

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 10, 1965.

The SPEAKER (Hon. L. G. Riehes) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Treasurer information on the balances held in deposit and trust accounts for the Electricity Trust, the Housing Trust and the Highways Department?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The aggregate of the trust and deposit accounts at June 30, 1965, was £13,141,000. The detail is with the Government Printer and is still subject to audit. As there are about 175 accounts involved, the full details cannot readily be supplied. The following are the specific balances asked for by the Leader, plus those in excess of £200,000, stated to the nearest £1,000:

Housing Trust, £397,000; Electricity Trust, £674,000; Roads Fund, £848,000; Commissioners of Charitable Funds, £464,000; Municipal Tramways Trust, £275,000; Royal Adelaide Hospital Endowment Fund, £353,000; University of Adelaide, £1,282,000; Commonwealth Grant towards Science Laboratories and Technical Training, £389,000; Leigh Creek Coal Fund, £436,000; Advances for Homes Insurance Fund, £326,000; Engineering and Water Supply Department—Working Account, £435,000; Primary Producers Assistance Debt Adjustment Fund, £402,000; Public Stores Department Suspense Stores Working Account, £250,000; Rail Standardization, £686,000; Railways Suspense Stores Working Account, £243,000; State Bank—Reserve on Home Builders Fund Loans, £356,000; War Service Land Settlement, £272,000; Woods and Forests Department Working Account, £721,000.

COMPETITIONS.

Mr. CLARK: To explain my question, I should like to read a short letter from a constituent of mine. The letter which I shall read in part, states:

Dear Sir, A few weeks ago a competition paper was placed in my letter box, in the form of a crossword puzzle. I duly entered and sent it to the address given, in my wife's name. Yesterday a salesman called on my wife and told her she had won £40, and after the initial shocked look, said "off a television set". After the usual sales talk he filled out a H.P. agreement which my wife refused to sign. He then called later that night, and after more sales talk I refused his offer. . . He then told me that the prize (£40) would be forfeited. I must add he was polite and well-mannered. What I want to know is, he told me I had won a prize, and because I didn't buy anything I lose it.

The address of my constituent and the name of the firm are contained in the letter. Will the Attorney-General inquire into this matter with a view to preventing this type of salesmanship?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will have an inquiry made into the matter and inform the honourable member.

FORESTRY.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I noticed a statement by the Minister of Forests, on his return from the forestry conference in New Guinea, to the effect that there would be a shortage of land in South Australia for planting forests by, I think, 1970. Indeed, I believe that to be the position. The previous Government was interested in preparing legislation that would assist the owners of suitable forestry land to plant forests for themselves. As a result of its interest in the matter, and because such legislation would be complicated, a small inter-departmental committee was set up to examine problems arising and to see whether certain taxation problems could be overcome. I believe this matter had the good wishes of the then Opposition, and I assume the Minister is still interested in the project. If he is, can he give me any information on it?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This matter has, of course, been discussed before, as the honourable member claims, and it was also discussed at the Forestry Council meeting in Bulolo, New Guinea. As the honourable member also knows, certain problems are associated with the matter, mainly in relation to taxation, and a request was made that the Commonwealth Government consider levelling income tax over a period of time, because most of the returns would be forwarded in the one year, which would make it difficult. Another problem concerned succession and estate duty which, as honourable members know, involves not only this State but also the Commonwealth Government. These problems are still being looked at and in due course we hope to have an official answer on the matter.

MOUNT CRAWFORD FOREST.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Can the Minister of Forests say what acreage of radiata pine is growing in the Mount Crawford forest in my district? What acreage has been reserved for further plantings? At the present rate of planting, when will such additional acreage be used up?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The honourable member was good enough to inform me this morning that he would ask this question,

but I may not have the answers in the same order as his questions. The total area is 14,853 acres; the gross area of plantings established as at June, 1965, was 9,074 acres, besides plantations of 841 acres in adjacent reservoir areas. Suitable areas for plantings comprise about 2,000 acres. This area is expected to be fully planted in about five years.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.

Mr. McKEE: I have received a letter from the Secretary of the Port Pirie Branch of the Waterside Workers Federation requesting me to inquire on behalf of one of its members regarding an unusually long delay in making payments of workmen's compensation to members in respect of a claim against a certain shipping company. On inquiring of that company, I was informed by the head office (in Adelaide) that the delay was due to some fault at the company's London office. As this is not the first complaint I have received relating to delayed workmen's compensation payments, will the Attorney-General ascertain whether anything can be done to expedite these payments in the future?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The question of reforms to workmen's compensation procedure is under consideration by the Government at present and amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act are expected to be introduced later this session. Amongst other things, this legislation could provide some means of obtaining a more expeditious procedure in settling claims than the present procedure.

FREE SCHOOL BOOKS.

Mrs. STEELE: Concerning book allowances for secondary school students, the August edition of the South Australian *School Post* (the official organ of the South Australian Public Schools Committees' Association) states:

Our representations to the honourable the Minister of Education to request increased book allowances for the secondary school students has met with little success due to the preoccupation of the Government on the problems connected with the policy of free books for all schoolchildren. However, from the Minister of Education we have now received the following report: "I wish to advise you that the matter of an increase in the book allowance for secondary school students has not yet been considered and some time must lapse before this is done. I have previously stated publicly that the Government's policy of free books is being examined in stages, the first stage being the question of free books for primary schools. Cabinet has not yet made a decision in relation to this stage, but I anticipate that a public statement will be made in the near future in regard to this matter."

Can the Minister of Education say whether the matter of free books for primary school students has been considered by Cabinet? If it has, what decision has been reached, and when will a public statement be made, such as that referred to in the Minister's reply in the journal?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Full consideration has been given to the supply of free books in primary schools, and insufficient finance is available for it to be introduced during the coming year. However, the matter is being considered with a view to the introduction of free books for these children as early as possible.

ILLEGAL USE OF MOTOR VEHICLES.

Mr. RYAN: The Attorney-General has often had brought to his notice the matter of the illegal use of motor cars, and he has given an answer to this House concerning the Government's attitude to this crime. Recently two magistrates, during the hearing of cases in which they have been concerned, have stressed the need to alter the law to bring this offence within a different category than is the case now. Last night's *News*, in collaboration with the South Australian Police Force and with the hope of alleviating the position to some degree, published a list of cars that had been stolen and not recovered. In view of the alarming number of such crimes, and irrespective of what has been said before, will the Attorney-General consider this matter along the lines of the request made by magistrates who have to deal with this crime every day?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am grateful to the honourable member for drawing this matter to my attention. I had not had drawn to my attention by any magistrate any deficiency that he considered existed in the law. If the honourable member has any information on this score, I shall be grateful if he lets me have it.

DOCTOR'S DISMISSAL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Last Tuesday (in common with members on both sides of the House, I believe) I was perturbed by the answer given by the Premier to the honourable member for Adelaide arising out of the dismissal of Dr. Gillis from his position at the Morris Hospital. I have now received (I should guess again in common with most, if not all, other members) a letter from Dr. Gillis, one paragraph of which is as follows:

The statements given last week for the Premier to give to Parliament and the public, statements which used one of the most dishonest and harshest forms of smear tactics known.

have only served to highlight publicly this contravention by a Public Service official of the fundamental and basic principle of our way of life here.

I make it clear that I am not expressing sympathy for Dr. Gillis himself or condemnation of the Government's action in dismissing him (rather the reverse); but I suggest that it was grossly unfair to imply misconduct, as the Premier did, and then to refuse to make public details of that misconduct. I therefore ask the Premier whether (as a few days have now elapsed for him to think the matter over) he will reconsider his refusal to make public the conduct for which Dr. Gillis has been dismissed and not just bring down a docket for honourable members to look at in confidence. Will he say publicly in this House what that conduct was?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: First, may I say that I am well acquainted with the capabilities of the doctor concerned, particularly his capability at writing letters. The Leader of the Opposition asked me whether I would make available certain dockets associated with this matter, and I replied that I would examine the position to see whether that could be done. I further pointed out that in any event they could be made available only on condition that they were not taken outside this House. In reply to the honourable member, and to assist the Leader, I can say now that Cabinet has decided that it will not make the dockets available to this House. Cabinet does not desire to reflect in any way on a person who has served the Government, as this man has; nor does it desire to reflect on his capabilities in any way. I think the least that is said about this matter the better the service that will be rendered to the community generally.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In common with other members, I have received a copy of the letter referred to by the member for Mitcham. Although I do not espouse or reject Dr. Gillis's cause, I find two matters in the letter rather disquieting. First, the doctor claims that he has not been given, nor can he ascertain, any reason for his dismissal, and, if that is true, it is a complete abnegation of British justice. I believe that every person about to be tried should have an opportunity to state his case and the facts of the position. That is a matter which I, as Leader of the Opposition, obviously must take up. The second point is that, although members have been refused information in this House, the letter contains specified information which has been supplied to honourable members of

the Labor Party at their Party meeting. Again, if that is correct, it is a very serious matter if the Opposition is refused information which, it is alleged, is provided to some honourable members in their Party room and the disclosure of which is supposed to be (although I cannot understand why it would be) against the public interest. Will the Premier be more specific about those two matters? Will he give Dr. Gillis, officially, the reason for his dismissal? He has already stated that he will not give it to this House; but under which rule does he give it to his own members while refusing to supply it to members of the Opposition Party?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am more than surprised at even the suggestion from the Leader of the Opposition that I would be prepared to take to a meeting of my Party certain matters associated with the person concerned and to give those members information without being prepared to give it to Parliament. I have never heard of anything so ridiculous from the Leader. I can tell him and the House that never at a Party meeting have the members of my Party been given more information in this matter than the information I have read to the House. Probably the Leader would know much more than I do about Dr. Gillis and his association with the previous Government over many years. I intend to take this matter back to my Cabinet colleagues for further examination. If Dr. Gillis, the Leader of the Opposition, and other members, including the member for Mitcham, are so keen for all this information to be made public, irrespective of the cost that may be involved, I will ask my colleagues just how far we can go in this matter. Dr. Gillis seems to be most concerned about his own position, but I point out that I have tried to protect him to some extent. I will consult further with my colleagues, and we will determine whether we can offer any further protection (if I may use that word) in respect of this matter.

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not wish to read all of the doctor's letter, a copy of which most honourable members have received. However, I should like to quote part of it:

Mr. Lawn's question was obviously asked as the result of the concern of some Labor members after a meeting of Labor members of Parliament on Wednesday, July 28, at which they had been given a report by the Minister from the official responsible, which could do nothing but exonerate me. After the meeting, Mr. J. J. Jennings, the member of Parliament for the area, informed us that the Minister,

having been given no grounds he could produce even to his associates over the four weeks from July 1, at last obtained the report from the official responsible—

I emphasize "official responsible"—

which the Minister gave to all Labor members—

I emphasize "all Labor members"—

at the meeting, and which could only say

- (1) my medical and administrative capacity were beyond reproach,
- (2) I got on all right with my patients,
- (3) I had not taken the major part of my leave,
- (4) I did not get on with some of my colleagues. When I asked for the names of these colleagues, Mr. Jennings said that no such colleagues had been named.
- (5) Mr. Jennings said also that some reference had been made to a patient of mine with regard to whom I had carried out instructions from the court to me under the law, but where an official had not wished the law to be kept in her case.

Will the Premier say whether these statements are correct? If they are correct, will the Government allow the public to know the details of this matter? If the statements are incorrect, will the Premier say so?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have already given the House certain information this afternoon concerning this matter, and I indicated that I was prepared to take it back to my Cabinet colleagues for a complete examination. I was under the impression that the member for Rocky River would at least have understood that I would have the dockets on the matter completely examined, if I could prevail on my Cabinet colleagues to examine them.

Mr. Heaslip: Dockets dating from when?

The SPEAKER: Order! There shall be no debate during an answer to a question.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I assure the honourable member and the public generally that I have complete confidence in the member for Enfield, and that the implications and innuendoes made by Dr. Gillis in correspondence are completely without foundation. I repeat what I said to the Leader of the Opposition earlier: I will ask my Cabinet colleagues to conduct a further and complete examination of the dockets on the file, and if the decision is altered I shall inform the honourable member accordingly. I believe that Cabinet would permit me to seek further information for the benefit of the House, in view of the innuendoes that have been made here today and, if it takes 10 minutes or half

an hour, I will read every word that is necessary to give the fullest information to the House.

Mr. HEASLIP: I know that Dr. Gillis has been dismissed, and, although I am not sure, I believe he has been dismissed without being given reasons. Evidently, certain information has been made available to members of the Government but not to the Opposition. More important still, the public does not know what is going on. Will the Premier, as the head of the Government, state publicly the reasons for the doctor's dismissal?

The SPEAKER: I do not know whether the honourable member was present earlier this afternoon, but an identical question was asked by the Leader of the Opposition, and the honourable member for Rocky River is not in order in asking it again.

COMPULSORY UNIONISM.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Premier a report concerning the authority under which the Government issued a circular that in future there would be preference to unionists in the Public Service?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The previous question by the Leader referred to "a decree that persons are not to receive employment unless they join a union." No such decree has been issued. The industrial instruction issued by the Public Service Commissioner sets out the policy of the Government, that preference in obtaining employment shall be given to members of unions. No statutory authority is required for the issue of this circular as any employer of labour has the right to exercise such a discretion in the engagement of employees. A former Liberal and Country League Government exercised this discretion by the issue of a circular on the subject in 1933, as follows—

Mr. Millhouse: That is a bit old, isn't it?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Things are different when they are not the same!

The SPEAKER: Ministerial replies shall not be debated: they shall be heard in silence.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The circular states:

Heads of departments are informed that Cabinet has decided that any instruction of the previous Government to the effect that daily and weekly paid employees should become unionists is revoked.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: In view of the recent Government instruction regarding preference to unionists in appointments to Government employment, is it to be understood that, in future, preference to ex-servicemen

now provided by the Statutes will be effective only if the ex-service applicant is a unionist?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: No.

VICTOR HARBOUR HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of August 3 about the purchase of a new site for a high school building at Victor Harbour?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Following Cabinet's approval, negotiations were commenced with the owner for the purchase of 25 acres as a site for the Victor Harbour High School. The owner was not prepared to accept the price offered for this portion of his land, but was willing to sell the whole of an area of 43½ acres at a stated price. This offer was referred to the Land Board whose evaluation is expected within the next week or two. Further consideration will then be given to the proposal.

FUEL GAS.

Mr. HUGHES: As representations have been made to me about the laying of a gas main from Gidgealpa to Adelaide, has the Premier further information on this matter?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: In the absence of my colleague, the Minister of Mines, who, unfortunately, is sick today, I received a deputation that he was to have received concerning the Bechtel Pacific Corporation Limited. Mr. George Steele and Mr. Mike Farley, the two representatives of Bechtel Pacific Corporation Limited, arrived in Adelaide today for preliminary discussions. In the unavoidable absence of the Minister of Mines, these discussions are taking place with the Director of Mines. In about four weeks' time the study will commence on a full-scale basis, and it is expected that the company will have its report ready to submit to the Government towards the latter part of the year, concerning the proposed gas main from Gidgealpa to Adelaide.

BULK HANDLING.

Mr. FERGUSON: Earlier in the session I asked questions of the Minister of Works and the Minister of Agriculture about the establishment of loading facilities at Giles Point. In answer to one question, I was told that a committee would be set up to thoroughly investigate bulk handling facilities generally. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the committee has made any investigations, whether it has taken evidence, and when its report will be presented to Cabinet?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The committee was appointed, but as yet I have not received a report. However, now that the honourable member has raised the matter I will ask for a progress report from this committee.

ELECTORAL ROLL.

Mr. LAWN: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question of June 29 about eligible persons receiving, at naturalization ceremonies, an enrolment form for the Legislative Council?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Assistant Returning Officer reports:

The conduct of naturalization ceremonies is in the province of the Commonwealth Department of Immigration. As to place of naturalization, the departmental policy is for naturalization ceremonies to be conducted by the heads of local government. Despite this policy, about 30 naturalizations a month are conducted by an officer of the Immigration Department because of the inability of the applicant to speak English and for other urgent reasons. At these each newly naturalized citizen is given a joint House of Assembly-Commonwealth claim card and a card of information for newly naturalized citizens.

I have a copy of that card if the honourable member wishes to see it. The report continues:

No Legislative Council claim form is supplied, the reason being that the Immigration Department's policy regarding distribution of claim cards is made in Canberra.

Apparently the department is concerned that, if the Legislative Council claim cards were distributed to new citizens, some would be confused and would make unjustified claims. I do not see any reason why they could not be dealt with by the State department. The report continues:

The information card, on the other hand, advises new citizens to inquire concerning Legislative Council enrolment when lodging claim cards.

Needless to say, we do not get many inquiries. I will consult with the Commonwealth Minister on that specific matter. The report continues:

Contact has been made with the office of the Minister of Local Government and he has agreed to forward to each mayor in South Australia a supply of Legislative Council claim cards.

