

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 23, 1966.

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

STATE LOTTERIES BILL.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

QUESTIONS

STATE DEFICIT.

Mr. HEASLIP: A report in today's *Advertiser* headed "Deficit 'Vital'", refers to a broadcast made last night by the Attorney-General. It states:

The Attorney-General (Mr. Dunstan) said in a broadcast last night it was vital to run a deficit in any period of economic down-turn when there was insufficient stimulus from the Federal Government to keep the economy of a State buoyant. By running a deficit the South Australian Government had ensured that the State had kept a high level of employment and services had in no way been cut.

Can the Attorney-General enlarge further on this statement in view of the fact that the "high level of employment" today in this State is the worst in the Commonwealth and that so many services, such as water reticulation to country areas and money for education at universities and this sort of thing, have been cut?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am afraid that what the honourable member has read is a reporter's precis of what I said and not the actual words I used. I will get a complete copy of the broadcast so that the honourable member will see there is nothing wrong with it.

SHOPLIFTING OFFENCES.

Mr. LAWN: Recently I have noticed in the press that persons charged with shoplifting have been gaoled for a first offence. Will the Attorney-General obtain statistics of such cases, also those relating to persons being charged and gaoled for the first offence of illegally using a motor vehicle?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Instances of gaol for first offences in both categories have occurred, but I shall try to get the statistics asked for soon.

MILK DISPUTE.

Mr. HALL: The dispute existing in the metropolitan milk distribution system is having

many social consequences in South Australia and, if prolonged, will cause inconvenience to producers and consumers of milk in this city. The union involved in the dispute is referred to in the leading article of the *News* today, which states:

The union, having approached the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission with its claims, now has resorted to direct action, without awaiting the normal course of the case before the commission.

This is similar action to that taken in the superphosphate industry earlier this year. The afternoon's newspaper states that the Minister of Labour and Industry has offered to be an intermediary in this dispute. To many of the public this may seem to be a reasonable offer, but as it presents an alternative to the normal means of conciliation and arbitration, can the Premier say whether the Government intends to support moves to settle disputes outside the jurisdiction of the conciliation and arbitration system of Australia?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: No.

Mr. HEASLIP: I was glad to hear the Premier tell the Leader that the Government did not support direct action. However, if this is so, why is the Minister of Labour and Industry offering to mediate and, by doing so, condoning the action taken? Also, what action, in addition to that being taken under the existing conciliation and arbitration provisions, is the Minister offering to take?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: In an attempt to put the honourable member at ease I will tell him that the policy under which this Government was elected was one of conciliation and arbitration. Although the Labor Party has never at any time denied people the right to strike if they desired to go that far, it is not the policy of the Government to encourage such action. When I was asked a question on this matter I replied in the negative. Because I still believe in conciliation in preference to arbitration, I devoted some time to this matter on Sunday. A meeting was convened through the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration channels, through Commissioner Portus, and I would have thought that if a dispute still existed the people concerned could at least have called a compulsory conference, because the matter is entirely in their hands. The Minister of Labour and Industry has merely indicated that he will see what can be done by the Government and particularly by his department in the interests of the people.

Mrs. STEELE: Can the Premier say what arrangements are being made for milk

supplies to infants and invalids who are not hospitalized?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Although I am unable to say now, I will try to obtain a reply.

MOTOR VEHICLE INSURANCE.

Mr. McKEE: Recently, I have received many inquiries about unsatisfactory settlements by certain insurance companies with respect to comprehensive and third party insurance. Because of these numerous complaints, can the Premier say whether the Government will set up a Select Committee to inquire fully into comprehensive motor vehicle and third party car insurance, so that the committee could recommend a pattern of insurance to be instituted that would be fair and equitable?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will inquire about this matter.

PREFERENCE TO UNIONISTS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is reported that in Queensland Mr. Justice Hanger has decided that preference to unionists does not and must not be construed as amounting to compulsory unionism. As it is common knowledge amongst all members of this House that preference to unionists in Government employment and in employment generally is this Government's policy, can the Premier say how many applications for Government employment have been refused because the applicant was not or has not been a unionist?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I know of nobody who has been refused.

GRASSHOPPERS.

Mr. CASEY: I was informed over the weekend that a widespread hatching of grasshoppers was occurring in the Hammond-Mooekra area of the State (that being one of the areas in which the Agriculture Department recently, together with the district councils concerned, investigated the normal breeding habits of the grasshoppers). As the hatching is unusual for this time of the year, can the Minister of Lands, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, say whether Agriculture Department officers have been notified of the outbreak and, if they have, what action is to be taken?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am unable to say whether the departmental officers have been notified of this particular hatching. However, I understand that Mr. Birks (a departmental entomologist) will be going to Peterborough early in September and be stationed

there for the purpose of carrying out an intensive survey in the area (although I am not aware of the specific area to be surveyed), so that the habits of grasshoppers and the various factors concerning their hatchings can be studied. I shall draw Mr. Birks's attention to the honourable member's question, and ascertain whether I can obtain further information on the matter.

BRANDING OIL.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Lands, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to the question I asked last week about branding oil?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Manufacturers and stock agents report that there has been a temporary shortage of fluids through one agent only at Naracoorte, because of the withdrawal of a consignment containing faulty ingredients. All other agents have had plentiful supplies at all times, and the shortage was localized and of short duration.

HOPE VALLEY SEWERAGE.

Mrs. BYRNE: In reply to a question I asked on August 18 (in which I requested the Engineering and Water Supply Department to consider extending the Hope Valley and Highbury sewerage scheme to include the Hope Valley Primary School) the Minister of Works said that the proposed scheme was not capable of further extension as a gravity scheme, and that further sewerage schemes eastwards and north-eastwards to serve the school and surrounding subdivisions would require an extension of the approved main sewer in Grand Junction Road (eastwards); the approval to sewer the area concerned depended on the completion of the proposed scheme. As I have been approached by the Hope Valley Citizens' Association, representing the residents of new subdivisions in the area, can the Minister of Works give me any additional information regarding the sewerage of these new subdivisions?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Following my reply to the honourable member, certain requests have been made, which are being investigated. Until those investigations have been completed, I do not want to say anything that could be construed as being encouraging, because I do not want to create false hopes. I assure the honourable member that her request will be investigated and as soon as a finding has been made I will inform her of its particulars.

HOUSING TRUST RENTS.

Mr. COURCEL: In view of the recent increases that have occurred in Housing Trust rentals will the Premier, in his capacity as Minister of Housing, obtain a report giving the details of these increases and including some information about increases that have occurred in rentals since June, 1965?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Government has been considering this matter for some time. Some misapprehension seems to have surrounded these rents. In most cases where an increase in rent seems to have occurred, other factors associated with the income of a tenant have been involved. Perhaps a tenant has been granted a reduction in his normal rent because of hardship he has suffered, following which his rent has been increased to its normal level after the person's income has increased. That has been the usual case, and no general increase in Housing Trust rentals has taken place. However, in case the honourable member is perturbed about the matter, I am prepared to see whether the position has altered, even in the last week; that is the best I can do at this stage. Some letters, views and comments that have appeared in the press have been concerned with the type of case to which I have already referred. If tenants suffer some hardship they have only to present a case to the Housing Trust, whereupon the trust will see whether it can make a reduction in the rent. In cases where obvious hardship has occurred the trust has gone out of its way to assist. Because of this, many people are not paying the normal rent for the houses or properties they occupy.

TRADE PRACTICE.

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently my attention has been drawn to the fact that a certain painter has been calling on people in the eastern and southern areas of Adelaide telling them that he has a number of men in those areas and can carry out a job for them quickly using Berger paint (a first-class paint) which, in fact, he does not use. In some cases a deposit is requested immediately and, if this is not forthcoming, some payment is requested in the early stages of the job and final payment before the job is completed. When such a payment is made the job is not completed immediately. The usual ethics of business people, especially in work of this type, is to receive payment when the work is completed to the satisfaction of the client. Those affected by this type of business practice are usually elderly people who judge others on their own

honesty. In view of the number of complaints I have received from elderly people about this practice, if I make these complaints available to the Attorney-General will he have an investigation made in an effort to stop this unsatisfactory method of exploiting elderly people?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

FIRE PRECAUTIONS.

Mr. QUIRKE: We have recently heard of the horror that occurred in a home in another State in which elderly people were either burnt to death or suffocated as a result of fire. We have many such places run by people dedicated to the service of aged and indigent persons in this State. Is the Premier able to indicate whether all these places are properly protected against the possibility of a similar occurrence here? Also, will the Government investigate such homes with a view to averting a similar tragedy? In the main, such institutions are charitable organizations and perhaps the Government will consider granting assistance to provide such protection.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The honourable member is aware that in this State we are most fortunate in the existing standard of housing because most houses are of solid construction. Most buildings of more than one storey have the first floor constructed of concrete and the tendency in new buildings is to provide solid floors. However, I will endeavour to obtain further information on this subject to see whether we are keeping up—

Mr. Quirke: My concern is that the buildings I have referred to are not new.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: As I have said, I will have inquiries made. As a matter of interest, one of the worst of the buildings I call to mind is not a home. I do not know whether there are sufficient fire escapes in the old Foy's building.

SHEUBS AND TREES.

