the *Australian Junior Encyclopaedia* or similar publications does not represent the Education Department and is in no way connected with the department. Heads of schools to inform parents, through the children, that this department does not recommend the *Australian Junior Encyclopaedia*.

I have also received a lengthy letter from Mr. H. P. B. Harper, managing director of the Ruskin Group Pty. Ltd., which has the copyright of this encyclopaedia, in which he says:—

I was disappointed to learn that you had a question addressed to you in the Assembly on the subject of our books by Mr. Jennings. This was apparently based on a letter from a Mr. Mares who criticized the price and worth of the *Australian Junior Encyclopaedia*. First, Sir, may I say that since my visit to Adelaide

in September last year we have used every endeavour to avoid the least complaint and, to the best of my knowledge, there has been no complaint. In accordance with our assurances to you we restaffed the South Australian branch almost entirely with people of known performance from Victoria and appointed a stronger manager. We believe this has been quite effective.

Later in the letter, Mr. Harper said:—

The quality of the work has never previously been criticized.

He offered to send two sets of encyclopaedias for study and I propose to hand them and the letter to the Director of Education to study so that he can let me have a report and recommendation. In the meantime, I propose to hold up the circular to heads of schools so that the lengthy letter and encyclopaedias can be studied.

SOUTH-EASTERN DRAINAGE.

Mr. HARDING—Has the Minister of Lands received a report relating to South-Eastern drainage?

The Hon. Sir CECIL HINCKS—I have a report from the South-Eastern Drainage Board as follows:—

In November 1959 approval was given for the drainage of 700,000 acres of land in the eastern division of the South-East situated east of the Baker's Range and extending from near Kalangadoo to north of Naracoorte. The first stage of the work is the construction of a main drain *via* drain M at Beachport to the Mosquito Creek near Struan. A start was made in January of this year commencing at Beachport. The enlargement of the section of drain M between Lake George and the Woakwine Range is practically completed and work is in progress in the Woakwine Range cutting. The construction of a new road bridge over the enlarged drain M is in hand and two new occupation bridges are nearing completion. Excavation to July 31, 1960, totalled 350,000 cubic yards.

LOXTON COURTHOUSE.

Mr. STOTT—Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked last week about the construction of the Loxton Police Courthouse?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The Director of Public Buildings reports that the design of the Government office block at Loxton, which includes the new courthouse, has always allowed for a separate entrance for magistrates. The drawings are now complete and a firm of private consultants will prepare the specifications and bill of quantities to enable tenders to be called.

UNDERGROUND RAILWAY.

Mr. LAWN—My question is directed to the Premier partly because it concerns Government policy and partly because he is Acting Minister

of Railways. Will the Premier state whether, having regard to the future expansion and development of the metropolitan area, the Railways Department is considering the probable future necessity for underground railways.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—That matter has been investigated on a number of occasions and will receive attention in the future if the necessity arises, although there is no intention in the foreseeable future of having underground railways and no plans are in progress at the moment with that object in view.

TAILEM BEND TO KEITH WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. NANKIVELL—I believe that plans and reports have now been completed for the proposed Tailem Bend to Keith water scheme. Will the Minister of Works confirm this information for me and, if it is true, will he state when it is expected that the project will be placed before the Public Works Standing Committee for investigation?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—It is correct that the general plan of the route of the proposed trunk main from Tailem Bend to Keith has been, I think, formally settled by the department as far as its opinion is concerned. The department has of necessity much preparatory work to do before tendering evidence before the Public Works Standing Committee. As this is a scheme of some magnitude, it will probably involve lengthy deliberations and the calling of much evidence by the committee, and that will not be possible until after the present sittings of the House are concluded. I therefore think that from both the departmental point of view and the convenience of the committee, it would not be possible to submit the matter to it until early in the new calendar year. However, I think that such a step is possible, and if the department, having cleared away some of the more urgent jobs in connection with this year's Loan programme, is able to formulate that evidence, I would probably take the matter to Cabinet for reference to the committee after the session ends, so that it could commence investigations during the autumn of 1961.

PORT PIRIE WEST PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. McKEE—I believe the Minister of Education has a reply to the question I asked recently regarding the poor sanitation at the Port Pirie West primary school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have been informed by the Public Buildings Department

that its resident building inspector at Port Pirie is about to prepare plans and specifications for the erection of one boys' toilet block and one girls' toilet block for the primary school and one double toilet block for the infant school. If approved, the work should be completed before the end of this year.

STUDENT TEACHERS' ALLOWANCES.

Mr. CLARK—I recently asked the Minister of Education a question regarding allowances for teachers in training, and I understand he now has some information on the matter.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes. All Teachers College students receive an allowance as follows:—First year, £305; second year, £315; third year, £330; and fourth year, £350. In addition, those students who are required to live away from home who attend the Teachers College are paid a boarding allowance of £100 a year. These students do not receive a travelling allowance except that a return fare each year to their home (or to the border if their home is outside the State) is paid if the home is more than 100 miles from the college. Students who do not receive a boarding allowance are paid the excess over two shillings a day of daily travel from their homes.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Can the Treasurer indicate when the Auditor-General's report will be available?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The problem regarding the Treasury papers and the Auditor-General's report is the same every year. The Auditor-General cannot submit the audited accounts to the Government Printer until the end of the year, and that always clashes with the printing of the Estimates and the Loan Estimates. I intend to introduce the Budget on the Tuesday or Wednesday before the Royal Show adjournment, and the Auditor-General's report will be in print and available for honourable members immediately after the Show and before they have to debate the Budget. That is the best that can be done, for the delay arises out of physical problems and not out of neglect by any officer. I assure the Leader that the Auditor-General is most anxious to have his report available as early as possible, but many lines have to be cross-checked in connection with both the Budget papers and the Auditor-General's report, and of necessity that takes some time. The report will be available before honourable members are asked to debate the Estimates, which is the normal procedure in this State.

EYRE PENINSULA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. BOCKELBERG—Despite the good rains experienced this year there have been few good run-offs in some areas. Can the Minister of Works indicate the water supply position on Eyre Peninsula, particularly in the Kimba district?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The general position of the reticulated system on Eyre Peninsula is now satisfactory. The Tod River reservoir had just over 1,100,000,000 gallons in storage last week, and although it is not quite half full that is considered sufficient to meet the needs of the Tod River system through the coming summer. Pumping from the Uley basin into the Tod River has been discontinued as from last week. The position at Kimba is not quite so good. As the honourable member has indicated, the rains this year in that part of the State have been consistent but not heavy, and there has not been a good intake into the Rooraa reservoir which supplies the town of Kimba. I have kept this matter under constant review, and everything has been done departmentally to see that the best possible supply is available during the coming summer, but so far we have not caught sufficient water there to ensure a full supply. The department has now cleared a considerable area, I think some 300 acres, in addition to the previously cleared land in the catchment area of the reservoir. This area is being graded off (in fact, I think the work has been completed) and if later rains fall this spring we will get some further benefit from that catchment. In addition, plans are in hand and, I think, are well advanced for roofing the main reservoir. There are two dams there, one of which is of a size and shape that lends itself to being covered, and we are hoping to get that done at the earliest possible moment so as to reduce the evaporation loss. In addition to that, next autumn, after the monsoonal thunder storms which frequent that area have passed, we intend to grade off an additional area of catchment so that we can get the maximum intake during the winter. I point out that the department considers it extremely dangerous to have the catchment area too bare during the summer time when heavy thunderstorms frequently pass through the district, because it could seriously erode the catchment area with a consequent deposit of mud in the reservoirs with very little water. It is also possible that the reservoir banks would be broken by a very heavy downpour of rain, an occurrence that has been narrowly averted once or twice pre-

viously. I repeat that we are keeping a close watch on the position and doing everything possible to maintain a supply.

PARACOMBE, INGLEWOOD AND HOUGHTON WATER SCHEME.

Mr. LAUCKE—For some years the operations of Messrs. George McEwin & Son Limited, canners, of Glen Ewin, Houghton, have been handicapped by lack of an adequate water supply in canning seasons. Is it expected that a water supply will be made available to this cannery, *ex* the proposed Paracombe, Inglewood and Houghton scheme, in time for the next canning season?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The department advises that it is now possible to supply a water scheme for the cannery and that it is hoped to commence laying the reticulation mains to serve the cannery within the next four weeks. It is hoped that a supply will be available if not in the early part then in the later part of the summer.

FRANCES TRUCKING YARDS.

Mr. HARDING—My question relates to the wet conditions in the Frances trucking yards. Will the Acting Minister of Railways have this matter investigated, and report to the House?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes.

PARILLA WATER EXTENSION.

Mr. NANKIVELL—I understand that the Parilla bowling club has lodged an application for an extension of the Parilla township water district to include its new bowling green. The green has now been planted and, should the season suddenly become dry, its establishment would be jeopardized. Has this application now been approved and, if so, when does the Minister of Works anticipate that work on the extension will be commenced?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The laying of the main to serve the bowling green involved the department in some extraordinary expense. As a result, the department asked the bowling club to enter into a guarantee of about £21 a year as the minimum rate. The agreement guaranteeing that minimum has now been received by the department and steps are being taken to put the work in hand forthwith.

OSBORNE SOOT NUISANCE.

Mr. TAPPING—Has the Premier a reply to my question of August 11 about soot nuisance at Osborne?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have the following report from the chairman of the Electricity Trust, Sir Fred Drew:—

Under normal circumstances emission from the Osborne stacks is being kept to acceptable limits. During the period referred to, adverse weather conditions resulted in unusually heavy power demands and boilers in both Osborne stations were operating at maximum outputs for unduly long periods. It was necessary for soot blow the boilers at intervals so as to carry these high loads and whilst every effort is made to do this when winds are favourable, prevailing winds during the period prevented this being done in all instances. With loads now easing and with the new station at Port Augusta making an increased contribution in output to the system, New South Wales coal burned at Osborne will be considerably reduced with a consequent reduction in emission from this area.

WHIPPINGS.

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

1. How many prisoners in South Australia have been whipped in the last ten years?

2. How many of those have convictions for subsequent offences of any kind—(a) in South Australia or (b) elsewhere in Australia?

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

1. Eighteen prisoners in South Australia have been whipped during the past ten years.

2. (a) Four have had convictions for subsequent offences. Three of these were minor offences only. One was convicted of indecent assault.

(b) There is no record in this State of those convicted outside the State of South Australia.

VENDING MACHINE COMPANIES.

Mr. RICHES (on notice)—

1. Is it proposed to provide for stricter control of the raising of money by vending machine companies in the proposed uniform companies legislation?

2. Has there been any recent investigation into the operations of vending machine companies in South Australia—particularly into the widely advertised claim of a return of 20 per cent on capital invested?

3. If so, is the Government satisfied that the interests of the small investor are adequately safeguarded?

4. Has any prosecution been launched, as recommended by the Attorney-General, against companies referred to in the reply to a question asked on April 21?

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

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Following upon this investigation the Government is considering the introduction of legislation during the present session.

4. Development and Vending Corporation Ltd. was prosecuted and fined £20 with court fees of 10s. and counsel fee of £5 5s.

EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

LOAN ESTIMATES.

In Committee.

(Continued from August 18. Page 686.)

Grand total, £30,772,000.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Edwardstown)—I refer to the suggestion made by the honourable member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) that, after a master plan has been provided for subdivided areas, the local councils should have the opportunity to purchase land for recreational purposes. One could commend that suggestion. The Minister of Education also made certain suggestions about recreation grounds that might be suitable for dual use by schools and residents of the locality. The Minister has had long association with local government administration and affairs; he is a former mayor. What would be the ultimate cost to the ratepayers of the upkeep of ovals of not less than 15 to 20 acres? The Engineering and Water Supply Department has made new assessments, which will be adopted by the local councils. Where will we get to in these matters?

Earlier this afternoon the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) asked the Minister of Education a question about the Norwood boys technical high school. I have received some information on that project. I remind members that about 12 months ago I referred extensively to the use of contractors and subcontractors on various Government building projects, and the effect the insolvency of contractors had on their subcontractors. The contractor I was then referring to went insolvent and according to his statement of affairs the book value of his trade creditors is £158,652. It is estimated that his deficiency will be £30,918 and that he may pay 17s. in the pound.

It is interesting to refer to some of the amounts owing to his subcontractors and merchants. Clarkson's Ltd. is owed £12,000. A

master plumber who subcontracted for work for this contractor was owed about £15,000 12 months ago, but that was apparently reduced to £7,089. However, the ultimate result was that this master plumber has been forced into liquidation because of the way this Government regards contracting and subcontracting. This Government is not prepared on any occasion to recognize subcontractors and is prepared to throw them to the wolves, expecting them to get out of the difficulty the best way they can.

Let us examine some of the other subcontractors. Floreani Distributors are owed £5,500, presumably for cement work; Freeman Wauchope Ltd., over £5,000; Haywire & Co. Ltd. over £2,000; Leverington, the earth-moving contractor, over £2,000; Mosaic Flooring Co. Ltd., almost £20,000; Victorian Engineering Ltd., nearly £3,000; Wiles Manufacturing Co. Ltd., nearly £24,000; Wool Bay Lime Ltd., nearly £6,000; and Ready Mixed Concrete (S.A.) Pty. Ltd., nearly £4,000. These companies have all supplied materials to this contractor, but this Government has not offered them protection.

Mr. O'Halloran—To what extent have they been paid by the Government for the work done?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I have not been able to resolve all of these matters. The amount of works in progress to May 20, 1960, is estimated at £60,434, but there are some final accounts outstanding, in respect of which the Government is withholding payments, amounting to £21,500, so that the total works in progress amount to almost £82,000.

I do not know what the contract was for the Norwood boys technical high school, but probably the Minister of Works could tell us. There is £4,886 worth of work still in progress. This afternoon the Minister said that this work would be done by another department. How will it be carried on? Will it be on the cost-plus system or on a day work system? No matter what system is adopted the taxpayers will have to make up the deficiency because the work must be completed. The work was shepherded out to this contractor who declined to pay his subcontractors.

This is only some of the story. What about the Unley high school? How long was that work proceeding? How long was work proceeding on the Seacliff primary school in the Minister of Education's district? That work involved another contractor who went insolvent. The Government recognizes these subcontractors as competent people, but claims

that our legislation will not permit it to recognize them and provide guarantees whereby they can be reimbursed for their services. When will the Government remedy this state of affairs? Is the Government prepared to require a contractor for a major project to render financial statements showing where his disbursements have gone? I believe that would offer some encouragement to subcontractors. Under the present arrangement the subcontractors will no longer trust the Government. Will the Government curry favour with some prominent builders who may be in a financial position to undertake large projects? Will it be more costly to the public to have the work carried out under a system of selected contractors? I have nothing against the contractors who may be selected to do the work, but there is always the possibility that they may get into difficulties and then the subcontractors would be the losers. In fairness to all concerned the Government should be prepared to recognize that every person is worthy of his hire and should be guaranteed full payment for the services he renders.

The master plumber I referred to is an honourable man who created a debt and paid wages but found himself in the Bankruptcy Court through no fault of his own but simply because of the Government's administration of contracts. That plumber can thank the Government for his present situation. This Government can say, "We have been successful in sending this man to the Bankruptcy Court because of our administration."

This afternoon the Treasurer, in reply to a question, said that the money made available to the State Bank for advances for housing was to be used entirely for the purchase of new houses and that no money would be made available for the purchase of existing houses. Will he define "existing" houses and "new" houses? Is a house that has been lived in an existing house or can it come within the category of a new house? Let me refer to some correspondence I have on this subject. I wrote to the Treasurer about one case asking whether the people concerned could be granted a loan. They had joined the line outside the State Bank in March. They are living in a caravan and have two children. They informed me that a builder was prepared to erect a house for them, but finance was the problem. I respectfully suggested to the Treasurer that anything he could do to help these people would be greatly appreciated. I received a reply from the Treasurer in which

he set out a report from the General Manager of the Savings Bank, who said:—

For some time prior to March 31 the bank had been subject to an unprecedented demand for housing finance and inquiries received were far in excess of its ability to cope with them. A substantial waiting list was consequently established; in fact, there are approximately 1,300 inquiries which were lodged before Mr. . . . and have yet to be considered. Although not committed in any way, the bank is continuing to receive formal applications for loans from these people as funds permit.

The matter about which I was more particularly concerned was contained in the following part of the report:—

Indeed, the need to obtain a home has been so desperate that many people have seen fit to proceed with temporary finance at higher rates of interest on the understanding that the bank will consider an application for a loan in due course, provided it is still lending on mortgage at the time.

On July 7 the Treasurer wrote to me again and gave the following report from the general manager of the Savings Bank:—

In reply to your letter of July 4, 1960, and further to previous correspondence, we advise that in a case such as mentioned, viz., that these people obtain temporary finance and in fact occupy the house prior to the arrival of their turn to proceed, we can assure you that they would not be deprived of an opportunity to subsequently submit their application by virtue of this fact. However, as in all similar cases, this bank will not proceed to valuation until receipt of the formal application sought by this office by letter to the inquirer, and then subject of course to the property being deemed to be a satisfactory security. As the continuance of this bank's lending is necessarily dependent upon the movement of its depositors' balances, which affects its investible funds, no guarantee can be given in advance that the bank will ultimately approve a loan.