The supply will be maintained by the Electoral Office. The report concludes:

The mayors will, in turn, be requested to make these available to new citizens at naturalizations and to give all possible assistance both in understanding the qualifications and in making the claim for enrolment.

TOURISM.

Mr. HEASLIP: On July 27 I asked a question of the Premier regarding the Bluff road and the Channel 1 television station, to

which he replied that the present Government did not intend to take the matter further at this stage. Complying with my request would mean bituminizing the road to the top of the Flinders Ranges, to a site that affords a wonderful opportunity for tourists to view the whole of the northern areas. Another drive exists, of which I think you are well aware, Mr. Speaker, through the Alligator Gorge, about 20 miles north of the television station. I think that the Alligator Gorge is under the jurisdiction of the National Parks Committee. The road through that area, although not a very good one, leads to a site that would give tourists an opportunity also to view the top end of South Australia from a lofty position in the ranges. In the interests of the tourist trade, will the Premier assist the District Council of Wilmington to bituminize the road through the Alligator Gorge?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will examine the honourable member's question and obtain a considered reply as soon as possible.

MEDICAL ENTITLEMENT.

Mr. BURDON: I understand in October, 1955, an amendment to the Pensioners Act enabled certain people on pensions (with an income of £2 a week, or less) to receive a medical entitlement card. In other words, no person whose income exceeded £104 per annum would receive that entitlement card. In view of the change in the value of money during the past 10 years, will the Premier take up with the Commonwealth Treasurer the anomaly created by inflated prices with a view to increasing substantially the base sum to assist the many persons who are at present denied a medical entitlement card?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am prepared to take up this matter with the Commonwealth Government and to see what can be done.

NANGWARRY WATER CHARGES.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Forests an answer to my question of July 27 concerning water charges at Nangwarry?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: For many years the water rate at Nangwarry has been £5 per annum, and that charge is operating. This sum is considerably less than would be charged if the town were a declared water district. In view of the limited supply from underground sources, of the great importance in maintaining supplies for the power station and mill, and, more important still, of the

need for adequate fire protection of the settlement, the known excess and wasteful usage of water at Nangwarry has been a matter of concern for a long period. In an attempt to curb this, a price of water was applied as from July 1, 1965. A liberal allowance for rebate water has been made and, unless there is wasteful use, there should be little, if any, increase in the present cost to the user.

THIRD-PARTY INSURANCE.

Mr. JENNINGS: Very often I have received complaints that difficulties are experienced in arranging third-party motor vehicle insurance. Can the Premier say whether an insurance company may refuse to grant third-party insurance or make the granting of such cover conditional on the applicant's arranging other insurance with the company?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Motor Vehicles Act contains a provision that before approving of an insurer to carry on third-party insurance business, the Treasurer may require the insurance company to enter into an undertaking by which it accepts duties and obligations relating to this type of insurance. There are at present 81 approved insurers, and each one has given a written undertaking that:

1. It will grant compulsory third-party insurance without delay to any applicant, unless the applicant has made false statements in the proposal, or by reason of the applicant's previous conduct it is in the public interest that he should not be permitted to drive a motor vehicle, or unless the consent of the Treasurer is first obtained.
2. If it fails or refuses to grant third-party insurance to any applicant, it will immediately notify the Treasurer of the reasons.
3. If the Treasurer after inquiry, requests the company to grant such insurance, the company will forthwith comply with the request.

In many cases a company encourages applicants for third-party insurance to effect other forms of insurance as well. There can be no objection to this practice, but this cannot be specified as a condition under which third-party insurance will be granted. The intention of the legislation is to provide immediate cover to the motoring public without inconvenience. Instances have been reported where the granting of third-party insurance has been delayed or refused because the applicant has no other types of insurance with the company or the applicant has declined to take out such other insurance. Such action on the part of a company constitutes a breach of its undertaking

with the Treasurer, rendering it liable to having its approval as a third-party insurer withdrawn or suspended. It is well for the motoring public to know its rights in this matter.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

Mr. QUIRKE: For some time now a commission of the peace has not been granted to applicants. Over the last few months appointments of justices of the peace have been applied for by district councils and other local bodies because, as the Attorney-General well knows, there is a continual wastage in the country through people coming to Adelaide or dying, or for some other reason. A shortage of justices of the peace can quickly build up in any country area. In their wisdom, the Minister and the Government have decided that some matters shall be ironed out before any more justices are appointed. For my information and for the information of people in country districts generally, can the Attorney-General say what is the position in relation to the appointment of justices of the peace at present? Can he say also how long it will be before those applications now before him will be considered in order to relieve the embarrassment of country police officers who find it increasingly difficult to find justices to sit on the bench in local cases?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As I have explained previously to the House, a survey is being undertaken by my department, in co-operation with the Police Department, of all existing justices and the needs of various districts both for justices for witnessing documents and justices to serve on courts. I expect that within about six or eight weeks we shall have completed this survey; most of it has been carried out. We are still awaiting reports from police officers in various areas who are investigating capabilities of existing justices to meet the demands that are made upon them. As to the difficulties that arise in the interim from lack of justices, I have explained to the House that, where a particular need arises in a certain district, I shall be grateful if the member for that district draws my attention to that need, and a justice will then be appointed to satisfy it. In fact, some appointments of justices have been made on this score in the interim. I recollect two justices being recommended in the district of the Leader of the Opposition this month on the basis of the information we had already received on the survey concerning the particular need to be satisfied. I should be

grateful if honourable members who see a gap where services are not being met in their district will draw this to my attention so that we may make appointments immediately. When the survey has been completed I intend to establish quotas for various districts, and thereafter appointments will be made to fill gaps in the quota.

The difficulty I found on assuming office in respect of applications that had already been made was that there were many applications from people whom it would be perfectly proper to appoint as justices, but, if all of them were appointed, there would be so many justices in South Australia that the value and standing of the office would naturally decline because far too many people would be appointed to this very responsible post. Therefore, I am endeavouring to establish a quota in relation to the clear needs of a district so that the standing of the office may be maintained and so that we will not have every second Tom, Dick and Harry appointed as a justice of the peace merely because he is recommended as a citizen of good repute. It was necessary to get a reasonable basis on which to appoint people to the commission of the peace, and we are endeavouring to establish this. However, where it is clear to honourable members that there is an urgent need I shall be happy to assist honourable members by the appointment of a justice in the interim.

CEDUNA AREA SCHOOL.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Several buildings have been erected at the Ceduna Area School during the last 12 months but, up to the present, no plumbing has been connected. Can the Minister of Education say when the plumbing will be connected?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The honourable member raised this question privately with me once before and, from memory, I believe that a successful tenderer was found by the Public Buildings Department. I understood that this matter had been cleared up, but I will check and let the honourable member have the information.

GILBERTON FLATS.

Mr. COUMBE: I should like some information regarding the activities of the Housing Trust during the coming year. Because of the information given by the Premier in introducing the Loan Estimates last week, wherein he indicated that the rate of the building of flats would be cut back, concern was expressed in my district. Will the Premier obtain information about the proposed building of flats

in the Gilberton area in my district and, if possible, indicate when this project will be commenced, because this project was a firm commitment between the Government and the Walkerville council?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am willing to undertake to obtain a report, but this Government has not come to any understanding with the Walkerville council, or any other council, on the question of flat building. The Government has already indicated that it is willing to make certain amendments to the Local Government Act to provide that all councils may erect flats if they so desire, on condition that they retain ownership of the flats in the interests of ratepayers.

LOAN OF PLANT.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I understand that the Premier has a reply to my recent question about a circular that I understand was issued to officers of various Government departments regarding the loan of plant.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: A circular was issued from the Chief Secretary's Department on July 19, 1965, on this matter and, as requested, I will make a copy of it available to the honourable member. The instruction provides that Government plant must not be hired to any person or organization without head office authority being first obtained, and the loan of plant without payment is forbidden. I point out that the instruction is in keeping with the practice endorsed by the honourable member when he was a Minister and when complaints were made to him alleging the hire of Harbors Board plant and skilled men to outside firms.

RAILWAYS DEPARTMENT.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the presentation of cheques for railway tickets?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have information on this matter from my colleague, the Minister of Transport. I was somewhat surprised to read in the press last night that the Acting Secretary of the Railways Department had already made a statement on this matter, and I can say that that was not at my colleague's instigation. The Railways Commissioner reports:

The interstate booking office does accept cheques under the following conditions:

- (a) That the customer has authorized credit with the department.
- (b) That the customer is known personally to the booking clerk as being of good reputation.

(c) That the customer is able to name an officer in the railways who is prepared to vouch for him.

(d) In the absence of any of the above conditions, when there is sufficient time available before date of travel (seven days for a South Australian cheque and 14 days for an interstate cheque) for the cheque to be cleared.

It would appear that the person who complained to Mr. Brookman required to travel within so short a period after application that his cheque could not be cleared in the meantime, and in such circumstances the booking clerk could only accept this cheque on his own responsibility. Although some transport instrumentalities may accept cheques without restriction, and take the chance of cheques being dishonoured, in the interests of goodwill, the Railways being a Government department would not be able to accept this risk because of audit regulations.

This refers particularly to the interstate booking office.

KALANGADOO PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Education say when the building of the new primary school at Kalangadoo is likely to commence?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director of the Public Buildings Department states that, according to the department's present programme, work on the Kalangadoo Primary School will commence early in December, 1965. The school, which is to be of Sameon construction, will take about seven or eight months to complete.

SADDLEWORTH PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Will the Minister of Education ask the Public Buildings Department when the new primary school at Saddleworth will be completed?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to do that.

MAITLAND COURTHOUSE.

Mr. FERGUSON: The police residence and courthouse at Maitland are attached buildings. The only room available for police officers, justices of the peace and the magistrate and his clerk attending this court is about 12ft. x 8ft. and is attached to the back of the house. I assure the Minister that when a court is held here, conditions are congested in this small room. The court at Maitland deals with many cases that come before the courts on Yorke Peninsula. Will the Attorney-General investigate these conditions, and see whether it is possible to provide a new residence and court facilities at Maitland?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will have the matter investigated and inform the honourable member.

WHEAT.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about the availability of wheat in the Adelaide Division?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Australian Wheat Board has covered the position of home consumption requirements in the Adelaide Division for this season, and is closely watching the position for next season. Present indications are that receipts from the coming harvest in the Adelaide Division will be well in excess of home consumption requirements.

ROAD TRAFFIC LAWS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Some time ago I asked the Premier whether the Government had considered the recommendations on road safety made by the Australian Transport Advisory Council and various alterations in arrangements for licensing and so on, and he said that Cabinet was considering the matter. As some time has passed, can the Premier say whether Cabinet has come to a conclusion on these matters, and if it has, what are those conclusions?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Cabinet has not come to a conclusion yet.

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER.

Mr. JENNINGS: During the recent absence of the Attorney-General on important business, a question was asked of him by an honourable member about the appointment of a public relations officer in his department. Has the Attorney-General further information on this matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This matter arose from a question originally asked by the honourable member for Ridley. He asked me whether I would table the docket on the appointment of a public relations officer to my department, and I said I would have the matter examined. I brought the docket to the House, and gave to the honourable member for Ridley, for perusal, the docket from the department relating to the appointment of the officer. I told the honourable member that there was a docket in the Public Service Commissioner's office which contained the details of applications for this position, but as this docket contained confidential reports either of referees or of senior public servants relating to some applicants, it was not proper that I should table the docket. I said, however, that if the honourable member wished to have any information from the docket, I would supply it if he approached me. The honourable

member did not approach me. He asked me whether I would table the docket that I had given to him, and this I did. At no stage has the honourable member approached me about any details in the docket which I told him contained confidential information and which, therefore, could not be tabled. I have told him he could have any confidential information contained in that docket, but in my absence he asked another Minister for that docket to be tabled. The reply is as before: I will give the honourable member any confidential information contained in that docket if he asks me for it.

UNIVERSITY FEES.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: On July 27, when I asked the Minister of Education a question about university fees and referred to a reported statement by the Attorney-General that the Labor Party intended to repeal university fee increases, the Minister told me a statement would be made shortly. An article by the Minister in this morning's *Advertiser*, refers, I believe, to university fees and to a means test. Will the Minister say whether that is the statement to which he referred, or whether there is to be another statement concerning the whole matter of increases in university fees?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Australian Labor Party's policy at the last election in regard to this matter was stated in material issued to its candidates to the effect that there would be a reduction in university fees for those students who did not have allowances or scholarships. That was the only statement of policy in this regard contained in the material issued to A.L.P. candidates. I am not responsible for what was reported in the press about this matter. We are following the policy enunciated during the election campaign. The press statement I have just made about further assistance being given to university students is correct, and relates to what was referred to during the election.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I ask leave to make a Ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Certain questions have been asked in this House about an address which I gave at the university immediately following the elections, and concerning which I was reported in condensed form in the university paper. The honourable member for Alexandra has read some quotations from that paper. At the meeting in question I gave to students the reply which, in effect, the Minister of Education has read out: that,

in relation to those students who were hit by any increase in the fees (that is, those who had no scholarships or those whose fees were not paid by their employers), action would be taken by the Government which would reverse the effect of the action by the previous Government. I made that explanation *in extenso*. The reply quoted by the honourable member from *On Dit* was a very much condensed version of the reply I gave to a question I was asked. My reply was entirely in accordance with the statement made by the Minister of Education.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Attorney-General's statement leaves me with the inference that I had unfairly quoted a report in the university paper, or had taken it out of context. Can he say whether he meant that inference to be drawn, or does he consider the quotation that I read to be a fair report?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I was making no implication as far as the honourable member was concerned. I believe that he quoted accurately from the university students' paper which, in the space of a few hundred words, recorded excerpts from my hour-long address and answers to questions. Obviously, it was a considerable condensation of what I had to say. I do not suggest that the honourable member has quoted either inaccurately or unfairly.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Attorney-General has refuted one inference which it was suggested could be drawn from his Ministerial statement. Can he say now whether the correct inference in his Ministerial statement was that he was, in fact, misreported in *On Dit*?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I did not suggest that *On Dit* had misreported me. I suggest that the full answer I gave to the students in reply to a question was not given in *On Dit* for reasons, I imagine, of space.

CEDUNA COURTHOUSE.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Earlier this session I asked the Attorney-General a question concerning a courthouse at Ceduna. Last year about 214 cases were tried at the Ceduna courthouse, and for seven months of this year the total reached 315. Will the Minister consider extending courthouse facilities at Ceduna?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Improvements to the courthouse building have been approved by my department. The matter has been submitted to the Minister of Works for his consideration in respect of the programme of public buildings. My department has agreed

with the proposal for a new building in Ceduna to provide for a courthouse and for other offices concerned both with the Department of Social Welfare and with the Aborigines Department.

TRADES HALL MEETING.

Mr. HURST: Did the Premier, last evening, attend a meeting of representatives of the building trades unions? If so, has he any statement on the cause of any industrial dispute that may exist at present?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I attended a meeting last night in the Trades Hall that dealt with a question that has been uppermost in my mind. It has been indicated that stoppages have occurred. I do not want this answer to trespass in any way on a question on the Notice Paper. In fact, the matters to which I shall refer will not affect the reply to the question on notice. I understand that the stoppages have occurred because of a disparity between wage levels in South Australia and those in the Eastern States. For instance, in some States a payment is made above that provided in the award, but I do not know whether it is defined as an over-award payment, attendance money, or some other payment. I have reason to believe that this payment is included in the provisions in other States. This payment in Queensland is £2 2s. 6d. a week; in Victoria it is £2 16s. 8d. a week; and in New South Wales it is up to £5 a week. I believe that this question has been very much to the fore in the conciliation and arbitration that has taken place. I told representatives of the building industry present at the meeting last evening that I believed that there would have to be conciliation between the Master Builders Association and the unions concerned, as the hidden costs would continue to build up if these stoppages went on. I hope, however, that these stoppages will not continue. It was also mentioned that, in 1957, 11,005 persons were engaged in the building industry on new work, and the value of the new work produced was £29,684,000. However, in 1964, 14,418 persons were engaged on new work, and the value of new work produced was £75,088,000. It is not for me to make suggestions concerning increases or comparative costs but, as an increase of 154 per cent has occurred, there must be a reasonable opportunity for conciliation within the industry. I believe that no-one would be more pleased than members of this Parliament if this industry, as an industry, continued without interruption. It was said that if persons worked

in Victoria they obtained £2 16s. 8d. more than they would in South Australia. I am not asking that this sum be provided: I ask only that reasonable conciliation take place. It is not for me to tell these people what to do, but I believe that conciliation should take place between the organizations concerned and the builders (who are greatly concerned) to see whether this matter can be ironed out. I do not believe they want to have this type of thing continuing.

POTATO BOARD.