Mr. BROOMHILL: I recently sought information from the Minister of Lands concerning the harmful effects of the rhus tree and other common garden shrubs, and I understand that the information is now available.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Director, Botanic Garden, has advised me that the question of harmful effects from the rhus species was discussed at a special meeting of senior staff of the Botanic Garden held recently. As a result of this meeting, it appears quite possible that the plant, which was publicized in the press a few weeks ago as causing harmful effects, has not been correctly identified and

investigations are being made to determine accurately the material being grown in Adelaide. The species growing here is purported to be *Rhus succedanea*. Medically, little is known concerning this plant and no complaints have been received. However, there are other species closely related to *Rhus succedanea* and these are known to have medical histories.

In addition to the investigation to definitely establish the identity of the plants, other inquiries have been instituted which it is hoped will clarify the position. These include writing to other Botanic Gardens both in Australia and overseas, to Japan which is the home of the various rhus species, and also seeking information from the nursery trades. The Director has supplied me with a list of plants commonly cultivated in gardens which have harmful effects on man and animals. The list shows both the botanical and common names of the plants concerned and the effects which they can cause. As the list is rather lengthy and it would be time consuming for me to read it in detail, I ask leave for it to be inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

PLANTS HARMFUL TO MAN AND ANIMALS CULTIVATED IN GARDENS.

Agapanthus orientalis. "Agapanthus." The viscid acrid sap in the leaves causes severe ulceration of the mouth.

Arum Family (*Araceae*). Most members of this family contain crystals of calcium oxalate which cause an irritant condition when chewed. In some instances fatal cases have been attributed to an unknown ingredient. The following species are cultivated:

Alocasia macrorrhiza. "Cunjevoi."

Arum maculatum. "Cuckoo Pint." Foliage causes mouth irritation and the brightly coloured berries are very poisonous.

Colocasia antiquorum. "Taro", "Elephant's Ears".

Dieffenbachia. "Dumb Cane." An extremely dangerous plant, the leaf of which chewed causes fetid breath and swelling.

Monstera deliciosa. "Fruit Salad Plant." Eating unripe fruit, which is exceedingly acrid, can cause ulceration of the mouth and throat.

Zantedeschia aethiopica. "White Arum", or "Arum Lily". Chewing the stems and leaves causes swelling of the tongue and throat.

Carissa spectabilis. "Winter Sweet", "Bushman's Poison". An ornamental shrub, all parts are poisonous. The latex or sap has been used as an arrow poison in Africa.

Conium maculatum. "Hemlock", "Fool's Parsley", "Parsley Fern". All parts are poisonous, often occurs as a weed.

Digitalis purpurea. "Foxglove."

Duranta repens. "Duranta", "Pigeon Berry". Reports from Queensland indicate children have been affected when eating the bright yellow flowers.

Euphorbia peplus. "Milkweed." A cosmopolitan weed and one of the commonest in gardens. Latex or sap can cause irritation to the skin, eyes, etc.

Euphorbia pulcherrima. "Poinsettia." Latex can be irritant, the leaves are poisonous.

Euphorbia tirucalli. "Pencil Tree", "Naked Lady". Commonly grown in gardens.

Hedera helix. "Ivy." Berries and leaves are poisonous.

Laburnum. "Golden Chain", "Laburnum". Flowers and seeds are poisonous. (Regarded by authorities to be one of the most poisonous plants in the U.K.).

Lantana camara. "Lantana." Green fruits.

Ligustrum vulgare. Common "Privet".

Ligustrum lucidum. "Tricolor Privet."

Ligustrum ovalifolium. "Aureo-marginatum", "Golden Privet". Leaves and fruits are poisonous.

Nerium oleander. "Oleander." All parts including the sap are poisonous.

Primula. Certain species cultivated as garden annuals can cause severe dermatitis.

Prunus. Apricot, cherry, peach, nectarine, cherry plum, almond—kernels of these are poisonous and the unripe and partly developed fruit can cause severe illness.

Rheum raphaniticum. "Rhubarb." Leaves are poisonous, but on cooking the harmful element in the stems is destroyed.

Rhus. Several species are known to be poisonous.

Ricinus communis. "Castor-oil Plant." Often planted, also a weed of common places. The seed contains toxic material and is fatal in most instances when the seed has been chewed.

Solanaceae. Nightshade Family. The leaves, flowers, fruits and seeds are toxic to animals and humans. Ornamental species include:

Cestrum.

Datura. "Angels Trumpet."

Petunia.

Potato. Green tubers are very poisonous.

Solanum nigrum. "Common or Black Nightshade." The green fruits are poisonous.

Taxus baccata. "Yew." The seed is poisonous, the red fleshy surround is harmless.

Thevetia peruviana. "Yellow Oleander." All parts including the sap are toxic.

Wisteria. Children have been poisoned from eating pods and seeds.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Members who wish to do so may also obtain a copy from me. Whilst the plants recorded above have toxic principles it must be borne in mind that very few cases of poisoning are recorded. It would be a pity if the majority were removed from gardens which would then be the poorer

so far as attractive shrubs and plants are concerned. As regards the rhus species, their position will be further considered in the light of the information obtained from the inquiries being made.

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Last week, when I asked the Minister of Irrigation about the salinity of the Murray River, I drew his attention to a letter in a newspaper from a Mr. Duncan of Wentworth. I understand the Minister has a reply on this matter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Much of the information given by the *Murray Pioneer* correspondent to whom the honourable member referred on July 26, 1966, is in accordance with fact, and generally speaking the views he expresses are sound. It is obvious that if half the water in a pondage evaporates, the salinity of the remaining water must be twice that of the water originally impounded. However, total tonnages of salt have no significance, the important aspect being the weight of salt per unit of water volume. The salinity varies from point to point on the surface, and also varies from surface to depth in Lake Bonney, and one could not be specific as to average salinity even if thousands of locations were tested. Comparative tests, using full chemical laboratory facilities, have shown our titration tests to be reasonably accurate and also that chlorides expressed as sodium chloride in waters of the up-river area are about 65 per cent of the total salts. However, salts other than chlorides are considered to be either not harmful or in insufficient proportions to be harmful. The method of testing on which the correspondent based his figures or whether he refers to chlorides or total salts content is not known. Based on a constant water level in Lake Bonney at R.L. 139.00ft. and the equally unlikely circumstance that the whole of the water in Lake Bonney during the period has a salt content the same as that obtained in a departmental test on the swimming pool site on July 11 last, namely, 2,480 parts per million, the position would be as follows:

Surface area, approximately 4,000 acres.
 Water in Lake Bonney, average depth 13½ft., 52,200 acre feet.
 Evaporation loss for one year, 20,000-23,300 acre feet of 40 to 45 per cent of capacity.
 Salts as chlorides left in lake from water evaporated during the year, 60,284-70,232 tons.

Salts as chlorides in the lake water, 157,343 tons.

Unfortunately, Lake Bonney has a common inlet and outlet and therefore there is no through circulation. This means that when the lake is controlled at the normal pool level of Lock 3 no water can run out and the only water running in is the amount necessary to compensate for evaporation losses. According to the Commonwealth Bureau of Meteorology the annual evaporation rate at Barmera is between 60 and 70 inches. The correspondent's remarks concerning the need to isolate or bank off shallow lagoons, etc., are undoubtedly sound, for such action will eventually be necessary, not only to reduce salt concentration by evaporation but also to save valuable water. Speaking generally, each acre of exposed water surface evaporates enough water to irrigate two acres of land. Both the correspondent in the *Murray Pioneer* and the *Advertiser* correspondent to whom the honourable member referred on Thursday last have raised the question of the possible effects of the Chowilla dam on the salinity of the Murray River water. This will be outlined when I reply later to a question from the honourable member for Light.

SOLDIER SETTLERS.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Irrigation a reply to the question I asked last week relating to a faulty pipeline at Loxton?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have received the following report:

The southern rising main at Loxton, a reinforced concrete rubber-jointed pipeline, usually develops a leak at a number of joints at about this time of the year. The leaks occur when contraction of the pipes takes place in low temperatures. Three leaking joints were attended to prior to the commencement of an irrigation on August 15 and unfortunately three leaks in other joints occurred a few hours after pumping started and another one developed on the evening of the 17th. Pumping had to be stopped from about mid-day on the 15th until the morning of the 17th and again from the evening of the 17th until 3.30 p.m. on August 18, to enable the leaking joints to be attended to. Such interruptions to pumping are inconvenient to settlers and the department, but at this time of the year it is unlikely to cause damage to plantings. Portion of this main was caulked internally last year and the results are being watched closely this season in order that a decision may be reached as to whether further internal caulking would be justified.

CADELL IRRIGATION AREA.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: A few days ago, after I had received a request from a constituent at

Cadell, I asked the Minister of Irrigation whether he could tell me what the salinity of the Murray River at Cadell was likely to be when the Chowilla dam was completed and filled. Can the Minister now give me some information on this matter?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The possible effect of Chowilla on the salinity of River Murray water was fully investigated by a technical committee appointed by the River Murray Commission. Under existing conditions the quality of the water entering South Australia by direct flow in the river or aided by releases from Lake Victoria is satisfactory at all times. In South Australia saline water seeps back into the river at many points from the high country abutting the river valley. While every care is exercised in controlling the saline water discharged by drainage systems in the irrigation areas there is no doubt that some uncontrollable seepage from these areas also reaches the river. The quality of the water in the river depends almost entirely upon the amount of fresh water available to dilute this saline seepage. Past experience has shown that the quality remains satisfactory as long as South Australia receives the flow to which it is normally entitled in terms of the River Murray Waters Act. However, on occasions when the River Murray Commission has been obliged to restrict diversions in the upper States and reduce the flow to South Australia, there has been an appreciable rise in salinity.