Even though people may obtain temporary finance at a high rate of interest and wait for, perhaps, nine to 12 months for their turn to come around, there is still no guarantee that they will be given finance. Can the Treasurer indicate when a house is considered to have been previously occupied and when it ceases to be regarded as new? The Reid Murray organization is building houses on which people are paying deposits of £1,000 or more, after which they pay between £4 and £5 a week rental while waiting for finance, not a penny of which is deducted from the principal. Would these houses be classed as existing homes or as new homes? Probably the Treasurer has a full and complete answer. Apparently these people are not entitled even to temporary finance, but must borrow from hire-purchase companies at rates of interest varying between eight per cent and 10 per cent flat.

Mr. Quirke—I think in this case it is 7 per cent flat.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—There is not much difference between seven per cent and eight per cent, although I admit there is between seven per cent and 10 per cent. I should like the Treasurer to state what comprises an existing house and how long people must wait before getting advances. The people whose case I took up with him were living with two children in a caravan and had a block of land on which they were prepared to build. However, even if they had obtained temporary finance there was no guarantee that they would receive a loan.

The Treasurer said that no money would be available for existing houses, which means that the purchase of houses in deceased estates in the inner suburban area will not be financed, yet they have amenities such as water, gas, sewers, electricity supply, telephone, postal deliveries, and garbage collection, and enjoy cheaper fire protection rates. Houses built by the Housing Trust on the outskirts have no roads for some time and the residents must put letter boxes on nearby main roads where there are footpaths.

Mr. Hall—Are you advocating decentralization?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I am trying to explain how much pioneering people must do because of the Government's decision not to provide finance for purchasing existing houses, irrespective of whether they are in the metropolitan area or country—and the honourable member supports this. The houses I am speaking about are in the metropolitan area. I have spoken often on decentralization but my views have never been received well by the Government or the honourable member. I do not know that there are any houses in the Gouger district in the same category as those I have been speaking about but if there are and if they come on the market the honourable member will find that, under the policy he is pleased to support, no money will be available from the State Bank.

Mr. Hall—You say you prefer older houses to new houses?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Sometimes you can take a horse to water and it will gladly drink; at other times you can take other animals but they will not drink, no matter how much you try. However, I am concerned about people who wish to buy existing houses that already have services provided, and which have an equity equal to that in a new house, yet they are denied finance because the houses have

been lived in. I am not satisfied that the Government is doing all it should in the interests of our community. Under the Advances for Homes legislation, particularly through the Credit Foncier Department of the State Bank, all people should be treated alike, yet the Government is able to determine this bank's conduct. That political influence is not altogether desirable.

Mr. Hall—Don't you agree with Government control of banks?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I am in the wrong House to speak about Government control of banking; the stupidity introduced in some debates by some members is equalled only by their standing in stupidity. All people should be treated equally, particularly when a substantial equity is available in the receipt of loans from the State Bank for the purchase of houses. The following is a copy of a letter I received from the managing director of the Co-operative Building Society of South Australia:—

I have noticed your remarks *re* loans on older houses and in my opinion if Government money was available for older houses it would not lead to less houses being built as those that sold old houses would build new ones and it would probably be an advantage to younger folk with large families as they could purchase older houses with more accommodation for less money than build a new house of the same size, and there are many large houses occupied by elderly people whose families have grown up and purchased homes of their own, and the larger house is a burden to the older folk. You may not be aware that the British Government is making money available to building societies to lend on houses built prior to 1919 and is giving £1 for £1 for the provision of modern conveniences such as bathroom, indoor toilets and food storage.

I commend the contents of the letter to the attention of the Government. I do not speak for any particular organization, but in this matter the letter contains much merit. The organization I have mentioned has rendered yeoman service to people in the matter of housing. It has not succeeded in all it has desired to do, but it has accomplished a great deal. The Government should heed what is said by people who have done something in housing the people. Their remarks about existing houses should be noted. In Unley Park and surrounding areas there are some fine homes but some are too large for two people. I am sure that some of the owners would be glad to sell their houses, and that would be possible if prospective purchasers could get money from the State Bank. A recent article

in the *News* under the heading "Builder hits 'Poor homes loan system'" stated:—

Lack of continuous finance for home building was increasing the cost of houses in Adelaide, the managing director of an Unley building company, Mr. Ian Wood, said today.

I do not agree with all he said, and I do not think we should adopt the policy of the War Service Homes Division, because it has a waiting period of 12 months after application for an advance has been made.

Mr. Quirke—Two types of houses are dealt with by the division.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I am speaking of new houses. For existing houses the waiting period is 18 months or longer. The point is that the division will permit the purchase of existing houses. I cannot see why the Commonwealth Government cannot arrange for the purchase of these houses through the Commonwealth Bank. Competent builders have been building houses for the Housing Trust for many years. They could probably build 3½ a week on the average. To do that they built up the necessary work force. They continued in this way for several years and then suddenly found that their means of supply had been reduced, with the result that their production was only 2 to 2½ houses a week. That meant that for the time being they had to find work outside their Housing Trust activities, which was not easy to obtain quickly, or dispense with some of the work force. If an organization had been able to build two to three houses a week action should have been taken to enable it to become a continuous process. I believe that that would have meant a reduction in the cost of a house to a purchaser. I understand that some builders have over-spent their allocation of money prior to the end of the financial year. In these days there is great competition in connection with public savings. It is fashionable for a person to join a club and make weekly payments and when £100 or £200 has been saved to consult a sharebroker or some other person about investing it. I think this practice must interfere with the operations of the Savings Bank in making advances for the purchase of houses. Some organizations seek investments by the public by offering higher rates of interest. This must assist hire-purchase companies and have an effect on the money available for the purchase of houses. In these Loan Estimates a considerable sum of money is to be spent on education. I want to deal particularly with the Forbes school. I have

had some correspondence with the Forbes school committee, which in one letter said:—

1. This committee is concerned at the low proportion of Forbes primary school children accommodated in permanent buildings. Of a total of 1,200 primary children, only approximately 400 can be housed in the permanent building.

2. Within the foreseeable future there is not likely to be a decline in the Forbes school attendance. It is considered that a start should now be made with a permanent building programme to replace existing timber-framed portable classrooms.

3. Parents who were eye witnesses of the fire on May 6 contend that the burning time of the prefabricated building is insufficient to allow safe evacuation of children in the event of a room catching fire during school hours.

4. Forbes school has had an unfortunate accommodation history, which we feel the parents and teaching staff have borne with tolerance. The school opened with half the required rooms and facilities. Each year since then has seen more temporary buildings encroaching on more recreation area, and this, too, has been accepted as an expedient of the post-war education problems.

The committee said it would be greatly appreciated if it could assure parent bodies that these views had been received, and that an early start would be made with a permanent building to house the 800 children now in portable classrooms. Earlier I mentioned 1,200 primary school children at the school, but I now exclude the infant school because it has become a permanent building. I was intrigued by a letter I received from the Education Department. It commenced by thanking me for my letter of June 7, 1960, and in part it stated:—

There are, however, so many newly-settled districts that require new schools and so many established schools that have a more urgent need for accommodation. . . .

The early history of the Forbes school reveals that, on the opening day, children were turned away and sent back to Ascot Park and other schools because the accommodation was insufficient. There were 1,200 children attending the school, but as there are more now the school is entitled to better consideration and should have permanent buildings. A more positive policy should be adopted instead of the practice of spread-eagling prefabricated buildings all over the place. Two-storey buildings should be constructed in an attempt to preserve the normal playing area. I cannot over-stress the importance of permanent school buildings, particularly at this school where 800 pupils are housed in temporary buildings occupying land that would normally be used for playing areas. I draw the attention of the

House to the fact that the Clovelly Park school, with over 1,000 pupils, is comprised entirely of portable buildings. Why should not that school have at least some permanent buildings? I hope that my pleas will not fall on deaf ears.

I recently asked questions about land that had been transferred from the South Australian Housing Trust to the Railways Commissioner. I sought information for the public and for the councils of Mitcham, Marion and Brighton. I have here another map that indicates the land transferred. The press has written about all sorts of things that this land is to be used for but the map shows that the land transferred in the Mitcham area and in the Marion area meets the South Road at points which are about two miles apart. How can that land be used to join up a railway system if the South Road is taken as the centre line? Can it be said that that is a convenient arrangement for a line intended to join the south line?

When what is known in the Mitcham and Marion areas is linked with what is known in the Brighton area that could indicate serious complications. A certain college could be involved in this matter if press reports are true. With all due respect to the Railways Commissioner and to this Government, which makes most of its policy and important matters known over the radio on Wednesday evening and in the press on Thursday morning—

Mr. Millhouse—It might be on television in future.

Mr. Hutchens—They would not all be forced to look at the telecast would they?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Everyone is not fortunate enough to have a television set. I hope that they would get some good photography. This Parliament should at least be given the information it is entitled to receive directly from the Minister—in this case the Treasurer—particularly on matters that have been raised by questions or by correspondence. Why was not my letter of June 10 acknowledged in any way? I was not able to have my evening meal on June 15 because the telephone rang incessantly after the press announcement about the Marion area but, notwithstanding that, I was unable to obtain a reply to my letter. Was I not, as the member representing the people in that district, entitled to some information on what was likely to occur? Why should I have to wait until the information was broadcast over the radio or made public over the television?

In this State, where a system of democracy should operate, information should be given to members representing the districts affected by these matters. I realize that certain members are not greatly considered when it comes to issuing invitations to go here and there but it is unfortunate that a member cannot obtain information for the people he represents. In my district there are about 29,000 people enrolled and many of them are keenly interested in what is to happen to the land that has been transferred from the Housing Trust to the Railways Commissioner. This Parliament is also entitled to know what is to become of it.

Looking at this question from another point of view, the three councils involved may decide that certain land is suitable for house building but that land may be divided by a road from land that is out of use. Raglan Street is an example of this. The council is responsible for the construction of the road, the kerb and footpaths, but almost every block on one side of that street is held by the Railways Commissioner and he pays no rates. About three people live on the other side of Raglan Street. Are they not entitled to roads and footpaths and should they not have a garbage collection? It is an important area. In other areas the Government makes money available, through the State Bank, to people wishing to build houses. For what purpose is this particular land held out of use? Is the Railways Commissioner going to use the land, or for what purpose is it being held?

I agree that the Railways Commissioner has to provide for traffic, but members are entitled to know where we are going and councils are entitled to know what they can expect and whether, having built a road, they are to be compensated for half of the cost in respect of the area held out of use by the Railways Commissioner. I do not decry the efforts of the Railways Commissioner in these matters: I am concerned merely that the people should know where they are going. I live in hopes that I may get further information.

The Loan Estimates provide £43,000 for new residences and if that money were to be used in Raglan Street, considering the cost of houses, I doubt whether more than eight or nine houses could be erected. If ten houses were built that would be a very good effort. In that street there are at present about 13 vacant blocks of land. Is that line an indication of an attempt to build houses instead of a railway? The only way I can find that out is to ask whether the Railways Commissioner is to

build homes in this section. Is the Commissioner to provide houses in Raglan Street? I am sure those houses, whether they are for purchase or rental, will not be vacant very long once they are erected. We would like to know these things, because it would assist the people I represent to learn the purpose for which this land is being reserved, and it is therefore very important from that angle.

An amount of £10,000 is provided for the Magill Reformatory. I do not know what that money is to be spent on, but I should like to know. My information is that the Public Works Committee has made investigations into the future of this institution and taken certain evidence, and that it has sought further details from the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department in order to ascertain the department's attitude on the future of Magill and the lads who may be sent there. I had hoped that we would be able to avoid the mistakes of the past, for I do not believe that Magill is the right place for those needing training to enable them to return as worthy citizens of this State. The people who work at the Magill Reformatory are most inadequately housed, and this is a deplorable state of affairs. It is too late, in my view, to offer the expenditure of £10,000 even to provide accommodation for the staff. I believe the reformatory should be transferred to an entirely different site, under different administration from what exists today. I am very concerned about this proposed expenditure of £10,000. I believe the Public Works Committee has endeavoured to solve the problem, but I make no apology for saying that it has not obtained the fullest assistance it could have obtained from the department concerned.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Which department are you referring to? We have had valuable assistance from the department.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Then what is causing the delay?

Mr. Fred Walsh—There are other aspects that possibly you don't know of.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—All I am concerned about is the proposed expenditure of £10,000. I am not damning the Children's Welfare Department, but I am concerned at the expenditure of that money until we know what we are going to do at Magill. If the £10,000 were to be spent to provide decent accommodation for the staff at Magill, I would agree that such expenditure should have been incurred long ago, but I do not think

Magill is the right institution for a reformatory.

In view of the most recent information that I have obtained concerning its policy on subcontractors, it is most deplorable that this Government should stay in office. The Government is permitting subcontractors to become insolvent as a result of their not receiving payment for the work they have done for and on behalf of contractors on Government projects. Any Government that permits that state of affairs to continue must stand condemned. A solution of this problem must be found and the Government must adopt some policy whereby these subcontractors are given equal rights with contractors.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra)—I support the first line. Every member in this House knows that we have more than £30,000,000 on these Loan Estimates and that this amount is quite insufficient to do all the work that honourable members would wish done and which, I believe, the community at large wishes to be done. We have not sufficient money, and these Estimates simply confirm that we have not sufficient money from Loan funds. Some members have spoken of inflation. I do not agree with the principle of Loan funds, because, of course, Loan funds lead to inflation.

The member for Edwardstown, who has just resumed his seat, brought before this House a question that has been raised before and which has concerned me for a number of years. He referred to the fact that the State Bank will not advance money for houses that have been lived in. However, the Savings Bank will do so, for it does not agree with the idea that all available moneys should be spent on new houses. I agree entirely with the Savings Bank's attitude. The so-called principle of advancing money for new houses hits people very hard and devalues property in country areas.

Mr. Bywaters—It does not allow for any transfers.

Mr. QUIRKE—Many splendid houses exist which, if built today, would cost many times the cost of a modern five-room house with all modern amenities, but with poorer materials used in its construction. These houses I refer to are solid brick and freestone houses that will outlast those that are being built today, yet people are refused advances by the State Bank to purchase these houses, and I say that principle is wrong. This policy hinges on the house itself, and not on what the people desire. This

type of older solid house may be owned by two elderly people who wish to get out, as many do, and spend the evening of their days somewhere in the city where transport and all other facilities are available for them. Young people may wish to buy that house, but unless they have the full purchase price they cannot do so. Very few young people have all the money necessary to buy such a house. The Savings Bank places a limit on the amount it will advance for such a transaction; it will not advance the £3,000 that one can get under certain conditions from the State Bank for a new house, but has a limit of £2,200 or thereabouts, and one has to find the difference between that amount and the purchase price. However, when it makes an advance of £2,200 it reduces the market value of the house to the people who wish to come down to the city to live. In every country town of any size in South Australia there are upwards of a dozen very good homes for sale which are unsalable to young people who desire them because they cannot raise the money, and if they go to the Savings Bank they find that the bank has finished making advances for that year or that the amount it will advance is insufficient. The policy is utterly wrong. Some of these highly desirable houses have had to be left untenanted, or let at below their rental value. I think this matter has to be looked at from the point of view of the requirements of the people, and if people wish to live in a house that is of good construction and there is a good equity in that property, that is the thing that should count. Money should be made available to them in exactly the same way as it would be for the building of a timber and asbestos house. One can get money for an asbestos and timber frame house provided it is new, but not for a solidly constructed brick and freestone house that has been lived in, even though the price is about the same. To me that just sounds silly. That beautiful, solidly constructed house, which has another lifetime's use in it, can be purchased for £3,000 if one can get the money. A person may not have the money to buy that house, but he can put up an asbestos and timber-frame house on a vacant block of land next door and get £3,000 to assist in building it. I may think differently from the powers that be, but to me that is just nonsense.

Mr. Hall—But you must admit there is a reason behind it.

Mr. QUIRKE—The reason is stupid.

Mr. Hall—You tell me why.

Mr. QUIRKE—The reason is that all the money that is available today must go into new

houses. That money goes into new houses and completely ignores the wishes of the person who wants to live in a house, and to me that is all-important. To hell with the house! The wishes of the people are what count, but we are departing further from that principle every day. Apparently it is not what the people desire, but what some bureaucrat says they shall have.

Mr. Hall—Are you speaking of the majority of the people?

Mr. QUIRKE—I am speaking for those who desire to buy these houses. I have no objection to the person who wishes to buy a new house and is prepared to have it that way, but I am speaking for the person who does not wish to buy one, but who may wish to buy his father's house, for instance.

Mr. Bywaters—Or the property in a deceased estate.

Mr. QUIRKE—Anybody's; it could be his aunt's or uncle's, or no relation at all. If a person wishes to buy such a house he cannot do so, but he can have a jerry-built structure that costs exactly the same. What sense is there in thinking along those lines? The sooner we alter that, the better. The Savings Bank recognizes that it is wrong and is prepared to make some advances, but the amount that it can advance on those houses is limited. There is another aspect of there always being a limit to the amount of this money. Advances for houses total nearly £2,000,000, but that sum does not build many houses. In other words, the amount of money available for house building is limited and, when we endeavour to force the erection of new houses, we are trying to fit so many new houses into an insufficiency of money. That is all it amounts to, and no honourable member can deny that. There is not enough money for housing, and the position is more chronic today than it was years ago.