Mr. McANANEY (on notice): Is the Chairman of the Potato Board in a position to cope with day-to-day decisions necessary to such a marketing board in view of the fact that he is also Chief Horticulturist in the Agriculture Department and a member of the Royal Commission on the Grape Industry?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

ROADS.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman, for the Hon. G. G. PEARSON (on notice): What amounts were provided for road works in the Western District for each of the financial years from 1960-61 to 1964-65 inclusive, for:

- (a) maintenance of roads;
- (b) expenditure by the Highways Department on new construction of highways;
- (c) councils for work on highways;
- (d) councils for work on main roads under debit order;
- (e) councils by grants for assistance on district roads?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: My colleague has asked me to request the honourable member to ask this question again on Tuesday, August 17.

EDUCATION JOURNAL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

- 1. How often is the *Education Gazette* published?
- 2. How many copies of each issue are printed?
- 3. How many of these are supplied to departmental schools and secretaries of school committees or councils, respectively?
- 4. How many annual subscribers are there?
- 5. What has been the average number of copies of each issue sold singly in the last 12 months?
- 6. Are there any other methods by which copies are made available to the public?
- 7. If so, what are these methods and how many copies of each issue are so made available?

8. How many vacancies on the staffs of teachers colleges in this State have been advertised in the last 12 months in—

- (a) the daily press of other States and Canberra, and
- (b) the Journal of the Australian Libraries Association?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The replies are:

- 1. Monthly from February to December.
- 2. 10,600 each issue.
- 3. 8,864 to State schools, 670 to school committees and councils.
- 4. 299.
- 5. 13.
- 6. Yes.
- 7. 41 are issued to South Australian daily newspapers, and local, interstate and overseas publishers of school textbooks as complimentary copies. Also, a few retired committee chairmen; 154 copies to professional and administrative officers of the Education Department; 44 copies to departmental inspectors; 137 to local, interstate and overseas Government departments, teachers colleges, public libraries, universities and other Government educational authorities; 110 kept each month for binding; and the balance of about 250 left and used as spares for future schools and additional requests from teachers.

8. (a) In the last 12 months 18 vacancies for teachers college positions have been advertised in the daily press in other States.

(b) Four vacancies were to have been advertised in the July issue of the journal of the Australian Libraries Association, but will appear in the September issue of that journal.

FUEL COSTS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (on notice): What is the cost to the Electricity Trust per 1,000,000 British thermal units for Leigh Creek coal delivered at Port Augusta power station, New South Wales coal delivered at Osborne, and fuel oil delivered at Osborne, respectively?

The Hon. Frank Walsh, for the Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The cost of Leigh Creek coal delivered to Port Augusta power station is at present 26.7d. per million British thermal units. However, fuel oil and New South Wales coal delivered to Osborne power station are in direct competition. The comparative costs have not been divulged in the past and the Electricity Trust considers that it would not be in the public interest to divulge prices of fuels supplied on competitive contracts.

STRIKES.

Mr. CUMBE (on notice):

1. Have any statutory declarations been received by the Chief Inspector of Factories as provided by section 107 (1) of the Industrial Code, 1920-1963, in relation to strikes which have occurred in the building industry in and around Adelaide in the past few weeks?

2. If so, how many have been received?

3. What were the dates on which they were received?

4. Why has the Chief Inspector of Factories not yet laid in the Industrial Court any of the informations required by the Industrial Code?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The replies are:

1. Yes.

2. Four.

3. On July 29, 1965, July 30, 1965, and two on August 3, 1965.

4. In accordance with the practice previously adopted, when statutory declarations of this nature have been received they have been referred to the Crown Solicitor, requesting that, if he considers that there are grounds for suspecting that a strike has taken place, he prepare the necessary informations which the Chief Inspector is required to lay before the President of the Industrial Court.

NOXIOUS TRADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

TRAVELLING STOCK RESERVE.

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's resolution concerning the travelling stock reserve in the hundreds of Eba, Lindley, Maude, Bunday, King and Baldina, and in land out of hundreds.

LOAN ESTIMATES.

In Committee.

(Continued from August 5. Page 875.)

Grand total, £36,964,000.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): This is the first time for many years that a Labor Government has introduced Loan Estimates, and at the outset I congratulate the Treasurer upon that fact. I know that it gave great cause for jubilation amongst the members of his Party, and I saw the Whip rounding up members to give the Treasurer a hearty round of applause.

Mr. Jennings: I didn't have to.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I know it was a matter of some excitement that this document had been prepared and submitted by a Labor Government. I thought the staging of the tribute to the Treasurer was most effective; but, having said that, I want to say that when we examine these Estimates we see many things that must give cause for great concern. First, I completely reject the suggestion, contained in the opening paragraph of the Treasurer's statement, that it was the outgoing Government's job to provide money for this year's Loan Estimates. The substance of the statement was that as no big balances had been carried over by the previous Government the present Government's task was so much more difficult, and it seems to have a chip on its shoulder as a consequence.

The position is, of course, that it is contrary to the rules of the Loan Council to carry forward large sums. The Loan Council's job is to raise the money necessary to provide for the public works of the respective States and the Commonwealth for the year in which the money is raised and, if I had carried a sum forward, the Treasurer would have had every reason to complain that his submission to the Loan Council for additional funds was prejudiced because he could not go along and justify it. Therefore, the opening statement of the Treasurer is just complete eyewash. The Loan Council is the authority to provide the money for the Loan works of the State; the Treasurer is now a fully authenticated member of the Loan Council; the States have six members on the Loan Council, each with one vote; the Commonwealth has only two members; therefore, the States completely control the Loan Council. If the Loan Council stands adamant on a sum of money (and that has happened in the past), the States ultimately win out. I remember that not so many years ago the Commonwealth Government took the view that the requirements of the States were too great and could not be met, but the States did not agree and they passed the programme. The Commonwealth said it would not support the programme, but within three months it called another Loan Council meeting and the States got so much money at the meeting that they were unable to spend it in that year.

Those are the facts. Let me say something else to put this matter in its true perspective. The ultimate decision of the Loan Council in the cutting up of the money must be unanimous. This means that the Treasurer,

who comes here complaining about what the previous Government did or did not do, agreed to a programme which (I agree with him) is completely inadequate. We need only look at the planned programme and at the devious means proposed in raising the funds required to see that the programme is insufficient, because the Loan Council did not provide, for this year's expenditure, an adequate sum. It may be said (and, I believe, quite truthfully) that the Loan Council members make their own deals with the Commonwealth. Some of the States did make a deal with the Commonwealth on certain matters. The fact remains, however, that if the Treasurer had sat tight and said that he would not approve of this distribution because it was not sufficient, the ultimate result would be that the formula would have to apply. That could never be applied under modern conditions because of the mixture of accounts. If that action had been taken and the other States had been organized to support the Treasurer, the programme would have been vastly different from what it is today.

This is the first Loan programme that the Treasurer has submitted. I quote from a document which I prize, and I am sure honourable members will be interested to hear it although they have probably heard it before. It describes how promises that were made by the Government at the last election were to be financed. I am sure this programme will interest honourable members in light of the sorry performance we have before us today. On page 24 of his policy speech, the Premier said, concerning finance:

As soon as I mention anything concerning finance, I am always asked "Where will you get the money?" Let me remind you that Sir Thomas Playford, as Treasurer carried on with a deficit of almost £2,250,000 for the first six months of the present financial year and the affairs of the State went on without any fuss. Ours is not a policy of extravagance, it is one of accuracy in budgeting. We have two State-owned banking institutions. The State Bank is a trading bank and has done outstanding business in the financing and development of the State. The Savings Bank of S.A. was brought under the control of Parliament in 1945 at the request of the trustees and under the Act passed by the Parliament in that year. While South Australia possesses a number of great State undertakings such as the South Australian Housing Trust and the Electricity Trust of South Australia, these institutions and a number of lesser State undertakings do not bank with our own banking system. Labor's plan therefore is:

(a) To strengthen the State banking system by amalgamating the State Bank and the

Savings Bank so that trading bank and savings bank facilities with savings bank cheque accounts will be available throughout the State.

(b) To provide that all Government and semi-government institutions bank with the State banking institutions. I believe that this will permit expansion of the home purchase plan, industries assistance and personal loan schemes, and also provide for hire-purchase at reasonable rates.

(c) That as Commonwealth and interstate loan investments fall due for reconversion, they shall be reinvested in our own Government-guaranteed State undertakings. Additional funds will also be available on account of the normal rate of growth in Government Revenue and Loan funds. The current trend of growth in Government expenditure and receipts is 7 per cent a year and there is no indication that this trend is likely to alter. Last year Government expenditure exceeded £140,000,000, and therefore we can anticipate cumulative increases of approximately £10,000,000 each year for the next three years, making £60,000,000 increase in all.

This is the accuracy of budgeting that was mentioned earlier in this quotation. The Labor Party went to the country with a programme providing for £60,000,000 additional to be provided by the normal rate of growth in Government Revenue and Loan funds. How they grow, I do not know. If you were to tell Mr. Bolte in, they would not grow at all. The Treasurer wants to get rid of the chip on his shoulder, as he is under a great disability. When I took over the Treasury of the State, the Loan funds, deposits, and the credits in the trust accounts were negligible. However, today £13,141,000 is held, as at June 30, in respect of the various State funds in the form of cash in the hands of the various institutions. This sum represents money in hand towards the current programme, and money to assist in solving future problems that may arise. The list is as follows:

	£
Housing Trust	397,000
Electricity Trust	674,000
Roads Fund	848,000
Municipal Tramways Trust	275,000
Royal Adelaide Hospital Endowment Fund	353,000
University of Adelaide	1,282,000
Commonwealth Grant towards Science Laboratories and Technical Training	389,000
Leigh Creek Coal Fund	436,000
Advances for Homes Insurance Fund	326,000
Engineering and Water Supply Department—Working Account	435,000
Primary Producers assistance Debt Adjustment Fund	402,000
Public Stores Department Suspense Stores Working Account	250,000
Rail Standardization	686,000
Railways Suspense Stores Working Account	243,000

State Bank—Reserve on Home	£
Builders Fund Loans	356,000
War Service Land Settlement . .	272,000
Woods and Forests Department	
Working Account	721,000

I do not believe there has ever been a Treasurer who took office in this State and who found the contingencies for the future had been more fully met than has the present Treasurer. Yet he says that the Working Account and the Loan Account were £30,000 overdrawn. How ridiculous can you get! The Treasurer points out, while he still has the chip on his shoulder, that in 1965-66 the Australian Loan Council adopted a total new borrowing programme of £295,000,000, an increase of only £5,000,000 on the programme for the previous year. Of course, that was the decision of the Loan Council of which he was a member. He then goes on to say:

Of that amount, South Australia will receive £40,446,000 which is an increase of £686,000. Though the increase is uncomfortably small I point out that it is over 13½ per cent of the aggregate increase of all States which is considerably greater than a quota determined upon a population basis.

Again, that is a legacy of the previous Government. The previous Government over many years had worked hard to have this State's share of Loan funds increased. The quota is 13.7 per cent.

Mr. Millhouse: It is 13.71.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: All the Treasurer had to do to obtain that 13.71 per cent was to say, "I want the quota."

Mr. Shannon: "I want what the previous Government has established."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, it was already established by the previous Government. On a population basis, it would be between 9 and 10 per cent in this State, but I did not hear any tribute paid by the Treasurer to the magnificent quota he had inherited because of a policy carried out over many years by the previous Government. The next quotation is a perfect gem:

Of this State's allocation I have nominated £9,500,000 to be taken under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, which is twice as heavy a diversion for housing on a population basis as is provided in the aggregate by all other States.

We have been telling the Treasurer that for the last 10 years, but he has always said, "But that is no reason. What we want is sufficient for the needs." If we are to deal with the matter on the basis of our needs, the first thing I point out is that the allocation is £725,000 less than it was last year, and

that never in the last 10 years has money been so short for housing loans as it is today. Let the Treasurer contradict that! Never in the last 10 years has it been so difficult for a prospective house builder to obtain a loan. Yet, although the Treasurer has nearly £700,000 more at his disposal for housing, he has taken £725,000 less for housing than the sum provided by the previous Government; and that sum, over a long period, was said by the Treasurer to be insufficient. If it was not sufficient last year at least it was more than it is this year. The Treasurer glibly says, "We are going to have a bigger housing programme than we had last year. Last year we had only £13,200,000; this year we are going to have £14,000,000," but that is solely by depleting the reserves of the Housing Trust.

Mr. Millhouse: That's obvious.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That is the only way it can be done. I doubt whether it will be done, but I shall come back to that matter shortly. In this matter, as in other matters, we are witnessing the "rake's progress". Funds for housing are necessary and for the maintenance of these great institutions, in the interests of the welfare and development of this State. I sincerely suggest that, when the Treasurer presents the next Loan Estimates to this House (if he ever does) he should forget to ask the previous Government to finance them and realize that it is the Treasurer's responsibility forcibly to put before the Loan Council the necessary case, and to ensure that the State receives sufficient money to carry on the general works and public services so necessary for its development.

This year, out of a total programme in Australia of £295,000,000 the increase is only £5,000,000, which is near enough to 1.4 per cent. However, the population is increasing at a rate well over 2 per cent, particularly in this State. The gross national product has been increasing each year over the last 10 years by 4 per cent, and I believe that rate to be unnecessarily conservative, when we take into account the amount of time in Australia in which to prepare to defend ourselves. I am not criticizing the Commonwealth Government unjustly: I have often said this to its face in the Loan Council. Since the war the gross national product of Japan has risen by about 10 per cent a year; I believe that in Israel (with its small resources) it has risen by about 8 per cent, and that West Germany's increase is also about 8 per cent. However, Australia is almost on all fours with Malaya. One would

have expected that at least the Loan allocation would rise by the same percentage as the gross national product has risen.

Mr. Shannon: At the very least.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, because the welfare of the industries would surely demand that the gross national product should at least be followed by investment in public works, and by at least a percentage increase. If we had had that percentage increase we would, of course, have had about a £12,000,000 increase in the allocation as against £5,000,000. Last year I believe we had exactly the same position in respect of the Commonwealth, when it said, "No, we are giving enough for Loan works." Having forcibly approached the Loan Council, I believe we obtained £17,000,000, which was higher than the percentage increase. We also obtained an increase in respect of the semi-governmental programme. The Treasurer's problem today arises out of two facts. In the first instance, at the time of the election, he entered into commitments that were based upon assumptions which were entirely incorrect. There is not likely to be £60,000,000 more available to him from the normal rate of growth; nor is there likely to be anything available to him from the Government's wonderfully ingenious scheme of organizing the State Bank and the Savings Bank into one institution. In fact, I do not hear much about this now. Nothing will be made available from trying to draw funds from the redemption as it may come along from any securities held by the Savings Bank, because I assure the Treasurer that, if he attempts that, then the same day the Commonwealth will undoubtedly proceed to cease to underwrite the programme that has been provided. The present position, as I see it with regard to this Loan programme, is that it is grossly insufficient. Scarcely a line is provided where I should say that the funds provided would meet the requirements of the State that are bound to arise. This programme has been boosted and expanded by means that are financially unsound. It is not good finance to use reserve funds for a temporary purpose.

Mr. Shannon: You cannot use them the second time!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: You cannot use them indefinitely. If the sum in a depreciation account is used for running expenses, then when it comes to replacing plant and equipment for which the depreciation account is provided there is real trouble. Depreciation accounts are obviously provided

for the purpose set out in the legislation establishing them. I believe it is unwarranted, bad finance and only the beginning of the Government's getting into serious financial difficulty to call upon the semi-governmental authorities to provide more from their reserve accounts.

Having made those general comments on the Loan programme, I now refer to the individual items, although I shall probably not deal with them in the order in which they were presented in the document. The Electricity Trust is getting the same sum from the Treasurer as was provided last year. Last year £3,000,000 was provided for it, and the same sum is provided this year. Last year the Treasurer gave the Electricity Trust the right to borrow, and it successfully borrowed £3,250,000 from semi-governmentals.

Mr. Shannon: From the public.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. A part of the initial State semi-governmental loan was allocated to the trust last year, and those are the sums that it had available to it. These are exactly the same sums as the trust is having made available to it under the programme this year. However, last year the trust had a total programme of £10,750,000, whereas this year (if I remember correctly) it has a programme of £12,000,000. This means that the trust will have to draw on its reserves to the extent of an additional £1,250,000, and that the sum of £674,000 held by the trust on June 30 will all be used and another £600,000 will be needed. This will probably be part of the depreciation account for this year. I do not deny for one moment that the trust wants the money, and that it is absolutely essential that it have the money: I say that the programme that we are considering is grossly inadequate because it requires the trust to keep up with the expenses necessary and to draw too heavily on its internal funds.