Without the aid of Chowilla, years of restricted supply would become more and more frequent and therefore salinity would become a problem of increasing gravity. When Chowilla has been completed, about 20 per cent of the water stored will be lost by evaporation each year and this will increase, to some extent, the salinity of the water remaining in storage. However, this increase will not be serious and its effect will be more than offset by the fact that the controlled flow to South Australia will be increased and therefore the effect of saline water seeping into the river in this State will not be as great. Restrictions will then be necessary only on rare occasions and, when this is necessary, South Australia will receive a greater share of available water than it does under present conditions.

When considering South Australia's position in terms of the 1963 amendment of the River Murray Waters Agreement, it is necessary to take other factors into consideration. This amendment established South Australia's right to a share of the water diverted from the Snowy River to the Murray River by the works

of the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Authority. South Australia is now entitled to only three-thirteenths of the water available in the Murray River during periods of restriction, but the amendment provides that when Chowilla has been completed this State will be entitled to one-third of the available water. Available water means water available from the Murray River itself, which comprises the natural flow above Albury, the quantity stored in Hume reservoir and Chowilla, and any additional quantity which can be obtained by lowering any of the pools above the various weirs on the Murray River. New South Wales and Victoria are and always have been entitled to use all water available from the tributaries in the respective States below Albury.

This is the main reason why Chowilla is vital to the interests of this State, for New South Wales and Victoria are continuing to harness the tributaries for their own use, thereby depriving South Australia of what may be termed fortuitous flows from these tributaries. Examples are Big Eildon dam on the Goulburn, Burrinjuk on the Murrumbidgee, and the Menindee Lakes storages on the Darling. Summarizing the situation, it may be said that Chowilla will tend to average out the salinity by more effective regulation of the flow. Whilst the salinity may be slightly higher in times of good flow, it will eliminate the critical periods in which there is insufficient water under present conditions to dilute the saline water seeping into the river in South Australia. The original River Murray Waters Agreement made no mention whatsoever of salinity, but under the amended agreement the River Murray Commission is obliged to determine the quantity of water which is to be allowed for dilution in South Australia.

COMMONWEALTH ASSISTANCE.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: On the national news today at 12.30 p.m., it was announced that the Commonwealth Government would today consider an application made by Sir Henry Bolte on Saturday that the Commonwealth, Victorian and New South Wales Governments should have financial discussions to work out plans for relief for New South Wales and Victoria with regard to their present budgetary positions. I ask the Premier, first, is he aware of the move that is now to be considered by the Commonwealth Government and, secondly, does he believe that conferences of a limited nature, involving only two States, would be a desirable way of dealing with Commonwealth-State financial positions?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: In answer to the first part of the question, I have not heard anything about this. Secondly, to prevent any misapprehension about this matter I believe that if representation is to be made to the Commonwealth Government about financial matters, it should be on the basis (as I have always understood it to be in the past) of an honourable agreement that the Premier of the major State would make the application after inviting other State Premiers to put their views on financial matters. From the South Australian viewpoint, the only representations made were in writing as I have already indicated, but I believe that if anything is to be done the least we can expect is to be invited to make representation, particularly if two States only are to do anything. I spoke to the Commonwealth Treasurer last evening at a function at Whyalla, and he did not say anything about this matter. However, I am sure that the newspaper controversy resulting from Sir Henry Bolte's move is not appreciated. If I said what I thought about the position and about the fuss and bother made by Sir Henry Bolte at the same time as he is increasing costs of transport and everything else, I should imagine that he is trying to distract the people's attention from these things by making a noise about the State's financial position.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I listened with the very greatest of interest and goodwill to the Premier, but I am afraid I was unable to follow the purport of what he said. Therefore, I ask (and I think this question is capable of an answer "Yes" or "No"): does the Government intend, in the light of the approaches being made by the New South Wales and Victorian Governments, to make representations to the Commonwealth Government to discuss financial arrangements between this State and the Commonwealth?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: This Government has already made some representations to the Commonwealth Government, and I hope that it will soon be able to make a further approach on some other very important State matters. If I were elsewhere I might be able to tell the honourable member something, but that is as far as I can go at present.

Mr. Millhouse: Why not tell us in the House?

STATE'S FINANCES.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the difference between the estimated and the actual recoveries as regards the State's finances?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The honourable member asked for an explanation of the cause of the difference between the estimated recoveries of \$12,000,000 and the actual recoveries of \$10,869,000. Full details of actual recovery will be published in the Auditor-General's Report that will be available in two or three weeks' time. The main differences were in Advances for Homes where voluntary repayments by borrowers fell short of estimate by \$489,000; in Woods and Forests Department, where a reduced recovery of \$333,000 arose from some build-up of stocks and debtors; a reduction of \$285,000 for the Railways Department where sales of lands and other assets no longer required were less than expected; and \$363,000 reduction in the Engineering and Water Supply Department arising from a similar cause.

OVINE BRUCELLOSIS.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Lands, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to the question I asked last week about ovine brucella?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Ovine Brucellosis Accreditation Scheme was put into operation by the Agriculture Department in March, 1965, at the request of the Australian Society of Breeders of British Sheep. It is unlikely that the disease, which is of minor economic importance in commercial flocks, can be eradicated from the State. As the successful implementation of the scheme is likely to benefit mainly stud breeders, it was agreed that the department should exercise supervision over the scheme, but that the costs of testing, both in examination of the rams and collection and testing of the blood samples, would be borne by the owner, except in exceptional circumstances. All examinations and collection of bloods are undertaken by private practitioners, but a condition of the scheme is that the department may take over the testing of any flock where it is considered desirable to do so for any reason. A scale of fees for this purpose was approved for application, mainly in those areas where there is no practitioner.

To date, the department has intervened in regard to four flocks for various reasons. In each case, there were problems which needed investigation, and which came within the scope of the department's responsibilities, or where the practitioner needed assistance. Although the operation of an Ovine Brucellosis Accreditation Scheme has been proposed in all the Eastern States, it has become fully operative only in South Australia where 86 flocks are

now either accredited (42) or in the process (44). In all schemes of this type, unforeseen difficulties arise in the early stages, and it is the department's responsibility to investigate and remove them. In the present instance, problems have occurred in three instances in large flocks which were beyond the capacity of the practitioners to cope with. As the number of flocks involved has been small, and the problems largely investigational, charges have not been raised. However, in view of the suggestion that this is unfair to other owners, charges will be levied in all future cases.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT:
GUM TREES.

The SPEAKER: I have received the following letter from the honourable member for Burnside:

Dear Mr. Speaker, I desire to give notice that this afternoon I will move that the House at its rising do adjourn until 9 o'clock tomorrow to consider a question of urgency, namely, the proposed removal of gum trees on Montacute Road.

Is the proposed motion supported?

Several members having risen:

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I move:

That the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow at 9 o'clock, for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely, the proposed removal of gum trees on Montacute Road. I am grateful to my colleagues on this side of the House for supporting me in bringing this matter before the House. I suggest it is a matter of urgency, because work is proceeding on Montacute Road and has nearly reached the stage of removing the trees that have been the subject of much public interest and concern recently. Montacute Road, of course, at the locality in question, is within the district that I have the honour to represent in Parliament. I know the road well and use it frequently in carrying out the business for which I was elected to this place. Since the controversy has risen to its present height, I have paid a number of visits to the area to see for myself whether alternative proposals could be considered, with a view to sparing the life of 100 or more native river gums on the verges of the road.

Honourable members may recall that I have raised this matter in the House recently by way of questions directed to the Minister representing the Minister of Roads in another place. I suggested last week that, because the Newton school was concerned in this controversy, the Minister of Lands might ask his

colleague whether he would confer on the matter with the Minister of Education. Although I am not sure whether that conference took place, the Minister of Lands was courteous enough to inform me that the Minister of Roads had decided to visit the site in the company of Highways Department officers, discuss the matter with them, and ascertain for himself whether an alternative plan could be used in an attempt to spare the trees.

We know now that on Friday afternoon the Minister of Roads made a public statement to the effect that he had spent some time on the site and that, after considering it from various angles, he had given instructions that all trees not consistent with the safety of the schoolchildren attending the Newton school should be removed. The Minister, correctly, had the interests of the schoolchildren at heart, and suggested that one life was worth much more than one tree. No-one would deny that the safety of schoolchildren came first, but I hope to show that the action approved by the Minister will add to the dangers of children at this site, rather than decrease them. Having been recently completed, the Newton school at present accommodates half its planned enrolment. Unfortunately, this school abuts Montacute Road, and the trees in which great public interest has been aroused are adjacent to the Newton school.