We know perfectly well that that is all we can get on the Loan Estimates, but don't ask me to agree with the idea that whence it comes is the only source. I still uphold the principle that, if the people want houses, providing we have the materials and the skill to build and the means to build them, money should be available up to the capacity of bricks and materials. There is no earthly reason why that should not be the position. But under the present system the manufacture of materials is actually being slowed down in order to accommodate the insufficient amount of money available. Is not that true?

Mr. Hall—Does the honourable member say that some of our resources applied to other things should be diverted to houses?

Mr. QUIRKE—I am old-fashioned enough to think this way: that the greatest asset a country has is adequately housed and protected people. A country has no greater asset than that. The people are what matter. I don't care two hoots what else goes bad. If there is insufficient money to do everything, then let us give sufficient money to housing. I do not agree that, where things are absolutely vital and necessary, there should be any shortage of money. That is what we have to overcome.

Where we go wrong year in and year out is in trying to squeeze the requirements of the people, be they in respect of roads, bridges, schools or houses, into a pattern, with insufficient money. The only shortage that we have is in this thing called money.

Mr. O'Halloran—How about when we get involved in a war?

Mr. QUIRKE—All honourable members can remember that. The Leader can remember when the Governor of the Commonwealth Bank was brought before the Bar of the Senate and he absolutely rocked Parliament—one man against the Parliament of the Commonwealth! He made them look like a lot of monkeys. They had to do what he said they should do. There was no money. People were walking the streets and carrying their swags all over the country. Six years later they were the people who got into uniform and became the saviours of the country that had damned them to misery six years previously. I do not like speaking like this and going back into history but it is an illustration of the stupidity of what we are doing today. Today's policy is not one whit different from what it was in 1933. We have some half-baked economists here at the university—three of them lining up, not one, and putting their names on paper. I believe those people are paid thousands of pounds a year. I do not know why we pay them thousands of pounds a year for putting out the nonsense they do in the newspapers, that the only way to defeat inflation is to tax the people more heavily. Is not that what they said? I am not misconstruing what they said, that increased taxation is needed to defeat inflation.

Of course, that is so obviously futile and wrong. Let us try to summarize it in this way. If a man, the head of his family, earning his living week by week gets his taxation increased, maybe by only 5s. or 10s. a week, that is 5s.

or 10s. that he has not got. In this wonderful system of ours, he probably has hire-purchase commitments for two or three things, and his income when he contracts to buy those things on hire-purchase is so much. Those bright boys at the university say: "Increase his taxation to make it difficult for him to pay for those things." Very well. He finds that he is not getting sufficient money, so he makes a demand of his union or the people representing him, and they go to the courts for increased wages. They get them because he can prove that he is not getting sufficient money. He gets an increase and, with taxation at the same rate, the Commonwealth Government gets more taxation from him every time his wages are increased. Up goes the Commonwealth's revenue from taxation. The Commonwealth Government spends that taxation money in the country and creates, as it says, employment with that. That, in turn, is taxed again—is not that correct?—and there comes a further demand from the people for more money because that, in its turn, is insufficient. Yet these economists say that to defeat inflation increased taxation is necessary! What we must do is get more money, only not the present way but in another way altogether.

Mr. Nankivell—Like the printing of notes by the Germans years ago?

Mr. QUIRKE—I am glad the honourable member made that interjection because I remember when he made a speech previously he mentioned something about inflation and the printing of notes. Now, he is again referring to the printing of notes, but that idea went out with hessian socks and blade shears. Nobody talks in terms of printing an increased note issue now. We do not have to. The inflation comes from the other side. Here, I could say, "It is elementary, my dear Watson!" When these people at the university had sat back and preened themselves on their wisdom, in came Dr. Coombs from the other end to put his finger on the real source of it. He said to the trading banks, "Thou shalt not make advances!" Is not that so? "Thou shalt not make advances"—of what?—bank credit. "We will restrict you," he said. He is very much a realist and is talking in terms not of taxation but of halting what he calls inflation by stopping advances of bank credit by half a dozen different organizations in the form of the private banks. As he is master of the Reserve Bank, he says, "I order your destiny. You shall come back. You must not do this," and people comply. The real

source of inflation is the way money rockets around. I will give you one illustration—hire-purchase. The last figure available of the amount of money outstanding on hire-purchase was £417,000,000.

Mr. O'Halloran—It is £441,000,000.

Mr. QUIRKE—If it is £441,000,000, so much the better for the hire-purchase companies, but, if ever there was a jerry-built paper empire, it is that one. If the price of wool were to take a sudden downward slide, down would come that empire with it. I accept the Leader's figure of £441,000,000, but the total subscribed capital of the hire-purchase companies is only about £50,000,000. They have debenture holdings. They borrow money on debentures at seven, eight or nine per cent, but how close to £441,000,000 do their debenture holdings plus their capital approach? How much in excess of their debenture holdings and their capital is represented in that £441,000,000? And every penny of it in excess is straight-out inflation. No one can deny that. If we are talking of inflation, let us look at it there, for that is where we shall find it.

Now let us consider something else. I want to show honourable members what value there is in some of these things. Let me mention Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited—and do not think that in my remarks there is any element of criticism of the efficiency of that company and what it has done for Australia. I am not criticizing, but showing what its real worth is to many people in relation to their purchasing power in Australia, taking Australia as a unit. The net profit of that company—and these figures were published only a fortnight ago in the *News*—in round figures was £13,000,000; for taxation, provision is made for £12,000,000; for depreciation, £11,000,000; for plant replacement, £7,000,000. Using all the figures, the total is £44,054,000. Every bit of that was recovered in its income. It had to recover depreciation and plant replacement, as we know, and had to pay taxation. Its total net profit was £13,000,000, but the total involved is £44,054,000.

Do honourable members know how much in wages it paid over that period? Wages and salaries amounted to £45,500,000. In other words, it took back in every medium that it had—taxation, profit, depreciation and plant replacement—every penny that it paid in wages out of the economy of this country. Do honourable members see any reason for hire-purchase? Is not that an illustration of

why people have to mortgage their incomes for years ahead, as they are mortgaging them now? That company took back every penny of it and that meant that it was concentrated in the hands of a few people, not of all the people. I know that the B.H.P. Company makes good steel and provides incomes for many people, that the steel it makes is cheaper than the steel made in other parts of the world. It can sell it in competition with Bethlehem Steel in the United States. I have no word of criticism of its activities as a company but, when I say there is not enough money in this country in spite of inflation, there is an illustration of what I am saying. If £44,000,000 is taken back from £45,000,000 paid in wages, how on earth can the country do anything but live under the duress of violent debt? And that is what we are doing today.

The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) said, "How can we have more money for education except through taxation?" He concurred in the opinion of his Commonwealth colleague at a meeting to which I was invited but could not attend. Their opinion is that we cannot have adequate educational facilities unless we increase taxation. How many members opposite believe that to be an unalterable truth? They cannot possibly believe it, because if they do they are going to limit what can be done for education in this country. We are limiting our capacity for educating our people according to the money we can gather through taxation. Other countries are not doing that and they are beating us to a frazzle and will continue to do so.

In this world are two ideologies: the one we adhere to, and what we call democracy, which is that the State is supposed to serve the people; and the other where the people are serving the State. There is no shortage of money under the latter ideology. In those countries they get what they want. They still tax the people because it is necessary to keep the people in submission. It is a highly undesirable system and they want to enforce it throughout the world. We are paving the way for them with our attitude to education and to everything else in this country. Australia is the wealthiest country in the world. There is no country that could be so individually and collectively wealthy as Australia, and it is only because of the ridiculous obeisance we make to our financial system that prevents us taking advantage of it. This is a marvellous country with a wonderful people and a wonderful future, but it has got the brake on so hard

that the sparks of resentment are flying off the wheels. We have to look out. Wool is coming down in price and today is as cheap as it was at the outbreak of the war.

Mr. Harding—That isn't the only thing.

Mr. QUIRKE—I am using it as an illustration.

Mr. Harding—Honey is cheaper.

Mr. QUIRKE—It might be. Were it not for a £14,000,000 subsidy on dairy products that industry would be non-existent because, without it, nobody could live while producing. If it is equitable to have that subsidy on dairy products, why can't a subsidy be paid on other products to internally maintain our standard? There are two types of people in this country who cannot transfer their costs. The first is the man who works and has to buy everything from his wages. He struggles and fights to get an increase in his salary or his wages through the Arbitration Court and he no sooner gets it than up go prices in order to meet the increased cost. Everybody knows that is true. It is the proverbial dog chasing its tail! However, the primary producer cannot do that. If his wool sells overseas at 3s. a lb. he gets 3s. a lb. The overseas parity is what he has with which to purchase the high-priced products of internal secondary industry. It is catching up with him and it is catching up with every phase of primary production. Quite frankly, I do not like the trend of things. The primary producer, notwithstanding the vast industries of Australia, gives real value to this country and with the least security. We must overcome that, but we will not overcome it until we are thrown down first. We never do things so that we meet them halfway and offset the coming effects: we wait until we are thrown into the mud and then we try to pick ourselves out of it.

I claim that increased taxation as a counter to inflation is no more than legalized robbery. Income tax collection is not very old. It goes back to the time of Peel. It did exist before then, but was rubbed out. People have always been taxed in some way or other, but income taxation did not come into full operation until about 120 years ago.

Mr. Hall—A good average wage is not very old.

Mr. QUIRKE—A wage is good if it will buy what a man requires. The wages that a man gets today won't buy what he requires.

Mr. Hall—Do you say his standard of living is not higher?

Mr. QUIRKE—He has a standard of living which takes him five years at any one time to acquire.

Mr. Hall—He could never acquire it in a lifetime on wages.

Mr. QUIRKE—It takes him five years to acquire what he has in his house. The incomes of our people are not sufficient to buy the output of industry in Australia. But why shouldn't they be? Why must we have to mortgage our incomes for five years to buy the output? Members tend to support a system because to speak against it is recognized as a bad thing. One loses friends if he speaks against it! Not one member in this House has risen to defend the system, although the member for Gouger—and I will let him down lightly and mercifully—did say that he looked upon the debt of South Australia as our capital.

Mr. Hall—It does pay dividends, does it not?

Mr. QUIRKE—Wait a bit! The bunny that pays the taxation pays the dividends on his own capital to whom?

Mr. Hall—Dividends are not always measured in pounds, shillings and pence.

Mr. QUIRKE—That is what I have been arguing. I do not want them measured that way, but don't tell me that the debt of the people of Australia is their asset. Their asset is what they can put in the houses that they can build. In addition to paying their rent they have to pay interest on their capital. If it were not for the fact that I am apt to string one or two words together, the honourable member's type of argument would leave me speechless. The member for Stirling (Mr. Jenkins) is in favour of increasing the State debt if by so doing we obtain our needs.

Mr. Clark—What does that mean?

Mr. QUIRKE—I would like to ask him what he means by that. He is in favour of increasing the State debt if by going into debt we can obtain our needs. God bless my heart and soul, that is what we are doing all the time!

Mr. McKee—And making a good job of it, too.

Mr. QUIRKE—It is possibly the best job that has been done in Australia. It is difficult to find out the total amount invested in hire-purchase, although the capital investment is about £50,000,000. The Leader said there was about £440,000,000 outstanding. How much of that is sheer inflation? It simply means that the hire-purchase companies are lending

more money than has even been subscribed to them because of their daily collection of funds. That is the most inflationary medium that we have in Australia today and it is all due to the fact that there is not too much money but too little money for the man who wants to buy. Is that an answerable argument?

Mr. Nankivell—Things must be too dear.

Mr. QUIRKE—If something costs a penny and one hasn't a penny it's too darn dear! If a man wanted a feed and did not have sixpence and there was no-one with any charitable inclination the man could not buy a bun! That's what it amounts to. I think it is time this House became realistic in these matters. I am wholly concerned with the individual having the right to earn his living his way. I do not want the imposition of bureaucracy upon him. If he wants to build a house and he is a desirable citizen in every way he should be able to build his own house. At present we have the mass production of houses. Members are acquainted with it. People nowadays sit down on their haunches and say, "I cannot get a house for five years because I went to the Housing Trust and was told I can't." That is a dangerous kind of reasoning: if the Housing Trust cannot build a man a house then he cannot have a house. That is exactly what they are told in Russia and we are drifting the same way unconsciously. If we are going to get away from that totalitarian idea we have to sponsor individuality in the brains of individuals themselves. Money should be available for them to build their own houses. A State instrumentality should not take over our individuality. We have a lousy sort of economy, but we have to make it work if we are living under it. We want houses. Hundreds of millions of pounds are subscribed by people for the purchase of things that go into the houses. But what about having a national fund subscribed the same way so that individuals can borrow to build their houses on a reasonably long-term basis with the payment of interest and principal, say, at four or five per cent? It could be done. It may be said that one can over-lend, such as hire-purchase companies are over-lending. We do not get inflation by building houses. If necessary the individual could pay simple interest at five per cent over a 30-year period. It could be done and it is worth looking at. It could be backed by the Government, and not for the mass production of houses by a lending organization, but the

money could be lent to individuals. I think that plenty of money would be invested by people in such a gilt-edged security, just as people lend money to the Electricity Trust and other bodies sponsored by the Government. I want to get away from the strangle-hold that now operates on the individual and I want him to have complete freedom to live his life his own way within the law.

All the time we are taking away the freedom of the individual through the Loan Estimates and other forms of Government expenditure and making him just as big a serf as people were in the old days. Once he is enmeshed in the operations of Government organizations such as the Housing Trust and other forms of bureaucratic control, he has no escape. It is wrong and is killing the initiative of Australians, who are proud of the boast that this country was developed because of the courage and enterprise of the individual. We have retreated from that position and have become just aggregates of people subservient to and dependent upon organizations such as the Housing Trust and upon Loan funds for the building of houses. When the time is ripe for a person to build his own house he is told there is no more money left. I will never believe that this is the correct answer when a person just at the beginning of his married life is told that there is no money for building a house and that he cannot have any. Anyone who believes that such a practice is correct condemns this country to the pernicious condition at which it will eventually arrive when everyone is subservient to Government and bureaucratic organizations. Every honourable member knows that every year we are getting closer and closer to that position, and the answers one gets in regard to the development of this country can be read in Marx's *Das Kapital*; and they are not put forward by a Labor Government or any other particular form of Government. The Government will eventually get control over the people through its housing policy and through every other medium that can be found in Marx's book and I am frankly afraid of it.

Mr. Jennings—Have you read the book and do you believe and understand it?

Mr. QUIRKE—I have not read all of it because I did not think it was necessary, but there are parts which if one reads and gets to the bottom of the communistic manifesto one will understand it thoroughly. What we are doing today is what Marx suggested should be done as a means of pulling down the

capitalistic structure and gradually transferring it to the Government. Today we have two finance entities—the banking system and the hire-purchase or finance organizations with their high rates of interest from the building of houses and for many other purposes. They are not pulling on the banks for their resources but on the people, and they are becoming banks on their own account. The banks have seen what is happening and now every bank is represented in hire-purchase. The money these companies lend is inflation money and I defy anyone to disprove that, but it is all being aggregated into a few hands; and the fewer of them the easier it is to crack and destroy the people. Although these people do not know it, they are playing right into the hands of those whose sworn aim is to destroy them.

I can see the danger of that structure—the aggregation of vast masses of wealth into a few hands so that they can get high interest rates. This results in the demand for increased salaries and wages because of the increased charges they have to pay for everything. Is there any end to it and can any honourable member say when it will stop? I cannot see that equilibrium can be obtained. It will go on until it reaches saturation point and falls with a crash, because there are no securities in these finance companies for the person lending money. If the crash comes he will have lost his money. Companies may say that they have £2,500,000 or perhaps £5,000,000 subscribed capital and that their assets are worth £80,000,000. Their assets comprise such things as 3-year-old washing machines, refrigerators, radiators, fish hooks and other things that they make and sell. They have not real assets in the form of vast areas of land, but only a paper empire; and the conflagration that will start will consume that empire in a week, and I am afraid of that. It can start through the attitude of people to the primary producer. Primary production is still the real wealth of this country and not such organizations as the Broken Hill Proprietary Company and other people who take back in charges as much as they pay in wages.

One can go to the north of Adelaide and buy a house from a certain organization and I understand can even get a second mortgage, on which seven per cent flat is charged. What that person will eventually have to pay for the house can hardly be imagined. Even under the ordinary State Bank rates for a house over a 30-year term one pays about £1,000 more than double the initial cost, so I do not know what the cost of these other houses will eventually be. That is not right. People should not be

muleted in this way when buying a house. I have to support the first line of the Estimates because I am not game to say that I do not support it; and there is no virtue in saying that I support it, but I do not support the principle behind the Estimates. I support the first line because like every other beggar in the universe it is all we have and can have and it is completely insufficient. It is a beggarly, miserly pittance of what is necessary for the development of South Australia, and it is a reflection on the sanity of the people who keep this thing going, and a reflection on our intelligence.

We should rise in our wrath and throw it back in the teeth of those responsible. Why don't the Premiers at the Loan Council meetings pick up their papers and say to the Prime Minister and the Federal Treasurer (Mr. Holt), "You can keep it and we will go away without your money, and the blood is then on your hands," and thus place the blame on them? We have no other source of money and we should say, "What we cannot build in South Australia is your responsibility." Every time the Premiers go to a Loan Council meeting they have a dog-fight. The States are told that they have no right to raise their own revenue and "This is all you will get and no more. If you ask for another £10,000,000 we will give you only £2,000,000." Why not throw the whole responsibility back on them?