No-one denies that it can draw. Last year it drew upon internal funds; there are certain profits that it makes and certain sums become available to us. Plant is depreciated and written off as being obsolete and obviously that money is available to the trust for re-expenditure, but the money provided last year for a programme of £10,750,000 is obviously insufficient to finance a programme of £12,000,000. More than that, I believe that at present, the trust should not be drawing on its reserves: it should be creating reserves. It matters not how the Government treats my motion on the Notice Paper about the future policy of the trust on fuel: the fact remains

that those matters are before us. It is easy for the Treasurer to say that, when the new oil contract operates, fuel costs will be lower than the cost of Leigh Creek coal and that Leigh Creek coal will not be used. The Treasurer said there would be a diversion of Leigh Creek coal from Port Augusta to the Torrens Island power station, which would be more efficient. Although the Treasurer says that we should forget Leigh Creek because it is going out gradually, if members look at the official statement on the Leigh Creek coalfield they will find that the opposite is the case. It was stated then that the Leigh Creek coalfield was to be expanded, that money was to be spent to enable it to expand, and that coal would be available at the expanded rate for years to come. Some of the information I gave this Chamber only a fortnight ago was challenged by the Treasurer. I want to tell him that I am not in the habit of making up information, and I will quote the source of my information, which is of great relevance to this debate. The source of my information is a book called *The Dynamic Natural Gas Industry*, by Alfred M. Leeston, John A. Crichton, and J. C. Jacobs.

Mr. Shannon: Is that of American origin?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. Those gentlemen spent nearly a decade writing this great American success story. Before his death in late 1962, Mr. Leeston was an economist serving the Delhi-Taylor Oil Corporation as Librarian; Mr. Crichton, a petroleum and natural gas engineer and petroleum geologist, is President of Oil and Gas Property Management Incorporated and Nafco Oil and Gas Incorporated; and Mr. Jacobs, an attorney with a background in engineering, is Vice-President of the Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation and has served as Natural Gas Regulation editor for *Oil and Gas Reporter*. It will be seen that these people have some experience of the industry in America. This information was published in 1961. I said that the industry at that time was expanding at the rate of 5.7 per cent a year, and that that expansion rate had been maintained for many years; it certainly has not gone back since 1961, so the figures quoted were obviously conservative. However, the Treasurer denied that 500,000 miles of gas transmission main had been laid in America: he said that 200,000 miles had been laid. A person could take any number out of a hat, of course, and double it or do anything else, but the Treasurer said that 200,000 miles had been laid and that if we were considering 500,000 miles, we would have to

take the service mains up the street. What this publication has to say on this question (and, as I say, it was published in 1961) is unambiguous:

The national gas pipeline network measured over 500,000 miles, and marketed production in 1960 was nearly 13 trillion cubic feet.

The second thing the Leader stated was that my figures regarding the energy provided by natural gas were incorrect. So that it would be freely available to the Treasurer and to anyone else, I had the graph of this taken out of the same publication (page 103), and that shows the rate of growth of natural gas in a diagrammatic form in the U.S.A. This shows that in 1920 natural gas (which is represented by the small black line) could scarcely be seen on the diagram.

Mr. Shannon: Can you give us the percentage figures?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In 1930 it had doubled the 1920 figure; in 1940 it had doubled in size again; in 1950 it had again doubled; and in 1961 the figures were (and these are the percentages the honourable member wanted) bituminous coal, 21.4 per cent; other (I presume that would probably be hydro or thermal), 8.1 per cent; petroleum, 41.2 per cent; and natural gas, 29.3 per cent. The heading of the graph is *U.S.A. Energy Consumption*. I do not wish to say anything about the reputation of the firm conducting the present survey for the Government; I believe it has a good reputation. However, I also know that a survey was made before the previous Government went out of office, and a document on this is already available to the Government. The survey was made by a most reputable American firm on behalf of the discoverers of the field, and they very courteously made a full copy of the document available. That document is on the file. Therefore, it is obvious that whatever we had before we will have again, because the facts speak for themselves.

Mr. Shannon: Have any new discoveries of natural gas been made at Gidgealpa since that report?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The natural gas at Gidgealpa was found before my Government went out of office: it was not discovered subsequently to that. Indeed, two drilling plants were in operation in the field when my Government went out of office, and there is no drilling plant working in South Australia at present. I make it clear (I do not want to mislead members on this) that one drilling plant is drilling a hole over the border.

Mr. Shannon: In Queensland?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. I believe that this hole could be of immense value to South Australia. I do not criticize the company concerned for going over the border. But, Mr. Chairman, what has changed since my Government went out of office is that Mereenie has been definitely proved and Palm Valley has been definitely established. Both of these places are of immense interest to South Australia, and both are owned by people who will not be prepared to allow those deposits to stand idle. Already I have told the Prime Minister in a letter that these companies are actively preparing to take pipelines to both Victoria and New South Wales.

Mr. Shannon: They will by-pass South Australia if they do it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Obviously. As I understand the policy of the Government, a report will be made on the practicability of a main. Why? That has been proved by more than 500,000 miles of main operating in America today, and with enormous networks established in Canada, and in every country in the world. We do not need a firm of consultants to tell us that it is practicable. A publication I have by Professor Rudd (and I thank him for his courtesy in making it available to me) contains all the facts about mains—the legislation under which they are provided, the working expenses, the pressure under which they work, and the cost of running them. These facts are all known. This is not a matter on which we should have a half-hearted policy. When introducing the Loan Estimates, the Treasurer said that the plant at the Torrens Island and Osborne power stations would have to be modified to enable natural gas to be found, should this fuel become available. That was a decision made when my Party was in office. At that time the Electricity Trust urged that a decision should be made by December 30 last, as this was necessary for planning. Now, for some mysterious reason that has not been disclosed to me by the Treasurer, we do not want natural gas until 1971. Has anyone heard such rot! In a State that is naturally devoid of all fuels, how can we complacently wait for five years before anything happens? The public of South Australia wants something to happen before then.

Mr. Shannon: It will happen in 1968, you wait and see.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The background of establishing a main had been prepared by a firm of oversea consultants; the cost of the main and the reserves of the field had been estimated. Dr. Levison, who, unfortunately, is now dead, and who was one of the foremost oil men in the United States of America, concurred with the summary provided by the American company. The Government's policy for the Electricity Trust is wrong, because we should be building up reserves now. When I discussed this matter with a member of the board, it expressed great interest, and I was once told that the trust would be prepared to contribute towards the main from its resources. I believe the trust would be well advised to maintain an active interest in the main. Apparently, the present policy is one of wait and see. However, at this time we are not able to wait and see; we should be more dynamic and do something of real service to solve the great problems of this State.

The Treasurer said that an industry had been established at Port Pirie because of the cheap power. I negotiated for that industry and I know the facts. The Government had to subsidize the power cost to enable that industry to be established. Tasmania offered power at an appreciably lower rate than we provided. The only thing that kept the industry here was the heavy transport charge involved in shifting the concentrate heap to Tasmania for treatment. The Treasurer is incorrect when he says that that industry was established here because of the low fuel charges: it came here in spite of that, which is totally different.

I now deal with the second great instrumentality established by the State for the servicing of housing. This year the Housing Trust has an official programme of £14,040,000, with £4,600,000 provided by the Treasurer and £2,025,000 from semi-government institutions, being £6,625,000 provided by the Treasurer. To make up the £14,040,000 programme, internal funds to the extent of £7,400,000 have to be used. Last year the "discredited Government" (a term used by the honourable member for Enfield when not engaged in other activities) provided £5,000,000 in the official programme and £1,800,000 in the semi-governmental programme. It provided £6,800,000 compared with £6,600,000 to be provided by the Government this year, and this was provided in a total programme of £13,400,000. In other words, there has been a decrease of £770,000 in trust funds this year for housing. At present the

Housing Trust has balances in hand of £397,000, so we can see what the rake's progress will do to this magnificent institution.

Mr. Coumbe: What happens next year?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am coming to that. If we are to deplete the working expenses of these accounts this year, what happens next year? Honourable members opposite are strangely silent on that matter. Are we to build houses only this year, and then go into recess? The Loan programme secured by the Treasurer was grossly inadequate, and he is trying to patch it up by making all sorts of raids on trust funds and deposit accounts. The proposals in the Labor Party's policy speech about this natural growth do not seem to work out. Of course, "accurate budgeting" is one of the great essentials here, but the facts are that the Housing Trust's programme has been diminished. Last year £950,000 was provided to the trust to construct factories and shops, but this year the sum for that purpose is only £430,000. We can therefore see that funds to provide for factories and shops erected by the Housing Trust are down by £520,000—less than half the sum provided last year. Honourable members opposite may say, "What interest has the trust in factories and shops? Why not leave factories and shops to other people?" If we are to attract industries to this State we must use the same method as is used in other States of making money readily available for factories. Indeed, this is the policy in Western Australia, which is becoming one of our main competitors. I venture to suggest that the honourable member whose district takes in Elizabeth would agree that Elizabeth would never have been a success but for the fact that the Housing Trust was permitted and financed by the last Government to assist in establishing factories in that area.

The honourable member knows, too, that some of the most important factories in the area were provided under the Industries Development Act. Not only have they been profitable to the Housing Trust but they have also provided employment for local residents, and in many instances factories that were going to other States have come here. One factory is the valuable pipe manufacturing organization, the directors of which had intended to go to Western Australia until we were able to show them that if they came to South Australia we would be prepared to put up some of the finance to enable the industry to establish here. In fact, we put up that finance

under terms entirely satisfactory and profitable to us. If this item is to be reduced, it would have endless repercussions in years to come. Are we to assume that because only £420,000 is provided for factories and shops this year under the Labor Government no more factories desire to come here? Indeed, I know that singularly few reports have been called for from the Industries Development Committee.

Mr. Coumbe: What about decentralization?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Of course, we will not hear that word from now on.

Mr. Millhouse: Even though a special officer has been appointed for this purpose, too!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Another gravely disturbing fact about the housing position is that a Cabinet decision has been made in connection with the Housing Trust, so that in future much expenditure in regard to water and sewerage previously met by the official Loan programme now has to be met by the Housing Trust. That is an interesting decision by a Government that claims it is interested in low-cost housing. It means, initially at least, that the cost of every house increases by £250, and that the rent of every house (or the weekly payment) increases by 2s. 6d. No reason was given for this decision, and no reason has yet been forthcoming. It reminds us of the increase in the water rates: it is one of those things that sneak up on us, and no reasons are given to us to justify the increase. My Government introduced a system of making subdividers who were not necessarily fully developing the land provide some money for water and other services. My colleague, the former Minister of Works, evolved a plan which, I believe, was just and equitable, but that was to apply where a subdivision took place, where services would be immediately demanded, but where housing would develop over years in some instances, leaving for the time many vacant blocks.

Here, the feature of our Housing Trust's development programme is that, concerning public services, it is the best type of development, because it is always a block or planned development; the houses are all built at once. No justification exists for this item on the Estimates. I deal now with the other side of the Government's housing programme, that is, the sum provided to the State Bank for advances for houses. There is nothing significant about this sum. The sum of £350,000 is provided this year, as against £250,000 last year. The additional £100,000 was referred

to in the Government's policy speech, which stated that money would be provided for the financing of old houses. Indeed, this was one of the great features of the policy. I have held the view, and have stated publicly, that the State Loan programme should not include financing the change in house ownership. There is a legitimate reason for including provision for the building of more houses: they create a natural asset; they are developmental; they provide employment; and they cater for additional population. We have the right to provide for this type of housing. However, I do not believe that the financing of a change of ownership should be the subject of a finance programme. Assistance is given for this in the Homes Act, under which the Government guarantees advances made by private institutions for the purchase of houses. That is not restricted to new houses and, therefore, the State is not unsympathetic to a change of ownership. However, this is not a proper matter for the official Loan programme, particularly when it is as tight as the present programme.

When I look at what is to be done with this money I become even more concerned. The Treasurer said that it was to be used in selective financing of the purchase of older houses in accordance with the election policy of the Government. What does selective financing mean? Is there to be preference for unionists? The sum of £100,000 provided for it is not much and would probably not meet the purchase of more than 35 houses. If the Treasurer had said that this money was to provide for the financing of the purchase of older houses in accordance with the election policy of the Government I should have let that pass without comment, but when the word "selective" was introduced I became concerned. What does that word mean? Who will be the selector, and what will be the qualifications for this loan? Will one have to be a member of the Liberal Party to be considered in the programme?

Mr. Jennings: I should not think that would be necessary.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I entirely agree with the honourable member. He did not say anything when I referred to unionists but, when I referred to the Liberal Party, he immediately showed his hand; he knew something about that. This is something that I decry. If we are going to have some item of housing that will not be considered

on the same basis as all other items of housing, then I say the Opposition will go to any ends to embarrass the Government on such a policy as this. Although this matter has not been to an Opposition Party meeting, I know what the views of Opposition members will be on it. We will not have this provision regarding housing. This item of selective financing needs further explanation.

A sum of £600,000 is provided this year for loans to producers. Last year the £649,000 provided was insufficient. With the problems that are arising I believe that the sum provided this year will be insufficient. The policy of the State Bank is again a matter that I believe requires examination. A sum of £500,000 is provided for advances to the State Bank. I believe that this sum is mainly to be used for rural guarantees given for the purchase of farms by people wishing to go on the land. Has there been an alteration in this Government's policy from the policy of the previous Government concerning this Act? Has a restriction been placed on it, a restriction that is not in the Act? I have heard that a restriction has been imposed, and that the sums now provided relate only to a much smaller project which, under present conditions, it is almost impossible to achieve. As a consequence, the number of people able to apply for the benefit of this Act has been greatly reduced. Indeed, what the Treasurer said on this has some significance because he stated clearly in his explanation of the Loan Estimates that, up to the present, the Savings Bank and the State Bank have been the only contributors to this function, and that he hoped the private banks would now take over. Has there been a change in policy? In my opinion this was one of the best Acts ever passed by this Parliament for the development of our country land and for keeping country areas from falling into the hands of a few. This was a good Act, and I should be disappointed if I found out that, as a result of some restriction in policy, it had been undermined.

The sum of £270,000 is provided for the Corporation of Adelaide for the building of the Morphett Street bridge. The total programme this year is for £540,000, of which £270,000 will be found from the Highways Fund. I believe that this is a fair allocation. I believe that the Highways Fund is properly debited with half of this cost, and that is a fair sum. However, I believe that the other half should not come from Loan funds; I think it should probably come from the Revenue Estimates. I have some doubt about whether it is proper to

charge this to the Loan programme. I will deal later with the Highways Fund, as I have some criticism to make of what the Government is doing.

I believe that the sums provided for south-western suburbs drainage are totally inadequate. The Government, when in Opposition, made many criticisms of the amounts provided by the previous Government. Actually, however, there was previously no restriction, as the previous Minister of Works knows, but this year only £375,000 is provided. A substantial part of this provision will be used to complete the flood control dam, and nothing is provided for the widening of the Sturt River. Unless that work is undertaken and treated as urgent, all the other work will have no value. What is the good of providing a drain up the river unless there is access to the sea? Nothing is provided, however, for enlarging the Sturt River. It has clearly been shown by examination that the real problem arises from the bottleneck that occurs at the lower end of the scheme. In this matter, the Loan programme again falls seriously short of requirements. The member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) is interested in this problem, and he will undoubtedly notice repercussions in his district as soon as we have another wet year.

The sum of £25,000 is provided as a loan to the Renmark Irrigation Trust. The arrangements that I entered into with the trust have been completely forgotten in these Estimates, except that the Treasurer had the grace to say that the matter was being looked at and that he would make a statement at some future time. Although that will be an interesting statement, it will not provide money. The member for the district, who has the esteem of the area at the moment, is looking my way, as he knows as well as I that the rehabilitation of the trust's area is urgent and that there is no earthly reason why the arrangements made with and agreed to by the trust should not have been carried out. I can tell honourable members in general, and the member for the district in particular, why I believe these arrangements are not being carried out—because I was involved in the negotiations and the Government wants to get something different. There will be problems the moment we get a low river, which we will have again. The member for the Renmark area will have the same difficulties when there is a low river as his friend from Glenelg will have when there is a high river!

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It is a case of misplaced emphasis.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It is. No satisfactory provision is made in this matter. Let me turn now to a more pleasant topic. I know everyone was intensely interested in the remarks made by the Premier in his policy speech. I do not think it is necessary for me to read all his remarks, but these are some of the things he said when speaking about co-ordination of transport and about railway passenger services:

These must be completely overhauled. The Railways Commissioner has announced an improvement in the number of passengers travelling on suburban railways. He also mentioned that country patronage had declined, but he did not say that this was brought about by his inefficient administration in not providing a suitable type of rolling stock, or perhaps he is not passenger-minded in railway services. Rail freight must be increased. The tonnages for 1955-63, both years inclusive, have been static at almost 4,500,000 tons annually. This state of affairs cannot continue. More rolling stock is needed and must be provided. I have personally visited many places within the railways and declare that the Playford Government has failed in its obligation to the people of this State concerning this very important industry.