Payneham Road, which gives access to this area, is, in fact, the main road, and at its intersection with Glynburn Road it divides to become Montacute Road and Lower North-East Road, and further north Gorge Road branches off Lower North-East Road. So, there are three subsidiary roads that take the traffic travelling along Payneham Road. Montacute Road, as its name implies, serves the district of Montacute. After a fairly straight course in an easterly direction, it winds into the hills and ends in the district of Montacute.

I understand this work is part of a long-range plan to widen Montacute Road, and in the last few weeks the roadworks have been completed on the area between Glynde corner and the Newton school. In fact, the road has been widened over this distance to a width of 62ft. When one drives along this section it almost looks as though one is coming on to the landing strip of an airport because the road is so wide. When it converges where the condemned trees are it does so into a two-lane road. It is intended that there shall be four 11ft. traffic lanes, a 4ft. median strip, two 7ft. parking lanes, and two 7ft. or 9ft. footpaths.

Knowing this area, I wonder why it is necessary to provide a road of such width.

It originally served a farming, fruitgrowing and market gardening area in the Montacute hills, and a number of quarries operated there at one time. I drove up there this morning—only a few hours ago—to check for myself whether any quarries still operated, but they have all ceased to function. I am not sure whether this was because the quality of the stone or the type of stone was not suitable for roadmaking and house building purposes, but the fact is that the quarries have closed and, although the road serves an area growing in house and population density, knowing the district extremely well I do not think that it warrants a road of such width. Many of the State's present main roads are not as wide and yet serve areas far busier than this one. My first point is whether a road of this width is justified, bearing in mind the expense of laying it, and whether the need has not been somewhat exaggerated and the work is not somewhat extravagant.

I appreciate that the Highways Department does not plan for only the next five or 10 years. I believe that at present it is planning up to about 1986 and, for that reason, it wants to save the taxpayer's money by building roads that will meet the traffic needs for the next couple of decades. However, I wonder whether the width of this road is justified in view of the district it purports to serve. I realize that the safety of children who use the road is of paramount importance. The removal of the trees would be for the obvious purpose of providing for a swifter flow of and for a better road for traffic. However, the plan for the road, I suggest, will have the opposite effect to eliminating a traffic hazard for children. I believe that in future children will have to contend with much faster traffic and that will be even more of a menace to them in crossing the road.

The main group of trees is situated on the northern side of Montacute Road and abutting this area are many newly completed houses. Although one of the plans suggested was that the road should deviate at this point so that the trees would not have to be eliminated, I appreciate that this could be quite expensive. On the southern side of the road (that which abuts Newton school) there are exactly six trees, which I counted this morning, fronting the school that would have to be removed. If they were removed the road could be considerably widened—its width could be doubled or at least one and a half additional traffic lanes

could be provided. It could be widened to this extent without removing trees on the northern side at all and that is where the greater number of trees are growing. I suggest that perhaps the Education Department (which has constructed a fence along this frontage), in order to meet the situation and to provide an alternative plan, could make a strip available that would provide a footpath and bicycle track inside the existing fence.

I said in the House the other day that I believed it was a mistake at the time when one of the main entrances to the school was placed so close to the main intersection of Hectorville and Montacute Roads. I suggested that perhaps this entrance could be closed and the main entrance located in Robson Street. Only a few days ago the Chairman of the school committee telephoned me because he was concerned that I did not have the safety of the children at heart. I hastened to assure him that I had, and we discussed the matter for some time. He said he had suggested to both the Highways Department and the local council that an entrance to the school could be made in a street that would run into Hectorville Road. A similar practice is followed in other schools; for instance, the Linden Park school provides access to children from a street behind the school.

It has also been said that no school traffic crossing could be provided at the intersection of Montacute and Robson Roads because these crossings have to be a certain distance from an intersection. However, I have noticed in the last few days that almost all traffic lights installed for the safety of children crossing main roads are near intersections, and so I do not feel that particular argument holds water. Much public opinion has been aroused by the department's decision to press on with this proposal, and I have received many letters from and have been telephoned by many people supporting the stand I have taken in the House and asking me whether, in fact, nothing more can be done. It is because of these requests that I have taken the course in which I am now engaged.

In recent years we have seen time and time again that new traffic highways and new main roads have caused controversy simply because they have meant the elimination of many fine trees growing on their verges. I have only to remind members that this happened quite recently when a furore of public criticism resulted from the fact that trees on Daws Road had to be taken away to make room for a multi-lane traffic road. Before that,

there was a public outcry when the widening of Sturt Road meant the elimination of many trees. Again, not long ago on the approaches to the Blanchetown bridge many trees were mutilated in order to widen the road. As distinct from the instances I have mentioned, it is interesting to see what has been done on the Main North Road where trees have been retained and make up a kind of median strip. They provide a measure of safety in eliminating light glare for motorists using that road at night. It always seems to me that a public outcry is justified because some alternative measure could possibly be found in the situation under discussion. The strange thing is that, while Government departments seem able to go ahead and remove trees, in the Planning and Development Bill at present before the House specific reference is made in several places against the removal of trees; such removal is also forbidden where the town planning authority has control of the property. I shall quote from the Bill in order that members will be aware of the position. First, clause 36 (i) reads:

. . . provide for the conservation, preservation or enhancement of the natural beauty of the foreshores or banks of the ocean, harbours, rivers, creeks, lakes, lagoons and the like and of any routes or localities of scenic beauty or value;

Again, in clause 52 (e) . . .

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is at liberty to use such material as a reference but not to pursue the debate on such matter.

Mrs. STEELE: Thank you, Sir. I will content myself with mentioning that the restrictions are mentioned in three separate places in the Planning and Development Bill. It specifically mentions that owners of land are not permitted to do certain things and amongst them is the cutting down, topping, lopping or destroying of trees.

I was speaking to a friend of mine who has just returned from America and the subject of the removal of trees on Montacute Road arose. This friend told me that whilst in Washington there was a suggestion of a road being made through an area in which were some beautiful trees; it was the intention of the roadmaking authorities to remove those trees. On that occasion, after all pleas had failed, the women of the district simply went and stood in front of the bulldozers on the day that workmen arrived with bulldozers and axes to cut down the trees. They did this to show the authorities that they really meant business and that they did not want those beautiful trees removed.

That action had the desired effect, but whether householders and people keen on the retention of the few trees we have left in the metropolitan area and on the plains of Adelaide would go to such lengths, I would not know.

Mr. Lawn: The Playford Government did it at five o'clock in the morning when there was nobody about.

Mrs. STEELE: What I am saying is true, of course.

Mr. Lawn: That is true, too, and it was on the Glen Osmond Road.

Mrs. STEELE: In any case, it shows the lengths to which people will go in America in order to protect something that they consider is a natural adjunct to the beauty and amenity of the place in which they live. My friend mentioned another interesting matter to me; in South Australia, if trees grow up into electric light poles or wires, the practice is for a truckload of Electricity Trust workmen to come along and ruthlessly cut down the tops of the trees. Then with special attachments on the truck the trunk, and branches are ground up. As a result it is some time before they return to their usual trim appearance. In America such trees are treated by making a hole through the foliage of the tree itself and running the wires through, thus keeping the trees in their natural shape.

Where trees are cut down in South Australia, what do we see in their place? A forest of posts and wires. I am sure members can readily recall many main roads where we have seen this kind of grim transformation. I asked a question in the House the other day in relation to trees to which the member for Burra further spoke and mentioned varieties of fast-growing trees. However, even these trees take a considerable time to reach the height of those which they replace. There was devastation on the South Road where an avenue of memorial trees was removed when that road was widened, and many people wondered at the time why those trees could not have been retained as a median strip with roads running on either side.

Returning to my comments on Montacute Road, I do not wish to take up the time of the House any more than is necessary. However, I want to bring this to the attention of the House, as I believe it is the proper place to discuss matters that are of great interest to the community. Judging by the letters that have been published in the press and the various articles written on the subject, it seems to me that a last-ditch stand, as it were, should be made in an attempt perhaps to get the

authorities to have another look at the problem, knowing the strength of public opinion against the removal of trees alongside roads.

The only other point I wish to make is that the members of the school committee at Newton were given to understand, when they applied for a traffic crossing in order to ensure the safety of their children, that this could not be provided until such time as the roadworks were completed. At that stage they did not know the extent to which trees would be removed. I believe the majority of the committee are embarrassed by the potential loss of the trees on the northern side of the road because many of them are homeowners and appreciate the beauty of those trees. I think that, although this is a more or less hopeless case that I am upholding, I speak for many people in South Australia who deplore the fact that this kind of thing goes on time and time again. It seems as though the people can never win; the departments concerned are able to produce all kinds of reasons why trees should be removed so that the roadwork can go forward, but I suggest we are sadly short of natural flora in South Australia and we should, every time such moves are made to decrease even more the few remaining stands of native trees in the State, take this kind of action and battle to try and preserve something that is our native heritage. With this in mind, I commend the motion to the House and I hope members will support me in my plea at this last moment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I certainly support the honourable member for Burnside in this motion. I hope that there is some prospect that the motion will succeed in its purpose of preserving the trees, even though the honourable member for Burnside apparently thinks it is hopeless. I hope that the Government, and particularly the Minister of Roads, will take notice of this motion and the arguments that have been put forward by the honourable member. People may ask why I should be interested in this matter because, after all, the trees are not within my district.

