

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 17, 1965.

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

### PETITION: TRANSPORT CONTROL.

Mr. NANKIVELL presented a petition signed by 166 residents of Keith and the surrounding districts of Tintinara and associated communities respectfully praying the Government to refrain from reintroducing transport control or, alternatively, if it be decided to reintroduce control, to ensure that livestock and other perishable primary products are granted a full licence.

Received and read.

### QUESTIONS

#### GENERAL PRACTITIONERS.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It is well known that a fund has been opened to provide for the particular training for general practitioners in addition to their ordinary training for the degree of Bachelor of Medicine. As I understand that the Government has considered making a donation to this fund, has the Premier any information for the House?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Government regards the health of the community as a matter of prime importance. It is providing a heavy expenditure and an increasing one towards the cost of medical training and research through the University of Adelaide. It is also spending large sums in hospital accommodation not only for the treatment of patients but for the teaching of the medical profession. The Government recognizes the importance of the general medical practitioner in our community, and despite the large expenditures I have already referred to, I am pleased to announce that the Government intends to provide a grant of £1,000 towards this appeal and, in doing so, it also commends the appeal to the wide and generous support of the public. I regret, Mr. Speaker, that the Government was unable to make this announcement when you, on behalf of the Government, attended the inauguration of the appeal.

#### RESERVOIRS.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Minister of Works information on current reservoir holdings as a result of the general rains, and what effect the rain has had on pumping operations?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am pleased to report that the weekend rains have been

responsible for an intake of about 315,000,000 gallons to the metropolitan reservoirs, which are now slightly more than half full. At this time last year they were nearly full. The present holding is approximately 13,190,000,000 gallons, compared with a capacity of 24,000,000,000 gallons. South Para reservoir increased by 25,000,000 gallons and storage is now 6,945,000,000 gallons. As a result, full-scale pumping from the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline has been reduced to off-peak pumping. For northern reservoirs the position is as follows:

	Intake for weekend to 8.30 a.m. Mon. 16/8/65.	Intake for 24 hours to 8.30 a.m. Tues. 17/8/65.
	Gallons.	Gallons.
Bundaleer . . . .	30,000,000	13,000,000
Baroota . . . .	9,000,000	26,000,000
Beetaloo . . . .	3,000,000	6,000,000
Quorn . . . .	1,000,000	—

At Bundaleer reservoir, the Bundaleer channel is running 6in. deep, and the Spalding channel 14in. deep. At Kimba, the weekend intake was 2,800,000 gallons making a total storage of 3,400,000 gallons. At County Buxton (including Kimba), the storages increased by 5,000,000 gallons over the weekend.

#### SHOWGROUNDS RAIL SERVICE.

Mr. HEASLIP: Prior to last year, a railway service operated from North Terrace to the Wayville showgrounds and this service had been available to country people who were in Adelaide to visit the Show. I asked a question last year about this service, and the answer was as follows:

I have a report from the Minister of Railways, who states that the reason for the removal of the siding to the showgrounds at Keswick is that its continuance would have had a detrimental effect on the layout of the new bridge to be constructed by the Highways Department at Keswick.

As far as I can see, no progress has been made on reconstruction of the Keswick bridge. I see no reason why country people should be deprived of railway transport to the showgrounds, particularly as the Railways Department is trying to obtain more revenue. Will the Premier inquire whether this service could be made available to country people attending the Royal Show?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will not refer this question to the Minister concerned, nor will I usurp his prerogative by inquiring into this matter. This service was discontinued prior to my Government's assuming office, the railway lines themselves having been sealed over the Anzac Highway. I point out that this matter had concerned

the previous Government. Much work on the bridge itself has been performed, but information recently given to the House indicated that a delay might occur in respect of pile driving. In addition the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) was told that the signalling services of the Railways Department had been interrupted and that certain tests were being made. However, until the bridge is completed, no firm decision can be made as to the future provision of a rail service direct to the showgrounds.

#### FAUNA AND FLORA RESERVE.

Mrs. BYRNE: I have been approached by residents at Tea Tree Gully regarding the preservation of an area of land which has been visited by an authority on local fauna and flora, who has stated that this area contains comparatively rare trees, shrubs and species of wild life worthy of preservation. The Town Planner's report prepared for the metropolitan area of Adelaide shows the area concerned as a proposed reservation under "open spaces". The reference is taken from the Metropolitan Area of Adelaide Development Plan, northern sheet, and lies in the bottom of the right-hand corner on a line between St. Agnes, Vista and Houghton. The section of land referred to is at Tea Tree Gully and bounded by the Main North-East Road at the north, Perseverance Road at the west, Range Road at the east, and Lower North-East Road at the south. Will the Minister of Lands obtain a report on this matter of the Government's intentions in relation to this area?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I thank the honourable member for drawing my attention to this matter, and for the comprehensive way in which she has described the area concerned. I shall be happy to inquire into the matter.

#### BARLEY.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked last week concerning barley?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: During the 1964-65 season, trial check classifications were carried out at seven country and four terminal centres in South Australia, and at eight country and two terminal centres in Victoria. With the exception of the Sunshine sub-terminal in Victoria (at which centre a member of the Barley Board's Classification Committee in Victoria was employed), the results obtained did not reach a standard that would justify the board's introducing an on-the-spot classification by the agents at all centres. However, in an endeavour to take the trial

classifications in the country a stage further, it was decided that on-the-spot classifications should be carried out by the agents at Karoonda in South Australia and Beulah in Victoria, from which centres the highest percentage of correct classifications was obtained during last harvest. In addition, the on-the-spot classification will be carried out at Sunshine sub-terminal in Victoria where the board's Victorian classification officer will again be employed.

#### CIRCUS DEATH.

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Attorney-General an answer to a question I asked during his absence concerning a coroner's inquiry into the killing of a man in my district by escaped circus lions?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The City Coroner reports:

A coroner's jurisdiction in relation to certain kinds of death is to inquire whether the death had occurred and into the manner and cause of death. If after inquiry an inquest is held the scope of the inquest is, who the deceased was and how, when and where the deceased came by his death. On inquiry the report submitted covered: (1) the routine of the circus management; (2) the fact of death and the circumstances leading to it; and (3) the assembling of riflemen after the death was discovered, and the destruction of the lions, one or more of whom killed the deceased.

The report and inquiry established beyond doubt who the deceased was, and where and when he died. There was nothing to suggest that any crime was involved. It appeared that the death was accidental, and that an inquest was not necessary (see section 11). I deferred forwarding a notice under that section that I deemed an inquest unnecessary, in order that any interested party might have an opportunity of requesting that an inquest should be held. No such request has been made, and I propose deeming an inquest unnecessary. I point out that what happened after death occurred is outside the scope of an inquest.

#### HASLAM JETTY.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: I have a cutting from the *West Coast Sentinel*, printed at Streaky Bay, which states that a Mr. White (who has something to do with the Marine Board) has been in my district, where he interviewed representatives of the Streaky Bay council and asked them to lease a section of the Haslam jetty. To the best of my knowledge that jetty is in perfect order for a promenade. Mr. White has suggested closing the outer end of the jetty. As many mainland and Eyre Peninsula fishermen use this jetty, in my opinion it would be foolhardy to cut off the end of it. Will the Minister of Marine use his influence to see that this is not done?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: During the previous Government's term of office (and I know that the honourable member for Flinders will not mind my saying this) certain agreements were made concerning jetties which were no longer a commercial proposition and which were being considered for dismantling. Some of these jetties, or parts of them, have, however, by arrangement with the then Minister, been retained and made available to councils at a low rental with the councils caring, in the main, for the decking and railing of the jetties. Many of our jetties no longer have any commercial value for the Harbors Board. There are about 70 jetties around the coastline of South Australia and many have been shortened because their upkeep has been costly and they have provided no return. The honourable member having raised this matter, I will examine it and let him know the outcome as soon as possible.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I believe that the Minister, in referring to the previous Government's policy, is correct. However, when I last considered this matter I believe that Coast Steamships Limited was prepared to continue using the Haslam jetty indefinitely. Consideration was previously given not only to the Haslam jetty but also to one across the bay from Thevenard. Although the Harbors Board at the time desired to close both jetties, representations were made to me by Coast Steamships Limited to the effect that these jetties should be kept open so that a shipping service could be provided at both points. The board's report showed that the Haslam jetty was in good repair, although I believe that sinking a pile or one or two other items would have to be considered to retain the jetty for shipping purposes. Will the Minister of Marine assure the House that, so long as the company concerned is prepared to provide a service to Haslam, the Harbors Board will maintain the jetty there in a serviceable condition?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Before giving that assurance, I should like to know more of the facts involved in this matter. As the honourable member well knows, it has been the Harbors Board's policy to retain for shipping any jetties with a commercial or possible commercial value.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Not without some encouragement from the Minister.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: If that is the case, I assure the honourable member that that encouragement will be forthcoming in the

future, because I personally would not be prepared to see the board destroy or reduce the facilities of such a jetty.

#### MARINO ROCKS CROSSING.

Mr. HUDSON: The railway level crossing at Jervois Terrace, Marino Rocks, is not protected by any automatic warning device, and the view of motorists crossing from the east is obstructed by a high bank of earth. Consequently, motorists cannot see trains coming from the direction of Adelaide until they are only a few feet from the crossing, and this makes the crossing one of the most dangerous in the metropolitan area. Will the Premier request his colleague, the Minister of Transport, to consider the installation of winking lights at this crossing as soon as possible?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall be pleased to take the matter up with my colleague, and as soon as I have a reply I will inform the honourable member.

#### MOTOR VEHICLES.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: My question relates to some remarks made by His Honour Mr. Justice Travers yesterday in the Supreme Court on the hearing of a false pretences charge relating to motor vehicles. Dealing with those remarks, today's *Advertiser* reports:

False pretence cases arising from transactions in secondhand motor vehicles were brought about by salesmen not asking appropriate questions of customers in fear of losing a sale, said Mr. Justice Travers in the Criminal Court yesterday. He said he had dealt with about six cases in a fortnight of false pretences over secondhand car dealings with traders and it seemed to him to be "over the fence." Mr. Justice Travers said that a fairly simple amendment to legislation would provide for certificates of title to be used for motor cars as they were for land.

"I strongly recommend that it is a subject well worth investigation," Mr. Justice Travers said.

Has the Attorney-General seen his Honour's remarks? If not, will he study those remarks with a view to seeing whether they merit legislative action?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I had seen His Honour's remarks, and I can remember His Honour raising the same matter when he was a member in this place. So far, of course, there has not been an opportunity for the Government to investigate this matter. There was a report some time ago about possibilities in registration which showed that administration would be very costly on the proposal then being investigated. However, His Honour's current proposal will be investigated,

and we will see whether something can be done along the lines he suggests.

#### ELIZABETH HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. CLARK: Last week I asked the Minister of Education when the new wing at the Elizabeth High School was likely to be completed. Has he that information?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Public Buildings Department states that the new wing for the Elizabeth High School is expected to be ready for occupation at the beginning of the third term on Monday, September 13, 1965.

#### MATRICULATION CLASSES.

Mr. RODDA: Last week the Minister of Education, when replying to the Leader of the Opposition, instanced those secondary schools where matriculation courses would function in 1966. It was significant to the people of Penola and Naracoorte that their schools were not listed amongst those centres of learning that would have matriculation courses. Can the Minister say how many students a school must have before it is entitled to a matriculation course, and can he also say when Penola and Naracoorte can expect to receive a matriculation course?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The number of students a school must have before it can get a matriculation class depends upon several factors, one being the available supply of secondary teachers capable of taking matriculation classes. To give some guide to the honourable member, however, let me say that of the new matriculation classes to be established in 1966 the two schools which have the fewest students expected in these classes in 1966 are Millicent, with 16 students, and Port Augusta, also with 16. The whole position of schools was examined, having in mind the estimated number of students in relation to the staff available, and there are no schools on the list with fewer students than that.

#### LEGAL AID.

Mr. LANGLEY: An article in the *Advertiser* of August 16 suggested that South Australia was lagging behind the times in legal aid to citizens regardless of their means. Sir Thomas Lund said that the aim of the Law Society in Britain, through its legal aid services, was to make legal aid available within the means of all citizens. Legal men considered that this was vital. Today Mr. J. N. McEwin (President of the Law Society of

South Australia) said that the Law Society in this State had for 30 years carried on largely voluntary work to help people in needy circumstances. As the Government has made money available in limited amounts over a period of years, which is far too inadequate for the service rendered in this State, is the Attorney-General considering ways to give the Law Society more finance to enable the society to grant assistance to all citizens who need it, similar to the method adopted in Great Britain?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Law Society scheme in South Australia is not, of course, as generous in giving legal aid as is the English legal aid scheme, and the funds provided by the State in England towards the cost of the scheme are much greater than those provided hitherto in South Australia. At present we are faced with the fact that very considerable demands are made on our existing scheme by Commonwealth jurisdiction for which we get no recompense from the Commonwealth for work under the scheme. For instance, a large part of the work undertaken by the Law Society concerns matrimonial causes work, and this has become very much more complicated than it used to be under the old State legislation by virtue (if it can be called a virtue) of the Commonwealth Matrimonial Causes Act's extraordinarily complicated procedures, and this burden on the provision of added costs with the rising rate of matrimonial causes has meant that the scheme is not now as generous as it was previously. In consequence, there are two courses we are currently endeavouring to use to assist the scheme. The first is that approaches have been made by all States' Attorneys-General to the Commonwealth for the Commonwealth's participation in schemes. This was discussed at the last meeting of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General, and a scheme is being prepared for submission to the Commonwealth Government, on behalf of the States, by the State of Victoria. We expect there will be further discussion in December this year. The other means that we are examining is the use of existing legislation to reduce the burdens relating to criminal cases on the direct grants to the society. In these two ways we may make it possible for the scheme to carry on reasonably. Given the limited resources of State finances, however, it could not possibly be contemplated that, without substantial assistance from the Commonwealth Government, we could introduce as generous a scheme of legal assistance as that which operates in Great Britain.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am interested in the Attorney-General's answer to what we could call a Dorothy Dixier asked by the honourable member for Unley about this legal assistance scheme. The Attorney-General shakes his head, and I accept his assurance on that point. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but that was an irrelevancy and I should not have mentioned it in the question. I was interested in the answer and particularly the two points which the Attorney-General said he hoped would assist the legal profession in the administration of the scheme. First, he told the House of the approaches to the Commonwealth Government and the scheme being worked out by Victoria. Can the Attorney-General give details of the Victorian proposals which, I take it, have been approved in principle by his brother Attorneys-General and himself? Secondly, I did not understand what he said about legislation to reduce the burden of the profession in respect of criminal cases in this State. Will he elucidate that statement?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot give the honourable member details of the Victorian proposal. As yet, details of this proposal have not been approved in principle by the State Attorneys-General. We have approached the Commonwealth Government and it has agreed to examine the proposal when it is put forward. The details being prepared by Victoria will be dealt with by officers of the Attorneys in conference and circulated to the Attorneys for their approval before being put on the agenda of the standing committee. When those proposals come forward in draft form from Victoria, I will consult the Law Society concerning them. As to the other matter, the honourable member will know that there is on the South Australian Statute Book a law regarding assistance in certain criminal cases. It was that to which I was referring. It may be that we can use this legislation more generously in future.

#### ONKAPARINGA VALLEY WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. SHANNON: The project for the extension of water to Heathfield tank from Chandler Hill, generally known as the Onkaparinga Valley scheme, to augment the supply to Bridgewater, and Crafers, was tendered to the Public Works Committee, and an investigation made. The Engineering and Water Supply Department was concerned about the ability of the department to supply water for the various schemes. This augmentation was urgent and was so treated by the Public

Works Committee. Can the Minister of Works say whether this urgent matter has been investigated and, if it has, has he a progress report?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The matter has come to my notice, but I cannot give details to the honourable member. He was good enough to inform me, prior to the House assembling, that he would ask this question but, unfortunately, I have been unable to get details. I will do so, and inform the honourable member.

#### SADDLEWORTH PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Can the Minister of Education say when the new Saddleworth Primary School will be completed?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The new primary school being erected at Saddleworth is expected to be completed during the latter part of October, 1965.

#### SOUTH AFRICAN DAISY.

Mrs. STEELE: Concern has been expressed to me by the Council of the City of Burnside in a letter received today, about the prevalence of South African daisy in some parts of the Adelaide Hills adjacent to areas under the control of the council, and I have noticed considerable patches around the Devils Elbow on the Mount Barker Road. The council considers that it, in common with other councils concerned with the problem, is taking all steps necessary to bring this menace under control, including contacting owners and giving instruction in respect of its eradication. The council considers that until Government departments such as the Tourist Bureau and Highways Department, whose land is heavily infested, take appropriate action, it will involve the small landowner in considerable waste of time, effort, and money. As I have written to the Minister of Agriculture and as he has informed me that inquiries are being made, I ask him whether, as the matter is urgent, he has further information on it?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am sorry that I cannot answer the honourable member's question today, but I will try to get a reply by tomorrow.

#### GILBERTON FLATS.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Premier, as Minister of Housing, a reply to my recent question about the building of flats by the Housing Trust in the Gilberton section of my district?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The building of flats by the Housing Trust on the site

purchased by it at Gilberton is not in the trust's programme, and the trust has not decided when flats can be built there.

#### TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Minister of Works an answer to a question I recently asked concerning a comparison of costs between temporary and permanent schoolrooms?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: In replying to this question, I say at the outset that the figures I shall give can be only approximate, because the cost of constructing such buildings varies considerably, according to the design, materials used and the locality in which the building is to be erected. A temporary timber classroom 24ft. x 24ft. erected in the metropolitan area costs £2,000. This is the bare cost of the classroom unit, exclusive of other school facilities, such as toilet accommodation, administrative, circulating and shelter areas, external drainage, paving, other siteworks and loose furniture. Drawing a fair comparison of costs with a school of permanent construction (by eliminating the cost of providing all the above facilities), the net cost of a classroom unit of permanent construction and of a standard size of 24ft. x 24ft. would be about £2,600.

#### DECENTRALIZATION.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on August 12 relating to proposals by the New South Wales Government to stimulate decentralization of industry? Has he examined those proposals and, if he has, do they contain anything of merit that would help decentralize industry in this State?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I do not intend to traverse the question of whether they contain merit. As I previously said, I did not see the reported statement of the New South Wales Minister for Decentralization and Development. The policy of this Government is actively to promote the establishment and expansion of industries wherever possible throughout the whole State. There already exists on the Statute Book the Industries Development Act which enables the Treasurer on the recommendation of the Industries Development Committee to give financial assistance to any industry desiring to set up in South Australia or to expand its activities.

The Act makes special provision for industries in the country, and the Special Committee which reported last year on decentralization expressed the view that the present legislation

was adequate to enable it to carry out its functions in this regard. The committee, as I know from my personal experience, has given (and I am sure will continue to give) very sympathetic consideration to the requirements of any industry that desires to set up or expand in a country area. The Government will continue to provide assistance to industry by ensuring adequate supplies of power, water, transport facilities, housing and, where necessary, technical information. Some inquiries have been received regarding the establishment of new industries, but many of them have been found to contain no real merit. For instance, people may desire to set up a certain type of industry at a place where industry is already well established. Further, I believe that a limited market exists for the item manufactured by certain industries desiring to establish here. It has come to our notice, too, that people have wanted borrowing terms far in excess of those provided by certain banks. I think the House will appreciate that such applications cannot be recommended. However, any application forthcoming will be treated on its merits. Indeed, if any honourable member can suggest an industry that should be established in a country area, that matter will be examined thoroughly.

#### CEDUNA SCHOOL.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked earlier this session regarding plumbing at the Ceduna Area School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I am sorry that I have no reply for the honourable member today, but I will get one as soon as possible.

#### MANOORA RAIL CROSSING.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Premier a reply to my question of August 5 regarding the safety of the railway crossing immediately north of Manoora?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: When the honourable member raised this question he asked that my colleague inquire of the signals and telegraph officer. The report, which is signed by Mr. Fitch, for the Railways Commissioner, and not by the signals and telegraph officer as requested, states:

The level crossing at 75 miles 57 chains, just north of the Manoora railway station, is equipped with standard level crossing signs, "stop" signs, and a gong. The provision of new equipment and alterations to existing equipment are carried out by this department in accordance with a schedule of priorities

which are assessed following joint consideration by officers of the Highways Department and this department. The crossing referred to is not included in the schedule of work proposed for the current financial year.

#### GUIDE DOGS.

Mr. BROOMHILL: A constituent of mine, who is required to use a guide dog because of his blindness, has drawn my attention to a problem that confronts him. He is a well respected member of the community and, occasionally, he has been refused the use of a taxi and the right to eat in a restaurant on the grounds that to let his dog into a taxi or a restaurant would be contrary to health regulations. Can the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Health, say whether health regulations prohibiting the entry of dogs into taxis or restaurants apply to guide dogs?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will take up the matter with my colleague and get a reply for the honourable member.