Having quoted the words of condemnation by the present Government of the past Government, I turn now to what the present Government is doing. This year £2,800,000 is provided for railway accommodation, but last year no less than £3,200,000 was spent, so the Government is going to force more transport on to the railways yet it is going to give the railways £400,000 less! I understand there are some very bright economists opposite, but I do not know how the Government can explain that. It intends to provide more modernized rolling stock and overcome the deficiencies of the last Government, yet it is going to do this in some mystical manner by which it can provide £400,000 less! We were told by the Treasurer in his policy speech that his Party would earn £1,000,000 more from transport. The Government said it would boost the £4,500,000, which has been insufficient previously, and subject to a declaration by the Treasurer—

Mr. Coumbe: And that document is official.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, and it even has the official numbering on it. It is all there, and it is a genuine original document. Another interesting thing is that last year the Government provided £33,000 for housing for Railways Department employees, whereas this year the provision has been reduced to £25,000.

Last year the Government spent £1,071,000 on harbours accommodation, and the provision this year is for £1,280,000—an increase of

£209,000. However, these Estimates show that the Harbors Board's operations are becoming more and more centralized, for there is nothing much except provision for Outer Harbor, Port Adelaide and Port Pirie. The Giles Point project has been referred back for further investigation. A small sum is provided for Thevenard, but in my opinion the whole programme for that port is totally inadequate. An opportunity exists to create a magnificent port there. If it had a berth that could accommodate the standard overseas ship today, our export of gypsum products to Japan could be expanded enormously, but the Harbors Board facilities are now being virtually centralized in the metropolitan area and at Port Pirie. Giles Point has gone by the board, and any improvements that may be necessary for shipping wheat from other ports on Eyre Peninsula have gone by the board; so far as I know, the Government is completely inactive in this matter. I think I can understand the board's point of view as well as the Treasurer's point of view. The board has no particular interest in the maintenance of a jetty that does not return it much revenue. Indeed, probably it would blow the middle out of some jetties if it had the chance.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Of course, this was done as the result of an agreement drawn up with your Government.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not criticizing the Minister of Works, or saying that he is to blame personally. My Government had many discussions with the board on this very topic; we pointed out that the board was not a revenue-producing department but a service department, and we must get that idea into somebody's head some time. I must admit that the previous Government was not always successful in getting things done, although we were responsible for some facilities being provided at places other than the metropolitan area and Port Pirie.

The Harbors Board has carried out work for the Agriculture Department by providing fishing havens, and I presume that the new Government will adopt the same policy in this respect. I understand that on his recent visit to the South-East the Minister of Agriculture said that he had a lot of time for fishermen, that he had been a fisherman himself, and that he did not have the same views as the unsympathetic Government that had just been tipped out—I suppose he said "ignominiously" tipped out.

Mr. Jennings: I agree with you.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: He said that he was not unsympathetic, and here was an instance where this Government could have given rein to its alleged sympathetic policy without seriously disrupting the Loan programme. Well, last year the Government (that is, the unsympathetic Government) provided £42,000 for fishing havens, whereas this year the sympathetic Government said, "Well, you have enough, we will give you only £21,000."

Mr. Quirke: When things are different they are not the same.

Mr. Jennings: That applies both ways, doesn't it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The member for Enfield the other day used an expression I thought I would never hear from a member of the Labor Party: he said something was financially impracticable.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: We never heard it here in the last 20 years.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No. What is the position regarding fishing havens? A large industry is being developed at Port Lincoln. Provision has been examined for proper landing and slipway facilities there for what will be one of the important industries of this State. In company with my colleague, the former Minister of Works, I discussed with the Harbors Board the cost of those facilities. The site has been examined, and so far as I know the plans are sufficiently well advanced for work to be done. However, there is not a word about it in these Estimates.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: And nothing for Ceduna, either.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No. Although many people there derive their livelihood from this industry, no landing facilities are being provided. Incidentally, I doubt whether the £21,000 provided for the facilities required at Edithburgh would have appeared on these Estimates had I not approved of that expenditure before my Government went out of office.

Mr. Jennings: I am amazed that the sun is still rising in the east since you went out of office.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Again, we are up against the fact that the provision in the Loan Estimates is entirely inadequate.

Mr. Coumbe: It is halved in this instance.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, but I am talking of the Loan Estimates generally. The next item to which I refer and to which I should probably have referred a long

while ago, because it is a big item of expenditure and I have been playing around with smaller ones, is waterworks and sewers. The expenditure there last year was over £14,500,000; the sum provided this year is substantially less. The Minister of Works cannot undertake his programme this year with the sum provided by the Treasurer. This programme is an almost complete continuation of the works in hand; there are very few new items. There is one that I shall refer to in a few moments, but this year's programme is virtually a continuation of the re-laying of the Tod main, the duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla main, the establishment of the Adelaide sewage treatment works, and so on. The provision made in the Loan Estimates is something within which the Minister of Works cannot live; he cannot hold his contractors down to this sum.

Mr. Jennings: The Minister of Works did not do it last year, either.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: He did not have to.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I did not have to.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Last year he did not have to hold them down, but, had he had to, it would have meant a wholesale dismissal of men. Is that correct?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Yes.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: And it will be correct now; so that, in the first place, without criticizing any items of the Loan Estimates, we return to the inescapable fact that the Treasurer at the Loan Council meeting failed in his mission. The department cannot be held down to the sum provided in the Loan Estimates. Secondly, it is wholly undesirable to hold it down. The works set out are essential to the establishment of industry and the maintenance of development and production in this State. When it was decided to duplicate the Morgan-Whyalla main, we were at that stage up against it to make sure that we could service the great industry being established in Whyalla. There has been nothing since then to suggest that the pressure is off: quite the contrary. As we expected, the establishment of the integrated steelworks there led immediately to the creation of supplementary projects. Now on the drawing board are coke ovens and a pellet-making plant. All those things mean an increased demand not only for water for the industry but also for houses, with a corresponding increased demand for water for those houses. I have the greatest sympathy for the Minister of Works in his trying to implement the various items of the

programme before him with the limited money provided. I do not believe he can do it.

I refer now to two specific items. This year there is provided for sewerage in new areas £445,000. Last year £1,056,000 was provided, which was not enough. Honourable members opposite may not be so conversant with this as are my colleagues in the former Ministry, but for years the Opposition could have legitimately criticized the Government for the fact that time and time again specific numbers of houses were erected but could not be occupied because sewerage connections were not available. The Minister of Works will agree with me on that. I am talking now of Housing Trust houses, but the position was even worse in areas of private house-building because the Housing Trust was receiving at least some consideration. If the sum provided for sewerage in these Loan Estimates had been the same as last year's, it would have been inadequate. The Minister of Works is placed in a hopeless position by being allocated only £445,000 instead of £1,056,000.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: And West Torrens will share in that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It will share in it later, because at present it has much leeway to make up. There is one item on the Loan Estimates that the Treasury should look at. I do not criticize the need for it (in fact, I support it) but I believe it is improperly placed upon these Loan Estimates. It deals with the duplication of a main and is part of another scheme. Under the Barossa water district, £90,000 is provided for work in duplicating the existing Barossa trunk main between Sandy Creek and Gawler. We are told that this work is the first stage of a scheme to improve supplies to Two Wells and Virginia. If this is so, this matter should have been referred to the Public Works Committee; it is unlawful to place it on the Loan Estimates at this stage. I am sure the cost of providing a water supply to Two Wells and Virginia would be about £2,000,000. As far as I know, this matter has not been referred to the Public Works Committee, and I believe that this item does not comply with the provisions of the Public Works Standing Committee Act. This item would be unlawful if included in the Public Purposes Loan Bill yet to come before the House.

I do not oppose the item as it is necessary work. I believe that about five or six years ago the Public Works Committee referred to the duplication of the main, but it did not refer to it in the present connection. It is stated

categorically in the Loan Estimates that this is the first stage of a scheme to improve the supply to Two Wells and Virginia, and therefore, it must be considered in that context. However, if that is done it will be found that it is not in accordance with the normal provision. The sum provided for waterworks and sewers is insufficient, and the provision relating to the Kimba water supply is a good illustration of this. No-one would suggest that the supply is not urgent.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: I agree: it is most urgent.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It is. It has been delayed for a considerable period for two reasons. First, the people at Kimba, not knowing there was a possibility of a local supply being developed and that the Polda Basin was sufficient to justify a local scheme, asked the Government to construct a small main from Iron Knob to Kimba. This was to serve the town of Kimba, but would not have been capable of serving any other area. It had the general disability of being placed on the wrong end of a supply that was gravely over-taxed; it would have meant expensive water at Iron Knob, and extremely expensive water at Kimba. If there had been no alternative, I believe that my Government would have recommended this scheme to the Public Works Committee and would have supported it in the House. In fact, the scheme was referred to the committee. However, an emergency occurred on Eyre Peninsula which caused the Government of the day to develop, as an emergency measure, the Polda Basin, and this development had one or two significant results. First, it settled for all time the contention that water, which had been pumped out of the Polda Basin by the Mines Department in pumping tests, was being recirculated and that there was not a proper supply. Pumping the water into mains and taking it out of the district proved conclusively that the water was there. Secondly, the Polda Basin stood up magnificently to the heavy pumping that was done. The Hon. G. G. Pearson, as Minister, gave instructions that the Polda Basin should be pumped intensively to prove its worth, and it stood up to this pumping. The Public Works Committee delayed its report pending the result of the intensive pumping of the Polda Basin. The committee was satisfied that not only Kimba but also extremely valuable farming areas, which were improving in production every year, could be supplied with this water. An amount of £10,000 has been placed on the Loan Estimates for work on the Kimba water

supply. At this rate, it would take about 80 years to complete the scheme.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The cost of the scheme was £960,000.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am sure the Minister realizes that this is only fiddling with the problem, but it proves that the programme is completely inadequate for the essential requirements of the State. Last year the amount provided for country sewers was £887,000 in respect of four projects, including one at the head of the Onkapinga River and another at the head of the Torrens River to purify the water used in the metropolitan area. There was a project at Whyalla and, if I remember correctly, one at Mount Gambier. There were four projects in all. The Gumeracha project has been completed and one would have thought that it would be possible to start another project this year. With the many country towns in South Australia, one would have thought that at least four projects were not unreasonable but, as matters stand, when the Gumeracha project dropped out, no other took its place and so we see that the provisions for sewerage have narrowed to provisions for Mount Gambier, Whyalla and Lobethal.

There has also been a reduction of £92,000 in the total provided. The inescapable fact is that the money provided by the Treasurer is not sufficient, and this applies to every line of the Estimates I have dealt with, because the Treasurer was not successful in getting what would have been a normal increase in the Loan allocation.

Mr. Hudson: What was the increase granted in the Loan Council for the whole of Australia?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the honourable member had listened to my preliminary remarks, he would have heard that the amount granted for the whole of Australia rose from £290,000,000 to £295,000,000.

Mr. Hudson: And you are saying that it is the Treasurer's fault that the allocation for this State was not higher?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I can develop the matter for the honourable member. The figures mean that we had a £5,000,000 increase in the capital works programme of all State Governments. Last year, the total Loan allocation increased by £17,000,000. Will the honourable member for Glenelg say that Australia can afford an annual increase in its developmental works programme of only 1.4 per cent, when its gross national product is rising by 4 per cent? I do not accept economics of that kind.

Mr. Hudson: I did not say anything about that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The highfalutin matter in the policy speech is so much rubbish!

Mr. Hudson: But some of the money comes out of taxation.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member for Glenelg ought to know that taxation does not come into the matter of Loan Estimates. I assert that the increased amount provided by the Loan Council, £5,000,000, is completely unrealistic and inadequate. The Treasurer is a member of the Loan Council and the final decision of that body must be unanimous. The Treasurer should have sat tight. As I have been a member of the Loan Council, I know the problems and on one occasion many years ago, I sat tight for three days and ultimately got the money for the first Morgan-Whyalla main, so I know what I am talking about. The provisions are inadequate for all lines of the programme.

Mr. Hudson: Will the whole £295,000,000 be raised through public borrowing?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: For the information of the honourable member, it is not necessary that the amount be raised by loan. In fact, except for one year, I do not think it has been raised by loan in the last 10 years. It will be seen that there will be enhanced provisions for all other Australian Governments under one heading or another. Only South Australia appears to have missed out in this exercise. The honourable member for Glenelg will doubtless have an opportunity later to state his case, and I hope he states a good one. If he can satisfy the people of South Australia that this programme is adequate, he is a good and eloquent economist. The sum of £250,000 is provided in the Estimates for the Chowilla dam, and I am delighted with this. Although we have an agreement with the New South Wales Government on rights over water from their catchment on the Darling River that will carry us on until 1970, we shall be in a precarious position after 1970 when there are dry seasons in the Darling and Murray catchment areas. This year we have seen what can happen in Australia.

We have had good years but we have also had years when we have been plagued by drought, as was the case this year in some parts of the country. I understand that the present dependence on Murray River water is in respect of about 70 per cent of our total population and already this year we have seen

something that I am sure concerns the Minister greatly: the catchment area in the hills has not been greatly productive, and even this year we lean heavily upon the Murray River. We are protected until 1970 by agreements with the New South Wales Government for the release of water from Menindee if we pay certain charges incurred in relation to those catchments. I am delighted that the Treasurer has seen fit to put down even a small sum for the commencement of the Chowilla dam, but I should say that—

The Hon. Frank Walsh: "It's not enough."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD:—this project from now on must be considerably stepped up. Speaking from memory, I believe that we have now been nearly three years in undertaking negotiations and investigations. Parties to the scheme, Victoria, New South Wales and the Commonwealth were originally opposed to it, and it took much negotiation (and much more than negotiation in some instances) to have the agreement ultimately signed by everybody concerned. We have sent three groups of people overseas to investigate different matters; we have employed overseas consultants, including probably the best soils firm in the world; we have enlisted the aid of the United States Government and its army, and, all in all, one would have thought we were embarrassed by our riches in taking these steps. However, I was rather concerned to hear recently that it is still necessary for another investigation to be made and for officers to travel overseas again. I hope that the sum of £250,000 does not mean that the programme will be slowed down, but that from now on we shall see some real development.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: I think you are referring to Mr. Dridan's trip, but that is only part of it. He is making the trip in connection with another organization, too, of which Sir William Hudson is President.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I should be the last to suggest that the dam be constructed before the engineers and authorities were entirely satisfied with the plans, but I hope that we shall now make some progress, because the matter is of such extreme importance to this State. I now refer to Government buildings, the programme of which for this year is to be £11,480,000, as against last year's £10,650,000.

Mr. Ryan: This is an increase, isn't it!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I hope the honourable member will notice how fairly I am speaking to the motion. It is

an increase of £830,000 in this case, but one disappointing feature is that, disregarding schools, police buildings and courthouses (which I shall deal with separately later on), the programme is an almost metropolitan one.

Mr. Jennings: What about Woods and Forests?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have tried to find out the reasons for this. One of my colleagues recently asked a question, without getting very far, in relation to a new hospital at Port Augusta. He expressed the hope that the plans drawn up for that hospital (which had been fairly well advanced by the previous Government) would not be forgotten, and in reply to his answer the Minister said, "It's all right; its on the boards. It will be referred to the Public Works Committee shortly." He used the words "on the boards", but I think he should have said, "on the skids", for the project has not materialized, and it has not been referred to the Public Works Committee; it certainly is not on the Estimates. The previous Government's policy was to make financial provision for one major country hospital, under which provision we built a major hospital at Mount Gambier and Port Lincoln, and we had undertaken major improvements at the Port Pirie Hospital. We had also promised a hospital for Port Augusta next on the list, and had had designs drawn up. However, I can find only one item in respect of a country hospital in the Loan programme—£20,000 to be spent by the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science for some laboratory provisions at the Berri Hospital. Speaking again from memory, I believe this was approved by Cabinet six months ago, and, as I say, if honourable members will disregard police buildings and schools they will see that the item "Government buildings" represents almost an entirely metropolitan programme. I believe that it is necessary to see that the country has reasonable facilities particularly with regard to health and schools. I do not criticize the Government's programme for schools laid down by the Minister of Education. I am not sufficiently conversant with the requirements of various areas to offer any criticism. Obviously there are many schools in the metropolitan area but I do not think their provision has been weighted unfairly against the country. However, the hospital building programme is a metropolitan programme. The line for Government buildings provides for expenditure on the Royal Adelaide

Hospital, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and a new Government building. Priority is given even for a Government motor garage. I should have hoped that there would be provision for at least one major country hospital, and obviously that should have been at Port Augusta because it was promised.

Mr. Hall: What about Tea Tree Gully?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That is a problem child to us. I am deeply disappointed that the promise made by the last Government, to see that Port Augusta had an adequate hospital provided for it instead of the very inferior and unsuitable buildings there, has not been honoured. I know that you, Mr. Speaker, will not think that I have any designs on your district because I assure you that I have not. I am happy with Gumeracha, and Gumeracha is happy with me. Port Augusta had to take its turn in waiting for a hospital. The people of Port Augusta, although they obviously wanted improvements, were not unreasonable in their representations. Port Augusta is the headquarters of a flying doctor service; it is on the East-West line, and services an enormous area because of its rail connection both north and south. I am disappointed that it was not possible to make some provision for that hospital. This all comes back to the fact that the Loan programme, as a whole, is inadequate.