Mr. Quirke: It doesn't matter where they are, does it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, it does not; the honourable member for Burra is quite right in saying that. I know that these trees, or any trees, can be cut down in a matter of hours, whereas they take decades to grow, and that once a decision has been taken and acted upon it is too late to do anything about it and the community must of necessity be the poorer for the absence of the trees. That is

my reason for supporting the honourable member for Burnside. Although I have seen these trees I do not know them very well and I do not know the locality well. However, many people in my district have spoken to me and written letters to me about it, supporting the retention of the trees and asking that the department make some serious effort to devise an alternative scheme. Speaking for myself (I must say this quite frankly) I do not believe that any serious effort has been made at all to find an alternative to the rooting out of these trees, 130 of them, I think.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: You don't think the people concerned are responsible officers?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I know the Minister of Education always finds it difficult to keep his temper in these circumstances, but if he will try to keep his temper for a little while I will read to him and the House a few of the letters that have been written to me on this topic and some of the arguments that have been adduced.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: That doesn't answer my question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I see that the Minister cannot keep his temper. If he will at least keep his patience, I will answer his interjection in due course. I hope he will do me the courtesy of allowing me to make my own speech and make the points I desire to make in the order I want to make them, and not the order in which he would like me to make them. I shall not quote at length from the letters I have received, but here is one, written on August 10:

I see that Mrs. Steele asked a question in Parliament this afternoon about the destruction of the Montacute river red gums. I have spoken to many people on this subject, and all feel very strongly against the policy of the Highways Department that beauty must always be sacrificed to progress or convenience. Could I ask you as my member of Parliament to add your voice in protest against this destruction?

That is precisely what I do now. Another letter I have had comes from a wellknown professional man in this city. I shall not give his name, because I think that is unnecessary. His letter, dated August 15, states:

Dear Mr. Millhouse, I am writing you as member for Mitcham, in which electorate I live, in connection with the proposed removal of red gums at Montacute Road by the Campbelltown council. If this project is carried through as planned a large number of residents and others will be sadly disappointed and the district will be the poorer for the loss of the trees. It seems that all too often when public works are undertaken scant consideration is given to preservation of native flora and

utilitarian considerations tend to be an overriding factor.

Then he goes on to instance a happening at Aldgate, where a magnificent stand of *Eucalyptus rubida* was preserved only as a result of action by a group of local citizens. In that case the trees were preserved, and I hope that through the action of the honourable member for Burnside in this House these trees, too, will be preserved. He goes on to say this:

I mention these details to emphasize the position that with forethought and due care for aesthetical considerations a much more successful and satisfying result can be achieved when public works are carried out. Of course, more expense is usually involved, but provided this is not completely out of proportion—

and the Minister has not seen fit to say what extra expense would be involved by the alternative scheme—

it is most important that this investment in retaining the best features of our environment should be made.

Then he goes on to say that he himself does not live near the area and therefore he has no immediate personal concern with it. He continues:

However, this same problem is bound to recur in other places at future times, and I feel justified therefore in writing on a matter which I consider is of great public importance.

The only other letter from which I desire to quote is from the Vice-President of the Mount Lofty Ranges Association, Mr. John Murray, himself a consulting engineer. Mr. Murray wrote to me on August 12 and said:

The S.A. Highways Department plans to remove a large stand of mature, and now rare, gum trees from Montacute Road, Campbelltown, to make way for road widening. In spite of numerous protests, and much adverse comment in the press, and an assurance that the department will reconsider its plans for this piece of road, fears are rife that the Highways Department will go ahead with its plans and remove the trees.

And, of course, that is precisely what is now planned, some 11 days after this letter was written. He goes on to:

This association considers it essential that these trees remain undamaged and that the Minister instruct the Highways Department to alter the design of the road accordingly. The reasons for preserving these trees in particular are obvious—

I am sure they would appeal to you personally, Mr. Speaker, as a lover of trees and of nature—

that they are one of the few examples of their kind left on the Adelaide Plains. However, there are more reasons than this for both preserving and planting native trees in the

greatest quantity possible. Australia is rapidly losing its flora, both large and small, and it is vital that it be replaced for economic reasons and scientific reasons, quite apart from any aesthetic value they have. Officers of the Highways Department have publicly stated that they are opposed to the removal of trees and that their road designs are made to avoid unwarranted felling. However, if this stand of trees at Montacute is destroyed, it will be apparent that such statements are merely a sop to public opinion. The highway itself is not supreme—there are other considerations, but unfortunately a great number of designers do not have the vision to provide for them. This association will be grateful if you will bring its views to the notice of the Minister.

That is what I am doing now. It was reported in last Saturday's *Advertiser* that the Minister on Friday made a personal inspection of the area between 8.30 and 9.45 a.m., a period, I point out, of merely one and a quarter hours. One suspects that he made this personal inspection last Friday morning because of questions asked of him in this place last week, questions which implied (as the Minister of Lands said in answering one) that the Minister was simply a rubber-stamp, that the decision had already been made, and that nothing he or anybody else could do would alter it. The Minister therefore went out and made this inspection. However, as I have already said, it was only for one and a quarter hours, and it was apparently only during that time that the Minister saw fit to consider any of the alternatives to the destruction of the trees, that is, if the report in the *Advertiser* under the heading "Bevan Says Trees Must Go" is an accurate one.

Mr. Casey: If you were so concerned, why didn't you get the information from the Minister himself?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am quoting from, I hope, a reputable newspaper. Why does the Minister not give a little more information to this House than he has given?

Mr. Casey: He is in another place.

Mrs. Steele: Why hasn't he given it to me?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, why has he not given it to the honourable member for Burnside, in whose district these trees are? The honourable member did not know about the Minister's decision before she read it in the newspaper. Is this any example of courtesy to a member in a matter arising in her own district? Following the interruption by the honourable member for Frome, let me carry on. This is what the newspaper said about it:

Mr. Bevan said that alternative proposals were put to him during the inspection.

During that time the Minister must have been busy because he was watching the traffic, talking to officers of the department and, at the same time, he was considering alternative plans. I am not satisfied that this was a sufficient inspection by the Minister or that sufficient consideration was given to the alternatives available. It was suggested, and everything the Minister has done confirms it, that the decision was made a long time ago and nothing that the Minister or anyone else could do would alter it. His inspection was a perfunctory way of rubber-stamping the decision. Officers of the department were making no secret that the review would be a matter of form and would not affect what had already been decided. I wonder how many members have read the letter in the *Advertiser* on August 5 written by Dr. Mark Bonnin on this subject? I wonder if any member, including the member for Frome, has noticed that no replies have been forthcoming to the questions he asked in his letter? Neither the Minister nor anyone from his department has answered the questions.

Mr. Casey: I could safely say that I have planted more trees than you have.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member is trying to divert me from the point. He should listen to this letter to see whether any answer has been given to the questions asked. Dr. Bonnin stated:

The statement submitted by the Campbelltown Council (*The Advertiser*, 2/8/66) to justify the destruction of 130 gums on Montacute Road is not supported by facts. The comment that the road is inadequate for the traffic using it could well be clarified as to how it is inadequate.

That so much traffic is, in fact, using the road means that it is able to carry this volume. Is the rate of transport so much slower over this stretch of road than over any comparable length of road the same distance from the city? Has it been shown that the accident rate is greater and that driving on this road is actually more dangerous than driving on other roads?

Straightening and widening roads does not necessarily reduce the number of traffic accidents: on the contrary, by encouraging speed the number of accidents is at times increased by such measures.

I was amused by the comments of the Minister implying that when it was a four-lane highway it would be easier for children to cross than it is now. The letter continued:

Has the council received many complaints from the drivers of M.T.T. buses, quarry trucks or private cars concerning the danger of this road? It would not seem unreasonable to take a census of opinion of all vehicle drivers who use the road to ascertain the percentage in favour of widening the road at the expense of

the gums. There is no reason for emerging vehicles to reach "the centre of the bitumen" before the drivers see oncoming traffic. The only entering road to which this statement could be applied is Meadow Avenue. Have there been more accidents here than at any other similar road junction? If there have been, then a good case could be made for removing a few gums.

If, on the other hand, poor visibility has led to a slowing of speed of entry with a reduced number of accidents, then this would be a further reason for leaving the gums. Such figures should be readily obtainable from the traffic division of the Police Department.

He concludes his letter by saying:

The sacrifice of a little speed and efficiency for the sake of aesthetic beauty and safety is not out of place in circumstances such as these. I am far from satisfied that any real review has been made or that any alternatives have been considered. I am certain that, in the 1½ hours the Minister spent inspecting the area, that would not have been possible. I support the member for Burnside, and hope that the Minister will pause and make a proper and genuine inquiry into alternative proposals. Once the trees are out they are gone forever and it is too late then to do anything about them. In view of what has been said and written about this matter, surely it is worth the effort of the Minister to do something about preserving these trees.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support my colleague because of the letters I have received from people living in and out of my district. These show that citizens in the metropolitan area, and in country areas, have the fate of these trees at heart, and are perturbed at the rather ruthless action being taken to rip them out. I had this same problem in my district a few years ago, but was able to stop the intended action in time to save the trees, which are now a valuable asset to the area. It would have been desecration to have removed them but, following representations made to me by many citizens, we were able to save the trees. I ask that a decision on this matter be deferred until a further investigation is made. All we know about the reasons for continuing this work is what we have read in the newspapers, although there may be other reasons. Apparently, the main purpose is to widen the road and to create a greater traffic-carrying capacity. The road, leading to a mainly rural area, passes through Rostrevor, Newton and Montacute, where much recent subdivision has occurred. Perhaps it is not as much as the Highways Department will have us believe.