#### FOOT-ROT.

Mr. RODDA: My question concerns the vexed problem of foot-rot. I was told by members of the Kalangadoo branch of the Australian Primary Producers Union that they directly approached the Minister (for which they apologize) and that the text of their lengthy submissions was that a small minority in the Kalangadoo area had failed to comply with the law, and that certain flocks in the district were infected. Using roadways, these flocks may infect clean flocks. Has the Minister of Agriculture examined the submissions and, if he has, can he say what his department intends to do to solve the problem?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The honourable member does not need to apologize: I was pleased to receive his constituents. Possibly the only thing missing was the honourable member himself, and I should have been pleased to see him on the deputation. I have had the matter examined by the department, but it has not been able to find the actual cases quoted. As I have told the honourable member, I should be pleased if his constituents were to supply me with the names of those concerned or give me something specific that is a definite clue, because my department and I are anxious to co-operate in the eradication of this serious disease.

#### TOWN PLANNING.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question regarding town planning regulations?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is understood that the honourable member's question

relates to the proposed subdivision of land at Mount Lofty owned by N. J. Harford. The application for subdivision was lodged in December, 1964, and copies were forwarded to the District Council of Stirling, the Highways Department, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Mines Department and the Public Health Department for report. The District Council of Stirling refused the application under regulation 62, subsections (b) and (d), of the Town Planning Act General Regulations. The council reported that the soil was considered quite unsuitable for the disposal of septic tank effluent and waste water, access to allotments would be very difficult, it was doubtful whether a road gradient of 1 in 7 could be achieved, and the land was very steep making the levelling of building sites extremely difficult because of sub-surface rock. The Commissioner of Highways approved the proposal without comment.

The Director and Engineer-in-Chief reported that the area was too high to be supplied from the existing reticulation system and the department had no plans under which a supply could be provided. The proposed subdivision was remote from existing sewers and therefore could not be advantageously and economically sewerred. The Public Health Department reported that two allotments, because of adverse soil conditions, should either be amalgamated into one allotment or be increased in size to 20,000 square feet. The remaining six allotments were considered satisfactory. The Mines Department reported that the disposal of waste waters into deep bores was not recommended as such bores tend to become blocked. Also the disposal of domestic effluent into deep bores was not recommended as this would cause contamination of ground waters used for domestic purposes. The department also considered that the stability of the soil profile would be affected by the addition of waste waters to the soil and soil slip may occur, especially along road cuttings, and areas above and below benches prepared for house foundations.

After consideration of all these reports, the Town Planner refused the application under section 12a (1) (d) of the Town Planning Act. The agents were notified on June 29, 1965, of the refusals of the District Council of Stirling and the Town Planner, and the time allowed for the lodgement of an appeal has now expired. Following receipt of the refusal letter, the agents inquired as to whether the Town Planner would give consideration to a subdivision into five-acre lots. The Town Planner replied that, as the land was situated

in the Town Planning Committee's recommended hills face zone, he would be guided by the committee's recommendation regarding the size of allotments in the hills face zone (see p. 290 of the committee's report).

#### HAMLEY BRIDGE CARAVAN PARK.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Premier information regarding a subsidy for the Hamley Bridge Apex Club caravan park?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Director of the Tourist Bureau supplied the following report regarding an application for subsidy towards the establishment of a caravan park at Hamley Bridge:

The Hamley Bridge Apex Club applied through the District Council of Owen for a subsidy towards the cost of £1,391 for building an amenities block as the first stage in establishing a caravan park at the Hamley Bridge recreation ground. The District Council of Owen was advised on July 28 last that a subsidy could not be granted. Notwithstanding that additional finance has been provided this year for tourist resort subsidies, the sum available is still inadequate to meet the very heavy demand. It was considered that the proposal to establish a caravan park at the Hamley Bridge oval was not of as high priority as many other jobs. Hamley Bridge is a pleasant country town, but it is not recognized as a tourist town and it is doubtful whether a caravan park would get much patronage except perhaps from overnight stoppers. The small area allotted for a caravan park just inside the oval gates is not particularly suitable for there is no privacy.

There are a surprising number of small country towns, with little claim to being tourist towns, which want to establish caravan parks. Nowadays caravanners look for parks with all modern conveniences including septic tank toilets, hot and cold showers, laundry, power points, water supply, area lights and so on. The establishment of such a park costs a good deal of money. There is a growing feeling in the Tourist Bureau and the Royal Automobile Association that the time has come when we should consolidate and make existing caravan parks better rather than attempt to establish caravan parks in every country town.

#### MOUNT COMPASS WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my earlier question regarding a water supply for Mount Compass?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief has reported that the possibility of supplying the township with water from nearby channels has been investigated, but the water has been found to be of doubtful quality and a scheme to supply the township with water from a bore has been prepared. An estimate has been made and an assessment of the area is being undertaken so that the economics of the scheme can be examined. A full report and recommendation will be sub-

mitted as soon as details of the estimated revenue are to hand.

#### METROPOLITAN DRAINAGE.

Mr. CUMBE: In view of the statement last year by the then Premier (the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) and a proposal that a metropolitan drainage authority be set up (which question was subsequently referred to the metropolitan councils for their consideration) can the Premier say whether the Government intends to set up such an authority? Has a decision been made in this matter? If not, can the Premier say whether it is still the Government's thinking to set up such an authority, and can he say when this may occur?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, has this matter under consideration, but he has not yet been able to make any report to Cabinet. I assure the honourable member that the Minister is doing his utmost in this matter. After Cabinet has made a decision, I shall let the honourable member have any information that might assist him.

#### RAILWAY CONCESSIONS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On June 16 I asked the Premier whether he would try to obtain travel concessions for retired South Australian Railways employees. In the last sentence of his reply, the Premier said:

If the honourable member wishes me to obtain further information—  
which I certainly did—

I think I can presuppose the answer, for it will be "No". If that is not satisfactory I shall obtain a further report, but it will only confirm what I already believe to be correct.

As a little more than two months has now elapsed since the Premier undertook to obtain a report, I ask him whether he has yet obtained it and, if he has, what it contains. If he has not yet obtained a report, will he expedite the matter?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I think I will have to learn to write shorthand or have my stenographer down here, for I find the question most complicated. However, after I have read the question in *Hansard* and found out exactly what the honourable member requires, I will endeavour to bring down the necessary report. I do not know whether or not it will assist the honourable member, but I will examine the matter and will obtain a satisfactory reply.

#### EGGS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to a question I asked last week regarding the rate at which export



equalization levies are being received by the State Egg Board under the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities bird levy plan?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The bird levy did not operate until July 1 of this year, and what amount will be required for equalization purposes for the year 1965-66 is unknown. The financial returns for the estimated export surplus of Australia of 25,000,000 dozen eggs for this financial year 1965-66 will not be known at the earliest until November or December of next year. The present C.E.M.A. bird levy has been fixed at 7s. a bird for the financial year 1965-66. Comparison cannot be made at this juncture as to whether equalization levies have been increased or not. The bird levy collected under Commonwealth legislation can be used only for cost of collection of the levy and reimbursement for losses incurred on the returns from the export surplus.

#### KIMBA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. BOCKELBERG (on notice):

1. What is the cost per week of carting water to Kimba?

2. What was the total cost for the six months ended June 30, 1965?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to continue carting water for the rest of the year?

4. How much water is held at present in the Government tanks around Kimba?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The replies are:

1. The cost per week of carting water to Kimba during 1964-65 amounted to £523.

2. The total cost during the six months ended June 30, 1965, was £11,185.

3. On August 9, 1965, the quantity stored at Kimba amounted to 677,000galls. and an intake of 400,000galls. occurred on the 10th of this month. If no further intake occurs, water carting will be resumed on September 27, 1965.

4. The total quantity of water stored in County Buxton at the present time amounts to 8,000,000galls.

#### ROADS.

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: Since the answer to this question involves a rather long table of figures, I ask leave to have the answer incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it. Leave granted.

#### ROAD FUNDS.

(a) Maintenance of Roads:

	£
1960-61	60,677
1961-62	136,159
1962-63	132,374
1963-64	154,603
1964-65	111,752

(b) Expenditure by the Highways Department on the Construction of New Highways:

	£
1960-61	239,969
1961-62	505,367
1962-63	334,013
1963-64	593,700
1964-65	509,423

(c) Payments to Councils for Construction Works on Highways:

	£
1960-61	71,115
1961-62	172,538
1962-63	51,689
1963-64	111,823
1964-65	58,714

(d) Payments to Councils for Construction Works on Main Roads:

	£
1960-61	12,962
1961-62	53,330
1962-63	35,453
1963-64	112,109
1964-65	30,664

(e) Grants to Councils for Assistance on District Roads:

	£
1960-61	138,891
1961-62	112,976
1962-63	141,708
1963-64	213,367
1964-65	171,616

#### POLICE AND COURT BUILDINGS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (on notice):

1. What amounts were provided in the Loan Estimates for each of the financial years 1960-61 to 1964-65, inclusive, for:

- (a) police buildings;
- (b) courthouse buildings; and
- (c) combined police and courthouse buildings?

2. What amounts were actually spent during each of those financial years on each of the abovementioned types of building?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As the answers contain many figures, I ask leave to have the report incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

## POLICE AND COURTHOUSE BUILDINGS.

	1960-1961.		1961-1962.		1962-1963.		1963-1964.		1964-1965.	
	Provision. £	Actual expenditure. £	Provision. £	Actual expenditure. £	Provision. £	Actual expenditure. £	Provision. £	Actual expenditure. £	Provision. £	Actual expenditure. £
Police buildings . . .	138,000	68,121	297,000	218,401	336,000	257,995	773,000	823,796	491,000	389,472
Courthouse buildings .	19,000	10,464	20,000	25,032	1,000	—	2,000	—	5,000	—
Supreme Court ..		34,802								
Combined police and courthouse buildings	141,000	100,895	103,000	105,087	238,000	152,261	117,000	79,767	71,000	11,083
Annual provisions:										
Police and court- house buildings—										
Minor works . . .	32,000	60,218	50,000	52,652	75,000	32,596	78,000	82,446	73,000	75,320
Land . . . . .	10,000	9,238	10,000	65,995	30,000	5,160	30,000	20,684	30,000	7,703
Residences . . .	60,000	108,986	100,000	188,740	120,000	128,271	100,000	103,330	80,000	28,796
Total . . . . .	400,000	392,724	580,000	655,907	800,000	576,283	1,100,000	1,110,023	750,000	512,374

## SCHOOL DISCUSSION GROUPS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Did the Hon. the Minister or any officer of the Education Department suggest who should put the other side of the question of American policy in Vietnam to the current affairs group at Enfield High School?

2. If so, who was suggested?

3. Is it the policy of the Government that current affairs groups at departmental schools must have all shades of thought presented to them on controversial matters or not discuss such subjects at all?

4. If so, is it ensured that this policy is carried out?

5. If not, what is the policy on this matter?

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

1. Since the United States Vice-Consul did not speak on the question of American policy in Vietnam, the matter of who should put the other side of the question does not arise.

2. See 1.

3. The policy of the Government is to encourage discussion of important public issues in current affairs groups at departmental schools, and that both sides of the question should be presented by speakers who are accepted authorities on the subject, invited with the authority of the headmaster.

4. This policy will be conveyed to all those concerned.

5. See 3.

EMPLOYEES REGISTRY OFFICES ACT  
AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

## LOAN ESTIMATES.

In Committee.

(Continued from August 12. Page 1009.)

Grand total, £36,964,000.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): I support the first line. During the course of this debate, I have been reminded of a remark I heard when I was a boy in Western Australia. This was made to my father, and I am sure I did not see its significance at the time. It was made by an elderly gentleman, who was a member of Parliament (not a member of the Party to which I have the honour to belong), and I often wondered how he was a friend of my father. I am sure he made the remark more in sorrow than in anger, because he said, when speaking about speeches in Parliament, that there were

three kinds: good, bad and frightful. I am sure that we are all guilty of falling into the last two categories at some time in our careers, and we may not often fall into the first. We often tend to enjoy a speech if something is said with which we agree: we do not enjoy one in which we are not interested. I am not sure into what category I shall fall this afternoon, as I have a bad throat and this no doubt will hamper my usually dulcet tones. I will do my best to avoid being placed in the last category.

So far, I have enjoyed all speeches except one. Some I have enjoyed for their instruction, some for the information they contained, and some for the interest they gave. I have enjoyed some speeches because they were amusing, although perhaps the speakers did not intend them to be. I enjoyed the speech by the honourable member for Flinders, the former Minister of Works. His contribution was a fair summary of the situation and the type of speech that we expect to hear from a former Minister of Works. He obviously knew what he was talking about and wanted to convey something worthwhile to members. I congratulate my friend and colleague the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon), who gave us a foretaste of what we are likely to hear from him in the future; his was a good and interesting speech. I enjoyed the speech made by the honourable member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne). I know that all members listen with much interest to speeches made by members who have not spoken often in this Chamber. An ideal speech for a new member, this was a good bread and butter speech, and I do not say that condescendingly. It showed that the member had a wide knowledge of her district and of its problems.

I particularly enjoyed the speech of another new member, the honourable member for Glenelg. This was a clear and analytical speech giving members the benefit of specialized economic knowledge, and the arguments put forward were unanswerable, even though the honourable member, who is the most famous dog fancier in this State, made some attempt by interjection to answer them. I enjoyed the speech made by the honourable member for Alexandra. It was interesting and reasonable, and he gave much valuable information about the fishing industry and about Kangaroo Island. I regret that the honourable member in the latter part of his speech descended to the tactic, common in the Opposition this year, of not allowing the Government much time to fulfil its promises.

Many people waited years for the previous Government's promises to be fulfilled, and it ill becomes the Opposition to criticize a Government that has been in office for only a few short months. I think that, on behalf of members of the Government, I should apologize to the member for Gouger, who, when debating the first line, received no interjections from this side of the House. He spoke for about 37 minutes but, because of the lack of any interjections, he held his audience for about two minutes. I must admit that during the honourable member's remarks I made one interjection concerning artificial boundaries between country and city which have often existed in this State. The honourable member seized on the interjection with glee, but I shall not talk about that now. I shall save it up for a suitable occasion (which will be soon). However, I repeat that I intensely dislike those artificial boundaries; we are all South Australians, and should be treated on that basis.

Mr. Quirke: You are in the unfortunate position of sitting on the fence.

Mr. CLARK: I was not speaking merely from a personal point of view. A few weeks ago, in company with the Minister of Roads and Local Government, the Minister of Works, the member for Gouger, and officers of the Highways and Engineering and Water Supply Departments, I visited the Salisbury area at the request of the local council. We were given an interesting tour of the area, the idea being, I think, to show to the Ministers present and their officers the problems confronting many local residents there. Most of us know of the exciting development that has taken place at Elizabeth, but many of us often tend to forget about the development that has taken place in the Salisbury district. Although it has been a slightly different type of development from Elizabeth's, it has brought with it many problems. On July 9 a large bus was put at our disposal, and the people I have mentioned, together with officers of the Salisbury council and others, were taken on a complete tour of the area and shown exactly what the council hoped the Government would do to help solve the problem there. Without going into great detail, I shall mention several of the items contained in a summary handed to us by the Salisbury council on that day, in an effort to put the relevant facts before the Ministers. I know both Ministers present were forcibly struck by the council's approach, and were sympathetic to its problems.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: The council's engineer is one whom any council would be fortunate to have.

Mr. CLARK: True; as we drove along in the bus he gave us a witty and informative description that could not fail to impress any member of the excursion. I am sure the member for Gouger would agree with that. Although the Minister of Works knows about this summary, I think it will interest many other honourable members, including the member for Gouger, because part of the Salisbury area lies in his district. The summary stated:

From this inspection the party will see that Salisbury council has a very serious problem that could be divided into three parts:

- (a) The need to provide drains (previously non-existent) across the flood plains from the hills to the sea. Much of the water to be discharged comes from outside the district.
- (b) Despite any possible amendments to the Town Planning Act, the fact must be faced that council has a very big backlog of broken-up, unsuitable roads. The rapid development with which the area has had to keep up is due in no small part to the Government-sponsored migration scheme and Government development. Inadequate legislation in the past has made the problem impossible without assistance. A further amendment to the Town Planning Act is urgent, so that council can control subdivisions more carefully and see that adequate roads are constructed.
- (c) Council has to find finance to develop recreation facilities for the population. During the past year council has negotiated for the purchase of reserves at a cost of £50,000, and a further £50,000 is required for the provision of swimming facilities.

It is council's wish that the Government provide funds to assist in the reconstruction of the roads and provision of underground drainage. An overall drainage plan of the district was prepared and submitted to the Government two years ago, and nothing more has been heard, although the previous Premier indicated that assistance would be forthcoming. It is emphasized that council has an overall drainage plan prepared. Design of the scheme is at the stage that: (i) the position and size of all mains and secondary drains is known; (ii) the design of most of the drains and roads required in the next five years is complete, and council can complete the plans of the design from its own resources without Government assistance, as funds become available.

The council is most anxious, in the interests of its ratepayers, to obtain substantial assistance from the Government. I have a summary of costs before me showing that, including road construction and underground drainage over

the next 10 years, the minimum of necessary work that must be undertaken in this area will cost £7,000,000. I am informed that the council could provide about £150,000 per annum towards this work for the next five years, but, as honourable members can see, this would leave it far short of the required £7,000,000. I raise this matter again, not because I think the Government is forgetting it but because my experience of Governments has been that it does no harm to remind them regularly of certain projects. Indeed, I believe that should be my duty.

I now turn to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, a speech which I cordially disliked. It was very different from the speech given by the member for Flinders. I thought that, with his great experience as Treasurer of this State, the Leader would have said something that could be of value, particularly to new members. I even had the audacity to consider that the ex-Treasurer, for once, would be charitable and give the benefit of his advice to the new Government.

Mr. Ryan: That did not eventuate.

Mr. CLARK: No. In fact, in my opinion, and in the opinion of many other honourable members, the Leader's speech was unfair, unjust and unreasonable. I think I am entitled to believe that our elder statesmen can very often give valuable advice. I remember that when I first came into this House I was speaking on a certain matter, and I was well off the rails. The Speaker of the time (Sir Robert Nicholls) said that if I were to pursue my speech along certain lines I would be in order but at that time I was not in order. I then proceeded with my argument along the lines he had suggested, and I was in order. This was a case of advice being given me by a member of another Party, who was anxious to give advice to new members.

I do not wish to talk about the economic aspects of the Leader's speech because I think this was amply covered by the honourable member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson). I agree with one thing the Leader said. He began his speech in a humorous vein by saying that he could see how the Labor members were jubilant in introducing the Loan Estimates again after such a long time; and indeed we were. I believe that we rightly felt pleased in doing this. However, we would have been much happier in introducing the Loan Estimates had the Leader's Commonwealth colleagues not done their best to dull our jubilation; and this is what I believe they did. The Leader of the Opposition said:

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.

Of course, as the Leader knows, that completely over-simplifies the matter. He knows, as do all members, that there is much more to it than that. I hope that before the debate on the first line is concluded the Treasurer or the Minister of Works (who the Treasurer, in his wisdom, took with him to the Loan Council meeting) will prove what I have said. I hope they will prove that there is much more to Loan Council meetings than voting strength, as the Leader suggested. The Leader also said:

The programme is insufficient because the Loan Council did not provide for this year's expenditure an adequate sum.

Of course, that is true: the council did not provide an adequate sum. But after all, whose fault is that? The Leader appears to think that the Treasurer did not do a good enough job at the Loan Council meeting and that, therefore, he did not get enough money.

I want honourable members to remember that nowadays, unfortunately, there are conservative Governments in Queensland, New South Wales, Western Australia and Victoria, and that our Treasurer went along as the new boy. When I say that I am not trying to say that he was an inexperienced new boy but that he was dealing, in the main, with men who had been there before and whose art of bargaining had been developed to a high degree. I think that, under the conditions, the Treasurer did a splendid job and I applaud him for it. Whose fault is it if South Australia did not get its fair share? What Party is in power in Canberra, and has been for a long time? It is not the same Party to which the Treasurer belongs. The Leader of the Opposition said:

If that action—  
and he referred to the Treasurer's sitting tight, as he put it—  
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.

I agree that that is so, but honourable members must remember that they were not so organized. I will go as far as to say that it is more likely that the opposite was the case. I think that if the Treasurer or the Minister of Works were prepared to tell the House just what went on then we might find

that the other States were organized all right, but that they were not organized to help South Australia. Unfortunately with a Commonwealth Liberal Government and with South Australia's new Labor Government (and I was not there but I have heard something about the events that took place) I cannot imagine that anybody would be going out of his way (with the number of conservative Governments) to support requests for increases in the sums for South Australia. These people would not be interested in helping a new Government seeking to make its name.