As far as I can make out, the sum spent on school buildings last year (this may not have been the actual provision) was about £5,591,000. The sum provided this year is stated to be £6,000,000, but when this is examined it can be seen that it is not £6,000,000 but £5,700,000 because £300,000 is provided by the Commonwealth as a special grant to assist technical education. Therefore, the provision made by the Treasurer this year for school buildings is only £109,000 more than the sum spent last year. I point out to honourable members that for years, when Government members were in Opposition, they criticized the inadequacy of the sum provided for education. I must admit that sometimes the criticism was directed at the Commonwealth Liberal Government and sometimes it was directed at the State Liberal Government, but honourable members said that the sum was never adequate and should have been more. Do honourable members opposite believe that the £109,000 additional provided this year is sufficient to meet the cost of servicing the new students to be catered for, plus the enormous cost of the erection of a new teachers training college?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It is really \$100,000 less than the previous Government provided.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I looked not at what we provided last year, but at what we spent. I know the Minister of Education is bitterly disappointed with this allocation, and I know that if I were the Minister of Education I should be disappointed. Again I come back to the fact that the Treasurer did not get the money necessary to meet the financial requirements of the State.

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

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The sum provided for police and courthouse buildings this year is only \$400,000 compared with \$512,000 last year, so the extra provision for schools, to which I referred earlier, has been made at the expense of police and courthouse buildings. Under the heading of "Public buildings" there appears to be nothing for country hospitals, and I now mention another side to this problem. Last year \$228,000 was provided for mental health, and this was subject to a considerable amount of criticism from the Opposition. In his policy speech as Leader of the Opposition the present Premier had something positive to say about provisions for mental health services. He said:

On mental health and mental sickness, a comprehensive report was compiled by Messrs. Stoller and Arscott for the Commonwealth Government in 1955 dealing with mental health facilities. It was a complete condemnation of the treatment provided in this State. The report indicated that there should be four beds per 1,000 population. On that basis we would need 4,000 beds and at present we have approximately two-thirds of that requirement. So, mentally sick persons have only two chances in three of obtaining hospital accommodation before they can receive medical treatment, and the report indicated that, at that time, both Northfield and Parkside were two mental health centres which were suitable for development as training centres. Ten years later we are still waiting for the Government to make up its mind. The plans that are now envisaged for Reynella and Hillcrest are so very long overdue that the Reynella project is still awaiting the consideration of the Government.

While we have had some success as the result of our efforts in Parliament concerning the long overdue improvements needed in mental hospitalization, they are still far short of the requirements. Labor has always insisted that the health of people is of paramount importance, and it is a State obligation to make the necessary provision for hospitalization for general purposes and also the mentally sick, and we also recognize that there must be a greater contribution of finance from the Commonwealth Government.

In many cases, people have become mentally sick on account of age and they undoubtedly will require attention, possibly not to the same extent as those who are mentally retarded. Whatever programme of works may have been already committed under the present Administration, this must be speeded up to completion as there will also be a need to make provision for children both mentally sick and mentally retarded.

The Labor Party is most mindful of the work being performed by Dr. Cramond, and commends him for his insistence upon the Government for better provision for the care of the mentally sick.

Mr. Jennings: If you hadn't had our policy speech to quote from, you wouldn't have had much to say in this debate.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have it here all right. It goes on:

His task would have been much easier had the Playford Government paid attention in 1950 to Dr. Birch, then Director-General of Mental Health, when he reported to the Government that additional infirmary accommodation was needed. But again the Government failed in its obligation to the people.

I wanted to quote that fully so that I should not be accused of quoting something out of context. It goes on:

Labor will: immediately increase Government infirmary accommodation; subsidize the erection and running of small cottage district infirmaries in co-operation with voluntary organizations which have already indicated their willingness to help in such projects; and immediately speed up the re-housing of mental hospital patients in modern buildings adequate for their needs.

According to that statement this was something that should be done urgently, something that was long overdue, and something that the Government would attend to immediately. I think those are the only conclusions we can arrive at from those words, and I think they were the conclusions the electors arrived at, that here was something that had been badly neglected by the previous Government over a period of years, and that the Labor Party, if returned to office, would take steps immediately to rectify the position.

Having stated that position to the entire satisfaction at least of the honourable member for Enfield, I now come down to earth again and deal with what we see in this Loan programme. Last year the Government made provision for Parkside, \$87,000; for Hillcrest, \$50,000; for Enfield Receiving Home, \$55,000; for St. Corantyn Home, \$26,000; and for Palm Lodge, \$10,000, a total of \$228,000. I have not had an opportunity since the Loan programme was presented to check on the performance of the department in spending that money, but that was the appropriation made

and it may be that that was the sum spent. At any rate, the appropriation was £228,000, and that was the amount condemned by the Labor Party as being totally inadequate and subject to immediate action.

Mr. Chairman, what is the sum provided this year? What is this immediate action which the electors were promised and which has now materialized in these Estimates? The only sums I can see are £5,000 for Parkside and £109,000 for Enfield. This, significantly enough, amounts to £114,000, which is exactly half of what was provided by the previous Government, and the previous provision received (as I pointed out to honourable members) no fewer than three pages of condemnation by the then Leader of the Opposition in his policy speech. Of course, that policy speech was prepared for the electors of South Australia, whereas this Loan programme is something entirely different. But the election is over. At no time in the last 25 years have I seen such a complete reversal of policy as that stated to be the policy of my friends on the Treasury benches, which is given effect to in this item of the Loan Estimates. Do we have a case of something being left to the dim and distant future? The word "immediately" is used, yet the provisions made by the previous Government, which were condemned so adequately by the then Opposition (the present Government), materialize in just 50 per cent of the amount provided in last year's Loan Estimates. The same story applies to the other two hospitals so elaborately set out in the metropolitan area. Every honourable member has heard of the 500-bed hospital at Tea Tree Gully and the 800-bed hospital in the Treasurer's district. But what is the position? The 500-bed hospital at Tea Tree Gully has not materialized, and I venture to prophesy that it will not materialize during the term of office of this Government.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Is there any provision for sketch plans?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall tell honourable members about that in a moment. I have what I believe to be real information on the sketch plans. These two hospitals were obviously election bait—and I use that word advisedly.

Mr. Jennings: You would be an expert on it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I would be, because I have seen so much of it. The position is that, if either of these hospitals operated today, we could not staff it

and we should not have the patients or the medical staff for it. So either project would be superfluous at present but combined, of course, they represent an expenditure of between £13,000,000 and £16,000,000; the amount is anybody's guess. It would depend on the facilities provided. Let us take the position at Tea Tree Gully—"An arrangement has been made for a district hospital to be erected." I believe that some work had been started on the foundations of the building, but that anything previously agreed on has been completely abandoned. The land that was purchased has been declared unsuitable for the larger project and the Government has been scouring the country far and wide for other land. I fancy that some has been purchased, though I am not sure. A 500-bed hospital having been promised, can the Minister of Works say whether the plans being drawn up today are for a 500-bed hospital or a 100-bed hospital?

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: We are planning for a 500-bed hospital.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I hope plans are being drawn up but I say that they will be for a modified project. If the Public Works Committee carries out the same type of investigation as it did previously (always a fairly protracted investigation involving large amounts of money), this Parliament will not consider an appropriation for the hospital at Tea Tree Gully. I say that with some knowledge of the time it takes to prepare plans. After the Public Works Committee had reported on the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, it was nine months before the detailed plans and specifications were drawn up. To enable this to be done in that time, a Melbourne consultant was engaged to assist in the work. People at Tea Tree Gully have been led up a blind alley about this hospital, as they will not see, during the life of this Parliament, the hospital they have been promised. I defy anyone to contradict that statement. What is the position about the 800-bed hospital proposed to be built in the Treasurer's district? As I understand it, this is even further away.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: If it had been left to you, we probably would never have got it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: We do not make promises.

Mr. Jennings: What about the power station at Lake Leake? What about the deep sea port at Oodnadatta?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Election policies laid down by my Government have been followed closely.

Mr. Jennings: You haven't got a Government now.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Perhaps, but I doubt whether South Australia has one either, when I look at things that have happened recently. These promises will not be carried out by the present Government, and I doubt whether any attempt will be made to carry them out. The finance available to the Government does not allow it to carry out two major hospital building programmes in the metropolitan area at the same time. That is the same problem that confronted the previous Government. The Treasurer in his policy speech stated that the Government had had to recall (I think it was last year) from the Roads Fund £300,000, and he proposed to recall £330,000 this year. This sum is to be taken from the Roads Fund to enable a boost to be given to the Loan programme, and the Treasurer quoted the pretext on which he was withdrawing this money. He claims that he has the authority to subtract this £600,000 from the Roads Fund. The words he used in his statement to members were:

Now with the revenues available from road maintenance contributions, which of course must be used wholly upon road works, the Highways Department has from all sources funds considerably more than necessary to secure the maximum Commonwealth grants, and no longer requires Loan advances for the purpose. For the immediate past year I have called upon the department to repay earlier advances to the extent of £300,000, and for the present year propose a repayment of £320,000. These have been called for under authority given by section 31a of the Highways Act.

Mr. Jennings: Don't you think he had the same advice as you had?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will tell members all about this. This is an interesting thing, something that has not been seen in the history of the finances of this State for a long time. If honourable members take the trouble to look up the *Hansard* report of the debate on the Bill that the Treasurer claims gives him authority for this withdrawal from the Roads Fund, they will see that that Bill was passed in 1955 and that a full explanation of it was given by the late Sir Cecil Hincks on my behalf when the Bill came into the House. Let me, if I may, give the circumstances of this particular legislation. In order to assist the Highways Fund, the Government made available to it an amount of £620,000 out of revenue.

At that time, South Australia was a claimant State and the Commonwealth Grants Commis-

sion took the view that the £620,000 paid into the Highways Fund would increase the deficits of the State and, therefore, increase the obligations of that commission to make a higher grant to the State. To satisfy the commission, a certain provision was contained in the Bill. I propose to read from the report of the debate on that Bill, which is at page 1253 of 1955 *Hansard*. After doing that, I will ask honourable members whether that Bill was ever envisaged to be used by the Treasurer as a support for Loan funds. Sir Cecil Hincks said:

Its object is to provide for the transfer of certain moneys from the Highways Fund to Consolidated Revenue, and for re-implementing the Highways Fund from the Loan Fund. The events which have led up to this Bill are the following:—In 1953 the sum of £620,000 was transferred from general revenue into the Highways Fund, pursuant to a special appropriation by Parliament. At that time the Government took the view, which it still holds, that this was a proper and reasonable provision to meet the costs of road construction and maintenance. When the money was voted there were prospects of a surplus in the Revenue Account, but the decision to vote the money was not based on the fact that revenue was buoyant, but on the needs of the Highways Department. Whatever the position of the Revenue Account may have been, the same amount would have been required. However, in assessing the grant for the year 1955-56 the Commonwealth Grants Commission has made a "correction"—that is to say a reduction in the amount which would have been recommended of £620,000. The substantial reason for this reduction is that in the Commission's view the payment of £620,000 to the Highways Fund in 1953 was the disposal of a prospective surplus of revenue which would otherwise have been available to assist the State in meeting its commitments in a subsequent year.

The Grants Commission rejected the State's submission that the transfer of money to the Highways Fund was a proper and reasonable appropriation for road purposes which would have had to be made whatever the state of the revenue was at the time. The Government, of course, accepts the Commission's decision on this particular appropriation, and intends, accordingly, to transfer the sum of £620,000 back to revenue. It is, however, desirable that the Highways Fund should not be deprived of this amount, and the Government therefore proposes that, in order to reimburse the Highways Fund, authority should be given for the making of advances from the Loan Fund to the Highways Fund up to the sum of £620,000. The money so advanced will be repaid from the Highways Fund to the Loan Fund at convenient times to be decided in future by the Treasury. That sets out the circumstances of the transaction which was placed before the House for ratification purely and simply to meet a technical point raised by the Grants Commission, and nothing else.

Mr. Quirke: Only one sum of £620,000!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, and it was for a specific purpose to meet a complaint by the Grants Commission about the way we had provided the grant to the Roads Fund. But what do we see today? The Treasurer is using the authority contained in the Bill to which I have referred to subtract from the Roads Fund £300,000 last year and £320,000 this year. In my opinion, it is utterly improper for the Government to raid the Roads Fund in this way. I have referred to many things that were contained in the Government's policy speech, but strangely enough this item was not mentioned.

Mr. Hudson: But Sir Cecil Hincks said it would be repaid at a convenient time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the honourable member likes to follow up the debate, he will see it was also stated that it would never be called upon. It was purely and simply to meet a technical objection of the Commonwealth Grants Commission, with which we now have no dealings whatsoever. Before the last election, honourable members opposite opposed road contributions; theirs was the Party that went across to Eyre Peninsula and said, "We're going to abolish this."

Mr. Heaslip: Now it is the Government of the day!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Will any honourable member opposite say that the Roads Fund is so adequate and that our road system is so good that we are now in a position to raid the fund? We have been proud that for many years all motor taxation, licence fees and sums provided by the Commonwealth for roads have gone into the road appropriation and have been sacred; they have been used only for the purposes for which they were provided. This policy was carried out in bad times as well as in good times. The present Treasurer is not the only one who has had difficult Budgets or Loan programmes to prepare. However, it is a written law that these moneys should be paid into the road appropriation. Before this matter was actually submitted to Parliament the Treasurer, without announcing it publicly, surreptitiously took from the Roads Fund £300,000. It is now stated that he will raid the Roads Fund of another £32,000. This is an improper procedure. The Roads Fund has always been held to be for road purposes, and I point out to the Treasurer and to all Government members that the policy of the previous Government was not to take from the Roads Fund but (especially if there were a major bridge to be built) to provide additional

money out of Loans to assist the Highways Commissioner in the programme he had before him. Therefore, my Party cannot condemn too strongly taking money from the Roads Fund in the way it is proposed now. This sum of £620,000 was provided by another Government 10 years ago for road purposes.

Mr. Heaslip: Where does it go?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It goes into the general Loan programme which, as I have pointed out at some length this afternoon, is not adequately provided for. The Loan Council did not provide adequate funds for the Loan programme, and it did not even provide an increase in the Loan programme that would be equivalent to a percentage increase that might arise out of the growth of the national productivity.

In his speech, the Treasurer said, "This £9,500,000 will be supplemented by recoveries of some £450,000 this year." I should like an explanation on this matter from the Treasurer. Where these recoveries come from or what they are is not explained here, nor can I see any explanation in any document before us at the moment. I should like to know the origin of this £450,000. I hope that the explanation will not be the same as explanations given so often: that the Government is beginning to encroach on trust and deposit accounts to finance the Loan programme. I have concluded what I wish to say on the first line, but I shall have some comments to make on some of the lines when we are dealing with them individually. The Loan programme is inadequate.

Mr. Hudson: What about 1956?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Unfortunately the honourable member does not realize that every year we are growing up—that what was good enough last year is not good enough this year and what is good enough this year will not be good enough next year. If we sit on what we did in the past, we shall not progress. With the exception of the last line I mentioned dealing with the Roads Fund I do not complain about the lines, but I criticize the Government for not providing more adequately for some of the urgent needs of the community.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): I have much pleasure in supporting the first line of the Loan Estimates, and in doing so I congratulate the Treasurer on the way in which he presented them and on the way in which he has handled the finances of this State despite the difficult financial situation that

he found on assuming office last March. When financial matters are being discussed, it is noticeable that the Leader of the Opposition and several members opposite are a little touchy. A remarkable feature of this Parliament has been the large number of notices of motion by members of the Liberal Party endeavouring to commit the Government to huge expenditures for things that they had promised but had not put into practice when they were in office.

Mr. McKee: They promised them all right!

Mr. BURDON: They have endeavoured to commit this Government to their policies. Today we have had a résumé from the Leader of the Opposition of several matters that were raised in this Parliament by the previous Leader of the Opposition, but I doubt whether all the promises made by the present Opposition when it was in office were carried out. During the five short months that the Labor Party has been in office the Opposition has criticized it and condemned its efforts. It is the privilege of the Opposition to criticize; nobody will deny that. When the Labor Party was in Opposition its members criticized the Government, and members opposite now have that right. The Treasurer was condemned in no uncertain manner this afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition who, as a result of being Premier and Treasurer of the State for 27 years, has had a vast experience of State politics. The present Leader of the Opposition introduced numerous Budgets when he was Treasurer, and nobody will convince me that on his visits to Canberra he ever secured all that he wanted. One has only to look through *Hansard* to see that in 1955 a total of £190,000,000 was raised by the Loan Council. The same amount was raised in 1956, when it was necessary for the then Treasurer to reduce his Loan Estimates from £29,000,000 to about £28,000,000.

Mr. Hudson: It was worse than what happened this year.