The road runs parallel to the Gorge Road and to other roads carrying much traffic, and

it is surprising to learn that it has to be widened to the extent that is required. Surely other alternatives can be found. When a four-lane highway is constructed it becomes a speedway, as instanced in the case of Melbourne Street, North Adelaide, which was in a bad condition a few years ago. It was reconstructed and re-surfaced by the Adelaide City Council, and became a speedway on which numerous accidents occurred. The Main North Road has been reconstructed and widened in the last two years, and, leaving aside the greater volume of traffic now carried on that road, the fatalities are mainly caused by excessive speed. I refer not only to that portion of the Main North Road extending north of Gepps Cross but also to the section that traverses my district. Because of the speed of the traffic, the Nailsworth Girls Technical High School and the primary and infants schools on the Main North Road have erected special lights, not because a motorist's vision may be obstructed in any way (there are no trees in the vicinity) but because motorists' speed, added to the greater traffic volume there, has caused a real hazard.

The moment Montacute Road is straightened and widened to a four-lane thoroughfare, a greater volume of traffic will be attracted (traffic that may not use the road at present); and, secondly, traffic speed will increase. This matter should be closely examined because, far from decreasing, the hazard to schoolchildren will, in my opinion, rapidly increase. When the Public Works Committee (of which I was a member at the time) examined the site for the Newton school, one of its recommendations was that the school (including the infants school) should be situated right at the back of the block of land, and that the recreation area and oval should be placed at the front of the block, adjacent to the road. That policy has been pursued by the committee continually.

Mr. Shannon: If we had known that it was going to be a speedway we would have recommended that the site not be used.

Mr. CUMBE: That is a pertinent interjection. The Chairman of the Public Works Committee knows well that the committee closely examines all matters involving the siting of a school on a main road, with a view to ascertaining whether it is possible to re-site that school off the main road and away from the main traffic thoroughfare. That examination is undertaken for two reasons: first, to reduce the noise level; and, secondly (and principally) to ensure the safety of schoolchildren. We are merely asking the Govern-

ment to review the decision to remove the trees at Montacute. Can the axemen be stopped from carrying out their duties right from this moment? I understand from the member for Burnside that the axes are to go into some of these trees almost immediately (if not today, certainly this week).

Mrs. Steele: The roadwork is right up to the trees now.

Mr. CUMBE: Could not a further exercise be undertaken? Surely, that is not too much to ask. If the road has to be straightened and widened, and if no alternative to the present site exists, can consideration be given to moving the road to one side, taking, at the worst, the trees from only one side of the road (the southern side of the road nearer to the school)? I understand that only a handful of trees would be involved. Although I should prefer not to have any trees removed, being reasonable I realize that an alternative must be adopted. However, from press reports, I believe that that alternative has received little prominence. We are suggesting that the whole matter be postponed so that the possibility of removing a few trees on one side of the road can be examined. If that were achieved, why could not a bicycle track be constructed at this point?

One of the best plantations in the metropolitan area is the one in the centre of the Port Road between Bowden and Port Adelaide, which carries bicycle tracks on the up and down sides. We wish to have the decision to remove the trees this week deferred, and to have the Minister and his department undertake a thorough review of the whole matter. Once these trees are felled, more than 100 years of heritage that we can ill afford to lose will disappear, and some lovely gum trees will be destroyed. The safety of schoolchildren and the motoring public is exercising our minds, but if the present proposal continues more traffic and greater speeds will ensue, which will create greater hazards to the children concerned.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I should like to amplify what the member for Torrens has said about the investigation made into the Newton school prior to its approval for erection. At that stage, the road in question appeared to be a little district road serving only local residents; it did not lead past Montacute to anywhere. The Public Works Committee, in its innocence, believed that it would never be more than a quiet district road leading to a rural community. Indeed, had we known that it would become a four-lane highway past the

school, we certainly would not have agreed to siting the school where it at present stands. In fact, we took some precaution by placing the infants school at the rear of the land, knowing that a road was to be constructed along the southern side of the property. It seems a pity that South Australia should be charged with being one of the greatest tree-haters in the Commonwealth, but I think some justification exists for that charge.

It is a joy to travel through New South Wales and Victoria, particularly their country towns, and to see the beautification and tree-planting that have been undertaken. We do not see enough of our native hardwoods (red, blue, and pink gums); because they are such slow-growing trees, apparently nobody can be bothered planting them. Somebody probably planted the row of trees on Montacute Road that is now the subject of this debate. Indeed, I assume they were planted, because these trees usually grow in groves and not in rows. I wonder what that person would think now if he knew the trees were to be axed. It must be heartbreaking for tree-lovers to witness this sort of thing.

The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) said that a group known as the Mount Lofty Ranges Association was responsible for saving some white gums (rubida) at a railway crossing. That is so, and it was not an expensive exercise. In the first instance, the department said it would knock down these trees. However, after the matter had been thoroughly investigated, the white gums were saved and they are still standing. At present the Highways Department is considering widening the section of Mount Barker Road between Measday Hill and Crafers. I have been informed that it has been examining the western side of the road where at present there is a stand of young but growing white gums. If this section of road must be widened I see no objection to the department's removing many stringy bark saplings on the eastern side, although they, too, would be a loss.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sure that the honourable member will realize the limitations of this debate.

Mr. SHANNON: Yes, Mr. Speaker; I am trying to draw the attention of the House to the need to have this matter re-examined. I have had previous success in having matters re-examined. I agree with the Minister that we are not dealing with unreasonable people. It may be that there is no alternative to the present scheme; I am not going to be dog-

matic about this because I have not seen the site since I examined it four or five years ago before the school was built. At that time, it did not appear that there would be a problem about the road. I believe the member for Burnside will have done a service if the matter is re-examined, because we should see whether there are alternatives and, if there are, what are their costs and whether they can be followed, thus saving the trees.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support the member for Burnside. I have not received any letters about this matter but, whenever trees are to be removed to make way for a new road in my district, I receive numerous complaints and letters on the subject. We are not questioning the integrity or the engineering ability of Highways Department engineers. However, sometimes the first survey made is by an independent surveyor and the outline of a project is drawn up without concern for trees. Sometimes a road is built on that survey alone irrespective of whether or not there are trees in the area. When a design comes to an officer of the Highways Department it is often adjusted. However, once the department makes a decision that a road should take a certain course the merits of the removal of trees are sometimes not considered because a decision on policy has been made, and in the department there is a degree of loyalty. Therefore, often the department does not change its mind unless there is a considerable outcry about a matter and a request for another decision is made.

I have travelled in many parts of the world and seen many wonderful things. However, I used to stop my car and point out to my children the valley between Crafers and Stirling; I told them they could not see a valley more beautiful anywhere in the world. Now the whole valley has been desecrated and all but one or two of the trees pulled down. Despite this, apparently only about a quarter of the area will be taken up by the road to go through the area. Although I may be wrong, I think that the freeway might go to the north of the area. The actions of the Highways Department in this case have resulted in the whole valley being desecrated. It is because of happenings like that that we ask that this matter be reconsidered. The trees on Montacute Road are near a school. I support what members of the Public Works Committee have said to the effect that they thought that, as the road was narrow, there would not be excessive traffic. If the road is widened with more traffic resulting it will be

difficult for children to cross, and it is hard to follow the reasoning that if the trees are left it will be more dangerous for the children.

We ask that further time be devoted to considering an alternative plan. In the case of the Ashbourne road, the original survey completely ignored some of the finest trees in South Australia. The trees will be removed to overcome a minor curve in the road, but with a little bit of imagination most of these trees could be retained. We do not want to see this wholesale uprooting of trees without more consideration. With further thought some alternative could probably be implemented to provide for future traffic on Montacute Road. Therefore, I support this attempt to have the matter reconsidered.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I join with other members in supporting the member for Burnside. I have my own approach to these matters, and if trees stand in the way of an absolutely necessary expansion or development then those trees must go. However, if it is not necessary to remove those trees then they should not be removed. It is only on the gravest and most imperative grounds that a stand of trees like those on the Montacute Road should be removed. People in other States have said that South Australians are the greatest tree murderers in Australia. There has been some reason for this comment but I am pleased to note that the intention to remove a stand of trees in the metropolitan area can become a matter of such importance. The time was when nobody would have lifted a hand to save them. However, we have reached a stage where a motion has been introduced in this House to save the trees.