Constant reference was made by the Leader to the Treasurer's having chips on his shoulder. If this is the case (and I do not think it is) then I must say that I have noticed large chips on the shoulders of many members opposite. In fact, one could almost describe them as logs. One member opposite, whose name I shall not mention because of my kindly disposition and whom I have always thought of as a kindly gentleman and one of the nicest members in this House, has unfortunately shown that he has a large chip on his shoulder indeed. The Leader reminded me of a spoilt child crying over the loss of his all-day sucker and, in this case, it must be remembered that the sucker was used for over 30 years. The Leader of the Opposition does not realize yet that he sucked this long all-day sucker right down to the hard, rough stick that is the base of every all-day sucker. I believe the Leader's entire speech was one large load of chips—enough to provide for a healthy fire. During the session the honourable gentleman has often shown evidence of a chip on his shoulder. I would not blame him for accusing the Treasurer of having a chip on his shoulder if he could prove it, but he made no attempt to do that. Let us consider the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition to the Bill introduced by the new Government for electoral reform. His attitude to that has been, "I did not introduce it, it does not agree with my ideas, therefore there can be nothing good about it at all."

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Is the honourable member in order in making these comments?

The CHAIRMAN: He is not in order in discussing the various Bills he has mentioned, but he has merely referred to them and not discussed them. The honourable member is in order in making the observations he has made.

Mr. CLARK: It appeared to me that the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition (and

he gave evidence of this constantly as he spoke) was that the Loan Estimates could not possibly be any good because he did not draw them up or have a finger in the pie with them. The attitude seemed to be (although he did not definitely express it, he certainly implied it on a number of occasions) that he would have done better at the Loan Council meeting on this occasion. Well, Mr. Chairman, who knows? No-one is in a position to know. Perhaps the Leader may well have done better, and I think it would have been very unfair of his colleagues in other States if he had not. I know the other State Treasurers are going along there (and I know the Leader from his long experience will agree with this) to get the very best deal they can from the Commonwealth. I am also strongly inclined to the view that if one belongs to the same political Party when he goes to the Loan Council meetings, that could well be of great assistance.

Mr. Millhouse: Mr. Askin did not seem to find it that way, did he?

Mr. CLARK: I am not sure about him, but in any event he is new to the Loan Council and it may take him some time to adjust to it. I think Mr. Askin was probably quite happy with the share he got. Of course we would certainly have liked to receive more, and we think we should have received more.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: I think Mr. Askin was very critical in the Sydney papers about what he got.

Mr. CLARK: Yes, I think he was. Naturally, as a new Government we would have liked to have received something to allow us to provide something really spectacular in our Loan Estimates. Well, Sir, we were denied that, and perhaps we could say that Commonwealth parsimony denied that. Our Treasurer and his officers have allotted the money as they thought best, and in my opinion (and in the opinion of everybody on this side of the House, and, I believe, of some members on the other side of the House) the results are as satisfactory as they possibly could have been in the circumstances. I thought when the Leader of the Opposition spoke that he tended to forget it, but we should remember that after all the South Australian Government's financial advisers, the gentlemen who are very largely responsible for drawing up these Estimates, are still exactly the same gentlemen who were helping to do the job in the period of the previous Government. Thank goodness, Sir, elections do not alter our Public Service. I believe that with the money at

our disposal the results would be much the same and our Loan Estimates would be much the same as they would have been had the Playford Government been there with the same amount of money to use.

The Leader says he would have allotted things differently, and possibly so would any of us. A member may have a fancy for a particular thing and he may desire that that matter be helped, and perhaps it missed out. Had that particular member been drawing up the financial statements, probably it would not have missed out. Typical of the Leader's attitude (in fact, it was the whole tenor of his speech on this occasion) was his statement that because moneys are allotted differently from the way he considers they should have been allotted they are completely bad. I am not happy about that attitude at all. This Chamber must decide whether or not it agrees with the Leader of the Opposition in the statements he made. We must remember that the people of this State have already shown whether they agreed with the Leader; they showed most conclusively a few months ago that they did not. So, again, when we see this constantly irritating habit of opposing a thing because "I did not do it", we must ask on whose shoulder really does the chip rest.

Nobody thought of rising in his place and taking the Leader to task for his remarks, nor would they have any right to do so, and if they had done so I do not think you would have upheld them, Mr. Chairman. However, you will recall that the ex-Treasurer took the opportunity again to make another speech regarding fuel supplies. He had already made one speech on that topic on his motion on the matter, and, if I may be so bold as to say so, his arguments had been completely refuted. But back he came with the same old story. The honourable gentleman has difficulty in seeing that he can be wrong; he cannot seem to learn the lesson (I do not say this unkindly), that he should have learned by now, that he can be wrong at times. We recall the Leader going on for hours chiding us for not spending the money we did not get enough of from his Commonwealth colleagues. How on earth we can be chided for not spending money we do not have, I do not know. The Leader told us everything except the real truth, which is that what he finds chiefly wrong with the Loan Estimates is that he did not introduce them, and that was a fact that was obvious to us all. There were so many statements that many people would think to be absurd. For instance, the Leader said:

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.

Now, Sir, what possible justification has anyone for saying that? How on earth would anyone know? How could one prove that what is taken off one item goes on to another specific item? There again I think that sort of statement was typical of the attitude the Leader displayed throughout his speech, which incidently I thought was the only speech so far in this debate that it would be very hard indeed to agree with. However I did find something in it with which I agree, for the end of the ex-Treasurer's marathon speech contained these words:

If we sit on what we did in the past we should not progress.

I assure the Chamber that that statement is 100 per cent correct. In fact, that is why members of my Party are now on this side of the House occupying the Government benches instead of the Opposition benches. The people of South Australia came to realize that it was no good to sit on the claimed achievements of the past, and that we could only progress by having a change. The public of South Australia made that change, and they will not regret it. The final sentence of the speech by the Leader of the Opposition was as follows:

I criticize the Government for not providing more adequately for some of the urgent needs of the community.

What does that mean? It means that the Loan Council, top-heavy with Liberals, thwarted South Australian claims. The Leader of the Opposition condemns the Treasurer for being denied the moneys, and further condemns him for not spending what he has not received, in the way recommended by the ex-Treasurer. That seems to be ridiculous, and is certainly not logical. Honourable members will not have failed to notice this year a peculiar change of pattern in the proceedings of this Chamber. We are often reminded by members of the Opposition of things that we have promised to do (and we will do them). The Opposition has tried to hasten us to do things that we will do in our own good time. This is rather unusual.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Are you going to remove the road tax on Eyre Peninsula?

Mr. CLARK: Give us time.

Mr. Millhouse: How much time do you need?

Mr. CLARK: That was not a promise: I merely asked for an extension of time. Many speakers have moved motions requesting the

Government to provide for various things in order to force us into doing something more quickly than we want to. If we had moved those motions while in Opposition, they would have been opposed. Can you imagine a more ridiculous situation? We have heard many quotations from the policy speech of the then Leader of the Opposition, now the Premier, and I applaud members for allowing honourable members to hear them again. No more sincere compliment can be paid to anyone than to have his statement continually repeated, so that more people hear it and know about it. I learned that lesson many years ago. The first year I was a member in this Chamber I was unwise enough to criticize the remarks of the then honourable member for Mitcham (Mr. Dunks). Although I could not agree with his opinions, I respected his debating ability as he was one of the finest speakers in Parliament. I quoted several of his remarks and attempted to refute them. Recently, I checked on my speech and I do not think I did a good job. When the honourable member spoke later he reminded me, in the nicest possible tone, that the most sincere compliment that can be paid to anyone was to repeat what had been said. The more one speaks about a subject the more it is likely to be heard and agreed with. I am sure that if the honourable member had still been here he would have been telling honourable members opposite that they were making the same mistake. By now, most people know about these things, and surely members of the Opposition must realize that it takes time for promises made to be brought to fruition.

Mr. Coumbe: Don't apologize.

Mr. CLARK: I am not apologizing. I am sure that we will miss the speeches of the honourable member who has interjected. We all remember how he sang the song of praise in his speeches on the Budget, the Loan Estimates, and on every possible occasion. Although I am not a betting man, I am willing to wager that the honourable member will not speak about these Loan Estimates in tones of fulsome praise—not that there is anything wrong with them.

Mr. Coumbe: We'll wait and see.

Mr. CLARK: I have not spoken much about my district, but there will be time for that during the debate on the lines later in the session. I should have referred, once more, to Gawler sewerage, and should have said something about the difficulties being experienced at Salisbury regarding the courthouse. I was happy to hear from the Minister of Education

this afternoon about the delayed work on the Elizabeth High School. One thing I did regret in the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. I do not know whether he realized it, or whether he intended anything by it. When criticizing the Estimates it seemed that he did not have faith in the Treasurer's advisers. When the Leader of the Opposition, as Treasurer, introduced the Budget or Estimates, he was quick, and rightly so, to praise these men for the work they had done. Apparently on this occasion, he has forgotten that they are the same people who assisted the present Treasurer. It is my earnest wish that either the Treasurer or the Minister of Works, who both attended the Loan Council meeting for the first time, shall inform the House before this debate concludes of what did go on at that meeting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): It is traditional on the first line of the Loan Estimates to have a general debate on the policy set out in those Estimates, and then on the various lines to debate the subjects to which those lines refer and which are close to the hearts of the various members. That is a tradition that I intend to follow today.

Mr. Jennings: Is that the end of the first lesson?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not sure whether that is an encouraging interjection from the Government Whip.

Mr. Jennings: I hope it is the end of the first and the last lesson, but don't let me distract you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am easily distracted, and now the honourable member for Enfield has thrown me completely. I wonder whether I will have your protection, Mr. Chairman, if things yet a bit stormy during the course of my speech. I intend to make only general observations on the Loan Estimates, and then to deal with details during the lines. I think that is a good tradition to follow. I can see from the encouraging look on your face, Sir, that you agree with me. The Leader of the Opposition, in what I consider to be (in spite of the remarks by the honourable member for Gawler) a magnificent speech—

Mr. Clark: Are you serious?

Mr. Ryan: You'll get on.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope so. In a magnificent speech he covered the field so adequately that I do not intend to speak for long on the first line. One name that used to be given to the Leader of the Opposition when he was Premier of this State was "master". On many



occasions I have heard you, Mr. Chairman, call him the master, and other honourable members who are still opposite me, although we have changed places, have used that term. We do not hear that often now; I do not think I have heard any member of the Government call him the master this session, but if ever he merited the name it was last Tuesday when he spoke in this debate. Whether you agree or not, Mr. Chairman, with the points he made, I am sure every member of the Committee will agree that he gave a masterly analysis of the Loan Estimates, and it has been even more apparent this session than it was before that he is still the master of this House.

Mr. Ryan: Wishful thinking on your part!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No other member on either side of the House has his ability to hold the attention of all honourable members; even the shining light on the front bench of the Government—the Attorney-General—cannot hold a candle to the Leader of the Opposition when he speaks in this place. The gravamen of his comments was that the Treasurer should have obtained more for South Australia at the Loan Council meeting than he did, and that to carry out our Loan works adequately (that is, the programme put before the Committee by the Treasurer), more money was required than was obtained. Although I have, I suppose, complimented the Leader of the Opposition so far in what I have said, I am not sure that I can altogether agree with him in his contentions. In fact, as was pointed out by the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) in his rather long speech, the present Treasurer obtained precisely the same percentage of the Loan funds for South Australia this year as was obtained last year—13.71 per cent. I am proud to say I have worked this out myself, and that is why I interjected at one stage, “13.71 per cent”, which was precisely the same percentage to the second decimal point as was obtained by the previous Treasurer last year.

One could hardly expect the new Treasurer to do better than that, and here I must say that to some extent I agree with the remarks made by the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) a few moments ago. The Treasurer's performance at the Loan Council was, I think, not an uncreditable one in the circumstances. I am rather reminded of the story I used to tell when I was debating in America, and when one of the opposition team was a woman. I speak with due deference to the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) and the member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne), but women debaters

are not as numerous as men, and we used to have a gimmick when we were debating, by referring to Dr. Johnson who, when talking about dogs, said, of a dog standing on its hind legs, that the wonder was not that it was done well but that it was done at all. We used to say that about the women debaters, and I think the same sort of thing can be said about the present Treasurer on his first visit to a Loan Council meeting. I have no doubt that he spent most of his time at that meeting trying to keep up with what was going on, let alone making a forceful contribution to the business before the Council itself. The state of confusion into which I suspect he probably fell was well illustrated by his remarks in the various newspapers. I have here, to be impeccably impartial, reports from the *Advertiser* and—

Mr. Ryan: Very impartial! What about the *Tribune*? Have you left that out?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I have today. The *Advertiser* report shows that the Treasurer was not certain as to which line he should take. On June 3 under the Canberra date line of the previous day, the report states:

He (the Treasurer) said later that the extra Loan money allocated to South Australia was not as much as he hoped for and it meant that expenditure would have to be carefully controlled.

The Treasurer had announced what South Australia's allocation would be, and later on he is reported as saying:

In any case the amount to be made available from the South Australian Loan allocation for housing will remain at least twice as great on a per capita basis as the amounts made available in all other States combined.

Curiously enough, that very sentence found its way into the speech he made when introducing the Loan Estimates, which leads me to believe that those particular remarks were prepared for him by his Treasury officers who accompanied him to Canberra and who, as we know, write the speech on the Loan Estimates. However, when he returned from Canberra that same night he was apparently approached at the airport, and he made a few remarks off the cuff. There is a beaming photograph of the Treasurer looking extremely happy, as though he had done an extremely good job, and accompanied by his henchman, the Minister of Works, who had attended the talks as an observer. The Treasurer, when he returned, was reported in the *News* as saying:

South Australia should be able to maintain its current rate of public works undertakings and fully maintain the present labour force.

Then he went on to say that the Commonwealth had allowed South Australia to borrow £40,466,000 which was only £686,000 more than this year's Loan raisings, but despite this, public works should be maintained quite well. It was obvious when he returned that he thought he had obtained plenty of money for the State.

Mr. Coumbe: Didn't he say it was a satisfactory result?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think he did. The tenor of those remarks is that the sum he had obtained for this State was satisfactory, and it is obvious that he, himself, was speaking there and was not being prompted by his Treasury officers. The Leader of the Opposition expressed alarm at the way in which the Loan Programme was being financed, and suggested that the Government was obliging various semi-governmental instrumentalities to draw on reserves. This matter was taken up by the member for Glenelg. I do not intend to argue with him on high economic policy, for going over the points one by one would be as tedious to listen to as it was to listen to him as he discussed, one by one, the points made by the Leader of the Opposition in an attempt to rebut them. It is a pity that the honourable member for Gawler had not spoken to the honourable member for Glenelg before the latter made his speech; some of his remarks made about repeating speeches would have been rather apposite. One is justified in doubting the member for Glenelg's reliability and accuracy. The honourable member holds himself out, and is held out by his Party, as an expert on economic affairs.

Mr. Coumbe: A brains trust!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. It is most unfortunate that he should have had to spend much of his first speech on economic matters, explaining why many things he had written into his Party's policy before the election had not quite worked out.

Mr. Coumbe: Why did he say that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He tried to explain why things had not worked out, and I suggest that it is rather unfortunate that a man with his qualifications, who is apparently confidently expected to be the next member to enter the Cabinet of a Labor Government, should have to spend much of his speech on economic matters, explaining why he had not been quite right before the election. Of course, that is what he did in trying to explain away this extraordinary assertion about the natural growth in Loan funds apparently made in a

television broadcast before the election. If I correctly understood the explanation he gave during his speech, he said that as Loan projects finished in every financial year about £2,000,000 of Loan money was available for new works to be used at the discretion of the Government. He also expected that the sum available through the Loan Council would rise by about £1,000,000 annually, and this would apparently mean that there would be about £3,000,000 to be spent every year at the discretion of the Government.

Mr. Nankivell: Which line did the Government leave out?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I found the member for Glenelg's explanation highly theoretical, but I suppose that is not surprising when one knows his background. What is surprising is that his Party was prepared to accept such an extraordinary argument. It is extraordinary because it completely overlooks the fact that as one project ends (and I adopt his argument to that extent) there are others so vital that they must be commenced straight away, and thus the discretion of the Government at any one time, regarding that £2,000,000 to which the honourable member refers, is severely limited. The extra £1,000,000 a year that he said would become available depends on the sum available through the Loan Council. The honourable member for Glenelg appeared to regret admitting that things had not quite worked out as he had thought they would. In the course of his speech, he said.

Unfortunately, we are at present faced with financial stringency, but I hope that in the next two years the position will be rectified considerably.

That is, he hopes that the sums from the Loan Council will start to rise again. Then, having criticized the Commonwealth Government for the sum made available this year to States for Loan works and having criticized the policy of the Commonwealth Government fairly severely, rather extraordinarily he took the opposite tack and said:

As I have indicated, because of financial stringency the Commonwealth Government has imposed during the present year the position has not quite worked out in the first year, but I am confident that when things relax in subsequent years that deficiency in the first year will be more than made up.

Mr. Jennings: You listen to your mate Harold Holt this evening and you'll learn something about financial stringencies.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Having criticized the Commonwealth Government on its miserly attitude in the past (which meant that his forecast did not quite work out), the honourable

member apparently expects the Commonwealth Government, in future, to come over and deliver the goods.

Mr. Jennings: A different Commonwealth Government.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Enfield will be the first to admit that there is no chance of a different Commonwealth Government during the next year and the member for Glenelg referred to this year and next year.

Mr. McKee: It is nice to hear the honourable member criticize his own Party.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thought the member for Port Pirie would be listening but he has not followed my points at all. I am saying that the explanation of the member for Glenelg as to why his forecasts before the election did not work out is very lame indeed, because it involves a contradiction. There is a condemnation of the Commonwealth Government to this point and then a hope that in the future the Commonwealth will be slightly more open-handed than it has been in the past. As his excuse for not bringing out these matters in the Labor Party policy before the election, the honourable member said that his statements were made on television and had to be made quickly; he said that he had only five minutes, and that there was not time to include all the qualifications. That may be so as far as it goes; however, I remind honourable members that this was not the only opportunity the honourable member's Party had to explain its financial policy.

Mr. Nankivell: The member for Glenelg is the only one who understood it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Leader of the Opposition, as he then was, was made to say in his policy speech, under the heading "Finance", a good deal about what the Labor Party would do if it were elected. He said:

Additional funds will also be available on account of the rate of normal growth in Government revenue and Loan funds.

This is the matter to which I have been referring. It could be said that the Leader of the Opposition did not have much time to include qualifications because this speech was made on television, but I remind honourable members that, after he had delivered the first part of his policy speech and come out with quite a peroration, he then went on to amplify various points for the benefit of those at the meeting. That would have been a perfect opportunity to amplify the financial proposals, and to give the qualifications that the honourable member for Glenelg now regards as so

important in explaining why things have not quite gone as he said they would go.

Mr. Coumbe: The honourable member attended public meetings afterwards, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes; this is not the only opportunity Labor Party members have had to expound their whole policy including the qualifications, but they did not do this. They said in an airy-fairy way that they had only been in office for a short time. However, to offer this as an excuse in this instance is absolute nonsense. Those things rather shake one's faith in the reliability of the arguments put up in this debate, or anywhere else for that matter, by the member for Glenelg. In passing, I bet that when he was speaking on television (I did not see the Labor Party broadcast on economic policy) he did not have time to go into these things, yet he had plenty of time to talk about the amalgamation of the two State banking institutions—the Savings Bank and the State Bank of South Australia.

Mr. Coumbe: Why haven't we heard more about that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My guess is that he spent much of his five minutes talking about that matter, because (just as the then Leader of the Opposition had done in his policy speech) he said straight out that this would be done. However, for some extraordinary reason we have not heard a word about it, either in the Governor's Speech or anywhere else, and whenever members on this side happen to raise the matter members opposite are curiously silent.

Mr. Coumbe: Perhaps it is like road tax.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. All these things, as I say, rather shake one's confidence in the honourable member for Glenelg. The whole fact of the matter is that not one member on the Government side (not even the honourable member for Glenelg) knew the economic facts of life until he came to office and found that things were rather different when in office than they had looked from the Opposition benches. We need not be surprised that this has happened, because, after all, a far more celebrated and a far better known Government has found precisely the same thing. I refer to the present Government in the United Kingdom, which came into office (just) on a wave of promises which have been discarded one by one, I think until there are none left at all, much to the gall of some Socialists in Great Britain.

Mr. Coumbe: Some have resigned, haven't they?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps they have. People who are strong supporters of the Labor

Party in that country have been bitterly disappointed because the Labor Party in England has discarded all the promises it made at the polls to gain office.

Mr. Nankivell: One member has threatened to resign.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. We should not, I suppose, be surprised that on a rather smaller scale (about one-fiftieth, I guess) the Labor Government in this State has departed from the election promises we heard from its members. Even in the speech itself, one wonders about the strength of the present Treasurer, because if one compares the form of the speech this year with the form of the speech last year one finds that whole sections of it are word for word the same, and only the figures are different. The verbiage is precisely the same, except for the few opening paragraphs, and if members doubt me they can look at the section on the Housing Trust, for example, and compare it with what was said last year. The fact is, of course, that the Treasurer has not been strong enough to break away from the influence of his own Treasury advisers.