Mr. Loveday—But that would be unorthodox.

Mr. QUIRKE—That is what I am preaching. We are not going to develop this country that way. As regards loans, nowhere can a person with a small farm get a long-term loan for say £2,000, £4,000 or £5,000 in order to set his boy up. However, if a man wishes to develop 5,000 acres in the South-East and wants a big plant, he can go to the Development Bank and I understand it will lend for genuine development purposes on properties. Some of these properties are already fully developed and the owners do not want to over-capitalize them; but if a person with a small property wants to transfer it to a son he cannot get any money for that purpose. These men with small properties are the backbone of agriculture and if they are destroyed inevitably this will result in the white-anting of the domestic structure of the country.

There is nothing like the real wealth produced from the soil such as wheat, wool, dried fruits, dairy produce and so on to sustain a nation, and the sustenance of a nation is what it eats, drinks and wears in order to make life something worth living. This involves having

a house to live in, a fire to sit by and a cupboard for the cat in order that one many enjoy the domestic side of life. The means of sustenance of that family is the thing of most importance and the thing that is of the least importance is this fictitious imposition on the country—the financial structure—when people pay large sums for the spurious doctrine known as economics. That only makes things better by making the cost to the people greater and by taxing them out of inflation. Do members believe in that principle? I do not, and year after year I feel in duty bound to expound my ideas. My ideas may be wrong according to members, but let someone get up and contradict them or give a better idea, or let him support word for word and clause by clause the existing conditions that have brought us into our present position! Let someone get up and defend our financial system or the fact that we are thousands of millions of pounds in debt!

Mr. Hall—What would you do to them?

Mr. QUIRKE—I would feel in duty bound to tell them in the Budget debate where they were wrong. Could anyone defend the system? Could the honourable member who classes himself as one of the shareholders defend it? If money is borrowed from people and then released, as it is in these Estimates, it is inflationary, because, when people give money, they obtain negotiable scrip in return; they do nothing but transfer it from one place to another and get negotiable scrip. The scrip can be sold at a discount at any time. It is similar to deposits in the bank: when banks lend money on overdraft they do not peg any deposits—the deposits are still there. When they lend money, it is new money. Every pound given in overdraft is an increase in the money available in the country at any one time. The bank does not peg anyone's deposits. When the Savings Bank lends £1,000,000 to the Commonwealth—and I hate it for doing it—every penny is inflationary, as the deposits are still there. The Savings Bank has lent between £50,000,000 and £60,000,000 to the Commonwealth. Yet it still has it, as every depositor is entitled to withdraw, so the £50,000,000 or £60,000,000 must be inflationary.

The same applies to overdrafts granted by banks. As I have said time and time again, every loan creates a deposit and every repayment of a loan destroys a deposit. It is as simple as that; there is no magic or mystery about it. If I obtained an overdraft for £1,000, gave it to the member for Enfield, and he put it in the bank, I would have a debit against me of £1,000

and he would have £1,000 worth of deposits. That would be entirely new money. We are doing exactly the same with these Estimates and with every other form of borrowed money. It is all inflationary. What is the difference between doing it that way and putting it in as costless money—which can be done.

Mr. Nankivell—Where are you getting the money? It is necessary to tax to get it. You are creating credit.

Mr. QUIRKE—Exactly. What is a Treasury bill? It is a direct creation of credit and, if the income of a Government falls below what it wants to spend, it issues a Treasury bill for what it wants. That Treasury bill is the money you do not know exists but, provided that it is backed by the Commonwealth Bank, it is as good as the 2s. you might have in your pocket. Only last year the United States Treasurer said that if he found himself short and got £100,000,000 from the bank he could draw on it. He asked, "What do I draw on? Is it money they have hoarded up?" His reply to this is "No, it is £100,000,000 in new money and they hope to cancel it out when I pay it back." Cancellation of money is in the consumption, and overdrafts are cancelled out by the repayment. Someone has consumed something and brought back the money to pay it off. The price of production is consumption.

Mr. Loveday—That is all that is for, too.

Mr. QUIRKE—Absolutely. It is to consume something, but people cannot get away from the idea that money is a tangible thing or that there are piles of it somewhere. In actual fact, however, the only tangible money is about £400,000,000 in the pockets of people, or perhaps in old socks and tobacco tins. The thousands of millions of other money is only figures in books. When the Savings Bank transfers £1,000,000 to the Commonwealth, it gives the Commonwealth the right to use that sum that is supposed to be lent by the Savings Bank. What is "lending"? A transfer of figures and, in the case of the Savings Bank, nothing is lent because the deposits still remain there. It is completely farcical, but that is how it is. If the honourable member who interjected makes a cursory examination by the time we come to discuss the Budget he will have some idea about these things and will not be thinking in terms of notes and coins, which are only the pocket money of the people in any case.

I reiterate that it is the right of the individual, as a father of his family, to bring up his family in a house he owns. The primary producer should not be thrust aside by having to pay the inflated cost of secondary industry products when his own prices are falling. If the family are in their own home and in their own jobs, with food and clothing and security, there is nothing wrong with the country, but everything is wrong while we have this incubus and everyone has to be a mendicant. With these reservations I support the Estimates.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray)—I have listened with a great deal of interest to the member for Burra who, whenever he speaks on the Estimates, puts forward a sound case for the policy he enunciates. We are always most interested in what he has to say along these lines. I do not profess to be an economist, but I am always pleased to hear him when in such good form as he was this afternoon, and I am always thankful for the education he imparts. Although members may not agree with what he says, I am sure they realize that he puts a great deal of time and thought into the matter. I congratulate him on his speech.

I now wish to refer to matters affecting my electorate. The first, adult education, applies also to most country centres. These Estimates provide for a new domestic science block to be built at the Murray Bridge high school, and at last the member for Gawler looks like getting an adult education centre at Gawler.

Mr. Clark—There was a nice piece on the Estimates for it last year.

Mr. BYWATERS—Then I hope the honourable member is successful this year. Other places are anxious to have improved facilities for adult education. Since the introduction of adult education, apart from the technical education we knew prior to the changeover, we have seen an improvement for the benefit of people in their leisure hours. I think we all agree that the Superintendent of Technical Schools, who is in charge of adult education, and his staff have done a good deal to keep pace with adult education requirements. We are all aware that with the increasing leisure available through the shorter working week there is a need for more adult education, be it technical, cultural or artistic. For instance, in many country areas the part-time registrar, who was usually a business man or school teacher, has been replaced by a full-time principal; I believe there are now three or four full-time officers. We have noticed a

big increase in enrolments and in the interest shown in adult education because of this change. In the centre at Murray Bridge, with which I am associated as chairman, enrolments have increased from 300 to between 1,300 and 1,400. As a result, a full-time principal has been warranted. However, he is in some difficulty—and I know he is not alone in this—in not being able to devote his full time to seeing people who come along to the centre because of necessity he has to go out organizing. He has to curtail his organizing work because he has to spend some time at the centre. I have been told that people have not been able to contact him because he has been away from the town: he cannot be in two places at once. We have asked the department for a clerical assistant and when a full-time assistant is appointed it will be a great help. In the past there has been the system of this year's fees being credited to the centre for the following year. This is apart from the grant. At Murray Bridge we are experiencing insufficient funds from the grant, and this year we have had to curtail commencing other classes. We have requested a further grant in order to keep up with the work that we have in hand for this year. I think the Gawler centre has a greater enrolment than Murray Bridge because it has had a full-time principal longer than Murray Bridge. That is why the Gawler grant is greater. When Murray Bridge becomes more stabilized no doubt our financial circumstances will change, but at present there is financial difficulty. There is a big field for adult education expansion as people are becoming more and more conscious of its benefits. There are needs for more domestic science, woodwork and art classes. It is something of pride for a district to have an adult education centre where people past the school-going age can get further education. Murray Bridge would like to have a better building on its land. At present it has only an old Loveday hut, which is not suitable.

A small water scheme for the hundreds of Burdett, Ettrick and Seymour was approved by the Public Works Committee and brought before Parliament. It was expected that the work would commence but it was shelved pending a recommendation in connection with the Taillem Bend-Keith water scheme. I told the Minister that it is a divided scheme and that one part of the first scheme runs within two miles of Murray Bridge, and that therefore it would be useless to include that part in the Taillem Bend-Keith scheme, and work has

started there. Now that the Taillem Bend-Keith scheme has been planned it means that the other part of the Burdett, Ettrick and Seymour scheme will not get water. I have asked the Minister to move quickly in providing water to the people in that other part, but I understand that the matter is not included in this year's Loan Estimates. Four years have elapsed since the Burdett, Ettrick, Seymour scheme was suggested and, although the people for whom I am speaking were willing to wait until the finalization of the Taillem Bend-Keith scheme, in view of the position I think steps should be taken to provide them with water as soon as possible.

It is proposed to have a permanent building in the metropolitan area for the Electricity Trust. A suitable building would give the trust some prestige. However, some of its country branches are well below standard. A large area is available at Murray Bridge. Recently the trust consolidated its activities in the Murray Bridge area and it is now located just outside the town proper. Prior to this the trust was housed in the town. Some of its officers are housed in small huts, but the houses are cold in the winter and hot in the summer. Better facilities and amenities should be provided for the staff permanently employed by the trust at Murray Bridge. Although a new building in the metropolitan area is warranted, the trust should not overlook its needs at Murray Bridge and other places where the amenities and facilities are not as they should be.

This morning I received a letter from the Clerk of this House intimating that Mr. Slade of the Public Buildings Department has made a progressive step in advising members of Parliament that a Mr. Burns will be available to help them with their problems. This is long overdue and I commend Mr. Slade for the move. Frequently members approach the department about a work in their district and they have difficulty in finding the right man. The position should now be much better.

I now want to refer to a matter that has perturbed me greatly over the last few weeks. It refers to a visit I made to the Heathfield recreation area. Statements made in this House and outside during the last two weeks have caused me much worry. I want to tell my side of the story in order to get the record straight. I have been accused of trespassing in the territory of another member of this place. That statement was made in this House and it has been conveyed to me by people outside. In this place last week Mr. Shannon

said that a Mr. Evans had contacted various members by telephone. He may have done that but he did not contact me. He approached Mr. Simpson of the National Fitness Council and then Mr. Simpson contacted me.

In the initial stages Mr. Simpson did not mention anything about going to the Heathfield recreation area. We had in mind a visit to other places in connection with camps. The Speaker and I represent this place on the National Fitness Council, and I have been appointed chairman of the camps committee. We have visited several areas in connection with camps and hostels. Prior to this we had arranged for a visit to a camp at Christies Beach and another area in the National Park at Belair. Mr. Lyon, secretary of the National Park Trust, told us that he had an area that he thought was suitable for a camp. We were naturally interested and we intended to make a visit there. It was fixed for August 9, and Mr. Simpson, Miss Black and I were to make the visit. I was to be picked up at the Adelaide railway station and we were to go to Christies Beach and then to Belair. Just prior to this Mr. Simpson telephoned me about the concern of the committee at Heathfield and on the Friday he rang suggesting that I get off the train at Mount Lofty and in order to save time, pay a visit to Heathfield and then go to Belair and Christies Beach.

I have no intention of buying into a dog fight between Mr. Shannon and any committee at Heathfield. Neither I nor the National Fitness Council is interested in that matter: we were interested only in an area of land being encroached upon unnecessarily, and consequently we had a look at the area. We were met by six people including Councillor Jenkins and a Mr. Evans. I do not know whether it was B. S. Evans. Another was the clerk of the Stirling District Council. This gentleman pointed out that he was new to the district and was present more as an observer. He was not so well acquainted with the position as some of the other persons present. We were told of certain things that they desired and their requests did not appear unreasonable to our lay minds. They suggested that, if the proposed site could be shifted slightly to the east, it would give a little more space for vehicles for parking purposes and they pointed out on the plan that the proposal would encroach upon the toilets that had been built at a cost of £350. It was also stated that if the site were shifted a little there would not be much difference in the natural fall of the land. All the

land was heavily timbered and we, as lay men, thought the request was reasonable. Nothing definite was mentioned or decided upon during the visit. I asked if they had approached the Public Works Committee and we were told that they had. We were also told that, in approaching the Public Works Committee, they had asked it to visit the area but that the request was refused. I doubted the statement but thought that I would be able to find out if it were correct.

After we left the gentlemen we went on to the two other areas, saw Mr. Lyon, and were impressed by the potential for a future camp at Belair. That area has possibilities. We then went on to Parnanga. The Christies Beach area is creating some concern because the lease will expire soon and there is a need for a future camp to replace the existing camp. After we had concluded our visit to the areas I returned to the House at about 12.30 p.m., so members can see that we did not waste too much time during the morning's excursion. During the trip Mr. Simpson, Miss Black and I discussed the Heathfield matter and wondered if something could be done at that late hour to preserve that area for recreational purposes because recreational areas are our concern and I know how you, Mr. Acting Chairman, and other members of the House think about this matter.

I suggested that I should ask one or two questions of the member for Onkaparinga, who is also Chairman of the Public Works Committee. The honourable member represents the electorate concerned and it was assumed that he would be *au fait* with the question that had been put to us. If we had intended doing anything behind the honourable member's back—I see he has now left the Chamber and apparently does not wish to hear what I have to say—we could have gone about it in some other way.

I thought that the honourable member would be the right man to answer a question if I asked it and I asked the question only as a member of the National Fitness Council. I was rather rebuffed and surprised at the answer I received from the nonhonourable member and I was a little hurt at his attitude. In view of what happened I thought the best thing I could do was to explain the position and I did that by way of a personal explanation. I thought that, having done that, at least the honourable member and other members would know that I had not acted in a way unbecoming to a member of this House but, apparently, that was not accepted because I learned from several sources

that I had gone to the honourable member's district alone and of my own volition and had, in effect, told lies in the House that afternoon. I wish to make my position perfectly clear.

I spoke to Mr. Simpson about this matter and it was placed on the agenda for the following Thursday. After a discussion, during which I asked the chairman of the National Fitness Council that I be excluded from the debate—this statement may be checked because there were three direct members of the Education Department present on that occasion and they will bear me out, and other members of the council would also do that—it was decided that a letter be sent to the Minister of Education because it was thought that the Minister was a fair-minded man and that he would put the matter back in its true perspective. Apparently this was not done. May I say at this stage, Mr. Acting Chairman, how pleased I have been at the remarks you made about recreational areas and the indication you have given of a genuine desire to further the future development of this State in an orderly manner. I know that you have a genuine desire to preserve land which may not in the future be available because people have bought it for building blocks.

On Thursday last the member for Unley asked a question about this matter because he was concerned about the density of the population in his electorate with a corresponding lack of recreational areas. These things are causing concern and the Minister of Education has expressed concern on similar matters. I wish to refer to a speech the Minister made at a businessmen's luncheon held at the Y.M.C.A. building on Tuesday, August 2, 1960, at 1 p.m. When concluding his remarks he said:—

The president (Sir Mark Mitchell), the secretary (Mr. Albert Simpson) and members of the National Fitness Council have rendered a signal service to the community by having undertaken an authentic and impartial survey of the total number of acres of recreation space in the metropolitan area and by frequently calling public attention to the established fact that this total acreage is much below actual and potential needs. They can quote expert opinions from many countries of the world to support their contention that "the world of tomorrow, with its increased leisure and its promise that a much higher proportion of the family budget can be allocated to various forms of recreation, presses upon us, demanding that we plan cities in which far more space is provided for leisure activities than is reserved in the cities of today." In the past no city has been known to have acquired too much land. Nearly all stand condemned for having acquired too little. Rather than deprive a neighbourhood

of even the possibility of some day having a recreation park, land could be acquired, by gift or purchase, and held in an undeveloped state until funds are available for its development.

The Minister referred to "members of the National Fitness Council", of which I am a member, so he was naturally referring to me. His statement is very true and the National Fitness Council has shown a marked desire to reserve land for recreation. It has a committee that has gone into the whole problem and gained expert advice from other States and from overseas and the committee has compiled a statement suggesting how much land should be held for recreational areas.

The Speaker and I introduced a deputation to the Treasurer on one occasion and the deputation expressed concern at the need for more recreational areas. The National Fitness Council has not spared itself in its desire to see that every possible opportunity is taken while land is available because once other people have purchased the land it is lost for all time; and the council's concern is evidenced by the visit to Heathfield to see if some of the proposed buildings could be shifted a little so that they would not encroach on the public recreation area already allocated. It is because I believe the council desires action to be taken at this stage that I have enjoyed my association with it.

Mr. O'Halloran—And you have done a good job on the council.

Mr. BYWATERS—I have endeavoured to do the best I can. I have had a good deal of experience of camping. Recently members of the council went to Bowmans Estate near Crystal Brook. That estate involves the electorates of both the members for Rocky River and Stuart. We also went to Christies Beach to examine the area there and I have been around all the hostels and other camps. The council was successful in having the Lands Department grant it a Beachport home so that people in that area could have recreation and camping facilities. The council has also approached the Lands Department for the old Kyeema Prison Farm in an endeavour to reserve that area for recreation purposes and to provide camping facilities. I have been associated with all those things and have enjoyed the association of my colleague the Speaker (Mr. Teusner) in our endeavours to do something for the council. I have enjoyed the opportunity of meeting with the members of the council and the friendship that has been built up over that time. All in all the National Fitness Council, I believe, has, as the Minister

said, "rendered a signal service to the community" by trying to help the youth of today and the youth of tomorrow. Because of that I have been happy to be associated with the National Fitness Council and I was surprised and very disappointed to hear the member for Onkaparinga last Thursday again attack me on this issue.