Mr. BURDON: The change of Government took place in March of this year, and the new Treasurer went on the now traditional annual visit to Canberra to secure a small piece of the cake. Possibly the smaller States get their proportionate share, but it is a very small amount when it has to be divided amongst numerous projects in an expanding State. This year the States received a total increase of only £5,000,000, so this State's increase had to be very small. The Treasurer in his own way (the same as the previous Treasurer)

endeavoured to secure an equitable share of the money allocated by the Commonwealth. The Treasurers could remain in consultation on this matter for two days or two weeks, but the fact remains that the Commonwealth Government can put up only a certain amount of money because it has large defence commitments. That was the argument used this year; South Australia had to accept what was given, an amount that was £686,000 more than we got last year. I say that the Treasurer has done a very good job in allocating the available money to the various departments. When we look through the figures for last year we find that in one section mentioned by the former Treasurer there was an over-spending of about £1,500,000. That was in the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and the then Treasurer gave reasons for it.

Mr. Ryan: There was an election coming up.

Mr. BURDON: Yes. One could assume that because a State election was coming along it was thought that some of this money could be used for a particular purpose. Along with other members on this side of the House, I have my suspicions in that regard. We vividly remember that in the past many promises were made through the press and radio, and on television. Such promises regarding projects were usually mentioned at least half a dozen times, but those projects were usually akin to the atomic power station proposed for Lake Leake in the South-East, and we are still looking for the deep-sea port. I heard it said at one time that the only place not suggested for that port was the Blue Lake.

Mr. McKee: What about the silo at Appila?

Mr. BURDON: I will leave that project in the capable hands of the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip). I shall be surprised if the catastrophe forecast by the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon for this State ever eventuates. I think that all honourable members on this side will agree with me when I say that every effort has been and will be made by the present Government to carry out what was promised in the policy speech, but we shall not be baited by things promised by the present Opposition when it was in Government for 32 years without implementing them. Members opposite have criticized many things in the last five months, and many subjects have been raised. Why raise them now when the Government has had only five months in office, with no opportunity to put anything into practice?

The preparation of the Loan Estimates has been mentioned. Many of these things have been forced on the Government. Anybody in the Government, or who has served on a local council, will know this. I make no bones about it. A new member on a council has very little to do with the coming year's works programme. He gradually gains some knowledge of it, but in his second year, if he does not stand again as a candidate, he passes it over to the man who follows him. Anybody with experience in local government will agree with me on this. I believe the Leigh Creek coalfield has benefited this State. Records will show that we on this side of the House played an important part in the development of the electricity resources of this State in bygone days.

Mr. McKee: They never mention that.

Mr. BURDON: We do not get these things mentioned because they may give some advantage to this Government. The Opposition keeps quiet about them. The Leader of the Opposition this afternoon made great play about a book that set out some matters relating to the future production of electricity in South Australia through gas resources. Any reasonable person assumes that, before we commit the State to an expenditure of £15,000,000 to £20,000,000 (whatever it may be) on the provision of a main from Gidgealpa or Mereenie or the New South Wales/Queensland border, the first essential is to establish the resources of the field. So far, it has been estimated that the resources of Gidgealpa could be exhausted five times over in the space of 30 years. I know that the Government and the Mines Department are doing everything possible to establish the resources of that field.

Mr. McKee: They have to be sure of them.

Mr. BURDON: Definitely. I do not doubt that every effort will be made to ensure that the resources of Gidgealpa are fully explored. The Government and the Mines Department will leave no stone unturned to establish, in our interest, the potential of the field. Any reasonable person will agree that the Treasurer had a difficult job in compiling the Loan Estimates. In 1964-65, over and above the Loan Estimates, there was an amount of £1,698,000 of unspent Loan money, and at the end of the financial year 1964-65 there was a further deficit of £30,000. This makes a grand total of £1,720,000 less with which to commence this year's operations before getting this year's Loan Council allocation. The Loan Council allocation for 1965-66 gave us an

increase of £686,000 over last year. It has been necessary for the Government to consider this year's works programme with £1,042,000 less than was available last year. In 1962, £29,800,000 was provided for the Loan Estimates programme; in 1963 it totalled £32,900,000, and in 1964 it was about £36,500,000. Over this three-year period the previous Government had about a £3,000,000 increase each succeeding year. The amount available to the present Government was £686,000 over the amount allocated to the State last year. As the nursery rhyme has it, we went to the cupboard and found it bare; that is what this Government found on assuming the Treasury benches.

We are being blamed for this state of affairs because the Treasurer did not put up a fight at Canberra. I am sure that my colleagues, if not all honourable members, will agree that he put up the biggest fight of anyone who has represented this State at the Loan Council meeting. Previously, the amount was not increased and the previous Treasurer had to re-allocate his Estimates.

Mr. Hudson: There may have been no increase at all but for the present Treasurer.

Mr. BURDON: Most of the allocations were increased last year because the Opposition probably realized what might happen at the end of its term. I read with some apprehension that the amount allocated to the State housing programme was to be reduced. However, I have been re-assured by the Treasurer's statement, and by the figures in the Loan Estimates, that the Housing Trust intends to increase the number of houses built this year, and to reduce the building of factories and shops. Many people, including private builders, agree that although the trust was created initially to build houses to be available at an economical rental, it has branched out and is now building good types of house for people who wish to buy them. Nobody will deny that the trust has "delivered the goods", as the saying goes, nor will it be denied that it has done a job of inestimable benefit to the State. Many private builders will be happy that the trust is vacating the factory and shop-building field. In fact, I have had it put to me that these builders do not think that it should be the right of the trust to be in this field. However, neither the South Australian Government nor the trust will spare one single effort in providing factories if they are necessary in order to attract industries to this State. We can depend on the Government to act in the interests of South Australia.

I have looked at the appendix to the Loan Estimates presented by the Treasurer. I was particularly interested in the figures relating to the building of houses in the country, because I represent Mount Gambier. I looked with interest at the provision made for Mount Gambier for the next 12 months. In 1964-65, 11 houses were completed and nine are under construction at present. However, the trust has 40 houses listed for erection in that city in 1965-66. I, along with many other people, hope that the Government will be able to get all these houses constructed, or, at least, to have them under construction, by the end of the year, and that more houses will be erected this year than was the case in 1964-65.

This afternoon the Leader of the Opposition referred to finance for house construction and mentioned the Treasurer's promise in his policy speech that £100,000 would be made available for the purchase of old houses. However, the Leader did not query this to the extent that I thought he might. He made a point about selection and nobody will deny that this basis of allocation will have to be used. It would not be possible to allocate money for any type of house; nobody would make money available for the purchase of a house that was falling down. If the money assists 25 or 30 large families to secure houses, it will be of great benefit. If we can only assist a few, the benefit will be there. It is far better to assist a few than to assist none.

Mr. Hall: Do you envisage some sort of limit on the age of the house?

Mr. BURDON: I think it may be necessary to consider that. I would not like to allocate £3,000 for the purchase of a house that may be many years old and falling down. I shall now deal with one or two matters affecting my district. We have under construction at Mount Gambier a scheme for the sewerage of the city. It was designed to meet the requirements of an ultimate population of 30,000 to 35,000, and it was ultimately to cost £2,250,000. This year, £330,000 has been allocated for that work, and the sooner this job at Mount Gambier can be completed the better. Anybody who has not received a sewerage connection in that area is certainly in for a shock when he does because, although it may be a necessary service to the community from health and various other angles, it is certainly an expensive item. It is essential that certain areas in the district be provided with sewerage, but the high cost is a hardship on the ordinary householder, who must set aside about £1 a week to provide for water and sewerage rates, etc., at the end of the year.

Mr. Quirke: What does the average installation in Mount Gambier work out at?

Mr. BURDON: I have no accurate figures, but it would cost between £150 and £350 to connect an older type of house to a sewerage main, and £37 10s. has to be paid before the connection is made. I know of one instance where a man built a house about 16 years ago and no provision for sewerage was made: it cost £425 for the existing facilities to be converted for a sewerage system, plus £37 connection fee, even though the system passed his door.

Mr. McKee: Few pensioners could afford it.

Mr. BURDON: When sewerage is provided the person concerned has to pay for that service the same as anybody else has to, even though a main passes his property. Many elderly people in Mount Gambier cannot afford to have this service connected, and this is just one of the problems. Other districts that will have a sewerage connection in the future will face a similar problem. My sympathy is with these people, and I make no bones about it to this or to any other Government that may be in office: wherever these charges can be contained they must be so contained in the interests of the people of this State and particularly of certain house-owners. With the ever-increasing charges, it is becoming almost impossible for the ordinary person to become a house-owner.

Mr. Quirke: What do you think of the idea of making it a charge on the estate, in the case of elderly people?

Mr. BURDON: That provision has already been made by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, but many people like to be independent, and that is one of the problems. The Engineering and Water Supply Department is spending about £13,000,000 this year, a similar sum to the one included in the Loan Estimates last year by the previous Government. Expenditure, however, was £14,500,000 because of over-spending. No-one will deny that it is necessary in this State to spend vast sums on water reticulation, and we should be in dire straits if we did not have the Murray River. It has been said that within the next six or seven years South Australia will depend on the Murray River for about 70 per cent of its water supply. This means that the State must look to the provision of additional water before the Chowilla dam is completed. I believe that the department is already examining other areas to find suitable ponds for

holding water. I give credit where it is due to the previous Government for initiating the pumping schemes from the Murray River. This has been the only means by which the Upper North has developed, and it will develop further. Pumping schemes have been the means whereby the industrial centres of Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Whyalla have developed.

Mr. Ryan: Unfortunately, in a season like this holding reservoirs do not count for much.

Mr. BURDON: That problem will face this Government this year. We had a bountiful rainfall last year and the reservoirs were almost filled to capacity, but this year they are half empty, so the Government will be faced with the high cost of pumping water from the Murray River to fill the reservoirs used by the metropolitan area. The Government will have to spend £750,000 on that score because there has not been sufficient rain. About £15,000,000 is to be spent this year in South Australia on roadworks—an increase of about £2,000,000 over the sum spent last year.

Mr. Ryan: Did the Opposition criticize that increase?

Mr. BURDON: This is one item that has not been referred to this afternoon. This item shows an increase, but every item that showed a small decrease was given great prominence by the Leader. I know that the Minister of Roads has already made certain moves for the sealing of roads, some of which are in my district. The road through to the border at Nelson, in the district of the honourable member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran), has caused much concern. The honourable member has referred to it often. I am happy and I know that he will be happy to know that the Minister of Roads has already indicated that the whole of this road is expected to be sealed this financial year. I hope that some of the road from Mount Gambier to the district of Victoria, which is being rebuilt by the Highways Department, will also be bituminized this year.

These roads are being provided from money allocated by the Commonwealth Government from the Commonwealth road tax. In the past this Parliament has often considered the allocation of these moneys to the States. I believe that there is still certain money collected by the Commonwealth that is not returned to the States. However, we are finding that by the provision of good roads throughout the State motorists are at least getting something in return, and that is what they want. It is necessary to provide good roads to all the

far-flung areas of the State, and I am happy to see that a reasonable proportion of these roads is being provided in the Lower South-East. I hope that this programme will continue. I know that various councils in the South-East are happy with the allocations that they have received from the Government in the last few weeks. Chairmen of councils have said that they are happy with their allocations; in fact, they are getting a little more than they expected. I believe this Government is doing everything possible for the benefit of country people.

We know that certain charges that must be imposed have been imposed. As I said earlier, I do not like increases, as they impose burdens on people living in the country. However, the Government has to govern in the best interests of the people, and it is fundamental that money cannot be spent unless it is raised.

I believe that the broad-gauge railway line being constructed between Port Pirie and Broken Hill will bring big benefits to this State. This line will provide a direct link between one side of Australia and the other. Modern rolling stock has recently been provided for passenger traffic on the service from Port Pirie to Adelaide. Nobody will deny that this was long overdue, but I hope that in the next two or three years the Government will be able to do something about the South-East service. We have a fairly good day service, with air-conditioned carriages. The Government has already indicated that certain steps will be taken to provide air-conditioned carriages for the night service to the South-East.

Mr. Clark: What about the sleepers?

Mr. BURDON: I am not concerned about them; I am immune to the problems of travelling in them now. The traveller can pull up a blanket. I should like air-conditioning to be provided in the carriages where the passengers remain seated, but I do not know that we want first-class and second-class carriages. The member for Victoria may agree with me on this. I am happy to say that we agree on many matters relating to the South-East and that there is a fair amount of co-operation between us. I think air-conditioned carriages would be a boon to the travelling public.

Mr. Freebairn: You had better stress air-conditioning. That is essential these days.

Mr. BURDON: Some people do not like air-conditioning.

Mr. Freebairn: I think it is essential to get increased patronage.

Mr. BURDON: I agree, and I think the Government has already made a move to do something about improving the service. Air-conditioning would be a way to attract patronage to the South-East service. I think the Treasurer dealt with the question of co-ordination of road and rail services. The problem in this respect, which is causing considerable concern to many people, was brought about as a result of certain legislation passed here last year. Nobody would deny that the railways have played an important part, and will continue to play an important part, in this State. I also recognize that our road services have a part to play in the development of this country. Our roads are being extended and better road services provided; this is something that could well be of great benefit to all concerned. However, we must see that we do not become obsessed with providing a service for one particular avenue of transport at the expense of another. In the interests of the State, it is essential that we dovetail all aspects of transportation, and I would not like to see one transport system rejected at the expense of another. I believe it is possible to make road and rail services complementary to each other.

I am a little concerned (and I have been concerned for some time) that the available land for afforestation in the South-East is diminishing. Three or four years ago it was predicted that this problem would become a serious one for the South-East of this State. I say "the South-East of this State" because the main afforestation in this State, which has no natural forests, is taking place in that area. I believe a statement was made at the Commonwealth Conference last week in New Guinea, attended by the Minister of Forests, that it was planned to double the softwood plantations of this country by the year 2,000. I understand that the New South Wales Government is embarking on a planting programme of 25,000 acres a year, which is three or four times the acreage being planted by this State. I believe we are planting about 6,000 acres annually and that private enterprise is planting about the same. As I said, the aim is to double the softwood plantations of this country by the year 2,000, and I believe that if this figure can be achieved £100,000,000 less will be spent on the importation of timber than would be the case if no further development of the forests took place.

The Government in these Estimates has indicated clearly and, I think, very effectively that it fully recognizes the importance of the Woods and Forests Department. I know

through my long association with the department and with afforestation that many of these matters have been planned over the years. On a visit to Mount Burr the other day I was interested to see the vast transformation that had taken place in the sawmill there, as I entered it a few weeks after it commenced operation. I returned there the other day to see it being completely rebuilt and modernized. I give full credit to the Forestry Board and the Conservator of Forests and all his officers for the work they have done, not only in modernizing the Mount Burr mill but also in establishing the most modern mill in Australia at Mount Gambier and completing the modernization of Nangwarry sawmill.

The Treasurer has done a good job in difficult circumstances in carving up the money available to him in this financial year. The Leader of the Opposition would acknowledge that any Government must place its confidence in the officers of the various departments for the preparation of these Loan Estimates. Whatever the composition of the Government may be, it relies heavily on these officers. South Australia has been well served by them in the past and I am sure it will be well served by them in the future.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): I suppose that this year the Loan Estimates are of more than usual interest to Parliament because the two Parties are in a reversed position: the previous Opposition finds itself in Government and the previous Government finds itself in Opposition. Looking at things from the other side, as we have an opportunity of doing this year, is of some interest. I say that because we heard from the Treasurer his exposition of the Loan Estimates programme for this year and something of the difficulties that he encounters in meeting the heavy, the almost insatiable, demands of the various departments and Ministers, especially those controlling departments where heavy Loan expenditure is involved. The Treasurer also has to bear in mind the demands of honourable members on behalf of their districts, all of whom expect (and, on this occasion, with some lively anticipation) that the new Government will bring about a change in circumstances for their districts.

On the other side, of course, we, in Opposition, view the Loan Estimates critically and are, therefore, able to speak with perhaps a little less inhibition than when speaking on the Government side. Every year the present

Treasurer, as the then Leader of the Opposition, made a speech in which he analysed and criticized the Treasurer of the State for his parsimony and inadequacy as a Treasurer, but this year he finds himself having to offer some apology in presenting his Estimates, though not very great, and to recite the Treasurer's problems in framing the Loan Estimates. The Leader of the Opposition today gave the Committee a full, careful and expert analysis of the Loan programme, as of course he, above all people in this House, was qualified to do. Many points that I had set down for discussion were crossed out one by one. I do not object to that. I commend the Leader for his full and careful analysis, as I believe Parliament is indebted to him and expected that he would, on this occasion, do just as he has done for the enlightenment of all honourable members. After allowing for the altered state of affairs in this Parliament and for the varied position in which we find ourselves this year, I make some criticisms; some are parallel to those of the Leader and some perhaps touch on matters to which he did not refer.