I said that I would not speak on any matters except general economic policy at this stage, but I must make some exception to that because there are a few things that do not appear on the lines at all and unless I mention them at this juncture it will not be competent for me to raise them again. Therefore, I must make some exception to the rule that I laid down. There are three matters that I desire to mention at this stage. First, I express my great disappointment that this Government, like the former Government, has not seen fit to provide money for the development of Windy Point. Windy Point is a part of my electoral district to which I have referred before with regret because of its present state. It could become the premier tourist attraction in and around Adelaide. Even today it is one of the great attractions, but we are not making enough of it, and if one goes up there (I should be glad if honourable members would do so) one finds that it is in an appalling condition at present. The kiosk is shabby and hardly ever open, the pavement at the parking spot is pot-holed, and the whole place is completely run down.

Mr. Ryan: Wasn't this investigated previously?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. I have already said, for the benefit of the honourable member for Port Adelaide, that I very much regret that the new Government has not seen fit to do any more than the previous Government did regarding the potential of this area.

Mr. Ryan: What was the report when the previous Government investigated?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The report was that it should be developed, and plans were actually drawn for the erection of a high-class restaurant at Windy Point.

Mr. Clark: Would it cost very much?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, £60,000 was the amount set aside, but unfortunately the previous Government preferred to buy a building for the Tourist Bureau in Sydney, I think, rather than develop Windy Point, and the money went that way. I very much regret that the new Government has not allocated any money, nor does it apparently intend to do so in the foreseeable future, for Windy Point. As a tourist attraction, and therefore in the revenue which we would get from tourists, it would more than pay for itself in a very short time.

The other two matters to which I desire to refer do not relate solely to my district. The first concerns the announcement made by the honourable the Treasurer in one of his telecasts that the Adelaide Gaol was likely to be pulled down. I have here an *Advertiser* report. I am sorry that I cannot quote from the *News* as well on this occasion, but probably there was something in it.

Mr. Clark: At least you are being fair.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am always fair. On Thursday, July 15, the lead story on the first page of the *Advertiser* headed, "Teachers College on Gaol Site; Government Plan for New Prisons", was as follows:

The demolition of the Adelaide Gaol to make way for a new Western Teachers College was announced last night by the Premier. The Premier said that 17 acres of nearby parkland would be developed as a sporting area for the college.

Not one mention of this project appears in the Loan Estimates, the very place, Mr. Chairman, in which it should appear and in which one would expect it to appear.

Mr. Ryan: You know it can't be approved until it has been recommended by the Public Works Committee, and it hasn't been to the committee yet.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am going to develop it along another line, if the member for Port Adelaide will allow me. I said a few moments ago that we used to hear a lot of talk about the master in this Chamber in days gone by. We do not hear that now. We also used to hear many complaints from the then members of the Opposition about the then Treasurer's telecasts and the proposals that he would put up there. There were complaints that these things should

have been done in Parliament, that the announcement should have been made in Parliament and not outside the Chamber. There were complaints that these announced proposals were merely castles in the air that never came to anything. The Government members are curiously silent about this sort of thing now, yet the same thing is happening, except that the new Treasurer does not do it quite as well.

Mr. Nankivell: We have a pretty picture about one of the projects.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Maybe we have, but we do not have anything about the Adelaide Gaol. I do not look at the Treasurer's telecasts, but I have been told that he does not do it nearly as well as the old Treasurer did. The present Treasurer is a voice in the background. He chooses to make his announcements (just as the old Treasurer did) on television, outside the Chamber, yet Government members are very slow to chide him about it, certainly very slow to do so publicly.

Mr. Hall: Perhaps they are frightened!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps they are: the master has spoken.

Mr. Ryan: That will be the day!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I point out, in dis-appointment and in a spirit of mild criticism—

Mr. Clark: More in sorrow than in anger!

Mr. MILLHOUSE:—that we had splendid headlines a month ago, but not a word has been heard since. It will be many years before we hear more about it or before more is done about it.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: At least we are securing the ground for a teachers college.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That piece of ground has been secure for a long time. The other matter that is curiously absent from the Estimates is any reference to a new Government Printing Office. This is a matter on which members of the Government, when in Opposition, were constantly attacking the previous Government. When they are in office the story is just the same and nothing is done. I hope that soon (although I do not expect it), something will be done about the three projects to which I have referred—Windy Point, Adelaide Gaol, and the new Government Printing Office. They are a motley collection put together, but they are of importance to the State, and I hope the Government will do (as it has said it will in the case of the second two) something about them, and about Windy Point as well. I support the adoption of the first line.

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide): Like many Government members, I expected the previous Treasurer, with 27 years' experience in these matters, to attempt to slay the financial policy of the Government, especially as this Government had no-one in its ranks with previous Government experience. However, even the Leader of the Opposition cannot fault the financial policy of the Labor Party Government. In criticizing the Loan Estimates, the Leader of the Opposition attempted to prove that the sum this State received from the Loan Council allocation was inadequate.

Mr. Quirke: It is always inadequate!

Mr. RYAN: I am glad the honourable member for Burra said that. Saying that the sum was inadequate, the Leader of the Opposition blamed the present Treasurer for its inadequacy. He said that if the Treasurer had stuck to his guns and had said that the amount for 1965-66 was inadequate he could have persuaded the Loan Council to increase the allocation to this State. Coming from the Leader of the Opposition, that is amusing. In 1962, during the Loan Estimates debate the then Treasurer, now Leader of the Opposition, said:

In June last the Australian Loan Council adopted a total new borrowing programme of £250,000,000. This was an increase of £10,000,000 over the original programme of £240,000,000 for 1961-62, but was an increase of only £2,500,000 over the programme as supplemented by £7,500,000 of housing moneys in February, 1962. Despite strong pressure from State Ministers, who pointed out that the provision of an additional £7,500,000 for the final four months of 1961-62 was roughly equivalent to £20,000,000 for a full year and that therefore a total programme of at least £260,000,000 was necessary for 1962-63 to maintain the rate of the States' loan activities, the Commonwealth declined to support a total programme for works and housing in excess of £250,000,000.

Today, the Leader of the Opposition attacks the Treasurer and says that if the allocation was not adequate, the Treasurer should have stayed until adequate money was provided by the Loan Council, yet according to the Leader of the Opposition in 1962, the sum provided was totally inadequate to finance the work programme of the State, and other State Treasurers agreed with him. Yet the Commonwealth did not increase the amount it intended to grant that year through the Loan Council. Why did not the Leader of the Opposition during his many years as Treasurer adopt the principle that he now says should be adopted by the present Treasurer? Apparently, when

one is in Opposition one is not in Government, and when things are not the same they are different: that seems to be the Opposition's policy. If the Leader of the Opposition had remained for another week in 1962-63, he would not have received any more of the £250,000,000 than he did. On that occasion he had more support than had the Treasurer this time: the Treasurer was a lone wolf at the recent Loan Council meeting.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: You're telling me nothing!

Mr. RYAN: The Loan Council programme is determined before the Treasurers arrive in Canberra. We saw by the action of Mr. Nicklin of Queensland and Mr. Bolte of Victoria that the amount to be allocated to the various States was pre-arranged. When Mr. Nicklin and Mr. Bolte were prepared to go behind the back of the Loan Council to receive an advantage in allocation, it is obvious that they would not be prepared to support the Treasurer of South Australia in his attempt to increase his allocation.

Mr. McKee: They took the cherries out of the cake before he got there!

Mr. RYAN: There were no cherries in the cake when our Treasurer got there, but just plain cake without icing. When the Leader of the Opposition attended these meetings, wasn't he the instigator of the behind-the-chair method of getting finance for the State? The present Treasurer is held in the highest esteem by the Liberal and Country League, or whatever it is called in other States, for his attitude at the Loan Council meeting.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Go to Queensland and find out!

Mr. RYAN: Mr. Nicklin praised the Treasurer for his attitude adopted at the Loan Council meeting. If Mr. Nicklin went back to the State of Queensland and told them a different tale from what he told the Loan Council, that is his pigeon and not ours. What did Bolte do? He went behind the scenes to get a bigger increase at the expense of other States. Because our Treasurer stuck out for what he thought was a fair and equitable slice of the Loan Council allocations, he was accused by the Leader of the Opposition of doing something he had not done. He told us that on one occasion he had created a position where the Loan Council was kept sitting for three additional days because he did not get the share he thought was necessary for this State. Not in my time as a member of Parliament did that happen, but since I have been a member the

former Treasurer (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) has returned and, on introducing the Loan Estimates, has complained on each occasion that the sum allocated to South Australia was inadequate. We agree with that, but at least we do not accuse people of doing something they have not done. Someone said that members of the Government did not have the insides to stand up on these matters. Obviously, the previous Treasurer did not have the insides to stand up to the Commonwealth Government when he was able to because, whatever the voting strength on the Loan Council, the Commonwealth has the final say on the amount to be allocated to the States and, even if they stayed there for a month, the State Treasurers would not get additional money from the Commonwealth.

The Leader of the Opposition went to great lengths to explain that the Loan programme money for the State should be spent by the State on the programme as introduced in Parliament, that no State should develop in other ways by using surplus money from the Loan programme; but these statements do not bear out the facts when one investigates what has happened in the past. The present Leader of the Opposition, when presenting the 1962-63 Loan Estimates, said that they were totally inadequate and that the State could not benefit from the sum allocated by the Commonwealth. The State had a £400,000 surplus with which to commence the year 1963-64. This is interesting because in 1962 there was a State election when the L.C.L. Party could not return a majority of members, so it would certainly make every effort to ensure that the State's finances would be healthy during the life of that Parliament, from 1962 to 1965, so that it would be returned at the 1965 election.

But, even with about £500,000 surplus at the beginning of that year, at the commencement of the 1964-65 financial year the carry-over from 1963-64 was a surplus of nearly £1,750,000; yet the present Leader of the Opposition said that no Government should budget for a surplus on the Loan works programme. The L.C.L. Government had a surplus of roughly £2,300,000 in two years. That is not a bad surplus when we consider that at the commencement of 1963-64 the surplus was equivalent to about 5½ per cent of the total works programme of £37,000,000. A surplus of about 5½ per cent does not substantiate the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition that Loan works programme money should be spent and that no surplus should be

carried over because it would interfere with the following year's application to the Loan Council.

The only interference was that, when the present Treasurer went to Canberra for the allocation for the year 1965-66, he went there with a deficit of £30,000 in the Loan works programme inherited from the previous Government. That meant of course that, comparing 1964-65 with 1965-66, there was a difference of over £2,000,000 in the works programme money for the State for this financial year. That is not a happy position for any new Government that has been in Opposition for over a decade to find itself in. It is also noticeable that, with all the pressure that the Leader of the Opposition has tried to exert on the present Treasurer, if one inquires into the total sum allocated by the Commonwealth over the years, the increase since 1959 has been on the basis of £10,000,000 from one year to the next. There has been no substantial increase on that amount from 1959 until 1963. No-one has to be an economic expert or a Bachelor of Economics to be able to appreciate that, if the Commonwealth is growing in industrial productivity, if our population and the States are growing, the annual increase in Loan allocation should also grow. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition said that the increase on one occasion was only £10,000,000. Even with the natural increase in productivity, industrial expansion and population, it should have been at least £12,500,000, but the Leader of the Opposition was prepared even in those years still to accept a static annual increase of £10,000,000 in the total to be divided among the States.

It has been said during this debate that the present Government does not intend to implement its policy of decentralization in a works programme. Why is this not possible? When we consider that the present Government has inherited from the previous Liberal Governments over the years a financial policy to which it must adhere, it is only natural to assume that the present Government cannot financially implement its own works programme. Let us look at what we did inherit. Under the heading "Loan to the Corporation of Adelaide", the present Government is committed for this financial year to the spending of £270,000, because that project was inherited from the previous Government; also, we have to provide £375,000 on a major programme for the south-western suburbs drainage scheme, £175,000 for the drainage scheme for the metropolitan area, and this year £230,000 for the

irrigation and reclamation of swamplands already commenced by the previous Government, last year's provision also being £230,000. Then this year we have to provide £300,000 for the South-Eastern drainage scheme, for which £500,000 was provided by the previous Government. The Renmark Irrigation Trust loan is £25,000 this year because it has already been provided for and this Government is committed to it by previous arrangement.

Mr. Jennings: And we are honouring the commitment.

Mr. RYAN: We have been accused of not honouring the previous L.C.L. Government's commitments, but we find that our financial programme is impeded for the very reason that we are honouring the financial obligations inherited from the previous Government. The previous Minister of Works (Hon. G. G. Pearson) made great play on the fact that we were embarking on a centralized scheme of expenditure in respect of Harbors Board accommodation, rather than adopting a policy of decentralization on this matter. Let us look at what we inherited in the previous Government's commitments in relation to Harbors Board accommodation: we have to provide £300,000 for the major scheme of deepening and widening the Port River, for which the previous Government last year allocated £330,000.

We are duty bound to complete schemes which have already been commenced and on which hundreds of thousands of pounds have been spent by our predecessors. This Government has to provide £170,000 for a new passenger terminal at Outer Harbour. I raised this matter myself two and a half years ago in the House, but was told that the work was unnecessary, as facilities in this State for passengers arriving on overseas ships were equal to any in the world. At the same time it was convenient for the previous Government (and I agreed with this decision) to refer this important project to the Public Works Committee. It was recommended by that committee and, as work has already been commenced, this Government will not overlook such an important project.

Mr. Clark: It was long overdue, anyway.

Mr. RYAN: It was 20 years overdue. For many years overseas shipping companies have threatened that, unless adequate provision is made at Outer Harbour to accommodate passengers, some of the large ships now visiting South Australia will by-pass this State and proceed directly from Fremantle to Melbourne.

The revenue thus derived would therefore be lost to this State, and it was only the pressure from those shipping companies that brought about the implementation of this project. This year £23,000 is necessary to supplement work undertaken by the previous Government to improve facilities at Klein Point; £253,000 is also necessary for wharf construction at Port Pirie.

Mr. McKee: Money well spent!

Mr. RYAN: Long overdue! The work should have been commenced years ago at half the cost. This Government would have been criticized (and rightly so) if it had not continued with projects already commenced by the previous Government. The sum of £82,000 is necessary to construct a new bucket dredger; £50,000 is required this year to rehabilitate dredges that are totally inadequate for the work they are doing in the various ports, all under the control of the Harbors Board.

Mr. Hurst: They are completely run down.

Mr. RYAN: Absolutely! Much expenditure is required because of the dilapidated condition of much of the equipment in this State.

Mr. Hurst: That would hold up progress on developmental works, too.

Mr. RYAN: Yes. The deepening of the Port River has not been able to proceed, because the necessary equipment has been allowed to become dilapidated.

Mr. Hurst: No doubt the constituents are suffering as a result.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, and the financial expenditure involved is probably far greater than it should have been.

Mr. McKee: Give them a long-handled shovel on the Nullarbor!

Mr. RYAN: The Opposition would not know what a shovel was.

Mr. McAnaney: I have used one more than you have.

Mr. RYAN: I am prepared to accept a challenge from the honourable member whenever he is ready. The Government is honouring a financial policy inflicted on it by the previous Government.

Mr. Jennings: "Inflicted" isn't the word!

Mr. RYAN: We are being accused of not implementing Labor policy, but this is because of the financial policy inflicted on us as a Government. I do not criticize the work being continued by the Government, because it is absolutely necessary. In regard to waterworks, £1,135,000 is necessary this year for the extension of the Happy Valley scheme, whereas last year the sum was £741,000. No-one will deny that these are important projects. The sum of

£70,000 is necessary to continue work on the Kangaroo Creek reservoir.

The member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) criticized the Government for not proceeding with the Middle River reservoir project, but if he does a little homework he will find that a scheme for his district was tabled in this House only a few days ago, yet he criticizes the Government for not expediting work on a scheme that was not officially recommended until a few days ago. The sum of £20,000 is necessary this year to continue the Clarendon-Belair-Blackwood water scheme; £80,000 is required for the Elizabeth water scheme, and there are numerous other projects which have been previously commenced by the former Government under the heading of "Waterworks" to the extent of £2,500,000, and which have been inherited by this Government. In relation to sewers this Government will provide £2,632,000 for the Bolivar scheme, and £30,000 is to continue the Le Fevre Peninsula scheme. For metropolitan sewerage schemes alone, which have been commenced by the previous Government, vast sums have to be found.

We heard many comments from Opposition members concerning country sewerage; they claimed that nearly all the money under this year's works programme was being spent in the metropolitan area, to the detriment of country people. This year the commitment is £25,000 to complete the Lobethal sewerage scheme; £330,000 is provided to continue the Mount Gambier sewerage scheme, and a similar figure for further work on the Whyalla sewerage scheme. Sewerage in country areas alone is a commitment for which the present Government is responsible to the extent of £685,000. In respect of Government buildings, the Leader of the Opposition went to great lengths to describe a repudiation of policy by the present Government, compared with the policy of the L.C.L. Government over the years. This Government, in its initial year, has to provide for the expenditure of £2,194,000 for the continuation of the rebuilding scheme at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I think every member on the Government side will admit that this work is about 10 or 15 years overdue. It should have been commenced many years ago, when the ultimate cost would probably have been half what it will cost this Government to complete the work. Further, £326,000 is necessary this year to complete a group laundry commenced by the previous



Government, and £550,000 for the continuation of work on the Public Library. Provision is made for £82,000 for the Port Lincoln Gaol and £400,000 for a new Government building in Victoria Square. The lack of action by the L.C.L. Government over a long period regarding a Government building has been the subject of severe criticism by every member, whether L.C.L. or Labor.

The Leader of the Opposition went to great lengths to try to impress on the present Government the need for making provision in the Loan works programme this year for the Port Augusta Gaol and he said the gaol was long overdue and necessary. We all agree with that, but the previous Government had 32 years in which to commence some of the work about which we are being criticized in our first year as a Government.

Let us look at the record of the previous Government as far as Port Augusta is concerned. Some years ago a proposal for a new gaol was recommended by the Public Works Committee. That work was considered urgent at that time. Last year, £20,000 was appropriated in the Loan programme for the commencement of this project, the final cost of which will be thousands of pounds. What happened? Nobody can tell us better than can the present Speaker. The work was not commenced; not a penny of that appropriation was spent on the project. Yet, out of the air, the Leader of the Opposition says that the Labor Government should have at least made some provision for the Port Augusta gaol. Why did the previous Government not live up to its obligations in relation to that project? The figures I have given are the minimum that this Government has been obliged to find in this year's programme for works that it has inherited, and they total more than £11,750,000.

We had no alternative but to continue appropriating money for important works that had been commenced or were about to be commenced by our predecessors in Government, so this £11,750,000 is included in our programme of works costing about £39,000,000. Slightly more than 25 per cent of the programme before us is an inheritance from the previous Government. How can a Government, in its first four or five months of office after being kept in Opposition through no fault of its own, meet the demands of its own Party? Let us hope that when we have completed the programme that has been foisted on to us by our predecessors we shall be able to meet the demands

as they come, rather amazingly, from Opposition members. They repeatedly ask why some projects have not been commenced. When they were in Government and were able to determine what works should be initiated, these provisions were not made. Our position would be vastly different if we did not have to continue the inheritance foisted on to us.

Mr. Quirke: But they are all necessary, aren't they?

Mr. RYAN: I agree. They are important projects.

Mr. Quirke: I am only querying the word "foisted".

Mr. RYAN: "Foisted" or "hoisted", if we inherit something that is necessary we have to continue with it. I have endeavoured to explain briefly that the Labor Government is honouring some of the promises made during the election campaign. We promised that we would continue some of the works commenced by the previous Government, or for which appropriations had been made. When it is realized that 25 per cent of the Loan allocation works programme for this year represents expenditure on projects commenced or proposed by the previous Government, we can fairly and squarely say that we have met our obligation and have not repudiated anything.

Mr. Langley: Do you think there will be brighter things next time?

Mr. RYAN: Absolutely. It is not necessary for any Government to inherit the policy of a previous Government. If that were the fundamental principle of Government, there would be no changes in Government. If a new Government had to continue the policy of the previous Government there would be no need to change the Government. People change Governments for the express purpose of having implemented the policy of one Party in preference to that of the other, and that is what has happened in this State.

Mr. McKee: They were looking for something better.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, and they knew that the Party that would give them something better was the Labor Party. Unfortunately, although we were successful at the election three years ago, we did not occupy the Treasury benches. However, we are there now and when we overcome the difficulty of the financial fiction upon us we shall be able to proceed with works to the advantage of the State, in accordance with the announced policy of the Australian Labor Party.

Mr. Langley: Do you think the people of the State will be told properly by the press about these matters?