After the debate was over I walked across to the honourable member to have a quiet word with him and to ask if he had heard what the National Fitness Council had done and whether the Minister had received a reply from it explaining what had transpired. The member for Onkaparinga rather rebuffed me on this occasion and was quite loud in his statements, so much so that the Speaker had to call him to order. I was quite embarrassed by his outburst and I want to make quite sure the records are clear that those things did transpire. They can be checked and proved. What hurt me most was that the Minister of Education, to whom I am responsible as a member of the National Fitness Council, did not attack the member for Onkaparinga for his statements for I believed that the Minister, as a fair-minded man, would have rectified the position, would have told the member for Onkaparinga what had happened, and would at least have cleared my name. I was hurt when the Minister failed to do that.

I feel that, because of this, as a member of the Council responsible to the Minister of Education I should not go on with the work I have enjoyed on the National Fitness Council in the past, and tomorrow at Caucus I shall resign from the council.

Mr. Jennings—I think the House should ask the honourable member to reconsider that decision.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—I am sure the announcement we have just heard came as a surprise and a shock to all of us and I am expressing the wishes of many honourable members of the House when I say that we hope the member for Murray will not take the action he has said he will. I am sure he has the confidence of the council and members of the House and on reflection I think he will consider that he is too big in stature and calibre to be hurt by the little pin-pricking he has had from the member for Onkaparinga. I do not think he should adopt that view and I do not think that any member should take the member for Onkaparinga seriously. That member mentioned my name in fun last week when he addressed himself to this very debate and

again later, but I do not propose to take him too seriously. I merely remind him of some of the things that he said in that debate to show just how they have worked out in actual practice.

The Treasurer presented us with the Estimates of expenditure on Loan works in South Australia for the ensuing year and gave an explanation of details of that expenditure. We admit the explanation has been sketchy in parts, but nevertheless it represents an estimate of the cost of the works proposed to be undertaken with the money made available for Loan works, and therefore constitutes a works programme for the State in the year that lies ahead. To that extent it is of intense interest to every member of this House, because in many respects it is the first intimation that we have of the actual programme that the Government has in store.

I have examined the programme as far as I am able to do so with the information available, and I agree that most if not all of the work proposed is not only desirable but necessary. Perhaps the chief criticism of the proposals could be that many of them are long overdue, as, for instance, the work proposed at the Port Pirie harbour. There has been a great lapse of time since this was asked for. Long before that part of Port Pirie was brought into the district of Stuart some six years or more ago, it was agreed that the rehabilitation of these wharves was urgent. The delay in referring the matter to the Public Works Standing Committee in the first place and the subsequent protracted inquiries of that committee have in the past caused anxiety and frustration; but the start on the £1,500,000 wharf plan that has now been made is promising and gives new hope to that part of the State.

I believe that, when these wharves are completed and a first-class deep sea port has been established, shipping will be busier than ever in Pirie, and Pirie can look confidently to the future because it will be a centre of real shipping communication and of service to a very large area of South Australia. It will be second in importance in the State only to Port Adelaide. Pirie can look forward to a very bright future. The possibility of the manufacture of coke at that centre, as mentioned in the Public Works Standing Committee's report, and the standardization of the line to Broken Hill will build up a trading centre equal to anything outside of Adelaide.

I am pleased that money is to be made available for a continuation of the survey of

the proposed standard gauge line from Pirie to Broken Hill. The report that there is every prospect of an early agreement following a meeting of railway chiefs and Ministers at Port Augusta is reassuring. We hope there will be no V2's or anything of a similar nature to upset what ought to be an amicable agreement. I urge, though, that the standardization proposals include a standard gauge line from Pirie to Adelaide if this State is to reap the full advantage that could accrue. When a standard gauge line is constructed from Pirie to Broken Hill, as it must be, there will be renewed interest in the construction of a standard gauge line from Port Augusta to Whyalla, and that would give Whyalla a direct rail link with the eastern States without a break of gauge. It would be wrong and unthinkable to have Whyalla connected with Sydney, Brisbane, Newcastle and Port Kembla on a standard gauge railway and a break of gauge between Whyalla and Adelaide. In those circumstances, I suggest that Adelaide manufacturers could lose a very valuable market. Also, it will be necessary for the Adelaide merchants and manufacturers to have direct rail access to the eastern States markets. The best and easiest way to accomplish that without a break of gauge would be to standardize the line from Adelaide to Pirie, and then through to Broken Hill. If the line between Adelaide and Port Pirie is not standardized as part of the standardization scheme, this State will miss out very seriously indeed.

With the standardization of the line between Albury and Melbourne, Sydney manufacturers will be able to send their goods to Queensland and Victoria without a break of gauge. Victorian manufacturers will be able to send their goods to New South Wales, Queensland and South Australia, as well as throughout their own State, without a break of gauge; but South Australian manufacturers will be faced with the difficulty of breaks of gauge in almost every direction in which they want to send their products. There has been no mention in reports emanating from these conferences between the Treasurer and the Commonwealth Ministers, and no indication in the explanation given in the speech introducing these Loan Estimates, of any proposal to connect that system with Adelaide on the standard gauge. That is why I draw attention to the need for this work to be done concurrently with the other work.

I am naturally pleased that provision is being made for a continuation of the work at the Sir Thomas Playford power station. It is gratifying to know that that is located in

the district of Stuart, although we have no illusions about why it is there. It is there not for the benefit of Stuart but because Providence has put deep water there, the nearest deep water to the Leigh Creek coal-field, and power is required for the district of Chaffey, in which the Government seems now to have a very special interest. So the power station is as much for Chaffey and Gouger as it is for Stuart. However, it does give employment in the best district in the State, and we are pleased to note that the money is forthcoming for that work to be continued and, in time, completed.

Mr. King—How many people are employed there?

Mr. RICHES—Between 400 and 600. We also notice that provision is being made for the construction of a new transmission line between Port Augusta power station and Leigh Creek. That will provide employment at a time when employment will be needed because, as the power house itself is reaching a stage of completion, there will of necessity be a changeover in employment there.

I notice that £150,000 has been provided for the construction of a pipeline from Lincoln Gap to Iron Knob. That also gives us much pleasure. It is in marked contrast, though, to the provision for the work at the Port Pirie harbour. That is one case where the Government recognized an urgent need for something to be done if shipping was to be retained, that there was a danger of an alteration of policy in which ore might not have continued to go to Pirie. That was stated in this House and urged very strongly. It took six years for that to be finally planned, referred to the Public Works Standing Committee and satisfactorily reported upon but, when the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited wants something at Whyalla, a pipeline involving an expenditure of £150,000 can be inquired into within a few weeks, planned, reported on, and the money voted in these Loan Estimates. We should like to see that expedition in other parts of the State, associated with other public works.

I mention that for another reason. I happen to be a member of the Eyre Peninsula Local Government Conference. At the last conference, which is representative of all the local governing bodies on Eyre Peninsula, a resolution was carried urging the Government to see that, when this pipeline was constructed from Lincoln Gap to Iron Knob, it should be of a sufficient capacity to enable

a further connection to be made with Kimba in the future should that be warranted. A special committee was set up to present evidence before the Public Works Standing Committee on this subject. I was appointed a member of that committee. So far as I know, that committee has not had an opportunity of presenting evidence before the Public Works Standing Committee.

Mr. Bockelberg—It will be in Whyalla shortly.

Mr. RICHES—In that case, the Public Works Standing Committee has already inquired into this matter. It has already recommended the pipeline and we are asked to vote for the £150,000 on these Estimates. The Treasurer has been very sketchy in his information. Whether this is only a provisional amount before the Public Works Standing Committee has finalized its report I am not sure. I understand there is an interim report from the Public Works Standing Committee.

Mr. Bockelberg—I understand it has to go over it again.

Mr. RICHES—Work on the construction is being started now and I consider that an urgent matter that should be given full consideration when that pipeline is put down. We have had experience of the pipeline now existing, of towns needing water supply comparatively close to the pipeline being unable to get a connection because the capacity of the pipeline is not large enough. I am glad to have these assurances from the member for Eyre that the decision has not been finally made as to the size of the pipeline, and that representation from Eyre Peninsula will be given full consideration.

We are glad, also, to notice on the Estimates a continued general expenditure on schools, police stations and other items that have been put together as group expenditure. I notice a line of £5,000 for the Port Augusta hospital. Some years ago plans were drawn up for a new hospital at Port Augusta, a five-storey building, in order adequately to cater for the needs of the town and the district that it served. As a public hospital, it serves the whole of the north, from Port Augusta to the Western Australian border and up to the Northern Territory border.

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

Mr. RICHES—Before dinner I was referring to the line on the Estimates providing £5,000 for the Port Augusta hospital.

The CHAIRMAN—Order! The honourable member for Enfield has a cigarette in his mouth.

Mr. JENNINGS—What will I do with it?

The CHAIRMAN—I would apologize; that would be the first thing I would do.

Mr. JENNINGS—I humbly apologize, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN—The honourable member for Stuart!

Mr. RICHES—Before the House adjourned I was referring to the line on the Estimates providing £5,000 for the Port Augusta hospital, and expressing the hope of the board of management of that institution and, I believe, the people of the district that progress might be made on the plans for completely rebuilding the hospital. This important hospital, which serves a large part of South Australia, extending to the Northern Territory and the Western Australian boundary, has a history of service of which the area is proud. We know that the building at present makes work very difficult and that it is inadequate to cater for the needs of the district. I think that is recognized by the department, for plans have been drawn for the erection of a five storey building.

Those plans have been submitted to the board and to the doctors and matron two or three times, and although they have existed three years or more we are not hearing very much about their progress or whether the stage has been reached when that undertaking can be referred to the Public Works Committee for investigation and report. We know that heavy calls are being made on the public purse for hospitalization in other districts, but we hope that the progress envisaged for other parts of the State will not interfere with the programme of plans for Port Augusta and that this year those plans will be referred to the Public Works Committee.

When the development at Whyalla got under way it was generally expected that there would be some beneficial reaction in places adjoining Whyalla. However, the only benefit we can see at Port Augusta as yet is the necessity to rebuild the gaol! I believe that plans have been drawn for a complete reconstruction there, catering for some 60 inmates of both sexes, and I had hoped to see some line on these Estimates in relation to that undertaking. Probably the planning has not reached the stage where it can yet be referred to the Public Works Committee, and that may explain why there is no line this year for that work.

Mr. Quirke—Is that decentralization of industry?

Mr. RICHES—It is the nearest approach to any industry coming our way at present. There is a need for rebuilding there, and that need has been present for some time. Too many escapes have been made, for one thing; that is acknowledged by the department and by the Government, and we had hoped to see some provision on the Estimates this year for that work to be put in hand. I understand the work is to cost more than £100,000, and therefore it must be referred to the Public Works Committee. However, the plans have not reached that stage, and that could account for the fact that the line does not appear.

As I mentioned in relation to the pipeline from Lincoln Gap to Iron Knob, lines may appear on the Estimates without a prior recommendation from the Public Works Committee. I know there is an interim report on that matter. I think the chairman of the committee was out of the Chamber this afternoon when I referred to this matter, but I understand from information I received that the recommendation was to be altered, that another investigation was to take place, and that the pipeline was to be larger than the one recommended. Perhaps the chairman can say whether or not that is a fact.

Mr. Shannon—I don't know; the committee has not heard anything more about the Lincoln Gap to Iron Knob pipeline. The only thing it has been instructed about is the duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline; that has to be enlarged.

Mr. RICHES—Perhaps the information given this afternoon was off the beam, but the honourable member was quoted to me as the authority.

Mr. Shannon—I would not know whether the information you have been given is right or wrong.

Mr. RICHES—In any event, I reiterate what I tried to say this afternoon, namely, that an interim report has been tabled in this House by the Public Works Committee on the construction of the line between Lincoln Gap and Iron Knob, and as far as I know no evidence has been taken in relation to the requirements of Kimba, although residents of that area have requested an appearance before the committee in order to present the claim that the pipeline between Lincoln Gap and Iron Knob should be of such a capacity as to make possible a future extension to Kimba.

Mr. Shannon—The honourable member is assuming that that is the department's planning for Kimba, but it may be entirely different.

Mr. RICHES—I am not assuming that the department is planning to connect Kimba with the pipeline at all: I am assuming that it is not, and I fear that it is not. The people of Kimba hope that that connection will be made, and they expressed that hope at a conference of Eyre Peninsula local councils that I attended. At that conference a committee was set up to present a case. I am a member of the committee, and I know that the department does not favour the suggestion of taking a pipeline of any size from Iron Knob to Kimba at this juncture. I have lived a good many years in the north and, as one of those who have depended upon catchment water supplies in dry areas for far too long, I believe that communities cannot be expected to develop if they have to depend upon catchment supplies, because such a supply is not good enough. I am surprised that the line is on the Estimates and that an interim report has been tabled in this House, when all the time the people concerned have been led to believe that, before the size and extent of this particular pipeline would be decided upon, evidence would be taken on the need to make it of sufficient capacity to be capable of extension later on. Much confusion seems to exist as to the actual situation.

Another line on the Estimates provides £8,000 for the erection of a waterworks office at Port Augusta. This has been requested for some time, but we had hoped that, in addition to the waterworks office, provision would have been made for the Department of Agriculture and other Government departments, and that a building worthy of the town might have been erected on the site of the existing waterworks office in the centre of the town. No details of this expenditure have been given, and whether that is the first vote for a building which would be in keeping with the situation in the town or whether it represents the total estimated cost of a small building to house the waterworks office and the Department of Agriculture we are not told. I express hope that it is merely the first vote for the expenditure envisaged for this year only, and that it will form part of a major scheme.

When the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) was addressing himself to this debate he spoke at some length on the move by the parent-teacher council to solicit support

for its approach regarding Commonwealth aid for schools. I was most interested to hear the comments of the member for Mitcham on the general subject of education, because it took my mind back to other speeches made in similar vein a decade or so ago. I thought that by now we had progressed beyond the school of thought which holds that it is beyond the resources of the State to give the future generation the education that the public and the department feel is necessary if this State is to make the progress of which we believe it is capable, but the view that education is too expensive still seems to be held by the member for Mitcham. He referred to the moves being made by the parent-teacher council, and his attitude seemed to be summed up in this sentence from his speech:—

I suggest in all sincerity and without wanting in any way to give offence to anyone that it is quite irresponsible to go through the community and say that we need more money for education unless we are prepared to tell people where the money is to come from: the only place it can come from is our own pockets.

The parents and teachers have for many years been told that the States cannot make adequate provision out of moneys made available to them, and since the Commonwealth is the taxing authority that determines State allocations from the taxes collected, surely the logical approach is to the Commonwealth if the people, in their judgment, require more money for education. This request has been made to State Governments, not only here but in other States, and in each case the answer has been the same—they have been referred to the Commonwealth authorities. I think the parent-teacher council is sufficiently wide awake to know that when it approaches the taxing authority for more money for education the money will be collected one way or another, either directly or indirectly by taxation, and that they are the ones that will have to provide it. I think it is reasonable to approach the taxing authority with this request. I believe that additional money is necessary for education and that the Commonwealth Government, which handles taxation, should provide it.

Mr. Millhouse—Will you suggest where the Commonwealth Government will get the money?

Mr. RICHES—I was told early in my career never to give reasons because they could be the wrong ones. I know that if I suggested one avenue the member for Mitcham and others would argue against it because it might not suit them. That question has never been raised on any other matter of major importance that has

been suggested by the populace. I can think of many undertakings that have come to South Australia and no-one has ever questioned where the money came from. If we are sufficiently concerned about education we will see to it that the money is provided. The member himself admitted that it was a matter of priorities; and I believe that education is of first priority.

Mr. Millhouse—Do you think the money could come out of the Defence vote, as so many people suggest?

Mr. RICHES—I am not in a position, nor is the honourable member, to say whether the Defence vote could be cut.

Mr. O'Halloran—It has not been wisely spent in recent years.

Mr. RICHES—I see some of the defence works and have my own opinion, but I will not pose as an expert on defence matters. As long as I have been a member there has never been sufficient money to carry out the Education Department's policy and members have never been told to what extent the department has been denied the money it has sought. The department draws up estimates of its requirements for the forthcoming year, but we have never been told what transpires between the department and the Treasury, although we do know that there has never been a sufficient vote for the department.

Mr. Shannon—The department has never had to turn away a child of school age. It has always had accommodation for every child who has sought entry to school.

Mr. RICHES—I admit that, if it gives the member comfort. The department has had some sort of accommodation and some sort of teachers, but no-one could say that it was satisfactory.

Mr. O'Halloran—Even if they sat on the floor.

Mr. Shannon—The Leader knows that that is not right.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN—Order! The honourable member for Stuart.

Mr. RICHES—The point I make is that we have never had sufficient money in the last 25 years to carry out the Education Department's programme. I remember 17 years ago it was held to be desirable to increase the school leaving age to 16 years. The Liberal Party included that as a pledge in its election policy then. In 1945 the then Minister of Education, Mr. Abbott, apologized in the House for not being able to carry out that promise. When it was suggested that the cost and other difficulties had not been taken into account,

before the promise was made he claimed that they had. He gave as reasons for not implementing the policy the teacher, accommodation and financial shortages, but claimed they would be overcome and called me a pessimist because I said I could not see them being overcome under a Liberal administration. We are still as far away from having that desirable policy effected as we were in 1945.