When South Australia was first settled, the tree was public enemy No. 1. In order to grow the equivalent in wheat for a loaf of bread a tree had to be dragged out of the ground. This practice took place over the years until a breakdown has taken place, and today we are realizing the shocking devastation inflicted on South Australia by the unnecessary removal of trees. In many quarters steps are being taken to remove the evidence of the outrage that was committed against the flora of South Australia. I have not seen these Montacute red gums, which I understand are river red gums. We have the river red gum and the forest red gum, and the only difference between them (which difference botanists can tell) is in how many berries are on their bunches of seeds. They are both majestic trees. On the property of Mr. Jack Duncan Hughes (formerly a member of the Commonwealth

Parliament) at Clare is the king of all red gums in South Australia today. It is a tree of such magnificence and grandeur that it is worth a trip from any part of South Australia just to view it. It is at least 50ft. to the first limb, and it would take half a dozen men with arms extended to span its girth. That tree must be about 200ft. high. Imagine that tree being in the same situation as the Montacute gums. Do honourable members think anybody would even dream of removing a tree like that? The obvious thing to do would be to put the road around it.

I should have much preferred to see these trees before entering into this debate. However, as I said when the member for Mitcham was speaking, it does not matter where the trees are, and it does not matter whether or not I have seen them. A very great reason (and a better reason than has been advanced, from what I read in the newspaper) has to exist for exterminating these gums. The red gum (both the river red and the forest red) do not take as long to reach quite good dimensions as many people think. In fact, in their own environment they are not so slow growing. A 30 or 40 year old red gum growing on good alluvial soil can be 40ft. high; there is plenty of evidence of that.

The regeneration of the red gum in its own environment is rather rapid. In France, a person has to seek leave to grub a tree on his own property, and the first condition of the leave being granted is that he must plant two trees. That is the reason countries like France have such an immense amount of tree cover over their landscape. One does not see these shocking semi-arid areas that we get in South Australia, where the sheep are just putting their heads into a fence post looking for something to keep their brains cool. I would impose a similar condition to the removal of trees to the one that exists in France.

I am pleased that we are getting away from the previous thinking on this subject, and today I am overjoyed to think that the contemplated destruction of gums can be of such importance to the State that it becomes a subject for discussion in this Parliament. I take some delight in seeing this come about. Because of outside pressure from people who have approached members of Parliament to see to it that even a last minute stand is made to preserve these trees, I say that this House should take the necessary steps to halt this road. It should insist that a real reason be given why the trees should be removed and why the road cannot

go around them, or why at least the trees on one side should not remain. I think the honourable member for Burnside moved the motion because she considers it is the wish of the people that serious consideration should be given to saving these trees.

At 4 o'clock, the bells having been rung, the motion lapsed.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

EDUCATION ALLOWANCES.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (on notice):

1. What is the total amount of grants made under the Government's university fees concession scheme for 1966?

2. From what sources have these grants been made?

3. How many students have received assistance under the scheme in 1966?

4. How many students have been refused assistance this year because the family income exceeded \$6,900 a year?

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

1. A sum of \$79,327 comprising—
 (a) \$42,705 in grants; and
 (b) \$36,622 in loans.

Further offers of loans amounting to \$4,172 were not accepted.

2. The grants and loans listed in (1) were made in accordance with the fees concession scheme for which the Government had agreed to make financial provision.

3. 419.

4. Five students have been refused assistance because the adjusted family income exceeded \$6,900 a year. In addition, 12 metropolitan applicants were refused because the adjusted family income exceeded \$4,400 a year.

HOUSING TRUST.

Mr. COUMBE (on notice):

1. What numbers of flats and cottage flats, respectively, were built by the South Australian Housing Trust in each of the last three years?

2. What numbers of each are planned to be erected in the current financial year?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The replies are:

1. Flats built by the Housing Trust:
- | | |
|-------------------|-----|
| 1963-64 | 55 |
| 1964-65 | 45 |
| 1965-66 | 53* |

*No flats commenced.

Cottage flats built by the Housing Trust:

1963-64: 81 (32 let to trust tenants; 49 sold to charitable organizations).

1964-65: 93 (55 let to trust tenants; 38 sold to charitable organizations).

1965-66: 140 (63 let to trust tenants; 77 sold to charitable organizations).

2. The trust has not planned to commence the erection of any standard flats during the current financial year. The trust is planning to erect 50 cottage flats for letting and 99 for sale to charitable institutions, but these figures might be exceeded according to the demand from charitable institutions.

GOVERNMENT LAND.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What land owned by the Government, or by any body on behalf of the Government, has been sold since July 1, 1965?

2. What is the total price to be paid by the purchasers for such land?

3. Had such land been valued by the Land Board? If so, what was its valuation?

4. Does the Government propose to try to sell any other such land?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The replies are:

1. to 3. No large sales of land have been made by the Government. To tabulate all the sales of very small parcels of land in connection with water, sewers, highways, railways, Electricity Trust and Housing Trust operations would require staff and expenditure not available to the Government.

4. If land is surplus to Government requirements, yes.

TRAFFIC SURVEY.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What were the results of the count of pedestrians and the vehicular survey, respectively, which made up the special traffic survey at Measday Hill on April 29, 1966?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Results of the count of pedestrians and vehicular survey for the Measday Hill traffic survey carried out on April 29, 1966, between 6 a.m. and 10 p.m. are supplied herewith:

Pedestrian and Bus Survey.

	Buses to Adelaide.			Buses from Adelaide.			Total.
	Adults.	Child.	Sub-total.	Adults.	Child.	Sub-total.	
Boarding	—	—	—	5	1	6	6
Alighting	5	6	11	—	—	—	11

Vehicular Survey.

	To Charlick Road.			From Charlick Road.			Total.
	Cars.	Coms.	Sub-total.	Cars.	Coms.	Sub-total.	
Main South Eastern Road No. 1 (W)	46	2	48	59	—	59	107
Main South Eastern Road No. 1 (E)	—	—	—	17	3	20	20

CITIZEN MILITARY FORCES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Why is there a difference in policy on pay for members of the Citizen Military Forces between persons employed under the Public Service Act, and daily and weekly-paid Government employees, and employees of the South Australian Railways?

2. Is it intended to continue the present policies?

3. If not, when will an alteration be made?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The replies are:

1. The military leave conditions for Public Service officers were varied by Cabinet following a request from the Public Service Association of South Australia and a report by the Public Service Commissioner. The conditions for daily-paid and weekly-paid Government employees and employees of the South Australian Railways are under consideration following requests by unions.

2. and 3. These matters are under consideration by Cabinet.

HOUSING DEPARTMENT.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What direction, if any, has the Premier given to the South Australian Housing Trust, and what control, if any, has he exercised, pursuant to section 3a of the South Australian Housing Trust Act, since its enactment?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to set up a separate Department of Housing in this State?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The replies are:

1. The Minister has directed that matters of major policy concerned with the administration of the South Australian Housing Trust shall be referred to him for consideration. Control has thus been exercised in these matters.

2. No.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2).

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the Government of South Australia during the year ending June 30, 1967.

In Committee of Supply.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That towards defraying the expenses of the establishments and public services of the State for the year ending June 30, 1967, a sum of \$24,000,000 be granted: provided that no payments for any establishments or services shall be made out of the said sum in excess of the rates voted for similar establishments or services on the Estimates for the financial year ended June 30, 1966, except increases of salaries or wages fixed or prescribed by any return made under any Act relating to the Public Service, or by any regulation, or by any award, order, or determination of any court or other body empowered to fix or prescribe wages or salaries.

Motion carried.

Resolution adopted by the House. Bill founded in Committee of Ways and Means, introduced by the Hon. Frank Walsh, and read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It follows the usual form of Supply Bills and provides for the issue of a further \$24,000,000 so that the current financial commitments of the Government may be met during the period in which the Estimates of Expenditure and the Appropriation Bill will be considered by Parliament. Supply Act (No. 1) was for \$36,000,000 and its authority will suffice until early next month. This Bill for \$24,000,000 will bring the total authority for expenditure to \$60,000,000, and this should suffice until the latter part of October. I would expect the Appropriation Bill to have become law by then,

so that it should not be necessary for a third Supply Bill to be introduced. Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of \$24,000,000. Clause 3 provides for the payment of any increases in salaries or wages that may be authorized by any court or other body empowered to fix or prescribe salaries or wages.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I accept the Treasurer's word that this is only a formal Bill, and will follow the appropriation as outlined in his explanation, but I think the Opposition should have been informed that this Bill was to be presented here today. However, its passage would have been facilitated if we had been informed of its pending introduction. This was a courtesy extended by the previous Government, which informed the Opposition when these matters were to be introduced. Apparently, this policy has changed, and I protest against the change. There were some swift changes in the Government's handling of the Notice Paper last week, and that sort of thing does not facilitate the passage of any measure. The Opposition was confronted with a change in the order of items on the Notice Paper of which it was not informed. I remind the Treasurer that, to facilitate these matters, it would assist the Opposition if it had information about the Government's intentions.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I did not think I was slighting the Opposition. However, I did not know that the discussion that has been going on this afternoon was to take place. If that had not occurred, I would have told the Leader what was intended. It was never the intention of the Government to embarrass the Opposition on any of these matters but, if the Opposition wants to know everything, then I point out that today's Notice Paper will be followed to the best of the ability of the House. I will adjourn this matter if necessary, but the Bill has been explained, and I ask the House to agree to it.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Issue and application of \$24,000,000."