Mr. RYAN: I do not think they will, because, unfortunately, one newspaper is adopting the policy of still trying to hold in front of the people an image that is no longer an image. What really counts is the ballot box on election day, and the people have, in no uncertain manner, voiced their opinion as to which Government they want, and they want that Government to implement its policy. As soon as money becomes available, we shall implement the policy of the Australian Labor Party. Members of the Opposition want us to continue with what they have promised, but we give a definite assurance that it will be in accordance with Labor policy that money will be spent, in future, and not with that of the Liberal and Country League. Several members of the Opposition said the present Government was heading for trouble by utilizing the reserves of Government instrumentalities. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) interjected loudly and said that it was bad business to use internal funds of Government instrumentalities to finance them. Let us look at what has happened in the past. The present Leader of the Opposition, who has said that it is bad policy to use these funds, when introducing the Loan Estimates on August 10, 1961, said:

In addition it is proposed to meet further expenditure, particularly on housing, out of cash balances held at the Treasury by the Housing Trust, the State Bank and other instrumentalities, so that the aggregate State works and housing programme will exceed in 1961-62 that of the previous year by about 10 per cent. The provisions included in the Loan Estimates for the Electricity Trust, the Housing Trust, and the Abattoirs Board are to be supplemented by £4,400,000 to be borrowed as semi-governmental loans, and by even greater use of internal funds than formerly.

Despite that statement, the present Leader and many sitting behind him say now that it is not good policy to use internal funds of Government instrumentalities for further expansion. In 1963, when Treasurer, the present Leader in introducing the Loan Estimates spoke about the State's works programme, including the Housing Agreement provision and the semi-governmental allocation of £4,756,000, and said:

This, too, was further supplemented inasmuch as the Electricity Trust, the Housing Trust, and the State Bank housing programme made use of considerable volume of internal funds such as surpluses, capital recoveries, depreciation funds and maintenance provisions.

I distinctly remember the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) saying during the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition that it was extremely bad to use depreciation funds of any instrumentality to create the further expansion of that instrumentality, yet this is just what members opposite approved when they were in Government. Is that not the scheme adopted by most business houses? Many members opposite are members or directors of various business concerns, so they would know that they finance expansion by using internal funds. Is that not the reason for the creation of internal funds? It is the reason, yet the moment the present Government is forced to use internal funds it is criticized and told that it is bad financial policy. If it is bad for one Party it is bad for the other, and if it is good to use internal funds they should be used instead of the Government's being forced by not using them to curtail its activities.

Mr. McKee: That is common sense.

Mr. RYAN: It is. That is the policy adopted by banks, insurance companies and lending institutions, and everyone applauds it. This policy has been adopted over the years, and the companies that have adopted it are considered to be sound; their policy is not criticized. As the Opposition can find no way to criticize the Government on its works programme, it has to draw red herrings into the matter to criticize anything that may be popular with the public.

This afternoon the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) said in reply to an interjection that members of the Government Party would not dare criticize what the Government did. I assure members opposite that I would be the first to criticize if the Government embarked on a programme that would be detrimental to the interests of this State and the people my Party mainly represents. If the Government did not do something to assist people unable to assist themselves, I assure members opposite that my criticism would not be withheld. The previous Minister of Works (Hon. G. G. Pearson) was gravely concerned and disappointed that this Government had not proceeded with a glorified scheme thought up by the present Leader of the Opposition that would cost the Government about £9,500,000 if implemented; I am referring to the Upper Port Reach Development Scheme. It would cost the Government nearly £4,000,000 before there was any return, and it would produce blocks of land to be sold at over £4,000. When the previous Minister was speaking I

asked if the blocks would be of any assistance to working people. They would not be of assistance and the Government would have to spend a large sum before receiving any return. In last Saturday's *Advertiser* appeared a report of what the present Minister of Marine had to say about the matter (and this is the opinion of members of the Government Party):

The capital works programme now before Parliament provided for further major expenditure on Port Adelaide projects, the Minister of Marine (Mr. Hutchens) said yesterday. He was commenting on a statement by the former Minister of Marine, Mr. Pearson, that the Loan programme contained no provision for a start on the Upper Port Reach plan for artificial lakes and waterfront housing, estimated to cost £9,000,000.

Members opposite criticize the Government for not spending Loan money on necessary works, yet they want it to spend over £9,000,000 on some glorified scheme thought up by them when in office. The article continues:

"There are other more essential projects to be tackled before the Government can consider a project of that magnitude," Mr. Hutchens said.

He was certainly voicing my opinion. The Minister went on to say:

The sum of £1,280,000 is allocated for harbors accommodation this year compared with £1,071,000 spent last year. Of this amount, £170,000 is proposed for work to start on a new passenger terminal at Outer Harbour. This will follow the preliminary work, mainly wharf strengthening, done last year. By far the major allocation—£300,000—is for work to continue on widening and deepening the Port River, to cost £3.3m. in all. I do not agree that the time is ripe now for a start on another major Port Adelaide project. The top priority jobs should be done first.

Mr. Hudson: That is a responsible statement.

Mr. RYAN: Yes. I would be the first to criticize the Government if it embarked on this proposal before providing money for many essential works which are urgently needed and which would benefit a greater number of people. The article continues:

Our political roundsman says it is possible the Government will accord the Upper Port Reach plan a low priority—

he should have said a very, very low priority—unless its loan resources improve. Government policy is to build more low-cost houses and the proposal to erect expensive waterfront houses has little appeal to the Cabinet.

For once I agree with the political roundsman of the *Advertiser*, but I would go further and say that it has less appeal to Government members, and even less again to the public in general. In my district the waiting period

for low-deposit purchase houses and even rental houses is about three to five years.

Mr. Hurst: Can they be obtained then?

Mr. RYAN: One is lucky to get a house even then. This position is critical, and the Government cannot afford to embark on a scheme that will benefit only those in the millionaire class. I have given close study to the average assessment made by the Engineering and Water Supply Department for this project and, if it were ever commenced, the average assessment would be £7,750. This project has such a low priority that it will not be commenced for many years to come. It could not be embarked upon without other necessary expenses being incurred. When this matter was considered, I believe that the cost for the provision of water and sewerage alone would have been over £3,000,000. Therefore, in addition to the expenditure of over £9,000,000 on the scheme, water and sewerage installations would have involved the Government in further expenditure.

Probably every member has asked the Government, irrespective of which Party may have been in power, to consider the installation of a water and sewerage scheme in his district. We will not be able for some years to come to embark on a scheme that involves the State in the expenditure of £3,000,000 on a project such as this, because some areas that have been established for many years are not yet provided with water and sewerage. The Minister of Marine amplified my opinion, and the opinion of practically all members, when he replied to requests for this Government to consider the implementation of this Port Adelaide scheme, which had been dreamt up by the previous Government. We inherited some schemes from the previous Government that we consider to be necessary and vital to the interests of the State. However, it can be expected that those in the luxury class will be pushed so far down on the priority list that they will not be proceeded with until such time as we have met the demands of people who consider their requests more urgent and absolutely necessary.

I compliment the Treasurer for his splendid effort at the Loan Council meeting. I am certain that the knowledge he acquired during his recent attendance will be used to the advantage of the State. I believe Opposition members sorely regret that for too long the opportunity to acquire the knowledge necessary to pit oneself against some of the greatest financial brains in the country at a Loan Council meeting has been given to one man. That is why I believe the present Treasurer is to be

complimented for taking with him an observer who would be acquainted with some of the facts necessary to ensure the progress of the State. It is fortunate for South Australia that there was a change of Government, because the Opposition would have been in dire straits if the knowledgeable member of their ranks had not been able to attend a Loan Council meeting. This allocation is probably of more concern to South Australia than any other. I have much pleasure, on my first opportunity as a member of the Government Party, in supporting the first line of the first works programme by a Labor Government in 32 years.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I am somewhat disappointed with the remarks by the honourable member for Port Adelaide. I have heard him over the years and I thought his remarks might include some constructive ideas and contain the Government's plans for the future. I did not hear any plans; rather, I heard an epitaph to the retiring Government. The member for Port Adelaide praised the Government for the plans it had provided for the future development of the State, and only when he referred to the Outer Harbour did he criticize those plans. I think this was a great tribute to the retiring Government.

A sum of £20,000 is provided to complete the water scheme in the Strathalbyn district, started by the previous Government. There has already been an increase in production in the area because of this scheme, and it is of benefit to the State. We hope and trust that the new Government will see fit to extend the scheme to areas in my district to which it will be of value. I refer in particular to the Hartley-Callington area. I trust that I will have the co-operation of the Minister of Agriculture in this project, because it was a plank of his platform when he spoke at Murray Bridge. Perhaps a well established district like Stirling does not have the pressing need for capital expenditure in the same way as some other districts. However, it must be remembered that this district provides much money for activities in the State and, therefore, I believe one or two matters should be considered. The police building at Strathalbyn is in a most unsatisfactory state, and we hope that something will be done in this matter in future. The Strathalbyn primary school, too, is unsatisfactory, for there is a new part and an old part separated by a considerable distance, which is an inconvenience to the children coming from the outside areas. We trust that the Education Department can see fit to complete the new

school, when possibly the old school can be used for adult education purposes.

A sum of money was made available on the Estimates last year to establish a meat marketing hall, and I think this hall has proved of great benefit to the State in that the butchers can go and see what type of meat they are buying. The meat is being brought direct from the producer.

Mr. Jennings: I have advocated that for years.

Mr. McANANEY: This elimination of costs is a benefit both to the consumer and to the producer. Although the honourable member for Enfield says he has advocated it for years, other people actually got to work and did the preparation to see that that was done.

Mr. Jennings: But I stimulated and precipitated it.

Mr. McANANEY: I think the same principle could apply with the potato industry at the present time. More direct contact between the grower and the consumer, rather than the produce passing through the various hands as it does now, would be to the benefit of all. For instance, a potato washer cannot sell his potatoes direct to the consumer or the retailer, and I think that is to the detriment of the industry and the consumer in South Australia.

Perhaps I should not be frivolous in discussing such a serious matter as these Loan Estimates, but I should like to tell a story concerning the requirements for an egg licence. I asked my wife the other day how many fowls she had, and she replied that she had 24. I said, "You will have the Minister of Agriculture's public relation officers on to you", and she said, "Well, I was going to sell five, but I had had them for so many years I thought it would be cruel to sell them, so I pensioned them off and I now have only 19 commercial producers." I trust that she will not be caught up with by the public relations officers.

The member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson), when speaking earlier in this debate, in his usual critical form said that it took one honourable member three hours to make a 40 minute speech and another 45 minutes to make a 15 minute speech. I should say that this document of the Estimates and the statement set out before us should be a document that we could digest and pick out the relevant facts from in half an hour. However, I have spent hours and hours on it, and it has left me in a state of frustration and confusion. I think that in these days when modern balance-sheets show comparisons from one year to another and include all the

essential details, surely a document such as this should be presented to members of Parliament in a vastly different form. It is quite an easy matter now with the modern balance-sheet to pick out just how things are going. Only last September an organization with which I am connected was presented with accounts that had been prepared by a leading accountant in Adelaide and audited by a leading accountant. When I looked at the accounts I said that they could not be correct. However, I did not have the time to investigate them myself. In May of this year the accountants admitted that they had been 30 per cent out in their calculation of profit, and they said that we would be down 30 per cent this time. If accounts are presented in proper form, one can see where one is going. However, I am sure that I, as a member of Parliament, cannot pick up just what the internal reserves are and how much has been used, and I think that this is something to which attention should be given.

The Loan Estimates for last year set out the estimate of proposed payments and repayments, but when we look at the Estimates for this year we see nothing about the repayments. The actual payments are shown as £36,819,684, but I am not able to take away the repayments because I do not know where they are; I cannot pick them up anywhere in the statement but, assuming they were equal to last year's Estimates, about £31,500,000 has been spent out of Loan funds. This year the proposed net payments are £31,000,000, which is about £500,000 less, yet this Government maintains it is going to spend more. The point I am trying to emphasize is that from the accounts tendered one would not really know. Last year there was a line "Roads and Bridges", but I cannot even see it on the Loan works at all this year; yet we are told that last year £320,000 was repaid and that about £300,000 will be repaid this year. However, nowhere can we see these figures in the accounts.

When we turn to the Housing Trust we see that the amount owing on loans is down about £146,000. However, on the front page there is no mention of that. Then when we look at the Estimates for this year we see no comparison with what was actually spent last year. I cannot see anywhere in the statement the amounts that were actually spent, so I do not know just what internal resources have been used. I consider that this is a situation that should not be allowed to continue. These accounts should be presented in a modern fashion so that we can easily pick up what the intention is. This would be to the benefit of

us all. Of course, we will have the Auditor-General's Report in about a fortnight, and we will then be able to trace back and find out just what the figures are. However, that should not be necessary. I think we should congratulate the Auditor-General on his prompt presentation of his reports and accounts. I consider that this Parliament receives a better Auditor-General's Report than any other Parliament in Australia, and that is something that is very good.

I will just quote the round figures for the Railways Department. In 1964-65 the estimated proposed payments were £3,000,000 and the estimated repayments £225,000, which leaves £2,775,000. Then the actual payments for this year are set out as £3,200,000. The total payments less credits to Loan Account from repayments and cancelled securities as at June 30, 1965, total about £58,000,000, whereas the figure quoted last year was about £56,000,000, which means that Loan funds were used to the extent of about £2,250,000. The payments were £3,200,000, and when you take away the amount the Loan Fund increased it leaves £950,000. The repayments were only to be £225,000, so where does the £725,000 come from? When one looks at the Auditor-General's Report for the previous year it would appear that this is railway depreciation, but it is repaid by the contribution from the National Debt Redemption Fund. Possibly it is correct, legally speaking, that it should be done that way, but it does not make sense from a bookkeeping viewpoint. Surely it would be better to write off Loan money used on unproductive schools rather than on something that should be productive, such as the railways.

The Woods and Forests Department leaves me really confused. The 1964 Estimate was just over £1,000,000 and the estimated repayments £1,250,000, and a credit of £200,000 is shown. In 1964 the balance was just over £6,000,000, and in 1965 it was about the same. The actual payments for 1964-65 were about £940,000, yet this year the department expects another £1,250,000 repayments, which apparently it did not get, and there is no explanation of it. The Treasurer in his policy speech said we were going to have fresh and progressive plans as an alternative to the doubtful promises of a tired administration which was minus new ideas, yet through the whole of these Estimates we can see no new ideas. Is it because they are the same age group as the retiring Cabinet, and the only young member they have seems to have plenty of ideas

on social reform and a compulsive urge to be the first in the field on many issues but appears to have no ideas about ways and means of increasing our productive potential so that everyone benefits by the increased amount of goods available? There used to be a cartoon in a leading journal "Famous Last Words", and I am reminded of this by what the Treasurer said in his policy speech:

As a party, we are very mindful of the need for a public works programme, but we are also aware that we cannot afford to be too elaborate in our approach in these matters when we have to compete against private works, as the labor market has its limitations insofar as manpower resources are concerned. But in the event of any curtailment on the part of private enterprise, our policy will provide for a speeding up of a public works programme which will be to the advantage of the State generally.

How is that policy being carried into effect by the Loan Estimates now before us. Last year's deficit was £30,000, and this Government expects a deficit of £17,000 for this year. But, as far as can be gathered from the incomplete accounts presented, the Government will use internal reserves to a much greater extent. The Treasurer stated that he has to overcome serious financial disabilities, and the Australian Labor Party column in Saturday's newspaper stated that the previous Government had spent £30,000 it did not have. What an extraordinary statement by a Government in power for three months and 24 days: that the previous Government had spent £30,000 it did not have, leaving a legacy of debt to the incoming Government. One thing is certain: that the Government by certain actions has already raised costs. The service payments would have some effect on the £30,000.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It is to be much more than £30,000.

Mr. McANANEY: I am not arguing whether the service payments were right or wrong, but obviously the deficit would not have occurred had the service payments not been arranged. The retiring Government could not be blamed for the deficit in any way.

Mr. Hudson: Have you worked out what the increase in wages will be for service payments for works shown on the Loan Estimates?

Mr. McANANEY: I know that they are retrospective to January 1, and will be a large sum.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: About £200,000.

Mr. McANANEY: I think the present Government claims that in actual money value,

it will spend £144,000 more than was spent last year under much more favourable conditions. If the increase in costs and other things is maintained, the actual achievements of public works this year will be considerably less than for last year. In 1964-65 it was estimated that £10,750,000 would be spent by the Electricity Trust, but the actual expenditure was £9,080,000. This decrease was possibly due to such things as the Narrung and Hindmarsh Island electricity schemes, where private contractors were behind schedule, although I am happy to say that the line to Hindmarsh Island has been linked up, and that practically completes the electrification of the Stirling District. This year, £12,000,000 will be spent, with £5,750,000 from internal resources compared with £4,500,000 estimated from internal resources last year.

There is no way of knowing how much of those reserves were used, but £1,250,000 is a large sum that is available to the present Government. Obviously conditions are not so unfavourable when it has such resources to call upon. The Government, by using internal resources when there is a greater demand for labor than can be supplied, is acting in direct contrast to what the Premier said in his policy speech. Although a small increase in unemployment occurred in this State this month (which we hope will not increase), a state of full employment exists at present. The Government in destroying this warm overcoat of security placed around the South Australian economy and development by the previous Government during many years, is acting to the detriment of South Australia, particularly if these resources are unduly strained. In the Address in Reply debate I referred to the cold wind of change. The Government might feel the need for this overcoat in future if it continues to dissipate internal reserves. The Treasurer when presenting the Loan Estimates, said:

Full utilization is planned of the internal funds of semi-government authorities for their own purposes so that their call upon Crown funds might be kept to a reasonable minimum. Mutually co-operative arrangements between such institutions as the State Bank and the Savings Bank of South Australia and the major instrumentalities such as the Housing Trust, Electricity Trust and Tramways Trust on a voluntary basis have assisted considerably in meeting obligations, particularly in housing, which otherwise it would have fallen to the Government to finance.

Unless something like Reid Murray activities are carried out by transferring from one section to another to cover up, I cannot see how

that policy leads to any further money being available other than from the Savings Bank of South Australia. If that bank lends more to the Government, it lends less to private people. Figures supplied by the Treasurer about six weeks ago show that this bank is not lending anywhere near the money to country areas that it does to the city areas. The main requirement in the country is to assist production on farms, as this adds to the goods produced in this country. Anything to the contrary would react unfavourably on the development of this State. Obviously, if we are going to develop on these lines there must be more savings, and there must be more incentive to save if we are to have more capital expenditure. Already the Commonwealth Government cannot get enough money on loans to finance the State works, and is using a form of compulsory saving by collecting money in taxation. The compulsory saving is for everyone, but the Government then turns around and builds houses for some people. For instance, in Elizabeth the houses are built by the Housing Trust, and as the member for Gouger said, everything is provided for them, but in another area of private finance things are not provided. If a compulsory saving scheme is necessary there should be some fair way in which everyone can make use of the savings to produce the right things for themselves.

Mr. Hudson: You would rather have private enterprise do the job than the Housing Trust?

Mr. McANANEY: My point is that we have a form of compulsory saving. It is all right to lend money in a general way for electricity or some other public utility but, if we are going to have compulsory saving for a group of people to build houses and thus give themselves advantages, I think it should be in terms of the community as a whole rather than in terms of a particular area. We have been discussing the building of houses, for example. With compulsory saving on these lines, if a young person amassed £300 or £400 in compulsory saving and wanted to build a house, the money would be there for him to use as a deposit on it. I should not think that compulsory saving was necessary but, if we have to have it, it should be on that kind of basis rather than picking out one section of the community to benefit by it in the form of cheap interest rates, thus gaining an advantage over a person who cannot use that source of money for building.

Mr. Hudson: Is it not better to provide some of these houses at a lower price and a

cheap rate of interest and some higher-priced houses at a higher rate of interest?

Mr. McANANEY: It is a matter of various sections of the community. It has been said in this debate that there has been an increase of only 1.4 per cent in funds compared with an increase of over 2 per cent in population for which we have to provide public utilities. It has been said there is a 4 per cent growth in Australia compared with 10 per cent in other countries. We have to ask why that is so. We have full employment. Up to a point we are trying to use our reserves to the full. There must be some reason why we are not getting this natural growth that other countries achieve. One reason is that we are not producing the goods that we are most proficient in producing. For instance, we recently had a difference of opinion about margarine. We boost one industry and find it puts at a disadvantage other industries, which, in turn, are at a disadvantage with somebody else.

Mr. McKee: You should discuss that with some of your colleagues.

Mr. McANANEY: These Estimates have gone through a wringer and there is little left to be said on them. I was only trying to make some constructive remarks on how to increase our production so that more money and goods would be available in order that more money could be cut up and apportioned to various projects and so that we did not experience difficulty in apportioning it to provide adequately for people's needs. So I hope that, despite the difficulties and the lack of money, the Government will not make too great a use of these internal reserves. It says that we are experiencing difficult times now. If we follow the advice of earlier speakers on how people can husband reserves to tide them over the bad years, the Government will not make too great a use of these internal reserves and, if we run into difficulty with, say, unemployment, the Government will have money in reserve with which to take up the slack to the mutual advantage of all South Australians.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): As has been said by many honourable members, this is the first occasion for 32 years on which a Labor Government has had the privilege of presenting the Loan Estimates. I take this opportunity to congratulate the Treasurer on the remarkably good job he has done with the limited money available for the Loan works programme. Although the Leader of the Opposition has criticized this programme as being inadequate, that worthy member failed to let us know how the

Loan works programme could be increased without further funds being made available from the Loan Council.

Mr. Hall: The member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) let us into that secret.