Mr. Clark—For the same reasons?

Mr. RICHES—Yes; for lack of finance, teachers and accommodation. I believe the lack of accommodation and the lack of teachers can be traced back to the lack of finance. I am convinced that we are paying a heavy price in child delinquency as a result of the failure to give effect to that undertaking. I am much impressed with the character and calibre of the young people who pass through our high schools. I have approached the judges of our circuit courts and have asked if they can remember whether, of the young persons who appeared before them on various charges, a substantial number had gone to high school, and they have admitted that in the great majority of cases those who have appeared before them left school too early. We have never had sufficient classrooms or teachers to be able to raise the school leaving age. I am glad that there has been a substantial increase in the number of students staying on at high school, but this has been because of an awakening by the parents to the need for this.

There is a shortage of teachers but I believe that it is possible for the experts in the Education Department to determine accurately future intakes into our high schools because the children have to come up through primary schools. By assessing the number of children in grade I today, the experts could estimate the intake into our high schools in seven years' time. I have been told that this is being done and that recommendations have been made from time to time by competent officers.

Mr. Quirke—It is done in every case submitted to the Public Works Standing Committee.

Mr. RICHES—There was a period when those recommendations were pigeon-holed on the score of finance and that practice is primarily responsible for our having too few secondary school teachers today. The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) could not have been serious when he said, "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." Then he went on to give a discourse, in his usual way, about unification.

Mr. Shannon—I did make a further comment that I could see no harm in a general grant to this State to permit us to do a few things for ourselves.

Mr. RICHES—I accept that, but am not taking exception to it. I was drawing attention to the extraordinary statement I have quoted. Today, the member for Chaffey (Mr. King) asked for details of Commonwealth grants for universities. I hope I am not misquoting him, but I believe he said that these might be taken as the pattern of what we may expect if the Commonwealth makes a grant for education. Those two members, of course, know the present Commonwealth Liberal Government better than I, and I suggest that if there were any substance in their fear, it is their fear of a Liberal administration in the Commonwealth sphere, and it is not an argument against the principle of Commonwealth aid for education.

Mr. King—I was inquiring about the policy. I cannot form a judgment on it until I hear it. A verdict is never given until the court hears a case, you know.

Mr. RICHES—I accept that. When the Chifley Government was in office aid was given in the form of Commonwealth bursaries. That was the first time the Commonwealth acknowledged any responsibility for education and I think that the people gladly accepted that form of assistance. It seems to me that members are allowing prejudice to warp their vision and that the general welfare of our students and the future of education in this State are secondary considerations. The Treasurer, in outlining the principle that has been adopted regarding universities, merely indicated that the Commonwealth, as it makes a grant, insists that there shall be a subsidy of an equal amount from the State. The State Government applies that principle in many of the undertakings it assists: assistance is given on condition that the undertaking is subsidized locally. The member for Onkaparinga and, I think, the member for Mitcham, by inference, hinted that if the responsibility for levying taxation were returned to the States the problem could be solved more easily.

Mr. Millhouse—I did not infer it; I said it straight out.

Mr. RICHES—I did not want to be unfair.

Mr. Millhouse—There is no question of being unfair about that.

Mr. RICHES—That makes it definite that they are of opinion that if the State were its own tax collector this problem would be more easily solved. A glance back to the time when this State was its own tax collector does not bear out their contention.

Mr. Shannon—The honourable member is wrong in comparing a time when things were entirely different.

Mr. RICHES—I am not going to compare circumstances, but attitudes of mind. The attitude of the Liberal Party when the State was its own taxing authority was fairly shown by statements made at the time. Its attitude then was that the Education vote was a burden, and it forced a reduction of the amount provided in 1931.

Mr. Shannon—There was a Labor Government in 1931.

Mr. RICHES—But the Liberal Party was represented in the House and its members made statements. I remind the honourable member that the only Party in South Australia that has ever forced a reduction in the education vote is the Liberal Party. I refer to the Budget debate in 1931, where we find that the Labor Government provided £908,000 expenditure on education for 1930, but as a result of pressure brought to bear the vote was reduced to £780,000 in 1931. Because the Government was not prepared to reduce the vote to the extent the Liberals required, we find one of the warmest debates on the Budget that *Hansard* has yet recorded and the following is taken from that debate:—

Mr. R. L. Butler—I charge the Treasurer to get Mr. Adey to prepare a statement disproving my figures. Surely we should consider whether we can afford to maintain our standard of education.

Mr. Blackwell—You say it is too costly?

Mr. R. L. Butler—Yes.

Mr. Blackwell—Where would you cut out?

Mr. R. L. Butler—It has to be cut.

The debate was then taken up by Mr. Anthony who suggested that the vote could be cut by closing certain country schools. He also questioned the advisability of establishing super-primary schools in the country, and also strongly opposed the introduction of technical schools, claiming, in a quotation from Mr. Holden, who was then a member of the Legislative Council, that these were unnecessary and undesirable. The following is taken from the Budget debate of 1931:—

Mr. Anthony—I remember asking Mr. Holden what became of the boys who passed through

technical schools, and he replied, "The brains of our business are in three or four men in the drafting room. The operatives can be trained to do their work efficiently in three weeks." It seems, therefore, that it is not necessary to spend so much time and money on the technical side of education.

If Mr. Shannon takes the opportunity to find out what the State had to do when collecting its own taxes, he will find out that it is not so easy to get money from State sources as he thought. He is advocating that we go back to the days when the State levied its own taxation and when it was responsible for the vote. I remind him that the people who are suggesting that an approach be made in these days to the authority which levies the taxation (the Commonwealth Government) are more realistic than those who suggest that we should go back to the days when the State was its own collecting authority. The difficulties experienced there and the attitudes adopted by members when they had to face up to these occasions was no encouragement to support their contention that everything would be right if we resumed the role of tax collector.

Mr. Shannon—We are collecting much more *per capita* than we did in 1930.

Mr. RICHES—But we are spending more. I am referring to the question of technical education and to the belief that we could not afford to teach our children, as education was too costly. It is the same attitude that is condemning the approach to the Commonwealth Government that it should give more aid to education. It is the same attitude of mind and the same conservative outlook expressed so disastrously when the State was its own tax collector.

Mr. Millhouse—You must have done much work to find that quotation.

Mr. RICHES—I have a fairly good memory. The honourable member's speech was so reminiscent of the conservative speeches we heard two and a half decades ago that I was somewhat surprised that we had not progressed in our thinking beyond that point. Mr. Shannon was good enough to give me an honourable mention in his speech on this debate, and I will do him the honour of quoting from his speech. He said:—

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.

If my name had not been mentioned, I would not have given a second thought to it. The motion I moved was:—

That a Select Committee be appointed to enquire into the desirability of establishing a steelworks in the vicinity of Whyalla and to report to Parliament on steps to be taken to implement recommendations made by the Director of Mines in such an undertaking.

The Director of Mines (Mr. Dickinson) had recommended that a steelworks should be established at Whyalla within two years. The recommendation had been before Parliament for two years, but no steps were being taken to give effect to it. The Director of Mines had drawn attention to the fact that Australia would be short of steel. He also drew attention to the danger that would face South Australia if the high grade ore resources continued to be exploited, and to the necessity for paying more attention to the low grade iron ore reserves, of which South Australia seemed to have almost unlimited quantities. He claimed that these should be used together.

The company failed to stand up to its part of the agreement to establish steelworks and indicated to the Treasurer that it was not prepared to consider building steelworks at Whyalla until 1960, and even then it would have to be considered in the light of the resources available. Those were the terms of the letter of affront that had been delivered to the Treasurer before we introduced the matter in this House. It was only when the Broken Hill Proprietary Company had indicated that it was likely to go back on the undertaking it had given, had in effect transferred its operations to the eastern States, and had built steel mills at Port Kembla—admittedly the ones it had planned for South Australia—that we urged the Government to act to preserve the interests of the people of South Australia.

We were not only concerned about the attitude of that company, but were also concerned (and had reason to be concerned) about the attitude not of the Treasurer, but of some of those who stood behind him and who expressed themselves very vocally on that occasion. For instance, the member for Onkaparinga said he did not think there would ever be a steelworks at Whyalla. That was in 1955. He referred to the capital required to establish a steel industry and to the fact that employees of the works numbering between 3,000 and 4,000 would have to be housed. He said that he did not know what would be the cost, but that it would be between £3,000 and £4,000 a family and that all those people would have to be provided with the facilities that the increased population would require. He said, "We will really have to double the present population of Whyalla. I do not know where all these new workers will come from." That is precisely what the Director of Mines stated in his report to Parliament would happen. The honourable member boasted in his speech that he had laid the ghost of Mr. Dickinson and had added that honourable members opposite did not seem pleased. I never was pleased with the attack the honourable member made on Mr. Dickinson on that occasion.

Mr. Shannon—We knew you were speaking for Mr. Dickinson. We could read between the lines.

Mr. RICHES—Mr. Dickinson had submitted reports to this Parliament year after year but they were not even discussed, and as they affected the district I then represented I considered it my duty to see that they were discussed and brought under the notice of the House. It was Mr. Dickinson who went to America and brought back in his reports the value of the beneficiation of taconites, the process to be adopted by the B.H.P. Co. in the utilization of low grade ores; and it was his advocacy that made this steelworks possible. For the honourable member to say that he had laid Mr. Dickinson's ghost is a boast that I would not be very proud of. Mr. Dickinson was the man who said that this steelworks was needed and a matter of extreme urgency. What do we find today? Australia is importing steel and the B.H.P. Co. has underestimated the steel requirements of Australia all along the line. Either it deliberately planned that there would always be a shortage, or realized that to wait until 1960 and then make up its

mind would then be too late. It had to come to the party earlier than 1960. Even then, it was much too late to meet the legitimate demands of Australia and to give the service to which the people were entitled. Those are the things to which this House drew attention, and Mr. Dickinson's estimates of cost, population, the benefit that his steelworks would be to Australia, and its importance, have been proved to the hilt. We owe more to him than to any other officer we have had. I think his services to the State should be recognized and I should like his name to be perpetuated somehow in the Iron Knob region. The member for Onkaparinga, who went back and singled out members for criticism for advocating the introduction of the steelworks five years ago, should remember the stand we took.

Mr. Shannon—I should like to hear the honourable member's own comment about cancelling the leases.

Mr. RICHES—I have commented on that. I pointed out that if there had been any repudiation, or any suggestion of repudiation, it was on the part of the company, as it failed to honour the undertaking it had given. The honourable member places terrific importance on a written agreement and no importance on the verbal agreement or pledged word.

Mr. Shannon—The honourable member has no regard for the written agreement.

Mr. RICHES—I have been brought up to regard the pledged word of a person as being just as sacred as a written document.

Mr. Quirke—It is more valuable.

Mr. RICHES—I think it is. In the marriage contract, the most sacred contract we enter, the pledged word is more binding than the legal document.

Mr. Shannon—It is not much good in a court of law.

Mr. RICHES—It may not be, but it is good among honourable men. In the company's undeserved rebuff in writing to the Treasurer, it indicated that it was not prepared even to consider the building of a steelworks until 1960. If there was repudiation, it was there stated, and it was incumbent on the people of this State to say something about it. With those few remarks I support the Estimates.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield)—I intend to speak only for a couple of minutes because I have not found much in the four or five speeches made by members opposite to criticize—certainly nothing worth criticizing.

Mr. Millhouse—Hear hear!

Mr. JENNINGS—However, there may be a couple of things to which I could refer if tempted, so, if the honourable member provokes me, he may get something for his money. The first line of the Estimates is something that no man on this or the other side of the House can speak about with any great enthusiasm. That has been amply demonstrated by the obvious lack of enthusiasm from members opposite, and I must admit that I am inclined to share their lack of enthusiasm. If you share a lack of something, it obviously makes less of it to go around. One of the things not mentioned by members opposite in all their long and eloquent speeches, which surely should be considered in a financial debate like this, is the recent adjustment to the basic wage, even though there has really been no adjustment. The recent adjustment, according to the C series index, showed an increase in South Australia of 7s. a week, which was the second highest in Australia.

Mr. King—To which index are you referring?

Mr. JENNINGS—I am referring to the one we are operating on at the moment, not the "television" index made up of gadgets.

Mr. Millhouse—Which is more up-to-date?

Mr. JENNINGS—I am afraid that the 18s. a week increase in the C series figures for Victoria was caused mainly—

Mr. McKee—You are not suggesting that the workers are behind, are you?

Mr. JENNINGS—They are still behind at the moment.

Mr. Bywaters—And they are the ones who know it.

Mr. JENNINGS—As a worker, I know it myself. The 18s. increase in the C series index for Victoria was due to Mr. Bolte's abolition of rent control. This is something that happened in Western Australia a few years ago and had almost exactly the same effect. I realize only too well that if we are not careful the gentlemen in another place may take some similar action here.

Mr. Loveday—Ablly abetted by some people here.

Mr. JENNINGS—That is so. However, they should be forewarned by something that happened a few years ago in Western Australia and only a few months ago in Victoria.

Mr. Millhouse—You would not like to compare the result of the new index with the C series index, would you?

Mr. JENNINGS—I certainly would not, and I do not think anyone else in Australia

would at the moment. A rather interesting feature was that in those States where the cost of living adjustments were continued, either in total or in part, the cost of living increase was not as great as in those States where it was never continued, so surely this should explode for ever that old fallacious argument that increased wages cause increased prices. We have been talking about that on this side of the House for years and years, but we have certainly never made much impression on members opposite.

Mr. Millhouse—Or on anyone else.

Mr. JENNINGS—I think that an analysis of voting figures shows that we have made a fairly good impression on the minds of intelligent people in Australia, who are in the majority and who vote for us, but, unfortunately, sometimes electoral arrangements can be rigged in such a way that a majority expression in the community does not result in the same reflection in this House.

Mr. Clark—But that wouldn't be in South Australia, would it!

Mr. JENNINGS—I would not think it would be in South Australia! I think we know enough about that. I intended to say something about what the member for Gouger said, but I have said it. I also intended to say something about what the member for Onkaparinga said. I believe in his very long, ranting, raving, rumbustious speech the other day he took to task one of my colleagues in a manner I certainly did not appreciate. He had an opportunity to do this previously after the member for Murray asked him a question, and he certainly did it. True, we may have differences of opinion on whether or not the member for Murray was wise in what he did, but certainly not on whether or not there was anything wrong in what he did. If the member for Murray had had anything to hide in this matter he certainly would not have come back into the House an hour or two after he had been in the district of the member for Onkaparinga and asked him a question about it. There are many more surreptitious ways he could have gone about it. I think all members on both sides of the House would agree with that. However, when the member for Murray asked a question of the member for Onkaparinga, the honourable member took advantage of the fact that he had plenty of time to answer the question, and he answered it rather drastically. He was not content with that, but, when he got a chance to speak

on the Loan Estimates, he took the honourable member to task once again. That, I think, was rather a compliment to the member for Murray in that it showed that what he said was worth an answer.

I think the member for Onkaparinga also engaged in a practice of abuse of Parliamentary privilege that surely we should be a little careful about. I certainly agree that we can use our Parliamentary privilege to castigate companies or prominent people, but I do not think it is playing fair to ask "Was his name Evans or Jones or Smith?" or "Was it T. G. Evans or B. R. Evans?" or something like that, just to get it in *Hansard*. If the member for Onkaparinga has someone in his electorate who does not like him—and I think there ought to be more of it—I think he certainly should not use his position in this House to defame him publicly or to pursue personal vendettas. It does not particularly interest the House. I am sure that not one of us was particularly interested in it except as it affected our colleague on this side. There is only one other matter to which I want to refer. Apart from Mr. Shannon's personal vendetta against the member for Murray, and apart from the matters that Mr. Riches has already answered very well, he quoted the following from an article in the *Advertiser* under the heading "U.K. Labour in Doldrums":—

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

It is true that some bones have been taken out of Socialism over the last few years, firstly because certain people are trying to tell us what we ought to do and, secondly, because some people have infiltrated into the Labor movement though they have never had any proper feeling for it. Mr. Shannon, in referring to that extract, said:—

That is a job for a surgeon, because, after all, I thought there was only one bone left. I point out to Mr. Shannon that if there is only one bone left it is the backbone, which is something that the Party that Mr. Shannon represents never had to begin with. In this morning's *Advertiser* I saw two things in which I was rather interested. The first was a photograph of the Treasurer and a very nice young lassie. I must confess that I was rather envious because she was—

The CHAIRMAN—Is the honourable member referring to the Loan Estimates?