The problem about Loan expenditure rests, as the Leader pointed out today, on the ability and adequacy of the total programme to finance the developmental works of the State, as it is in the field of development that Loan moneys are applied. Many people who read *Hansard* and the press reports are at a loss to dissect the various phases of Government expenditure. For those who understand them, even superficially, the Loan programme is the programme for the utilization of moneys borrowed by the State on the security of the resources and general revenues of the State for the developmental activities of the State and State enterprises. Therefore, if we are concerned with the growth and development of South Australia (as undoubtedly we all are) and, as every citizen has a direct interest in that growth and development, we are accustomed to examining the Loan Estimates with much care. We know that the moneys are derived from the resources the Loan Council is able to marshal in order to make its allocations to the States. We know that these funds come partially from borrowing on the public market in the form of Commonwealth loans, which form a varying degree of the total funds available for these purposes each year.

It has been the practice for several years for the Commonwealth Government to apply to the Loan pool a substantial amount of its revenues to help finance the State's programmes. It has always been something of a mystery to

me why it is that, having raised this money in the form of revenue from various forms of taxation, it should be handed out to the States as Loan money. It hands it back to the States, the whole of this money bearing interest and sinking fund charges under the terms of the Financial Agreement. Of course, it became an accepted method of dealing with the finances of the Commonwealth at the time when uniform taxation was introduced and when the new Financial Agreement was contracted. I have not gone into history carefully enough to determine this matter definitely in my mind, but I presume that at that time it was envisaged that the greater part of Loan finance would be borrowed money. We know that in more recent years, when Commonwealth revenue has been more buoyant, it has been possible to apply revenue to that purpose. I hasten to add that I think this is extremely good business for the Commonwealth as a whole.

After all, what we are doing by this method is developing the resources of the Commonwealth, through State activities, on a cash basis. There is, of course, some contribution by the Commonwealth. It is always much better, if we can do so without increasing our Loan indebtedness, to finance development out of current earnings. Therefore, to the extent that the Commonwealth has been able to apply these revenue moneys to Loan programmes, Australia has been placed in an extremely favourable position as far as Government finance generally is concerned, in competition with (and in contrast with, in many cases) other countries.

Although I think there is some measure of unfairness in the matter so far as the States are concerned, it is undoubtedly a good thing that the Commonwealth is able to bolster the Loan borrowings by placing revenue surpluses into the Loan pool. I think the fact that our revenues have been buoyant is largely a reflection of the methods and sound principles observed in the investment of our Loan funds. It is all very well to say, as the present Government said when it was in Opposition, that we should, in effect, raise money by any means to finance all sorts of projects within the State, but I think the Treasurer knows well now, if he did not appreciate it before, that this is not sound financing and can only lead the State into a serious financial position. When all is said and done, the Loan funds of the State are applied largely to business undertakings and to revenue producing and developmental

projects. Therefore, it stands to reason that if we have to meet the requirements of the Financial Agreement with respect to interest and sinking fund charges on every pound borrowed, the State must see that it spends these moneys on projects that will return something worth while to State revenue. Interest is paid out of the Budget and unless Budget returns are sufficiently buoyant and unless the expenditure of Loan money reflects a wise policy, the position must deteriorate sooner or later, and usually it is sooner and more acutely later.

There is another aspect of the relationship between the Loan Council and the States to which I wish to refer. The States, of course, spend the money and if the States, as a result, develop new land through the establishment of water schemes, transport, and so on, the additional revenue accrues largely to the Commonwealth Treasury. In the days when the State levied its own income tax, it was a fair proposition to say that if we got back in direct return from an investment on a railway line, water scheme, or something of that sort, about two-fifths of the capital expenditure involved, this was a good proposition for the State. The position now is that taxation on the incomes derived from developmental projects goes first into the Commonwealth Treasury, and although much of this comes back to the State in various forms, the first Treasurer to benefit from the State's developmental expenditure is the Commonwealth Treasurer—not the State Treasurer. This, of course, creates some problems for State Treasurers in their Budget affairs. I am concerned that some departments most vital to this State's development have this year suffered some reductions in Loan expenditure. The allocations to some other important departments remain static at about last year's figures.

Mr. Heaslip: Some lines have been wiped out altogether from the Loan Estimates.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That may be so, and I shall come to that later. Surely, in a State that is developing so rapidly it is not in our interests that a vital Government department should stand still. In any lively community we expect that the gross national product shall grow at varying rates, but that it must at least grow and be supported by expenditure that will encourage that growth. However, when a department such as the Engineering and Water Supply Department has to suffer a severe cut in Loan expenditure, as it does this year, how on earth can we maintain the development of the State? In South

Australia water has largely been the determining factor in our development, and it is one particular item among many that has been a problem to South Australia.

We have overcome that problem in a way that is probably unique. Indeed, I made the statement on several occasions as Minister of Works that the water supply system in South Australia was unique in the world, because probably no other country has the problems of water supply that we have, and if they have, probably no country has overcome these problems to the extent that South Australia has. I pay a tribute to those people who administered certain departments long before I did, to the present Leader of the Opposition, to the previous Minister of Works, who for many years administered the departments concerned, and to the engineers, who by dint of application to their tasks and by their imagination and determination to overcome the problems that confronted them, were able to offer solutions at costs that were economic and profitable to the State.

The fact that today we in this dry State have an interwoven water supply system of about 12,000 miles of mains at a capital expenditure of about £100,000,000, which is at the rate of £100 for every man, woman and child in South Australia, is something of which any Government could be proud. It has meant that our animal population has been able to grow rapidly over the years with an assured water supply to back it up, and it has meant that our country towns have been able to enjoy the amenities that a water supply can bring. It has meant that people could go out in new areas with some certainty that by the time their stock-carrying capacity was seriously limited by their ability to conserve water by local catchment the Government would be providing them with a reticulated supply. The numbers of livestock carried in South Australia are showing a steady and constant increase, which is proof of this fact. I believe the number of sheep carried has reached an all-time record figure of about 17,000,000.

Mr. Heaslip: They cannot live without water.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Precisely. The member for Rocky River knows that only too well, and so do I. I know of many properties where, despite unfavourable seasons, water will run and where it can be conserved, but this year they are without water. Many good dams placed in good catchment areas have not a drop of water in them, or are practically empty. If we had to face a

summer where properties did not have reticulated water schemes, despite their water carrying capabilities we would be already underwriting large numbers of stock. The water reticulation system has been of incalculable benefit to, I should think, about three-fifths of our agricultural areas.

Mr. Hall: It has been a sound financial investment.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That would be the understatement of this half century, because it has been an absolute life saver to the community. I want to deal with a few aspects that concern the Engineering and Water Supply Department because the progress of water reticulation through the State has reached a point where it requires a little imagination and planning. In many parts of the State remote from sources of supply (for example, in the district represented by the honourable member for Eyre) there are places that are beyond the scope of the present pipelines. I shall quote an example, but it is only an example as there are other parts of the State that similarly qualify in this regard. Areas to the north and north-west of Ceduna are beyond the scope of the Tod River trunk main. Incidentally, this is one of the spectacular mains of the world; it is 280 miles long and a gravity main all the way, except where it has to be boosted to keep up the supply to Ceduna. However, the mains are fully taxed. In many parts of the area they are over-taxed and require boosting at two, or three points along the line to lower the grade and keep up the quantity of water.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There are too many audible conversations. I think that honourable members could be fairer to the honourable member addressing the Chair.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It is impossible for these mains (and I would agree with the Minister if he said this) to cope in the normal way with considerable extensions beyond the present limits. However, there is a way (and I believe the Minister is looking at it because it was the matter of some discussion with the Engineer-in-Chief and his officers before I left office) that is acceptable for extending the water supplies to those districts at present not served. I believe owners of land in these areas would be extremely happy to co-operate with the Government in coming to something of an unorthodox but nevertheless joint scheme for the provision of this facility. Faced as they are with heavy annual expenditure for carting water for stock over long distances—and anyone who has not had this job does not

appreciate what a burden and total loss it is—I believe they would be most happy to assist the Government in meeting their needs. During the winter, when the draw from the mains is probably only one-fifth or two-fifths of the summer draw, storages could be built up. This would serve them during the summer, and in that way they would avoid this back-breaking, heart-breaking and purse-breaking job of carting water.

Mr. Quirke: You mean in storage tanks?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

Mr. Quirke: What capacity do you suggest?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The capacity would depend on the stock being carried. A simple assessment can be made on the basis of one gallon a day for each sheep. Because the owner would get some water into the storage tanks during cool spells, he would be able to work out his requirements. It would be possible for these people to provide small pipelines at minimum cost so that the capital cost would be somewhere in line with the value of the land through which they passed, and therefore high rating would be eliminated. As the Minister has said something about this in reply to a question, I hope it will come about, as I think it will be a big break-through in extending water to remote areas. This State has several remote areas—the area I have mentioned, the areas around Mount Cooper and Arno Bay, and south of Meningie. I could go on enumerating areas about which there are files of requests for a water supply. It has not been possible to grant them before, but I believe they would come within the ambit of such a provision.

Mr. Hall: What size pipeline do you envisage?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: A 2in. or 3in. asbestolite pipe laid above the ground and anchored at each joint with a concrete anchor. That is the basis of the proposal that the Engineer-in-Chief has been looking at, and I believe it would be successful. There is a precedent for this, as other small schemes, both private and public, have been built in this way.

Mr. Quirke: There are one or two in the Murray Mallee.

Mr. Hall: What about evaporation?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: There would be none, because the tanks could have roofs made from secondhand galvanized iron and a minimum of timber.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: That would apply to the county of Buxton.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Minister properly reminds me that there are storage tanks in that county that have a capacity of, I think, 17,000,000 gallons. They were put there by the previous Government in response to representations made by the late Hon. Arthur Christian. They are served by local catchment. The water is pumped into them when the rains come and it stays there as a reserve for the area when water becomes scarce. As the Minister knows, there is virtually no evaporation. A problem that I pose for the Committee is how the Minister will do these things if he has less money. As the Leader said today, about £2,000,000 less is being provided this year than was provided last year. This must come as a severe blow to the Engineer-in-Chief, who has to work out Loan programmes for years ahead. When I was Minister I used to sit down on occasions and work out the programme with him. It was based on an expected allocation from the Loan programme of about £13,500,000 or £13,750,000 a year. When speaking in the Address in Reply debate I made the comment that I did not know why the Minister was telling us and other people outside, perhaps deputations and so on, that he was finding some difficulty in meeting all the commitments, because I expected that when the Loan programme came down it would have an allocation of about that figure for the Engineering and Water Supply Department, which is organized to spend this amount. I agree that it is no use offering a department money that it cannot spend through not having the manpower, the machinery, or the organization to spend it economically, but this department is geared to this rate of expenditure and can do it. But how can it increase its activity with less money?

It is a matter for some serious regret to me, Mr. Chairman, that this department, of all departments, should be obliged to curtail its activities, and it will have to curtail its activities: there is no question about that. The Engineer-in-Chief cannot maintain this rate of activity, having regard not only to the lesser amount provided to him but also to the rising cost of everything. It means, in terms of actual work he can do, that he is down more than the difference in the Loan Estimates suggests.

Mr. Jennings: I say this more in sorrow than in anger: I am not criticizing, but isn't it a fact that the department overspent its budget last year?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I accept that the department did slightly overspend its budget last year. That was because of various reasons, one being that some of the contracts in the department went along rather faster than expected. As a matter of fact, last year the Engineer-in-Chief, when his rate of monthly expenditure began to exceed the average for the year, approached me (and I approached the Treasurer successfully on the matter) for an increased allocation, so actually he spent very little above his total allocation, taking into account the additional allocation made to him. I accept the fact that he did spend a little more than was expected this time last year; that is understood. Mr. Chairman, I make the point again that he did not waste the money: he spent it on accepted projects, projects authorized by Parliament, projects which were well designed and which were vetted by himself as the Engineer-in-Chief.

I might say in passing, Mr. Chairman, that the Engineer-in-Chief is a most responsible officer. I repeat that he spent the money on projects that were accepted by Cabinet, and that the expenditure was properly authorized in the usual way. If he did overspend, he spent to good purpose. I point out again that jobs that are done do not have to be done again, and the Minister perhaps can console himself that certain matters are further advanced or off his plate altogether when they might otherwise have been worrying him in this year's programme. My policy as the administrator of the department always was to spend as much as I could get hold of (and I say this in the presence of the former Treasurer), because if I could get a job off my plate it would cease to be a worry to me, provided the money was wisely spent. I make that proviso. In this case I know that the money was wisely spent. I accept the fact that in some of the expenditures under discussion the Government is committed to works in progress. Therefore, this does to a large extent circumscribe not only the Treasurer but the incoming Minister in his ability to perhaps make changes in his programme if he desires to make them. We cannot stop a job that has been approved or is in progress. If it is under contract, we have to finance the contractor to carry out his job.

Before leaving the Engineering and Water Supply Department, I point out that in addition to the overall cut in the amount for that department there are some things that reflect the overall cut. For example, in my own district, combined with that of the member for Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg), last year

the programme provided for an expenditure of £693,000 on the Tod River water district; this year the total is down to £614,000, £80,000 less. Expenditure on the Tod River trunk main has been cut by £15,000. That is not a bad cut. The job is proceeding reasonably well and a cut of £15,000 in £400,000 is not so serious, but the Minister knows, as I know, that the job was deferred for several years because of a desire to carry out other works. It was deferred to a point where it became a serious hazard. At one stage 15 gangs of welders were working on the main, putting patches on it. As a matter of fact, I was told that they were the only welders in Australia who could weld steel on to concrete, because there was only the concrete lining of the pipes left on to which to stick anything.

I am disappointed with the amount of £2,000 set aside for the Polda Basin scheme. This project must go ahead and be completed as quickly as possible. The development of the basin has, so far, been happy. We have found much more water than we ever dared to believe was there. Last December a bulldozer was put in and tracks were bulldozed through a large area of fairly rough country so that the Mines Department could get in with its drills and bore over a wide area of the basin. It is necessary to determine its limit of capacity as soon as possible.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: It was being tested by pumping over 30 years ago.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, at one place, at the trench, and the data accumulated then was so indeterminate that when a crisis arose in the drought year it was a job to make up our minds whether it was safe enough to hang a water scheme on to it. They were pumping the water out a short distance away, and nobody knew whether it was re-circulating or not.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: I am reminding the honourable member that it is not a sudden discovery.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I accept that it is not a sudden discovery. Nobody can charge the previous Administration with not developing the water resources of Eyre Peninsula, because we developed the Uley Basin, then the Lincoln Basin, and since then we have tested the Uley Homestead Basin. We have developed the Polda Basin and are still testing it. Although many people in the Minister's area on Eyre Peninsula have been saying repeatedly that water should be brought from the Murray River to Eyre Peninsula, I

resisted that point of view, and argued that there were unknown reserves on Eyre Peninsula, which we must use to the fullest extent before talking about such a costly project as bringing water from the Murray River to Eyre Peninsula. Until we have explored and harnessed to the fullest extent the local resources, there is no point in embarking on such colossal and grandiose schemes as bringing water from the Murray River. I urge that the tempo of work on testing the Polda Basin be not reduced, as I am confident (and I believe the Minister agrees with me) that the research will pay dividends for the department and for the people of Eyre Peninsula.

The cement lining of water mains is a process whereby old cast-iron mains are reclaimed by scraping out the inside and lining them with cement. These are the old mains, laid from 40 to 80 years ago, which are still in reasonably good condition externally and physically, except that they are badly corroded inside and caked with sediment. The company doing this work has been working for the department for many years, and it has perfected the process so that it can successfully re-line a 2in. main. This activity is an extremely good investment for the Government, as it enables pipes to be reclaimed *in situ*, so that they may give many years of useful service, as they are restored almost to their original capacity for carrying water. In 1965-66 it is proposed to carry out cement-lining work throughout the State. I have added the amounts allotted to all districts, and have calculated that a total of £105,000 is required for this work. In the Adelaide district the amount is £27,000; in Barossa, £9,000; in Warren, £11,000; in country districts, £7,000; in the Tod River district, £26,000, and in the Beetaloo district, £25,000. This is half of the sum that was provided in the previous year. In 1964-65, £80,000 was provided in the Adelaide district; £10,000 in Barossa; £10,000 in Warren; £25,000 in country districts; £40,000 in the Tod River district, and £35,000 in the Beetaloo district. I know that once a pipe has been re-lined it does not need attention again, and this may account, to some extent, for fluctuations in the amount provided. The decrease, however, reflects stringency in budgeting. I know, and the honourable member for Gouger agrees, that he has in his district long lengths of small-diameter mains which are over-taxed and which cannot maintain supply during peak-load periods. He is most anxious that the activities of this firm, which is under contract to the department, should be extended

rather than curtailed. As old mains have virtually been written off in respect of capital cost, and as their replacement with new mains would cost about 30s. a foot, it is extremely good business to rehabilitate them *in situ*, as can be done by the cement-lining method. There are several more important matters to which I

should like to refer. However, in view of the hour I ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.36 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 11, at 2 p.m.