Mr. CURREN: On page 641 of the *Hansard* of July 1 last appears a significant statement by the Treasurer in reply to a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition about the State finance, the final paragraph of which states:

My Government must accordingly approach its 1965-66 Budget proposals from a £3,750,000 less favourable position than did the outgoing Government last year.

That indicates the difficulties with which the present Government was faced in drawing up its Loan works programme for the current year. Various items are referred to in the programme for this year that affect my district in particular, and one of considerable importance for the expansion of industries in the Upper Murray towns is "Loans to Producers". In past years considerable sums have been advanced to the various co-operatives in the Upper Murray areas to finance their expansion and take care of the increasing production of fruit and other commodities produced in my district. The sum provided this year is £600,000, which, I believe, should be adequate to cover the requirements of the firms desiring to expand. In recent months two considerable advances have been made from this fund (to the Riverland cannery and to the Berri co-operative winery and distillery) to finance expansion so that they can accommodate the increasing production.

Another aspect of the Loan works programme is the activities of the Housing Trust in the Upper Murray areas. It is interesting to study Appendix II relating to the building programme of the Housing Trust. In 1964-65 in the Upper Murray towns two houses were completed in Barmera and four were under construction. The programme for 1965-66 is set at 18, which is a considerable improvement in the building programme for the town of Barmera.

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

Mr. CURREN: During 1964-65 eight houses were completed at Berri by the Housing Trust; eight were under construction, and the building programme for 1965-66 provides for 18 more houses. In 1964-65 eight houses were completed at Renmark; three were under construction, and 18 will be built during the current financial year. That indicates a considerable amount of building activity in those towns, which is in line with what I have advocated

many times, namely, that an urgent need exists for a stepping-up of the building rate in the river towns. So far the building programme has been well behind the demand, and a considerable waiting period has always existed. I hope the expanded programme will take up some of the back-lag and reduce the waiting time that imposes a great hardship on many of my constituents requiring rental houses.

From inquiries made of the Housing Trust I understand that all the houses to be erected in the expanded programme will be for sale, but that failing sale (either on a straight-out cash basis or rental-purchase basis) they will be available for letting purposes. An urgent need still exists for more rental housing in the river towns. An expanded building programme was announced with great fanfare by the previous Treasurer months ago, and it was envisaged that 15 houses in each of the towns mentioned would be constructed. As that figure has been increased to 18, honourable members will realize that the present Government is mindful of the needs of the people in those towns, and that it will expand the previously announced programme. The Leader of the Opposition referred briefly to the Renmark Irrigation Trust and said:

The sum of £25,000 is provided as a loan to the Renmark Irrigation Trust.

That is only part of the story, for it goes much farther than that. Although £25,000 will be loaned to the trust, there will be an annual grant of £150,000 to the trust, which puts a completely different light on the picture. That continues the arrangement that has been in force for some years. If honourable members look back through the statements by the previous Treasurer for the years 1962-63, 1963-64 and 1964-65, they will see exactly the same reference to the Renmark Irrigation Trust in connection with grants and money provided by Loan. The position is not as the Leader of the Opposition would have people believe. The £150,000 grant money will be used to complete the installation of the comprehensive drainage scheme in the trust area, and I, as would any person with a knowledge of irrigation settlements, regard this as of vital importance to the area. There will be a great benefit to the landholders when the scheme is completed, and internal drainage can be installed. The Leader of the Opposition also said:

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.

That is a rather remarkable statement to come from the Leader of the Opposition with his supposed knowledge of trust affairs. The agreement that was more or less thrust upon that body by the former Treasurer after a discussion lasting a couple of hours was, to say the least, extremely harsh. It dealt with the rehabilitation of the pumping and channel system. The new agreement between the present Government and the trust, as announced by the Treasurer last Thursday in reply to a question I asked, provides an entirely new look at the financial needs of this authority to enable it to overcome difficulties regarding the rehabilitation of the pumping station and the channels.

This recently negotiated agreement, which has been agreed to by the trust board, will be of immense benefit to the settlers. It was reached only after a thorough examination of the financial affairs of the trust by the Auditor-General, whose recommendations were considered by Cabinet and put to the trust, which accepted the proposals. The agreement will put the Renmark area on a similar basis to other settlements. The trust will have a pump that will draw water direct from the river instead of its being gravitated through a ditch to the pumping station. Regarding the agreement entered into between the present Government and the trust, the Leader of the Opposition also said:

Although that will be an interesting statement, it will not provide money.

If one searches back through statements made by the previous Treasurer when introducing Loan Estimates one can find no reference to moneys being provided for rehabilitating the pumping station and channels, so I do not think he has any justification for criticizing the present Treasurer. He has been free with his criticism; apparently he thinks a thing is all right when he does it but it is not all right when the present Government does the same thing. His version of why the previous agreement with the trust was not carried out was:

I can tell honourable members . . . 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.

This petulant statement does not increase his stature. Reference is also made in the Loan programme to £250,000 for the work of the River Murray Commission; this includes work already done and to be done on the proposed Chowilla dam, which is progressing at the

desired rate. The Engineer-in-Chief recently submitted a report to the Minister of Works on the progress already made and on the difficulties encountered in the construction work, which is new to South Australia. Apart from this sum, considerable sums have been allocated for the general maintenance of the various mains and channels in irrigation settlements along the River Murray. The electrification of the Cobdogla pumping station is to be completed at a cost of £8,000. This will mean that the pumping system for the Barmera, Cobdogla and Loveday area will be completely electrified.

For resiting and renewing the town water supply in North Berri £21,000 is provided. I raised this matter several times in the House but the previous Government did nothing about it. However, planning has been completed and I understand that the work will be undertaken during the current financial year. This expenditure will provide the residents of North Berri with a better water supply, as it will give them a pressure and quantity of water comparable with the supply to the rest of the Berri township. A sum of £1,050,000 is provided for afforestation, most of which, I understand, will be spent on the softwood forests of the South-East and Mid North. As most Government members know and are pleased to claim on every possible occasion, the softwood forests were commenced by a Labor Government in 1924. I understand that at present they are a profit earner for the State. After taking into account the money spent each year on them from Loan and other funds we find that the net return provides a profit to the Treasury. A few days ago I raised the need for more attention to be given by the Forestry Department to hardwood timbers on the Murray River, namely, the red gum and the box tree.

Mr. McKee: Is there much of that in South Australia?

Mr. CURREN: Yes, there are great stands of red gum along the river, and considerable milling is going on, principally, I believe, for the supply of sleepers.

Mr. McKee: I thought most of that timber was in Victoria and New South Wales.

Mr. CURREN: Considerable stands of red gum exist in the areas to be inundated by the Chowilla dam. A great many trees are being removed, and I have requested that the red gum timber in the South Australian area of the dam be removed; this matter is being examined at present by the Conservator of Forests. I believe that, with proper care and restriction of grazing on many of the river

areas, regeneration of the red gum timber will occur, and future generations will be pleased that the red gum (which is quite a useful hardwood and about the only one of any consequence in South Australia.) has been preserved. I have raised this matter with the Minister of Forests and he is having it examined.

Large sums are to be spent on repairs and renewals for schools, and the Minister of Education is doing his utmost to see that the needs of students in the river areas are catered for. Many additions have been made to school buildings, mainly by the provision of temporary wooden classrooms, which fill the immediate need. However, school buildings in the Upper Murray areas should be of solid construction because of the weather conditions prevailing there (extreme heat in summer and severe cold in winter).

Mr. Freebairn: What about air-conditioning?

Mr. CURREN: That is not normally provided.

Mr. Freebairn: I have a fine new school in my district that is air-conditioned but is not of solid construction.

Mr. CURREN: The honourable member is fortunate. I noticed in Appendix I, page 21 of the Estimates, in the list of primary and infants schools that were to be referred to the Public Works Committee or on which major planning was taking place during the current year, that the Renmark Primary School is included. That is a school in which I have taken a great interest. There is an urgent need for its replacement; that was admitted by the former Minister of Education and I know that it has the sympathy of the present Minister of Education. I am sure that as soon as funds are available he will have new school buildings erected at Renmark.

Provision has been made on the Estimates for additions and amenities at the river hospitals. The sum of £20,000 for the construction of a pathology block at the Berri Hospital has been provided, and the final cost is estimated at £60,000. I believe that the construction of this block will be the beginning of a base hospital to serve the whole of the Upper Murray area, and this will be a good thing. With the provision of the pathology block and the necessary staff of technicians it will be possible for specialists to perform major operations at the Berri Hospital and it will dispense with the need for patients to be taken to either Adelaide or Mildura where the necessary facilities are available.

The sum of £30,000 was allocated in last year's Loan Estimates for the Barmera Hospital for the provision of extra wards, administrative facilities and new nurses' quarters. From information supplied to me I know that that money has not been spent, and the facilities at this hospital are now in the course of being reviewed by the Minister of Health and the Minister in charge of public buildings. I trust that in the near future better facilities will be available in the hospital at Barmera.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: The Minister of Health and I, with officers from both departments, will be visiting Barmera in the near future to examine the whole set-up there.

Mr. CURREN: I thank the Minister for that information and I hope that it will lead to the establishment of a good hospital in the Barmera district. In conclusion, I commend the Treasurer and his Ministers for the fine work that they have done with the allocation of available funds. I believe that the funds available have been fairly allocated, that country districts have been reasonably well served and there has not, as alleged by the Opposition, been a preponderance of money or a disproportionate amount spent in the metropolitan area. I have pleasure in supporting the first line.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): We have before us Loan Estimates that have been presented by a Labor Treasurer and a Labor Government for the first time for more than 30 years. Naturally, we in this Chamber (and especially members on this side) have looked forward with keen anticipation to the contents of those Estimates. We believed, with some justification, I think, that we would see some new departures, some new thinking, some new implementation, perhaps some innovations in the presentation of this year's programme. Certainly we expected that there would be some implementation of Labor's announced election policy and the carrying out of the many promises that were made. But, Mr. Chairman, what do we find in this document before us tonight?

Mr. McKee: I think the least you say about not carrying out promises the better.

Mr. COUMBE: I thank the honourable member for Port Pirie for trying to make my speech for me, but despite his great assistance and his desire to help I shall continue with my remarks. I asked what we found in this document. In my opinion, humble as it is (and, of course, it may not coincide with the opinion of the honourable member for Port Pirie), this is a very tame and placid programme

indeed; in fact, a very ordinary one. Of course, as is usual, some lines have been adjusted: some have gone up and some have come down. To be quite fair to the Treasurer, who is, after all, presenting his first Loan Estimates ever, I say that it was to be expected that the great bulk of the expenditure in these Estimates would have to go to financing capital and developmental works already under way—works that had been initiated and put in train by the previous Liberal Government. As we see, the great bulk of the expenditure in these Estimates is devoted to that work.

Mr. McKee: Well, you can sit down now; that is as far as you can go.

Mr. CUMBE: The member for Port Pirie makes me look forward with greater eagerness than ever to his speech in this debate, when he can get up and say something. We will be hanging on his every word. I am sure that with his new authority as Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee he will be able to carry out those duties admirably. I repeat that it was to be expected that these continuing works should take up the great bulk of the funds available. However, at the same time, members of the Opposition could be excused for expecting some provision to be made for one or two new ideas—new works and undertakings—that we thought might have come along, in line with Labor's announced plans and programmes at election time, but we look in vain for any new ideas. In addition, some projects that I and possibly other members on both sides of the House would have expected to come up in the normal way, irrespective of which Party was in power, are not mentioned.

Mr. Ryan: Such as?

Mr. CUMBE: If the honourable member likes to wait, I might mention them.

Mr. Clark: You might not, too.

Mr. CUMBE: I waited a long time to find something interesting in the speech of the member for Gawler this afternoon, but I gave it up and walked out. Some of the projects I referred to a moment ago have been reported on favourably by the Public Works Committee, reported on as being in the public interest to be proceeded with. It is not an enterprising policy to neglect these projects, and I sincerely hope that it will not retard progress. I should like to have seen a policy that provided a continuing programme of works now in operation, and other items introduced to provide an incentive and impetus to public works in this State. I decided I would listen to Government speakers

to hear what they had to say about the programme. Naturally, I expected they would justify the uninspiring programme introduced by the Treasurer, their leader. Apart from the natural desire of every member to talk about projects in his own district (and we all do this), speaker after speaker obviously has adopted an almost defiant and apologetic attitude.

Government members covered up by attacking Opposition speakers who had the temerity to criticize the programme. They were critical of the former Government for what I call good housekeeping in the past in providing a well balanced public works programme, the benefits of which may not be appreciated for many years. We heard the member for Gawler followed by an encore from the member for Port Adelaide, and in each speech could be discerned a note of apology for the programme presented. Their statements, however, were a compliment to the previous Government on the works which it had introduced and which are currently nearing completion.

Mr. Ryan: You would have been the first to criticize if they were not continued.

Mr. CUMBE: Yes, that is why I support the first line. We had the spectacle of the member for Glenelg (who has been suggested as the Labor Party's new hope on fiscal policy) going back to 1956 before being able to criticize the previous Treasurer's fiscal policy and his many Loan programmes. I should have thought that the member for Glenelg, new to this House, would have, in all modesty, been constructive instead of living in the past, as he has been in this debate. But that is so typical of Labor's thinking today.

Mr. Millhouse: It is the most conservative party in Australia today.

Mr. CUMBE: Yes. The member for Glenelg has not lived up to the reputation with which he came to this House, and which his attainments so rightly deserved. He could have adopted a more forward-thinking policy, or outlook, instead of wearying us with a dry and pedantic lecture on public finance. I had hoped to hear something about his plan for the amalgamation of certain banks, but this gem may rear its ugly head later in the session. We get our housing moneys usually at a 1 per cent lower rate under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, so that this money should be available to us at 4 per cent or just over. We in South Australia, according to my reckoning, have a greater proportion of Loan funds per capita at these lower concession rates than do other States, which raise far

more money by semi-governmental loans. Semi-governmental loans usually run at about  $\frac{3}{4}$  per cent higher than our Loan money and, in addition, we get the extra  $\frac{1}{4}$  per cent of the sinking fund repayment, which is most useful to us.

Therefore, in this State we materially benefit from the way in which we arrange our finances. There is an interesting table set out in the latest available issue of the *Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics*, under Pt. I "Public and Private Finance", which shows that the amount spent per capita on net Loan funds in South Australia was £27 14s. 8d. in 1961 compared with £15 10s. in New South Wales. I admit that New South Wales uses many more semi-governmentals than we do. If they want to do it that way that is their business, but it has been the policy over many years in South Australia to raise as much money as possible through the Loan Estimates and to cut semi-governmental and more expensive money to a minimum through the Loan Council, and in that way we get these benefits to which I have referred.

This is not merely an academic exercise: it is of real importance as a substantial proportion of our programme each year is made possible by the use of such internal funds as we can obtain without incurring additional capital interest charges. In other words, our public finance system carries lower interest charges than do systems used in some other States and, therefore, we can usually carry out many more capital works with the money available to us. I am not criticizing other States, for what they want to do is their own business. They have different problems, perhaps because of different outlooks and historical and geographic features. Perhaps we shall change our policy here in years to come, but working to our advantage is this system, introduced some years ago and fostered by the previous Treasurer (Sir Thomas Playford). Our Loan expenditure per capita in South Australia is £27 14s. 8d., which is by far the highest figure achieved by any State on the mainland. Tasmania, of course, has peculiar problems of isolation and a small population, but South Australia is a long way ahead of other States, although Western Australia (another Liberal State) is rapidly extending and catching up. Whatever Treasurer is in office, we in this State gain a definite advantage from this system.

I turn now to one or two specific matters, some of which are contained in the Loan Estimates, and some not. First, I want to speak

briefly on the provision for mental health—or rather, as I see it, the lack of it. The history of this over the years has been quite simple. The previous Government programmed a general overhaul of the mental health department in this State. It appointed Dr. Cramond, a world-renowned authority in this field, to carry out the widest possible survey of the facilities and the future needs of the mental health department. Accordingly, an enlightened scheme was evolved, and short-term improvements were effected. They are not all completed yet, and I notice that some work is currently being provided for. A new staff training programme was instituted, and I believe that every honourable member would completely support that scheme. In addition, planning for new hospitals was undertaken. The principal projects recommended in the report presented to the last Government were two major hospitals or institutions for the mentally retarded in our community, and I use that word advisedly.

Mrs. Steele: Don't use the word "institutions"!

Mr. CUMBE: They were hospitals for the mentally retarded. When completed, they would cater for several categories of sufferer and would immediately relieve the pressure and congestion at the existing hospitals. They would relieve the staff and conditions generally, as well as provide one of the most modern treatments possible for their patients. Consequently, two large hospitals were designed and submitted to the Public Works Committee last year, one to be erected at Strathmont (near Enfield), and the other to be called "Elanora", situated at O'Halloran Hill in a delightful rural setting. Members of the Public Works Committee took much evidence on these two major references both in South Australia and elsewhere in an endeavour to obtain the best evidence, medical opinions and advice available for this necessary and humane work. It subsequently resolved that the two hospitals be built, that an urgent need existed for them, and that their construction would be in the public's interests.

Mr. Ryan: When was the recommendation made?

Mr. CUMBE: I think the exact date was July 23 or 27 this year, well before the Estimates were presented. Members of the Public Works Committee who are present this evening know that many recommendations made by the committee are contained in the Estimates, provided they are presented—

Mr. Ryan: That recommendation was made only three or four days before the Estimates were submitted.

Mr. COURCELLE: The honourable member knows that the Government received the recommendation long before the report was tabled in Parliament. The Public Works Committee resolved that the hospitals were urgently needed and should be proceeded with as soon as possible. It presented the reports to Parliament, and I confidently expected (and I believe many others, including interested bodies in the community expected) that provision would be made in this year's Estimates for at least the Strathmont Hospital to be commenced. I believe that it would be sound thinking to build one first.

Mrs. Steele: Considering how critical the then Opposition was about the state of our mental hospitals, it is surprising the Government has shelved this for the time being.

Mr. COURCELLE: That is an extremely pertinent interjection.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: You may be interested to know that planning is proceeding.

Mr. COURCELLE: I am delighted to hear it. My point is that there is no line on the Loan Estimates dealing with these hospitals; there was not even a passing reference in the Treasurer's speech when he introduced them. I wonder why? I sincerely hope that the programme that was so carefully worked out by the previous Government, and I am assured by the Minister of Works that it is being looked at by the present Government, will not be delayed. I know that it will not be abandoned, but I hope that it will not be delayed.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: In a few weeks the Minister of Health and I will be determining the order in which work on these projects will be planned.

Mr. COURCELLE: I am glad. In these Estimates there is no mention of planning, and I hope that the programme will not be put back one year. In answer to the Minister of Works, who, I know is trying to help me, sometimes in the past few years when we have had major projects like this a small amount has been provided on the Estimates so that planning and some preliminary work can be done. There is no mention of this in these Estimates, and that is what concerns me. I do not charge the Government with failing in its duty, but I am concerned that it is not providing at least some money to enable a start to be made on some of the urgent projects, in which so many people are taking an interest.

This is humane work and I suggest that the Government would be failing in its duty if some provision were not made.

The honourable member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) asked me about the Labor Party's policy in this regard. I know that last session a special subcommittee of its members inspected the buildings at the various institutions. I know that they are all sincere in this matter and that they were all seized with the urgency of doing something about existing conditions. They thought that something better should be provided, so I was extremely heartened when I read of this subject in the policy speech of the Labor Party. Having read it, I naturally assumed, as so many people did, that there would be lines on the Estimates to enable a start to be made on the work. These words appeared in the Labor Party's policy speech:

Labor will immediately speed up the rehousing of mental hospital patients in modern buildings adequate for their needs.

That is a categorical statement; it is not ambiguous in the least. After reading it, one of the first things I looked for when the Loan Estimate papers were laid on the table was how much money was provided for a building at Strathmont.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: It might depend on the lottery.

Mr. COURCELLE: I do not know about that. When Labor assumed office I was heartened by what I heard in the Governor's Speech at the opening of this Parliament. This speech illustrates the legislative programme of the Government for the coming year, and on this occasion His Excellency said:

Improvement will be effected in connection with the care and treatment of the mentally sick and the mentally retarded patients.

Once again, this reinforced my optimism that we would see something on the Loan Estimates, but that was sadly lacking. I thought I was a realist, but, instead I proved to be an optimist. The only provision I could find in these Loan Estimates for mental hospitals was £5,000 for a new kitchen at the Parkside Mental Hospital (already approved and reported on by the Public Works Committee) and £109,000 for alterations and additions at the Enfield Receiving Home. What else did I find? Nothing! The Government will be failing the people of this State and members of its own Party if it does nothing to provide increased amenities for this important section of our health service. I am dismayed that nothing is provided in these Estimates for a start to be made. The Minister of Works has assured me that planning is proceeding, but I

would have thought that something could be done on this project during this financial year. I know that it takes nine months to prepare working drawings and to let tenders, but surely some preliminary amount could have been provided. I should be delighted if the Minister of Works would give me a complete statement on what is being done in the planning of this work and on when a start will be made.