Mr. JENNINGS—Yes. The photograph caused me a certain amount of envy because the Treasurer was contiguous to a rather nice-looking young girl. She seemed to be so close to him that it almost looked as though it were the member for Unley. Although I was disappointed with that, I was pleased to read at the bottom of the front page of the *Advertiser* that the Treasurer, as from next Thursday, will make a weekly telecast. I was confident before that the Labor Party would win the next State elections, but now I am supremely confident, because if there is anything in the world that will enhance Labor's chances it will be the Treasurer's television appearances.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens)—I support the first line. After having listened to the very curious remarks by Mr. Jennings I think that it is well for us to turn our attention to some of the lines in these Loan Estimates. We should get on with the debate, which is so important to the State, instead of indulging in a few cheap personalities. The main thing that strikes me in these Loan Estimates is that all the works mentioned are essential to the continued progress and expansion of the State. I do not think that one member of this place or any person outside can cavil at the programme. Every item indicates that it is the desire of the Government to push ahead with the development of the many projects in being today, and to further not only the interests of the State as a whole but the interests of every citizen within that State. It is a worthwhile programme and one that we should support to the hilt. Over a number of years the State has been developing and we have now reached the stage where we shall have a much better balanced economy as between rural and secondary industries. It would be fatal for anything to be done to stifle such progress, and it could be stifled if the money made available were not adequate to permit the essential projects to proceed. We can see what is taking place when we consider the large number of projects investigated by the Public Works Committee. We had a record report from that committee covering 40 separate items, some of which are included in this year's Loan Estimates and some which will come forward in years to come. Whether it is the Harbors Board, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Public Buildings Department or any other department it all indicates that the State is progressing, and how the Government realizes that the work

must go on, and in consequence it is determined that the money available should be used to the best advantage of the State.

Last summer we were in the happy position in the metropolitan area of not having water restrictions. It is easy to make such a statement, but we must remember that at that time the State had gone through and was still experiencing the worst drought in its history. Let us compare that with the position in other States where there were water restrictions. Those States did not have so much rain as usual, but they did not have a drought, as did South Australia. There was no talk of restrictions in the metropolitan area in South Australia, and I pay a tribute to the work on that occasion of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. In these Loan Estimates we see indications of the large developmental work that is taking place. We have inter-connecting trunk mains, and the preparations for the duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline, including a spurline from Lincoln Gap to Iron Knob. This duplication will provide water for a large country town and will engender and foster development there. It will bring new industries to South Australia, besides building up present industries. Employment in the town will be created. It must be to the good of the people in that area, and the standard of living in the whole State will be raised. This all shows that by making money available for such projects the Government is assisting the whole State. I am glad that the Government has insisted on the money being allocated primarily to major projects, because there are a number of minor ones. These major projects are vital to the continued development of the State.

Some speakers in this debate have referred in a derogatory way to the schools position, but the Government is facing up in a realistic manner to the problem of overcoming the shortage of school buildings. This year we have a record allocation for the building of school premises. During the last decade or so our school population has doubled, which has presented enormous difficulties to the Education Department, as well as to the Public Buildings Department in designing schools. We have now a tremendous school building programme and it will not stop this year. Already on the files we have reports on schools, following on investigations by the Public Works Committee. The programme will increase year by year until the shortage of accommodation has been overcome to a great

extent. For some years the major problem in connection with the school building programme has been the provision of facilities for primary school children. The rapid rate of increase in that sphere has been overcome to a large extent. I think there is still an increasing number of students to be catered for, but the sharp rate of increase has fallen, and the acute problem now relates to the secondary school children. That is why we have in these Loan Estimates a large number of area, high and technical high schools, far greater than the number of primary schools. This was not the position two or three years ago. From what I have read on this subject I believe the problem will continue for some years to come. I anticipate that the Education vote for two or three years to come will cover the provision of many more of these types of secondary schools, especially if the curriculum is to be varied and increased as has been suggested on several occasions. Before long the problem will be felt severely in tertiary education. Already it has been felt to some degree. The University, the School of Mines and other organizations of that nature are experiencing grave accommodation problems and are planning to overcome them.

Mr. Millhouse—Do you agree with the Government's actions over Bedford Park?

Mr. COURCEL—I agree entirely with them. I think it is a wise move indeed. I am happy with the arrangements arrived at for the use of our high schools at night. In this matter I can speak with knowledge of what is happening in the metropolitan area. It is pleasing to know that on five nights a week and sometimes on Saturday mornings our suburban high schools are full of adults who have returned to school to take advantage of the facilities offered by the Education Department under the adult education scheme in order to gain additional knowledge. That is a fine piece of work and it is decentralization of learning that makes use of existing facilities and establishments provided by the department. Members may remember the amending Bill that was introduced last year, altering the name of the South Australian School of Mines and Industries to that of the South Australian Institute of Technology. It was stated then that the department, which received funds from this Parliament, would shed many of its trade subjects and they have in fact now been undertaken and are being taught by the Education Department, mostly at night time. The institute is now concentrating upon diploma and

degree courses. That is a great movement and one that should be fostered.

I have heard the honourable members for Murray, Mount Gambier and Gawler speak on the subject of adult education and a week or two ago, in the company of the member for Mount Gambier, I inspected the adult education centre in that city and it is a magnificent one of which other members may be envious. I think that the honourable member for Mount Gambier may be getting preferential treatment there. I hope that work may be extended in future because it illustrates that the Education Department is alive to the problem of providing secondary education facilities. I trust this will continue for years to come. I content myself with saying I find that the Estimates before us indicate the confidence felt by the investing public and the citizens of the State in what this Government is achieving and setting out to do. I am sure those sections of the public which are "really intelligent"—I take the words of the honourable member for Enfield—and which are interested in the true progress of the State realize the magnificent job this Government is doing for the people of the State in its allocation of the funds provided and the way in which this programme of Loan works is being effected. I have pleasure in supporting the adoption of the first line.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—This debate gives members an opportunity to examine the Loan expenditure proposed for the coming year. It is pleasing to note that funds have been allocated for additional pumping houses and to extend irrigation areas. That provision is long overdue. A sum of £50,000 is provided for the purpose of commencing work on the Blanchetown bridge over the Murray River. I have not been informed, but I guess that probably some previous provision was made as this matter has been debated here. If the £50,000 on the Estimates is the total expenditure for this year on that important project it is hardly enough to start it and get it well under way. Some preparatory work has been done on the approaches to the bridge, but that work has been held up and I believe the reason is that the department is waiting for the design of the bridge to be approved. After that, specifications will be drawn up, but the Treasurer, in his speech, said that tenders would be called shortly to get the bridge under way. The construction of the bridge will probably take two to two and a half years before it is completed. I draw the Minister's attention to the £50,000 provided and ask

whether some previous provision has been made or whether provision has been made elsewhere to get the work under way as the sum provided is insufficient to start the project off if tenders are called within a few weeks and the design of the bridge is accepted.

The lines referring to education should make pleasant reading to many rural members who can see, in the various lines, the allocations made for high and primary schools. The growing population in this State demands a greater provision for the education of younger people and that growth will aggravate the problem of providing buildings to cater for the students and of providing staff to maintain schools in addition to the necessary personnel required to carry education to its logical conclusion. Whilst dealing with education I wish to state that insufficient persons are undertaking university courses to fulfil the many jobs that are available and will become available in the future. I refer particularly to technical education. Men with suitable technical educational qualifications will be required in future on important projects. I do not know exactly what the reason for this trend is but it is possible that, when these young people reach the university stage and decide on a course that will lead them to the careers they desire, they find that the salaries offered in that career after they have obtained their degrees and are ready for work are not sufficiently attractive to induce them to continue with the study involved. Consequently, many go into other avenues where the rates of pay are much more attractive and they leave the rural field faced with a shortage of the trained technical staff necessary to carry on the important projects.

Government departments and Ministers should examine this position because it will be aggravated as the population increases. The trend is for higher salaries: men will undertake the jobs paying the best salaries and those men will be lost to the important works in the country. That trend has affected scientists and teachers in the universities and the State may find that it is lacking in men of that calibre if the position is not closely watched.

The State Bank, together with the Housing Trust, has allocated much money for the building of houses. I have spoken on this matter before on the Budget and Loan Estimates particularly on the apparent shortage in country towns of houses for people requiring them. As costs increase we have reached a

position in many country towns where people requiring a house have insufficient money to pay the deposit required to purchase a house and the only thing remaining for them to do is to apply for a rental house. The Housing Trust, because of the demand to purchase houses, does not seem to be enthusiastic about building houses for rental purposes. The trust is able to get people to purchase houses particularly as funds are available from other sources if the people are prepared to pay high interest rates. Many country people are more cautious and a little hesitant about entering into these long range hire-purchase agreements because of the high interest rates involved. They prefer to crawl before they run, and as a result they desire rental houses they can afford to rent. I would like to see the State Bank examine some country towns to see if it cannot enter into the field of providing houses there.

In my district—and I suppose many other rural members would have had similar experiences—a mechanic in a garage may wish to get married. He may find that his income will only allow him to rent a house. I know of an excellent mechanic who was forced to leave his country town because he could not get accommodation. He made arrangements to get married and he would have stayed in the country town had he been able to get a house, but there was no rental house available and, as a result, he had to leave. He was able to get a job in the city and obtained a house from the Housing Trust.

Mr. O'Halloran—He was lucky.

Mr. STOTT—He was lucky, but he got accommodation through the man for whom he was working and then he got the house he was after. That was a loss from the individual point of view and it was a distinct loss to that area because the garage proprietor was left without a first class mechanic and the farming community, which had previously brought its trucks and tractors in to be serviced, was held up and had to go further afield to find a workman to do the necessary work. That illustrates that the effect of this is much wider than the individual concerned.

I would like the State Bank and the Government to look at the question of providing more rental houses in the country towns. Some departments may contend that they have examined country towns and have gone into the question of how many applicants there would be for houses but they have found that few people are willing to go on with it. The time factor is involved there because after the

department has examined the position these men are still looking for a house and, as time goes on, they cannot wait but they are forced to leave that town and go elsewhere. The number of applications drops and that is how it is reduced. If the whole business could be speeded up and if we could get somewhere with it there would not be the same number of cancellations for rental houses.

I suggest that the Engineering and Water Supply Department examine another line on the Loan Estimates. The department has adopted a negative attitude on the Kingston-on-Murray extension. This is a prosperous irrigation district and many settlers with sons desire land to be made available for their sons to continue growing the citrus and stone fruits. The land is there, but it is no good without water. The Lands Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department have been asked to go into the question of providing channels with an increased capacity pump house for this area, but the matter has been deferred, or, in other words, refused for the time being. Again, the same sort of position applies. Sons are growing up and wanting to know where they are going and what particular work they are to do. These young boys have been born on an irrigation block; they know the business from A to Z, and time cannot wait for them because they are getting to the age when they have to earn money somewhere. The block on which they have been brought up is not big enough to absorb two sons, and consequently lads are lost to that country town; instead of the town's being built up into a happy local community, the population is reduced because the sons are leaving. The Government, and particularly the Minister, should look at this question of providing more amenities, in addition to water, to encourage these young lads to stay close to their parents. If the sons are encouraged in that way the population will be kept growing, and consequently the increase of population will justify the provision of more amenities for rural people and encourage them to live in their country areas. If we adopt the policy that we will just "stay put" in these irrigation areas, the sons and daughters will go somewhere else.

Mr. King—What do you mean by "amenities"?

Mr. STOTT—The local people themselves can provide amenities such as youth clubs and that sort of thing, but if the young people leave the town there are not sufficient remaining to warrant going ahead with such clubs. If the

sons and daughters remain in the town the population increases and the community is then justified in providing some of the amenities that can be obtained with Government assistance. I hope the Government will look at that matter. I support the first line, but will need some explanation of one or two lines later.

Mr. KING (Chaffey)—I support the first line, and in doing so I congratulate the Treasurer on the presentation of these Estimates and the Under-Treasurer (Mr. Seaman), whose job it was to help prepare them. I believe it was the first task of this magnitude for which Mr. Seaman was directly responsible since taking over from Sir Fred Drew, and I congratulate him on his entrance into this field. Despite all that the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) has said—and his speech, as usual, was a most interesting one from the financial aspect—what we have to consider is how much of the cake there is and how we are to cut it up. The way it has been done in these Estimates under the hand of the Treasurer has, I think, resulted in the fairest possible division between the various calls made upon the public purse, and to that extent we can be assured that the State's progress will continue.

The member for Burra also mentioned the plight of the primary producer, and to a certain extent I must agree with him. The dried fruit industry and the canning industry, both of which are prominent in my district, export about 80 per cent of their production. They sell it on overseas markets, and they are the people the Government is anxious to keep on the export market because they are valuable producers of export income. Our export income today is supporting the secondary industries of Australia. I agree with the member for Burra that we are living in a fool's paradise if we think we can continue to keep these classes of primary producers in business, fighting rising internal costs over which they have no control, when they must sell their products on an open market. We know what has happened in other countries where subsidies have been made. Some experiences of America and the United Kingdom, for example, have not been happy. At the same time, these exporting industries must be kept in business if we are to continue to provide that overseas income. This State has practically no control over policies in that direction, but I must join forces with the member for Burra in pointing out where we are going with these particular industries.

Much has been said today of the member for Onkaparinga and the many phases of his various activities. I congratulate him and his committee on the tremendous work the committee has performed in the last 12 months on the projects which have been before it and which it has so assiduously examined and reported upon in order to keep the progress of this State going forward as we all hope it will. Coming closer to home, I point out that there is a reference concerning the internal drainage of horticultural properties. The people in the Benmark Irrigation Trust, the Cooltong War Service Land Settlement area, and the old Chaffey Ral Ral division are being catered for, and I assure the House that once those comprehensive drainage schemes have been properly established the production from those areas will increase. Until such time as those drainage schemes have been brought to fruition, the production from those areas will always be in danger, but having established those schemes I sincerely hope and believe that the production will remain constant from that point onwards.

The member for Enfield referred to the C series index, and pointed his index finger, I think it was, at the double standard that exists. I point out to the House that the C series index has been suspect for a long time, and that the Commonwealth Statistician himself a few years ago took the trouble to emphasize that the basis upon which it was being drawn up was scarcely a satisfactory one. I do not blame Opposition members and the people they claim to represent for hanging on to it, because it presents their case in a favourable light.

Mr. Fred Walsh—It can still be made use of, if necessary.

Mr. KING—The double standard undoubtedly exists. The Commonwealth Statistician has also pointed out that the new basis is perhaps fairer and arrived at with much more statistical evidence than the old one. It will be remembered that the increase in Victoria was due to rents, but on looking at the rent situation there and the removal of control one can see that it really affected only a very small percentage of the population. The C series index did not take into account the rents of Housing Commission houses, and to that extent it gave a false reading. I think the Commonwealth Statistician in his new index has drawn attention to those anomalies and has endeavoured to find a better basis that will ultimately benefit the people we all try to

help, namely, those on the lowest earning scale of wages. I do not think there is any need for injustice. If any conclusions are to be drawn from any set of statistics, any statistician will agree that a valid conclusion can be drawn only if there are a sufficient number of valid examples; any other conclusions can be fallacious.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Which series do you think the New South Wales Government will follow?

Mr. KING—That is an interesting speculation.

Mr. Jennings—At least they will be better off than we are here.

Mr. KING—I would not think so. I refer now to education. So far as this State is concerned, we have nothing to be ashamed of; indeed, we have much to be proud of. I was fortunate to be fairly closely associated with the convention held in Sydney on May 21. Prior to that, I attended the first meeting convened by the Parent-Teacher Council and the Teacher's Institute, which was held at Berri on the Upper Murray. I claim that I helped frame the original resolutions adopted by the subsequent meetings, in which we agreed that additional help from Commonwealth sources would be necessary. At those meetings we did not stipulate where the additional funds should come from but later, when Professor Madgwick opened the convention with a very good address in Sydney, his concluding remarks were to the effect, firstly, that education was the greatest asset that any country, and particularly our own country, could have; secondly, that if we wanted more money we should be prepared to pay for it.

At the opening of the Berri meeting, which was one of the first, both Mr. Ray King, the president of the Parent-Teacher Council, and Mr. Golding, the president of the Teachers' Institute, stated that they thought that the South Australian Government had gone as far as it possibly could towards meeting the requirements of education in this State. It was quite illuminating at the conference to discover that even in this year people from one State said that 900 students who had been prepared to go to the teachers' training college could not be accommodated and were therefore turned away, and in another State there were 60-odd people in that category. Then we hear reports of quotas of people in various States for secondary education, that if they do not get in under the quota they do not get secondary education—that cannot be denied; further, if one family moved from one sector to

another and they had children who wished to have secondary education, those children could not be accommodated because the quota had already been filled. Consequently, the children had to be sent to private secondary schools if they were to continue their education.

My point is that in South Australia no child has ever been turned away from any school, primary or secondary; no child has been denied an opportunity to go on to the University. At the same time we not only have caught up the lag caused by the greatest percentage increase in school population of any State, but today are able to say that we can reconsider the position of Leaving and Leaving Honors classes because we can see daylight ahead where teachers are concerned. Those facts speak for themselves; they cannot be refuted. That justifies our claim that South Australia has nothing to hide its head over in education. On the contrary, we can be proud, so much more so when we regard the position of the university. When the Universities Commission was set up, what did we find? We found that the wealthier and more populous States had to have huge grants for university purposes whereas South Australia did not fare so well because of the generous attitude of the Playford Government. If that does not set the seal on our claim that we are foremost in education, I do not know what does. I should like to speak later to some of these lines but cannot let this occasion pass without paying great tribute to the Loan Estimates and to our Treasurer.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood)—I rise to support the first line of these Estimates. I should not have entered this debate but for some words of the honourable member who has just resumed his seat. The honourable member for Chaffey (Mr. King) would have this House believe that the position of education in South Australia is such that we have nothing in this State for which to apologise. He pointed out that in some other States of the Commonwealth there are in fact difficulties of accommodation of students in secondary education. For instance, it is perfectly true that in New South Wales, which spends more *per capita* on education than we do, there is some difficulty in accommodating students in secondary schools. New South Wales has a higher leaving age for secondary school students than we have because, although this Parliament passed a law many years ago to provide for a higher school-leaving age, this Government has never put it into effect. What

is more, at the very conference about which the honourable member spoke, the New South Wales delegates deplored the fact that in New South Wales teachers were entering secondary schools who were university graduates but had inadequate teacher training. In South Australia there are entering the secondary schools teachers who not only have had inadequate teacher training but are not university graduates. No other State is faced with the high proportion of temporary unclassified teachers in its Education Department that this State has, and the Minister's own report makes it perfectly clear that an astonishingly large number of our teachers, through no fault of their own, have inadequate training to get a minimum basis for classification.