The really big surprise in the Loan Estimates was the reduction for the Engineering and Water Supply Department. This surprised members on this side and I suppose some members opposite. Last year over £14,550,000 was spent, but this year only £13,350,000 is provided. The money spent last year by this department was almost 40 per cent of the total Loan programme, which was an increase of 5 per cent on the previous year. Although the total of this year's Loan Estimates is greater than last year's total, the percentage allocated to the department this year is only 36 per cent. This major service department is expanding, and it has an important job to do to cope with a growing population that makes ever-increasing demands for water and sewerage services, yet its allocation has been cut. This is an astounding state of affairs.

Mr. Freebairn: The Minister of Works will get an ulcer before he is finished.

Mr. COURCE: I hope he gets nothing worse than that. I would have expected this department to get an increased grant because it has to cope with the growing population's needs, and I would be the first to support an increase. Parliament has always made funds available to develop and expand water supplies, irrespective of fluctuations in economic conditions—and there have been plenty of them. Although there is a gap between direct revenue and expenditure on country water supplies, which is made up only from the Budget, the total expenditure of more than £100,000,000 on water supplies has been one of the soundest investments this State has ever made. The benefits cannot be estimated. The growth, development and expansion that have sprung from this policy are immeasurable. This policy was vigorously followed by the former Government over many years. I wonder whether this wonderful progress will now be halted. Are we going to mark time or falter in our development? I sincerely hope not. However, I have some grave doubts about this matter when I see the reduced sum provided. I sincerely hope that progress and development in South Australia is not to be retarded because our water supply system is to be cut back.

Mr. Ryan: Has any major scheme been left out?

Mr. COURCE: I intend to develop this point further, and perhaps I can satisfy the insatiable mind of the member for Port Adelaide. As the honourable member knows, many large projects are in the course of construction or are about to be constructed. However, even if there were no major schemes the number of minor and tributary mains has to be increased, because the State's population is growing each year, and this creates a greater demand for funds to put the minor mains into service. Not all the money goes into the provision of major projects like the Morgan-Whyalla main.

I pay a tribute to the former Treasurer for the way in which he made funds available for this purpose to various Ministers of Works. My tribute applies particularly to the way in which the former Minister of Works (Hon. G. G. Pearson) administered his department. I believe the former Treasurer was generous in the way in which he allocated ever-increasing sums of money to the Minister of Works to carry out the Government's programme. In an extremely fast-growing State like South Australia it is only logical to expect that more and more people and industries will use more and more water. The continual growth in the consumption of water per head is the largest problem. This consumption has risen amazingly in recent years. Twenty years ago the average daily consumption of water a head in the Adelaide metropolitan area for all purposes (cooking, washing, laundry, and for industry) was 70 gallons. Today it is 110 gallons a head.

Mr. Ryan: Modern amenities have caused that increase.

Mr. COURCE: This means that the consumption of water has increased by about 180 per cent while the population in that time has risen by about 85 per cent. The population increase has created a greater demand for water, but so have new methods of use caused by a higher standard of living. In 1963-64 the total water consumption was about 26,000,000,000 gallons, and if people had used the same quantity that they used at the end of the Second World War this figure would have been only about 16,000,000,000 gallons.

Mr. Freebairn: Is that in the metropolitan area?

Mr. COURCE: No, that is the figure for the whole State. The use of water by industry has remained fairly constant in proportion,

but the increase has been enormous. One reason is the growth in housing and the establishment of new household gardens. It follows that when people move into a new house the first thing they do is to establish a garden. They like to have a lovely lawn, which requires much water in our climate, especially if it is of English-type grasses. In addition, hot water systems, automatic washing machines and many other gadgets have come with the higher standard of living we are enjoying today. These things have caused the extraordinary increase in the use of water. So we have a combination of more people and a greater rise per capita in the consumption of water, thus putting ever-increasing demands upon the limited resources of the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Mr. Ryan: You would not like to see us go backwards.

Mr. COUNBE: That is the last thing I would suggest; I want us to go on and on. But the point I make is that we should have more and more money devoted to the Engineering and Water Supply Department so that it can keep pace with development—not only keep pace, but give an impetus so that more and more people will be encouraged to settle here.

Mr. Langley: Washing machines use less water now than in former times.

Mr. COUNBE: Rubbish! Start an automatic machine and it washes, empties out—

Mr. Langley: And the water flows back in again.

Mr. COUNBE: No, it does not. If you have ever washed clothes in an old trough, as many of us have done, the first thing is to be careful with the use of water.

Mrs. Steele: In a modern washing machine the original water comes back again.

Mr. COUNBE: We will not argue about it, but this is only one facet of the argument. We are not here trying to sell washing machines: we are trying to get enough water to go into them.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: I think you are trying to hang out the dirty linen!

Mr. COUNBE: I am trying to wring the last ounce out of it, and I am not going to get into the blue. Some idea of the increased development in this State can be illustrated by the figures that I shall quote. I shall be comparing the years 1949 and 1964, a period that coincides with a vast expansion of population, housing and industry in this State. Water consumption rose from 16,000,000,000 gallons in 1949 to 38,000,000,000 gallons in

1964; the length of water mains rose from 7,000 miles in 1949 to over 10,000 miles in 1964. The number of services have increased from 137,213 to 288,350. The next item is significant: the number of services laid in 1949 was 8,242 whereas in 1964 it reached the astounding figure of 14,900! The capital investment in that time has risen from £24,000,000 to £100,000,000; the capital invested in the year 1949 was £1,500,000 and in 1964 it was £14,000,000. I quote those figures simply to highlight the absolute necessity—in fact, the moral obligation of this Parliament as well as the Government—to provide sufficient funds to continue this programme. It will be a sorry day and a tragedy for South Australia if ever this programme is allowed to slip back and in any way retard the progress of this State. I am saying this only in the interests of South Australia because I believe that the Engineering and Water Supply Department is very closely associated with the progress this State can make. I have been looking at the Minister of Works while speaking and I believe that he is in agreement with me, although it may be that he does not have enough money to do what he would like to do.

Mr. Ryan: You were going to tell us what major works were not proceeded with; you have not come to that yet.

Mr. COUNBE: I have announced two major works that have not been proceeded with. Turning to waterworks, obviously if there is less money available then something will not be done that should have been done.

Mr. Ryan: What would you suggest?

Mr. COUNBE: All I am saying is this—and the honourable member for Port Adelaide knows this as well as I do—that if more money is available more work can be done and more properties can be connected to the mains. If a department has less money it cannot do as much work, and this is in a period when wages are higher than they were last year, even if only the Government's grant of service pay is taken into account. The member for Port Adelaide invited me to deal with this matter.

Mr. Ryan: I am getting impatient, and you still haven't mentioned the projects you said had not been proceeded with.

Mr. COUNBE: Less work will be done this year than last year. I do not care whether they are major or minor works; the fact still remains that less work will be carried out, and the member for Port Adelaide knows that as well as I do. All I know is that no major

pipelines are going into my district, and I did not expect them, either. However, many people in my district will be looking for water connections, and I shall have to tell them there is not enough money to provide what they want.

Mr. Ryan: They will be looking for another member after the way you are carrying on. How much more patient do I have to be to get the information you promised?

Mr. COURCEL: The sad fact still remains, Mr. Chairman, that staring us in the face, if I may say so, is the fact that the Treasurer has reduced the Engineering and Water Supply Department vote this year, and I suggest that this is not a reasonable thing for any responsible Government to do. The Minister of Works, I regret to say, will have a very worrying and uneasy year ahead of him, for I foresee that he will be besieged by members of this House and by angry petitioners who will be seeking extensions of services, only to be told, especially towards the end of this year, that there is no money to do the work they want. I firmly believe also (and I regret to say this, too) that the Minister of Works will not be able to meet his commitments in his department. I believe that because of the lack of money for his department he will not be able to carry out the programme he would like to carry out. Worse still, I believe that the Minister will be forced later this year into the invidious position of having to force some contractors to put off some of their men and possibly retrench some employees of his own department.

Mr. Jennings: There has been no suggestion of that.

Mr. COURCEL: I hope it does not occur. If the department is going to carry out a certain programme with less money (and all of us here will be on the Minister's back to get some extra extensions), I regret that retrenchments may be the outcome, and I will be the first to regret it. This would indeed be a very fine start to the new Labor Party Government which is, we are told, heralding in a new era of prosperity for South Australia. In fact, some have called it "the new Utopia".

Mr. McKee: Wait until you read about what your mate, Mr. Holt, is doing now. You will read it in the press in the morning.

Mr. COURCEL: I realize I have some competition. When we look at the amounts that have been provided in various years for railway accommodation we find some contrasts. In 1964-65 the amount actually spent was some £3,200,000. This year the vote has been

reduced to £2,800,000, a drop of £400,000. Last year the vote was 8.7 per cent of the total of the Estimates, but this year it is 7.8 per cent. All members were impressed during the recent visit to the Islington railway workshops. We saw the rolling stock that is being made—the diesel engines, waggons, carriages, guards' vans and employees' sleeping vans, and we were impressed with the quality of work, the capacity of the workshops, and the craftsmanship and skill of the men. We naturally assumed that the high volume of output that we saw, and which was explained to us in the pamphlet presented with the compliments of the Minister of Transport, would be continued. However, I am concerned to see a drop of almost £400,000 in the allocation to this department for this year. I am concerned, as is the honourable member for Enfield, because the workshops adjoin our electoral districts. Hundreds of railway workers live in my district—

Mr. McKee: I hope they don't vote for you.

Mr. COURCEL: —and some in the district of the member for Enfield. Many of them may vote for me after seeing this year's Loan programme. We are concerned about the future welfare of the men and of the prosperity of the workshops. How will the men react to a reduced works programme? This, by a Labor Government, too, which almost promised the earth at election time and which heralded a new era in South Australia. The stark fact is that the Labor Government has failed in its duty to these men. The total vote for Railway Accommodation is £2,800,000, a drop of £400,000 on last year, while £1,798,000 has been allocated to the rolling stock branch. Last year the Liberal Government voted £1,920,000 for that line, but this has been reduced this year by £122,000. This branch constructs, repairs and maintains locomotives, waggons, carriages and trucks, and employs most of the men at Islington. Not only is the Labor Government doing a grave disservice to the State, but it is letting down its mates at Islington. On occasions, the present Treasurer, when Leader of the Opposition, made speeches suggesting that more work should be undertaken at the Islington railway workshops. I remember these speeches because they touched on a subject in which the members for Enfield and Torrens are interested. The first thing that the new Treasurer, who had been advocating this, did when he assumed office and occupied the Treasury was to repudiate that view and to



reduce this programme instead of increasing it. This matter really concerns me. I have a high regard for the ability of these men at Islington and the product of their skills in their various categories. I also appreciate their common sense.

Mr. Hudson: Do you agree with nationalization then?

Mr. CUMBE: I wondered when the member for Glenelg would interject, after getting his instruction from the member for Enfield. These men have a great deal of common sense and they will be interested in the actions of the present Government and of this Treasurer in cutting back this vote. Being men of common sense, they will remember this for a long time.

I turn now to the Housing Trust. The question of flats arises because it is stated in the Treasurer's Financial Statement that this year the Housing Trust will reduce the flat-building programme and instead build more houses. That is a decision of the Government and we shall have to abide by it. I am a little disappointed that this has come about. As honourable members know, for some years I have advocated in this place that the inner suburbs are ideal for the building of certain types of flat. In my district, where there is not even one Housing Trust house, there are some Housing Trust flats that fill a useful purpose for certain types of people. A balanced programme of flat-building and house-building is to the benefit of the trust. I suggest, further, that flats return more revenue to the trust than do other types of housing accommodation, which enables it to build more and more houses by reason of having a bigger turnover.

I do not think I am far wrong in saying that the cost today of a £50-deposit house would be nearing the £5,000 mark. The rental for this type of house must be high to give the trust a reasonable rate of return, or it will be out of pocket to a great extent. I believe also that the recoup to the trust from this type of house would be low compared with the rate of return it would get from flats. My point is that we should build some £50-deposit houses, some rental houses, some purchase houses and some flats. We had reached a stage where we were getting a balanced programme, and it is with regret that I notice that the flat-building programme is to be cut back. The trust will get smaller returns from some housing it is building today than from flats, and the rentals of many types of house that have

recently been increased may have to be reviewed soon.

Then, if flats are to be reduced in numbers, what will happen about pensioner flats? Every member of this Chamber from time to time gets these problems of the pensioner or the single person who wants to go into a special type of modestly priced accommodation. In some flats in the past, accommodation has been provided for this type of person. We all know of the long waiting list there is for pensioner accommodation for widows and widowers. I should like an assurance from the Government during this debate that this type of accommodation will not be reduced, because I believe it would be a tragedy in our community if that were the case. As an advocate for flat building in the inner suburbs (including those in my own district), I am wondering how the Treasurer's statement on reduced flat building can be reconciled with the statement made a few weeks ago by the Attorney-General, who is the Minister in charge of the Town Planner's Office. At a town planning convention the Attorney-General suggested that denser flat building should occur, especially in the inner suburbs, and he may also have advocated the same thing to members of the Local Government Association. He said this would create a denser population which, in turn, would reduce the cost of essential services per capita. How does this tie in with statements made by the Treasurer to the effect that less flats will be built? Last year the former Government announced that it would erect a block of 100 flats at Gilberton, in my district. I have asked several questions on what is happening to that programme, and only today the Treasurer replied, in effect, that this undertaking was being deferred indefinitely. These flats may be built at some time in the dim future, or perhaps never, and I am extremely disappointed that this has happened, because I believe much merit exists in building flats of this type in an inner suburb.

Indeed, a definite demand exists for this type of housing in our community. Young and elderly people alike may desire to live in a flat, and this can include people whose children have grown up and people without any families at all. Some provision should be made for this undertaking. This was an ideal site, and many workmen are well aware that an ever-increasing proportion of their wages is spent on fares as they commute across the metropolitan area. In a central situation only one section from the city, a saving on fares would be immediately effected. The flats to be built

there would have been let at rentals similar to those applying in flats being built at Elizabeth, Henley Beach and other areas, and I sincerely hope that the Treasurer will review this matter before long.

I refer now to the festival hall to be built in North Adelaide on the Carclew site, as we all know it, and to be ready for the 1968 Adelaide Festival of Arts. This was the subject of consideration by a Select Committee last year, of which both you, Mr. Chairman, and I were members. Certain features of this project were also recommended by a special committee set up by the Lord Mayor. I was a member of that committee, and you, Sir, as the member for Adelaide subsequently accepted an invitation to participate. The design has been approved by the committee set up and, as we read in today's newspaper, by the Adelaide City Council. This hall has to be in operation for the 1968 festival but no funds are being provided in these Estimates and I would like an answer in due course as to what funds are being made available to enable this work to proceed. Perhaps the Minister can say whether funds will be made available in the Revenue Estimates (although that is unlikely) or whether Supplementary Estimates will be brought in later to provide for this project. Only a modest amount would be required this financial year but my point is that finance has to be made available before the architect can receive instructions to proceed with working drawings and it is desirable that tenders be called without delay. Therefore, a decision has to be made on when funds will be available.

It would be a great tragedy if, in 1968, this magnificent hall was only three-parts finished and we could not use it. Because of the hard work of many people in our community and their faithfulness in fostering this idea, we have achieved world-wide recognition of our Adelaide Festival of Arts.

If I may sum up my remarks, I say that we were disappointed that certain desirable features were not contained in these Estimates. The Treasurer has indicated that he has made a fair allocation to certain departments, but funds are lacking in relation to several projects; for instance, the two major mental hospitals to be built. I express regret at the vote for the Engineering and Water Supply Department and surmise that the Minister of Works will be the most worried man in this Parliament towards the end of this financial year. I stated plainly and categorically that the Minister would not be able to carry out the programme he contemplates with the funds

provided for him. In addition, I was extremely disappointed with the vote for the Railways Department. In my view, it is an uninspiring programme to put before us and I sincerely hope that it does not in any way retard the progress and prosperity of South Australia.

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): I congratulate the Treasurer on his magnificent effort of behalf of South Australia at his first Loan Council meeting. The more I hear in this debate, the more I appreciate the job that has been done by the Treasurer. His accomplishment is something of which we will all be proud and the way he has allocated this money deserves support. Each and every one of us knows that the sum available is determined by the Commonwealth Government. The Leader of the Opposition referred to what had to be done to obtain additional Loan funds. If that is what had to be done, it is regrettable that he did not spend two or three weeks a year at Loan Council meetings to get increased amounts to provide the facilities this State needed. The *News* today contained a report that the Commonwealth Budget would be aimed at curbing a rapidly-expanding economy. The Commonwealth Government's policy is supported by members opposite who travel the State asking people to vote for their Commonwealth colleagues, yet when those colleagues impose stringent measures to deprive our Treasurer of money they criticize him. That is not just and fair criticism.

Mr. Quirke: Have you heard the Budget speech?

Mr. HURST: The honourable member knows that each member of his Party has admitted in this debate that the Commonwealth Government has been rather harsh in its allocation of Loan funds.

Mr. Quirke: Did you hear the Budget tonight?

Mr. HURST: Yes, and I know that the honourable member's colleague in the Commonwealth Parliament (Mr. Holt) announced increases in income tax, petrol tax, in excise on beer, spirits, cigarettes and tobacco, and even lighthouse dues and airport fees. These Loan Estimates represent a developmental programme, and it was obvious from the outset that the Commonwealth Government, which wanted to restrict development, would take it out on our Treasurer. I commend him for the magnificent job he did, particularly as he was practically a lone wolf at the meeting. Mr. Reece from Tasmania was there, but Tasmania is a claimant State, so the Treasurer had to stand up to all the others, who were in cahoots.

This talk about sitting pat was just so much poppycock; that was answered by the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson).

I listened with interest to the Leader of the Opposition. Although I do not pretend to be an economist, after hearing some members opposite I though it was a pity that others did not realize that they were not. When one tries to follow some of their statements one realizes how ridiculous and illogical they are. Members on this side may well wonder how this State has progressed, but it has done so despite and not because of the present Opposition. The people knew that, despite the gerrymander, ultimately public opinion would come our way and we would occupy the Treasury benches. I think that was the only inspiration they had, and that it was the basic cause of the progress made in this State. Although the present Opposition has attempted to take credit for this State's progress and development, the Labor Party has really been responsible for it. The Opposition is not worthy of an ounce of credit because all the credit should go to the Government, which has had the interests of the State at heart for many years.

Mr. McAnaney: You want it both ways.

Mr. HURST: Not both ways; we will show results. Honourable members know of some projects where they would like to see a little more money allocated. After all, the pressure was put on the Government by the Loan Council allocation, and I commend the Treasurer for his wonderful effort in obtaining the allocation he did. There have been criticisms of certain allocations, but Opposition members have also said that it was the former Government's planning that was responsible for the work done previously. Opposition members cannot have it two ways; they cannot criticize and try to take credit at the same time. I believe credit should be given where it is due, and honourable members opposite should have been more sincere in their approach to this matter. In their criticisms they are trying to make political capital and to demoralize the people of the State. All members know that if there is to be any advancement the workers and management must work together as a team. I suggest that even where lesser sums are provided there will be new life and a new feeling amongst many people.

Mr. Ryan: Opposition members have supported the first line.

Mr. HURST: Yes. It will be found that increased effort by many people will more than offset some deficiencies in allocations. The amount of work done will be far greater than

was done in the past. It is well known that people get sick and tired of one thing all the time and like changes: a change gives them a lift.

Mr. Ryan: The Liberal Party tried to delay the change for a long time.

Mr. HURST: It practically demoralized the whole State. Despite the lack of money in some directions people will work better than they did when they were demoralized, taxed to the maximum, frustrated and unable to see where they were going. They were aware of the political situation. They had only to look at where the money was being spent last year. It could be seen that some was spent in certain members' districts, which the Liberal and Country League thought it might lose. This brought about a spirit of depression, frustration and demoralization, and people became inefficient; we were not getting the best value from these people.

The member for Torrens has had something to do with industry, and he should know that it has been said time and again that if the work force is demoralized much production is lost. The previous Government's attempt to spend money in certain areas to entice electors to return Liberal candidates was a complete failure because, in fact, the Labor Party should have been in power three years earlier, and members opposite know that.

Mr. Ryan: Thirty years earlier!

Mr. HURST: Yes, but at least three years before, as the Labor Party had the complete confidence of the people of South Australia, but were denied the right to govern. Had this Party been in power three years ago it would have been in a position to plan and organize these things. Everybody knows that in any organization there must be constructive planning. A job must be planned beforehand and then a move is made to proceed with the actual work. I was amazed when the member for Torrens stated that the Labor Party had said it would proceed immediately with its promised works. I say that the expression "proceed immediately" means to prepare plans so that a job may be proceeded with in the most efficient manner. In this way people will receive the utmost benefit from any money spent on a particular commodity, building or project.

The criticism made by the member for Torrens was unjustified because the Minister, in reply to questions, showed that work was proceeding in the manner that he wanted it to proceed. Those who criticize the Treasurer forget that the manner and method of the

previous Government in dealing with these things has been rejected by the people as a muddling method and one that modern society will not accept.