The fact is that it has been pointed out time and time again that this State, according to the reports of the Grants Commission, has consistently spent on education less *per capita* than has any other State except Queensland. That cannot be denied: the figures in the Grants Commission reports speak for themselves. I need not repeat them; they are available to every honourable member, and that position has been maintained year after year after year. True, the honourable the Minister for Education has on occasion pointed out that the position in South Australia is nearer to the average of the Australian position than that of any other State. That is a fairly remarkable claim to make. The average is brought down by our own figure, which is less than that of any other State except Queensland *per capita* on education. In fact, if we take the average of the other States, we find that we fall decidedly below it. So there is not terribly much for us to claim credit for upon this score. In fact, although it is true that South Australia has in the last few years spent a higher proportion of available Loan moneys on school buildings than the average of the Australian States, we have yet spent a smaller proportion of consolidated revenue than any other States upon Education.

The fact remains—and this again appears from the Minister's reports—that for a very long time indeed we have faced the position that South Australia has had a larger increase in school enrolments proportionately than any other State in the Commonwealth. This, of course, would place a greater strain upon our State education system than that placed upon the education systems of other States, but the answer to that is that if this State were

to give a comparable education service with that given by other States it should have been spending more *per capita* on education than any other State. In fact, we have not. This is not a situation upon which South Australia can congratulate itself. As a matter of fact I have the figures for the last year of review by the Grants Commission, but as I have already quoted them I do not think there is any need to do so again. However, this brings me to another situation revealed by the Treasurer's statement that of the proposed public works to be put into operation during this financial year a considerable proportion will be financed not from Loan moneys but from internal funds of Government undertakings. This House is not to vote on those funds. The amounts upon which we are to vote are before us, but the Government's policy has been that the financing of these undertakings shall be something separate from direct Government expenditure passed by this House. In other words, we are faced with the fact that industrial undertakings in South Australia are run by independent boards, for which there is no direct responsibility to this House, which may allot funds available to them without this House authorizing them.

However much we may congratulate ourselves that we have £12,500,000 available through State industrial undertakings for financing public works, those funds should be taken into account in the general programme of this State. They should be allotted according to general priorities and not the priorities of the individual undertakings. It may be true that the money which is being spent by the Forestry Commission is being spent wisely for the purposes of the commission, but it may also be true that there are considerable needs in this State which could be assisted from the Forestry Commission funds rather than some of the works for which the Forestry Commission is making those funds available. What is happening is that the funds of the industrial undertakings are being treated as watertight amounts for spending within those undertakings, and they are not brought into account in the general spending programme of the Government. That means that although members of this House are elected to vote upon the general spending programme of the State, a considerable proportion of the money available for spending on public works is not being voted upon by this House at all and is not being allotted according to general priorities.

I believe that it is essential within any socialistic economic set-up—and the Govern-

ment goes some way to having such a set-up in South Australia—that the people should have the right to determine the priorities of expenditure. At the moment that right is being deprived the people. The people are having more and more of this State's activities removed from their direct control. Of course, that is part of the Treasurer's general policy. He does not believe, and the Government has made it abundantly clear not only in this House but to the people generally that it does not believe, that there should be any adequate circle of financial control in South Australia. It will not have its State industrial undertakings directly subject to this House, nor will it have a public accounts committee to scrutinize the effectiveness of Government spending, consequently the people are deprived of the rights of democratic citizens. Of course, they are deprived of those rights in any circumstances in South Australia because they are deprived of the right of electing the Government they want and of rejecting the Government they do not want.

I do not wish to delay the House further, but I do deplore this business of suggesting that South Australia in its spending on the general social services, as they are called in the Grants Commission's reviews, is, in fact, doing an adequate job. It is not doing an adequate job, and all the glossy and smiling statements which are made by the Government in its various propaganda media from time to time won't get over the fact that we are not getting an adequate service for the poor, the sick, the needy, or the children of South Australia in present Government spending.

First line—State Bank, £3,566,000.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I have no desire to commence another debate, but I understand that under Standing Orders this line has to be put in order that we may continue consideration of the other lines. I am particularly concerned with the amount of £2,850,000 which is provided for Advances for Homes. I think it will be realized from the tenor of the debate that members generally are not quite happy about the implications of this expenditure by the State Bank, and in order to clarify the position I asked the Treasurer today a question about the conditions which will apply to the expenditure of the money being provided by the State Bank, either through these Loan Estimates or from other sources. The Estimates this year provide £2,850,000 for the purposes of the Advances for Homes Act. From the Commonwealth Housing Agreement,

£1,340,000 will be available, making a total of £4,190,000. In addition to this total the Treasurer has had to include the amount of £400,000, which earlier was stated to be earmarked for building societies, in order to try to boost his figure for housing advances. Even so, this still only amounts to £4,590,000 and therefore a further £205,000 is required from mysterious other moneys held at the Treasury to make the Treasurer's figure of £4,795,000. While I am particularly concerned about this, as I remarked earlier many other honourable members in the course of the debate expressed their concern that the whole of this amount is to be earmarked for the purchasing of new houses—houses that have not been lived in. The Treasurer's reply to that proposition, as I understand it from his reply to my question today, is that it is to secure the maximum number of houses being built with the money available. I agree with that. I think I can say on behalf of every honourable member of the House who has spoken on this item that we agree entirely that the maximum number of new houses should be erected with the money available, but I do not think we should carry that to the absolute extreme to which we are carrying it if the words of the Treasurer this afternoon are correct, namely, that none of this money whatsoever will be made available for the purchase of houses that have been lived in.

This question of housing looms very large in our Estimates at the moment and represents one of the most important factors in the lives of many of our people. The member for Burra mentioned this afternoon the difficulties of people who have good houses they want to sell for various reasons and cannot sell because no finance is available. However, finance is available to an applicant who wants to build even a frame house on a vacant block alongside such houses as I have mentioned. I can visualize that there are many workers who own their own houses in different parts of the State, due because of the exigencies of their occupation—transfers, unemployment and other reasons—wish to dispose of their house in order to migrate elsewhere to get employment. If they could get reasonable finance, under the provisions I have already mentioned, they would have a chance to dispose of their houses at a fair price and use the proceeds to purchase another house in the metropolitan area or in the town to which they wish to migrate. However, under the provision being discussed they cannot receive consideration. I suggest

that that does not provide a solution to the housing problem, and it is not fair that these people should be penalized in order that the money available is spent in some particular way. I suggest that the Treasurer should seriously consider this matter. I admit the justice of using the maximum amount of the money available to build new houses, but wish it would be possible within the limits of the administration of the State Bank and with the guidance of the Treasury to make some provision under the Advances for Homes Act to allow advances to be made for new homes, for making additions to existing homes, or for the purchase of existing homes. I am not saying that we should give full sway to these provisions as was the case in the old days, but contend that it would be administratively possible to look at the hard luck cases that have been mentioned during the debate. I know of two or three that might be considered. I suggest that the Treasurer report progress at this stage to give him an opportunity to look at the position and explain any conclusions to the House he may have arrived at.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—This matter has received much consideration by the Government and is one that has not been entered into lightly as it is of great importance to the future of the State. When the Advances for Homes Act was originally passed it was always considered an Act for the purpose of building new houses. Among other things, it provided for architectural assistance and that type of thing and went so far as to enable the bank to build houses. The purpose of the Act was always directed towards the building of new houses. From the point of view of the welfare of the State there could be no increased number of houses by the mere change of title from one person to another. That would not add to the living accommodation in the State one iota. The only thing which does is the building of more houses. The Government has purposely given its support—very much more support than by Governments in the other States—to the building of new houses. That is the only way we shall ever get over the housing shortage. For many years insufficient houses were being built in the State. During the war years it was practically impossible to build and during the depression years and the immediate following years there was again very great difficulty in getting houses built because of financial problems. At the end of the war

there was a grave dearth of houses and every honourable member knows how difficult it was for people to get accommodation and the Government set out realistically to see that accommodation was provided.

It is true that the State Bank is a direct Government instrumentality but it carries out housing projects not at its own expense, but purely as agents of the State and any losses accrue to the State, and the amounts we are now discussing are devoted to new houses. It is also true that the State Government is providing from its Loan funds through the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement £400,000 to building societies which are completely unrestricted and can use the money for any purpose. It is also true that the State Government is guaranteeing certain building societies in making advances that are completely unrestricted; that it is guaranteeing the Superannuation Fund, which is also unrestricted; and that it is also guaranteeing the Savings Bank in making advances. The latter institution, I will admit, is not completely unrestricted, as the Government has asked it to channel its new funds as much as it can reasonably do into new housing, and the bank is, in fact, giving the majority, although not all, to new housing. Insurance companies, the Commonwealth Bank and other agencies are also making money available for housing, and none of these have a rule that it must be for new housing.

It is not correct to say that a person is deprived of selling a house merely because the Government is making its own resources available for building new houses. The answer to that is that houses built before the war are still bringing a tremendous premium—in some instances four times the cost of construction. I think the Leader will realize that if we are going to make progress new houses must be built. Incidentally, last year we made some progress in this respect, as in this State approximately 9,000 new houses were built. That shows that considerable sums of money, quite apart from the moneys the Government made available, were provided for erecting new houses. If the Leader desires it, I can assure him that we are not unduly restrictive in relation to house purchases, but I believe we should channel the money that comes out of Loan funds fairly and squarely towards the erection of new houses. The more we use it in other ways the more we are dissipating it, as frequently money paid for the purchase of an existing house has gone

towards the purchase of a motor car or television set, or other things not associated with housing. Even now we have great difficulty in ensuring that the money is channelled into housing, as there are so many other ways to finance the purchase of television sets or motor cars at the expense of housing. It takes a great deal of policing to see that the money is not used for these things at the expense of the housing fund. This State, more than any other State in the Commonwealth, is using a big percentage of its money for house construction, and I believe that policy alone will overcome the housing shortage.

In speaking previously, the Leader raised the question of a mysterious £800,000. There is no mystery about that sum. When the State was asked at the Loan Council to allocate its Loan funds, it allocated £5,000,000 to the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, but told the Loan Council that, subject to getting an agreement that this State be not required to make another provision to building societies, it would desire to transfer another £800,000 into the Commonwealth Housing Scheme.

Mr. O'Halloran—I had no means of knowing that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No, of course not, but I am explaining what actually happened. When I took up the matter with the Commonwealth Minister for National Development, he agreed that there was no case for South Australia to have to part up with any further amount for building societies. The Loan Council approved of the transfer, so the amount under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement was, in fact, £5,800,000, not £5,000,000 as in the original agreement at the Loan Council meeting. That accounts for the £800,000 about which the Leader desired information. It is of vital importance to this State that new houses should be built, as that is the only way in which we shall catch up with the housing problem. The fact that the Government has made additional money available for this purpose shows how earnest it is in its intention to see that, as far as possible, every citizen shall have a reasonable house available to him under certain conditions.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—The Treasurer said that the Superannuation Fund will assist people to purchase existing homes, but I do not know if it makes this money available. I know it makes money available for other building purposes but I believe the money is more or less reserved to subscribers

to the fund. The Treasurer said that the Savings Bank was not under the direction of the Government to make money available only for new houses, but can the Treasurer explain what is a new house and what is an existing house? On one hand people are advised not to obtain temporary loans, yet on the other hand an organization is building houses on which people pay a substantial deposit and then have to pay rent, without any reduction in principal, while they are awaiting finance. That is not a fairy story. Is that a new home, or must the purchaser wait until an institution makes a loan available? Some people have been waiting 12 months to get a loan. We know what happened in Pirie Street recently. We were told that in March of this year 1,300 applicants for advances had not been satisfied. The Treasurer said that the Government has control of the activities of the State Bank. I think that institution should make money available for the purchase of existing houses. Maybe I have the wrong impression of the working of the credit foncier system. Let us have a look at this position. Under a will it may be necessary to sell an existing house, on which there may be a mortgage or it may be freehold. The house is for sale with vacant possession. Surely money could be made available by the State Bank for the purchase of this house. The would-be purchaser should be entitled to some consideration. Again, the worker who has to transfer from one district to another in order to earn a living should have some consideration. He should be entitled to a share of the money available in order to sell his house and purchase another.

Many existing houses could be sold if loans were available from the State Bank, and they would not be so costly as new houses. With normal maintenance they would last for some time. I do not want to be accused of having loans made available on houses 50 and 60 years old, but I do think that houses built comparatively recently should be covered by the money available. If they were the State Bank could have a discretion in the matter. It could say that a house is vacant and is for sale, is in good condition and on today's market values has considerable equity in it. In such a case the State Bank could make money available for its purchase. The Treasurer stated that houses built many years ago are bringing very high prices. Because of the higher assessments adopted by the Engineering and Water Supply Department owners of houses will have to meet higher local government rates,

higher water rates, and higher charges in other directions. They will be struggling to cope with the position. There must be some way in which the State Bank can accept an application for an advance for the purchase of an existing house in which there is equity. Can the Treasurer guarantee that the Superannuation Fund will make money available for the purchase of existing houses, and will the Savings Bank allocate money for the purpose? Will it be possible for the State Bank to make money available for the purchase of existing houses?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The honourable member, this afternoon, spoke at some length about what is a new house. The rule has been not to take a narrow view of what is a new house and the Government has accepted (and accepted quite freely) a house as being a new house where a person has, in fact, built the house with some temporary finance pending his loan becoming available. We have not excluded him on that account; nor is there any restriction on the Savings Bank or on the State Bank so far as the moneys of the banks are concerned on housing loans. The policy of the Government is only concerned where the Government is either guaranteeing the loan or providing the money.

I point out to honourable members (and I mentioned this in the debate) that since we liberalized the terms of the loan no other institution in Australia is giving the terms that we are giving on housing loans. We provide £3,000 on a five per cent deposit and we accept Housing Trust valuations. We provide the lowest rate of interest and in those circumstances we have no difficulty in getting clients, and all the money that we get would be spent twice over if we could make it available for building new houses. In those circumstances why put our money into merely transferring the ownership of one house to another person?

I reject entirely the suggestion that because a house for some reason or other has a change in ownership it will stay vacant for very long. The rents that can be obtained for a house today would soon ensure that the house was rented and no-one can afford to keep a house empty. With the rates the honourable member mentioned it will be occupied as quickly as possible, and I have no evidence at all that there are any number of vacant houses anywhere. If I knew of any houses vacant at present, I assure honourable members I could speedily find some tenants for them.

Mr. Lawn—You're not the only one there.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No. So the pressure today is undoubtedly on new houses, and I would have thought that the Government's policy would have had the support of honourable members opposite because it is the only policy that would ever help overcome the problem. There are one or two disgruntled people, and no doubt honourable members have been approached by them in connection with this. I know that is so because I have had letters from honourable members on the matter.

A number of builders desired to go to the State Bank and put in a bulk application. In other words, they would put in an application for 20, 30, 50 or 100 houses and would arrange for the selling of the houses subject to the State Bank providing the money.

Mr. O'Halloran—You had no letter from me on that subject.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No. I do not want to go into this matter. The honourable members were seeking information, but I do not blame them for writing to me. The Government rejects that approach absolutely. It is not going to be made the cat's paw for an additional profit for anybody. We have always made it clear that applications must be on a personal basis. We now get a tremendous number of requests for exemptions for the purpose of enabling a person who has had a loan to sell out and start again, and we are going to tighten that very much because frequently the first loan has been converted to a considerable profit, and when it comes to getting a second loan it is desired to keep

the profit on the first loan to buy a motor car or some other gadget. In future no exemptions will be granted to a person who has had a loan unless there is a substantial reason, or if the profit made in the first instance is ploughed back into the second one because, unless that is done, it is depriving someone else of a substantial sum.

We have not been difficult regarding temporary finance. The Deputy Leader made a suggestion regarding the Superannuation Fund loans. They go through every week, so I see them, and I do notice what has transpired. I think that of all the Superannuation Fund advances under the Homes Act, probably three-quarters or four-fifths are for old houses. Frequently a list may come through with only one new house on it, and the rest are old houses. I think the Deputy Leader is correct when he says that the Superannuation Fund does give preference in applications to its own fund members, but I point out here that that in itself is very valuable, because the Government officers are the ones who frequently have to change their place of occupation. If a Government officer in Peterborough, being a Superannuation Fund member, has to change his place of occupation, I never refuse an exemption from the Act in those circumstances. I believe that the Superannuation Fund is a fund which has almost entirely concentrated upon that type of finance, so that does meet the position the Leader mentioned previously.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.08 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 24, at 2 p.m.