Mr. Nankivell: The poor old public servants will get more work.

Mr. HURST: I am sorry for the public servants. I do not know how we maintain a Public Service with all of the frustration that has been caused in the past and the political skulduggery being carried on here and there. I admire the public servants for having sufficient confidence in the people of South Australia to know that ultimately they would get a Labor Government, a Government that would embark on a proper planning and enable them to proceed with their jobs efficiently. I commend them for their work and I think that they have been most tolerant.

I found certain aspects of the speech of the Leader of the Opposition difficult to understand. The honourable member for Glenelg made some comments on that speech, and I agree with him, though I realize I have a limited knowledge of economic affairs. For example, the Leader of the Opposition criticized the Electricity Trust for financing capital works out of revenue, that is, out of electricity charges. Only a few weeks ago he wanted to move for a Royal Commission to inquire into the price of power. He was concerned that the price would increase out of all proportion to that in other States and that we would not be able to entice new industries here. If it is not sound policy to finance new capital works out of the amount put away for depreciation, I do not know what is sound economic policy. In fact, the New South Wales Labor Government was doing that until they reached the stage—

Mr. Jennings: You know that the Electricity Trust has been doing that for years.

Mr. HURST: Yes, and I would like to see it continued as it is one of the best methods of getting a reduction in the price of power in South Australia. Everyone knows our disabilities regarding fuel. Something has been said about delay in bringing gas down from Gidgealpa and Mercenie. With the technical development that is going in the world today I am not sure whether at this stage it would not be wise to give this question further examination. On his return from the United States of America Mr. Casey spoke on the position regarding atomic energy and the member for Albert also asked a question in relation to it; it was a question that I had intended

to ask myself, but he beat me to it. We find that, with more and more technical developments, changes are being made every day in the establishment of power stations. These have to be planned years ahead, for the orders have to be placed and the equipment obtained. I believe that we in South Australia are at a stage where we have to examine all these aspects; we do not want to rush into this sort of thing willy-nilly for it may be uneconomic and the developments in other fields may be such that in addition to assisting us with cheaper power we may also be able to go a long way towards solving some of our water supply problems, which in this State are serious problems.

I believe the Government is wise in looking closely at this question of natural gas, because if we commit ourselves to it and find that the expenditure is going to be too great, we shall be saddled with it for many years. The big question is whether we can provide power at prices that are competitive, and this is tied up with the problem of adequate water supplies, which we lack in this State. The water costs in South Australia are much higher than they are in Victoria and New South Wales, where the rainfall is greater. I say quite advisedly that the Government was wise in considering that particular factor.

Another matter on which I want to commend the Government concerns the way in which it is tackling the housing problem. The Leader of the Opposition criticized the Treasurer for setting aside money for the purchase of old houses. I believe the Government's move in this matter is a very sound one, because we all know that many people today (especially elderly people) are living in houses where the accommodation is more than is required. The maintenance of these houses is becoming a burden to these people. Many of the houses are quite sound and of good construction, and if money is available to assist younger people to purchase such houses, thus allowing the original occupants to build smaller houses, we shall be utilizing more efficiently the amount of accommodation available in this State. I say quite definitely that this is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Quirke: Many of those houses are very costly.

Mr. HURST: Often it is just as economic a proposition to buy one of these houses as it is to buy a new one, for usually they are solidly constructed; they may need some modification here and there, but I maintain that in the final

analysis the total accommodation can be more efficiently utilized by providing finance for these old houses.

Mr. Quirke: Unfortunately, those old houses have been devalued, and in order to get the price you have to get more money on loan.

Mr. HURST: The fact that the Government is doing something about it is a progressive step.

Mr. Quirke: They are desirable houses, but the monetary policy attached to them has to be altered.

Mr. HURST: Quite a number of these houses are available, and this matter will be dealt with by the Government. If we can house another 300 to 400 people by switching finance from one avenue to another, so much the better. Mr. Acting Chairman, you know that the housing of workers in Semaphore and Port Adelaide is an important project, and you also know the difficulties. Although the Estimates will not solve completely all the problems, they will assist. We have been told that Government members represent industrial and metropolitan areas. I listened intently to members of the Opposition, trying to hear comments about Loans to Producers and Advances to Settlers. It is regrettable that a representative of an industrial area has to refer to these matters as well as to the fact that the Government is to assist people on the land to improve production. Although Opposition members talk about people on the land, when they are in the city they forget their country colleagues, whereas the Labor Party is at least trying to make money available to help country people.

Mr. Nankivell: The line has been there all the time.

Mr. HURST: The honourable member did not draw the attention of members to it. I suppose someone will now recommend that the amount be increased, but up to now, no one has referred to these matters, demonstrating that the Opposition has completely forgotten some of the people it represents. At least it should have said that the amount was insufficient or was adequate, but it has not been referred to. The building of student hostels is a sound practical move, deserving the support of all members. The Corporation of the City of Adelaide has been allocated a loan, and this is another progressive move. After analysing the Estimates, we find that progress is being made in every way. The Labor Party has an important job, but people are responding quickly to its progressive programme. People will not know

the State in the next 10 years as a result of the development to take place.

Provision has been made for metropolitan drainage, and I hope the district of Taperoo is considered when this money is allotted. Too much money has been spent in certain electoral districts that could have been lost or won, and as a result of this the backbone of this country (the working class districts) have not been considered in the way in which they deserve. You, Mr. Acting Chairman and I, have to make ourselves heard to ensure that workers get the fair share to which they are justly entitled. No doubt this Government will be sympathetic to them. We have heard that it is not progressive or developmental to allot funds for irrigation and reclamation at Renmark. It has been clearly demonstrated that by draining the land, more efficient production is obtained, and the honourable member for Chaffey knows that this move will be welcomed by people in the river districts.

Mr. Quirke: You are a bit out of date. The previous Government gave Renmark £1,350,000 for nothing.

Mr. HURST: You get nothing for nothing these days.

Mr. Quirke: They got it for nothing.

Mr. HURST: At least this represents further progress for country people. The only honourable member whom we have heard mention it is the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren). The provision for the South-Eastern drainage scheme will be welcomed, as will the Renmark Irrigation Trust loan.

There is a comprehensive and extensive programme for the Railways Department. I notice that an amount of £388,000 is provided to meet the cost of sundry small works such as track relaying, bridges and culverts, signalling and safety devices, minor buildings, and improvements to yards, as they are required. The deficiency in this section was the responsibility of the present Opposition. Somehow, it did not get tidied up. I should like to see more money made available, particularly for signalling. Two weeks ago the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) asked a question about the delay of trains on the South-East line. What is the situation? For donkey's years hardly any money has been spent on railway communications in South Australia, yet the Railways Department depends on efficient communications for the proper running of its trains. Signalling is an essential part of this programme. Unfortunately, although year after year people scream for more devices at level crossings, the Railways Department is not

getting sufficient revenue to do the required work. This is important because, when new locomotives and carriages are being built, what is the use of having first-class trains held up in sidings for three or four hours at a time when they should be usefully employed? A machine designed to keep moving should do so. These things must be planned but, unfortunately, this is a relic of the attitude of the previous Government, which did not tackle railway communications.

Mr. Nankivell: What would it cost?

Mr. HURST: Possibly £300,000 or £400,000 would be needed to rectify the position. Also, because of the paucity of wages paid to employees, difficulty is experienced in maintaining a staff able to do this work. The progressive step has been taken of starting to train them.

Mr. Nankivell: Power is needed to operate these things; they have not had that all the time.

Mr. HURST: They have had facilities for training, which is badly needed. This problem must be seriously considered because the whole railway system depends on communications.

In respect of Harbors Board accommodation, provision is made for Port Pirie. An amount of £300,000 is provided to continue the work of dredging the Port River. This is essential and I am glad that it will be developed. However, owing to the restricting attitude of the Commonwealth Government, which has been trying to cut down the amount of money it will allow the State Government, I do not think this will progress as quickly as it should. Work in my district is urgently needed because of the construction of a roadway and embankment at Torrens Island. This has interfered with the flow of water, and the pollution which occurred in this area in 1962 has become worse. The sum of £170,000 is provided for the construction of a new harbour terminal. Members opposite have criticized this line, but let us be forthright. Outer Harbour is the main port for overseas vessels coming to this State.

Mr. Ryan: It would be the worst in the Commonwealth.

Mr. HURST: Yes. Members opposite have said much about attracting tourists to South Australia and about the remarks of those tourists after disembarking at Outer Harbour where the facilities are outmoded. I listened with interest to the member for Rocky River, and although I have never seen the Ippinitchie Creek the name is fascinating, and one day I intend to look at it. Perhaps it can be developed as a tourist attraction. I suggest

that the honourable member have a talk with the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse), for it may be more advantageous to establish a restaurant on the banks of the Ippinitchie Creek than at Windy Point. However, we shall let them sort that out for themselves.

Provision is made for increasing facilities at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which caters for many of my constituents. This is indeed a progressive step in a State which for years has urgently needed more hospitals, all because of a conservative policy and the lack of planning on the part of the Commonwealth Government. It applies the squeeze, for which the Treasurer of this State receives the blame, but I point out that the blame is misplaced.

I know that the Treasurer has given the sum to be provided for the Electricity Trust his deepest and sincerest consideration, with a view to meeting the present needs of this State and to catering for future progress and development. The building of an electrical and radio trade centre will soon be commenced on Torrens Road, which is in the district of the member for Port Adelaide. This work is 14 years overdue. I sympathize with the Minister of Education, not because of the way in which he has been treated by the Treasurer, but because of the way education is being treated by the Commonwealth Government. In every phase we find shortages and lack of accommodation and the Commonwealth Government will not face up to its responsibilities and provide the necessary facilities. The trade school referred to has been in need of extra accommodation for many years. To my knowledge, there has never been a proper trade school. There was a school at Kintore Avenue and one at Thebarton 15 or 16 years ago, but although everyone knew that that trade would develop we have not yet got a good trade school. I have heard criticism about the lack of tradesmen in South Australia. The Commonwealth Government conferred with employers and the trade union movement, and the apprenticeship system was altered. A provision was inserted in the Metal Trades Award dealing with a 20 weeks' concentrated training course for apprentices, but the standard of education required was equal to the Leaving standard. I know from experience that if the employers had made use of that provision the electrical trade school would not have known how to cater for the number of students. South Australia is the only State where apprentices are required to do training in their own time. They must do this because there are no facilities. I believe they have

been restricted deliberately so that the standard of apprentices in this State would be inferior to that in other States. That is not good enough, because if we are going to develop we need skilled people, but the ability to obtain these skilled people has been restricted for many years. I sympathize with the Minister of Education. Sooner or later the Commonwealth will have to face up to the situation and make more money available to the States for education. The demands made on the different schools from kindergarten level to university are not being met rapidly enough, particularly in view of the present development.

Mr. Langley: Do you believe in pressure-cooker courses?

Mr. HURST: A person who has had anything to do with industry over a period of time realizes that pressure-cooker courses are of little value. Theory can be "pumped in" for a while, but in order to achieve the best results the theory should be weaved in when the boy is doing the practical side of his training. If it is true that a lad can learn a trade in the time set down, I know little about industry. However, I think I have seen as much as the average person. The system operating in the past was beneficial. When Australian tradesmen go overseas they have no difficulty in getting jobs, and they are regarded as being some of the best tradesmen available. I know the system has its faults, but when we break down the system we lower the standard, and that is something we cannot afford to do. If we do, we will not achieve the efficiency we have had in the past. I have great pleasure in supporting the first line.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): To a degree, I am on common ground with the Treasurer, as this is the first time he has presented Loan Estimates and the first time that I have been privileged to see this side of the State's finances. I have found the document containing these Estimates to be most interesting and most confusing, but I am sure that all those members who have preceded me and have made learned statements have known what they are talking about. However, this will come out in the wash.

Mr. Ryan: The member for Torrens mentioned washing, but what does he know about it?

Mr. RODDA: He is a learned man. At times I have blown hot and at other times cold on the opinions I have formed about how the Treasurer has allocated the Loan funds. At one stage I could not point upwards, but I

have since listened to the member for Semaphore, who has put me completely at ease. Although the Loan Estimates may not contain all that we desire, and although it is the duty of the Opposition to criticize, we should nevertheless be constructive in our criticism and realize that, as sure as hens will lay small eggs, no matter what we say we shall have to accept the lines as they are presented.

I am pleased that provision has been made for a new primary school to be built at Kalangadoo, which is in my district. There is a real need for this building, as the students in this area are working in cramped conditions, and the headmaster and staff have done an outstanding job in maintaining the standard of instruction while working under difficulties. They have even had to use the stage in the local institute as a classroom. When this new school has been completed there will be some grateful parents at Kalangadoo.

Notwithstanding the proposal, however, other areas in my district need new school buildings. Although I know the Treasurer will not take any notice of me, I think I should put it on record that other things in the district need attention. One of these is the completion of the Naracoorte High School. This project was partly constructed in 1955, and as yet it has not been completed. I refer to it as a matter for the future. The Naracoorte North school is of timber frame construction and is attended by about 450 students. Whilst it is serving its purpose now, its usefulness is coming to an end, and it is another school that will have to be replaced. Likewise the Penola Primary School building is old; it is not as dilapidated or cramped as the Kalangadoo school but the time is not far distant when something new will be needed.

I was interested to see the allocations for the Woods and Forests Department. The total sum to be spent is £1,050,000. Of this sum, £155,000 is set aside for maintenance of existing forest areas; £275,000 for preparation of land and planting; £40,000 for land purchases; and £20,000 for erection of employees' houses. Also, a sum of £29,000 is provided for the control of the Sirex wasp. The need for an area to replant forests has been referred to. Afforestation is certainly something that must be considered, and I know the Minister is giving it his attention. We were pleased with the Minister's recent visit to the South-East, where he made a firsthand examination of the forestry industry in this part of the State. Whilst I have a large proportion of the State's forests in my district,

the members for Mount Gambier and Millicent are also greatly concerned with this industry. I have talked about housing to the Minister. I have some ideas on it but at this stage I do not think it prudent for me to enlarge on them.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: I think the honourable member will be pleased with what is happening.

Mr. RODDA: I am glad to have the Minister's assurance on this matter. I believe there is much work to be done, and I have made some comments about this. However, at this stage I do not intend to hit hard, as it were, because there are some real problems. I do not care what Party the Treasurer represents—this matter will have to be dealt with over a period. I do not think we should be unfair to any Treasurer handling the purse strings.

It is encouraging to people associated with forestry to see the efforts made to control the Sirex wasp. We have been careful in keeping this pest from our forests; it could ruin plantations over night. It is gratifying to see provision made in the Estimates for this branch of forest protection. Drainage is another matter that concerns me, and I notice that £261,000 is set aside for the Eastern Division. At the moment we could cope with large schools of fish in our drains. In the South-East there is an enormous quantity of water that is an embarrassment to many people, but it ensures a splendid season. I commend this Government and previous Government for setting up the drainage system that operates in the South-East. Some of my distinguished colleagues have spent many hours taking evidence and looking at this project constructively. It has not been received with good grace in many circles, and there have been many strong expressions of opinion against over-drainage. I think in the areas where drains have perhaps made in-roads, or dried out pasture areas, we should not overlook the fact that we may have to construct weirs to retain the water. I have seen them in private drains on some properties where they take away water in the winter but it is necessary to block them up and prolong the growing period in summer.

The Eastern Division has as the principal work in hand the completion of Drain M to Bool Lagoon and the construction of the outlet there that will connect Bool Lagoon to Mosquito Creek. This will harness the floodwaters that rise in the watershed in Victoria, flow down Mosquito Creek, and make their way across the plains north-westerly and ulti-

mately link up with Alfs Flat. In this connection it will provide some much-needed relief in that area. An interesting aside concerns the Recreational Waterways Committee which has been recently appointed by the Minister and which is headed by Mr. Donaldson. A request has already been received concerning the project of ponding Bool Lagoon or providing a recreational waterway there, so some people have already foreseen some success from this scheme. I mention that merely to show the faith that people have in the drainage scheme there.

The other drainage proposal of interest is the one that will link up with Drain M from Penola, and when that is completed it will give much needed relief to people in that area, there again relieving the congestion by water from Victoria. I have noted with interest the remarks of other members in this debate when referring to the railways, and I speak especially of the rolling stock intended to be constructed in the form of passenger cars for use on our railway lines, particularly on the South-East line. I was pleased to see this week on the Blue Lake express that the Railways Commissioner had placed in service on that line a corridor car for second-class passengers. Hitherto those passengers have had an open car with lights on and it has been most uncomfortable. I believe that the honourable member for Mount Gambier, my predecessor, and Mr. Corcoran have raised the matter many times, and it is pleasing to see this corridor car in use. I commend the Minister of Railways, the Railways Commissioner, and his officers for this provision. This corridor car affords comfort to many people, especially to mothers with young children who, if they so desire, may switch off the lights and settle down for the night without any problems.

Many projects of interest are proceeding in my district but I do not intend at this late hour to dwell on them. As I have said, this is a formidable document and far be it from me to offer any great criticisms. As I said, I have some sympathy for the Treasurer. I am intrigued that the new member for Glenelg, who entered this Parliament at the same time as I did, has such great confidence at this stage of his parliamentary career. He hopped into my Leader, although I do not think my Leader minds one scrap; in fact, he seems to enjoy it. However, I would feel totally inadequate to jump up and hop into the Treasurer. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have had the opportunity to say something



in this debate. I have much pleasure in supporting the first line.

Mr. BROOMHILL (West Torrens): I, too, support the first line. I join with other members in congratulating the Treasurer on the fine job he has done in presenting these Loan Estimates. In view of the Commonwealth Government's despondent outlook, as evidenced this evening, it is a wonder to me that this State received anything at all by way of assistance. The fact that the Treasurer has acquitted himself so well is certainly of great importance to this State.

At this late stage of the debate I do not intend to weary members by making widespread comments on the Loan Estimates. However, I consider that there are one or two matters to which I should draw attention. I noticed that the previous speaker was honest enough to indicate that he, as an Opposition member, had no criticism to make of the Treasurer on these Estimates, and I feel that in honesty no member of the Opposition could fairly criticize the Treasurer. In fact, we have had a procession of Opposition speakers simply repeating parrot-like the criticisms that were made in a most lengthy way by the Leader of the Opposition. I do not criticize the Leader for taking that step, because it is recognized that it is the Opposition's duty to criticize. However, on this occasion it was most apparent from the Leader's lack of constructive criticism that he was not really genuine in the attacks he attempted to make on the Government.

The main matter to which I wanted to refer affects the first line of the Estimates in relation to "Advances for Homes". The Treasurer's final paragraph on that aspect states:

The bulk of the funds will be employed in new housing, but it is the Government's intention that at least £100,000 of Advances for Homes money be used in selective financing of the purchase of older homes in accordance with the election policy of the Government. This policy should help toward a more effective use of our stock of older houses, including larger houses suitable for young families.

I consider that the Government should be particularly commended for including this provision in the Loan Estimates. While I would be the first to agree that the amount provided is not sufficient to meet the complete needs in this respect, it is certainly a start, and by the reactions of the people on this question it is clear that they, too, appreciate the action of the Government. Many sections in my district have a close interest in this question. I refer particularly to the old-established areas of Keswick, Plympton, Camden, Glenelg North and

similar areas, where many of the people have reared families; they are now nearing retirement and pensionable age, and their children have left them to set up homes of their own. This means that the old larger houses are a burden to the residents, because the housewife finds them too big to care for, and the husband has difficulty in maintaining the large property. The houses are usually in areas with high rates and, as a result, pensioners or those due to receive the pension pay up to £2 a week in rates and taxes.

Mr. Nankivell: What would be the average price asked for this type of house?

Mr. BROOMHILL: The price varies considerably but it would be about £5,000. The houses are much sought after by young people, because the size is ideal for families, and usually they are close to town and convenient in all respects. The main problem affecting both buyer and seller is the lack of funds to purchase them. The sum of £100,000 will not solve all the problems. An additional problem exists because under the previous policy of the bank £3,500 could be borrowed for a new house, whereas, if the money were available, only £3,000 could be borrowed for an old house. This discourages people from purchasing the older-type house. On a £5,000 purchase price a person would need £2,000 as a deposit, if a loan were available, whereas he would only require £1,500 on a similar priced house if it were new. Thus we have the position of people wanting to sell their house to people who are anxious to buy, but little can be done about it. This step by the Government will help to solve a serious problem confronting elderly people who are virtually forced to sell their house, and it will provide younger people with an opportunity to establish themselves in houses that are close to the city.

Mr. Nankivell: What would you expect the bank's advance to be?

Mr. BROOMHILL: Under the present system £3,000 is available, but if the house were valued at £5,000 the same amount should be available.

Mr. Quirke: That would mean that only 30 additional houses would be available.

Mr. BROOMHILL: True, but it would relieve pressure in 30 cases, and I hope to see in the next Loan Estimates a further advance so that the money will be available to be used in the proper way.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.6 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 18, at 2 p.m.