Mr. SHANNON: I have received one or two disquieting reports about the Government's policy of not replacing officers of various departments who have retired or resigned. Can the Treasurer say whether it is the Government's policy not to replace teachers in the Education Department who leave the service?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: There will always be resignations and retirements from the various departments, particularly the Edu-

cation Department. It is not the intention of the Government to curtail expenditure, particularly for the appointment of teachers.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As the Government has admitted spending about \$9,000,000 of trust funds in the last financial year, can the Treasurer say whether this clause authorizes him to use further funds from trust accounts?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: As I have said, I shall introduce the Budget at 7.45 p.m. on August 31. The passing of this Bill will ensure that salaries will be paid to public servants, and I assure the honourable member that I want my salary the same as others want theirs.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I shall not press the Treasurer because I do not think he can give a direct answer to my question, but I protest that he has not said whether this clause authorizes him to dip further into the trust funds.

Clause passed.

Clause 3 and title passed.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The reference made to trust funds a moment ago concerned Loan moneys. As we are dealing entirely with revenue on this occasion, I should have expected that the member for Mitcham, with all the knowledge that he professes to have, would have realized that that was so, and that we were not dealing with Loan moneys.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOAN ESTIMATES

In Committee.

(Continued from August 18. Page 1205.)

Public Buildings, \$22,310,000.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): Having earlier received a reply from the Treasurer to the effect that the 10 acres of Netley land purchased for the Government Printing Department cost \$290,000, I take it that that sum is included in the \$320,000, which is allocated for the purchase of land under "Other Government Buildings". However, I understand that the Municipal Tramways Trust holds about 16 acres of vacant land immediately adjacent to that 10 acres and that the local council concerned has approached the Minister of Transport to release the 16 acres held by the trust, for development.

Although the Minister has refused that request, I believe no reason has been given for holding the adjacent land. Will that 16

acres of land remain unoccupied, while the Government continues to subsidize the trust? If that happens, it will be a great waste of public money. Indeed, I believe that the trust is holding the land for purposes that no longer exist, so that, to all intents and purposes, the land can be regarded as Government property. Can the Treasurer say why this land is required?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): Land at Islington was examined for the purposes of establishing a new printing works, bearing in mind the level of the water table, etc., in the vicinity. A vital need also exists to transfer the Public Stores Department, which is at present sited on Railways Department property at Mile End and which the Government has been requested by the Railways Commissioner, time out of number, to have removed. As soon as the Islington land is subdivided for Government purposes generally, an exchange will be made for the land now held at Netley by the Municipal Tramways Trust. Having received a deputation from the West Torrens council only last Friday morning, I was informed that the price of the Netley land in question was \$15,000 an acre, which was established when the Griffin Press purchased land in the vicinity. Since then the price of land has been measured largely by the price paid at that time. The most direct route that the Government can foresee is down West Beach Road direct to where the Government Printing Department will be established. In addition, the Public Stores Department will be transferred to the site adjoining the Government Printing Department.

Mr. HALL: The Premier was either unaware of the import of my question or he confused it with some other matter. The Municipal Tramways Trust already holds about 16 acres at Netley and the Government has purchased 10 acres adjacent to this land for \$290,000, so there is an area of 26 acres of vacant land. I cannot understand what land at Islington has to do with this matter. If the Treasurer is suggesting that the trust will swap 26 acres at Netley for land at Islington, it becomes clear that the Government will hold 26 acres at Netley. Can the Treasurer explain why all this land is required, in view of his statement that the Government Printing Department and the Public Stores Department will be contained on 10 acres? I am not complaining about the price of the land: I am sure the Government purchasing authority would have ensured that the land was purchased for about its valuation.

However, I want to know why the Government requires this complex of land, and I would expect the Treasurer to have a report when a price of about \$300,000 is involved.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have already said that the Government has purchased land at Netley for a Government Printing Department and that I am informed that there will be an exchange of land at Islington for land at Netley, involving the M.T.T. I am not sure at the moment about the details of the position, but I know that many motor cars are being used to take people to their places of employment. I also realize that the provision of necessary car-parking space for industry is expensive. An industry will not be successful in obtaining necessary labour unless it has adequate parking facilities available. Many acres of land are used as parking areas for cars owned by people who travel a few miles to their places of employment, and that will happen wherever industry is established. The most successful industry is the one that provides necessary parking.

Mr. HALL: The Committee has not been told why all this land is required for Government departments that will occupy only 10 acres, particularly at a time when the State is heavily in debt. This is not good enough in State administration.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: I have already said what it is for.

Mr. HALL: The Treasurer has not explained what the land in addition to the 10 acres is required for. The money is being wasted if there are no plans for the development of the land. The Treasurer may be able to obtain from other Ministers information about what all this land is required for. In the last year the Government has spent unnecessarily other people's money. The Treasurer owes it to the Committee to give a better explanation than he has given so far.

Mr. CUMBE: The last item under Hospital Building, "Preliminary investigations and design, \$100,000", did not appear last year. This item may refer to planning of works that are subject to scrutiny by the Public Works Committee. I should like information on the matter, because last year and again this year the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) and I mentioned provision for the Strathmont mental institution. Can the Treasurer say whether some of this expenditure on preliminary investigations and design has been allocated to the Strathmont project so that advantage can be taken of Commonwealth subsidy? If it is not, can he say what the money is provided for?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Some of this money is associated with work on the Modbury hospital, and some may be associated with the south-western districts hospital. I am not sure about Strathmont, but representations have been made to the Commonwealth regarding subsidies and such matters. If I am able to obtain information regarding Strathmont, I shall supply it. I recall that the Chief Secretary was involved in conferences about the matter.

Mr. CUMBE: Is part of the allocation of \$100,000 for purchase of land in the provision for hospitals and buildings for the proposed south-western suburbs hospital, or has that land been provided for previously?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Land for the south-western suburbs hospital was paid for; \$5,000 an acre had to be advanced. I believe that was fully dealt with last year. However, when I have the complete information I shall give it to the Committee. It might be necessary to examine this land again later, as it might not be all that it looks to be.

Mr. SHANNON: Provision is made for major additions for the Maitland Area School. This could be misleading because I believe the money would be for the new school at Maitland. The old school consisted of many prefabricated buildings but I understand the new school is to supply all needs for students in Maitland.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The total estimated cost of the school is \$606,000; and the expected expenditure for 1966-67 is \$486,000. I do not know whether this is for the new or for the old school. Of the land at Netley, 10 acres is for the Government Printing Office, 16 acres for the Tramways Trust, and some is to be used for the extension of the Public Buildings Department.

Mr. SHANNON: Is the allocation of \$200,000 for agricultural college additions to go to Roseworthy Agricultural College? I understand that the Government must spend money in this connection before it is reimbursed by the Commonwealth Government. When the reimbursement is made, is it credited to Loan Account?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: We must spend the money and then redeem it. When the money is redeemed it will be put back into revenue.

Mr. Shannon: Not to Loan?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It must go to revenue before we can do anything with it.

I doubt whether we will have it to use this year.

Mr. SHANNON: I am a little disturbed about the delay taking place in the construction of the new women's prison. I do not suggest that the Government is to blame for the delay, but something should be done. The Public Works Committee examined the women's prison at the Adelaide Gaol two years ago and the conditions were anything but adequate. We recommended that the new gaol should be established. However, I do not think any provision is made for it in this year's Estimates.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: When the Chief Secretary presented his programme for Loan works this year he had to take it back for reconsideration. Undoubtedly he is mindful of the matter raised by the honourable member. The Government intends to provide a new prison but nothing is provided in this year's Estimates. However, as soon as it is humanly possible to make some provision this will be done.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Provision of \$43,000 is made for a police station and courthouse at Tanunda. Can the Treasurer say when these buildings will be available for occupation? Also, can he say what it is intended to do with the existing courthouse, which is a massive building about 100 years old? Does the Government intend to sell the building on the land on which it is situated, or to demolish it?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I do not have that information but as soon as I have it I will give it to the honourable member.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: As the Treasurer knows, I am interested in Samecon schools, and \$740,000 is provided to extend Samecon school units and components. Can the Treasurer say for how many Samecon school units this sum will provide and what components are envisaged? Provision is also made for minor alterations to school buildings of about \$1,250,000. On Monday morning of this week, I went to Kapunda at the request of the President and Secretary of the Kapunda High School Council to inspect the proposed works to be done at the Kapunda High School.

Over the last three or four years, the high school council has been active in purchasing blocks of lands to the south of the school as part of its overall plan for a new oval. Only two months ago the final block of land, negotiations for which had been delayed, was acquired compulsorily by the Government, so the Public Buildings Department can now go ahead and

level this area. The high school council is most anxious to press on with the seeding of the oval. Promises were given the council that funds would be found this year for levelling and preparing this recently-acquired land. Will the Treasurer let me know in due course whether the sum allocated for minor works will include the levelling works to be done on the new oval at the Kapunda High School?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: There is no immediate line for this purpose. A reference was made to Samecon buildings. Although these are doing a splendid job in difficult circumstances, there is still experimental work to be done, and until that work is finalized there is little hope of ascertaining exactly what costs will be involved. Levelling is generally done as a result of a tender arranged by the Education Department and the Public Buildings Department, and I imagine that as soon as those arrangements have been made the work will proceed.

Mr. RODDA: I refer to the line "Struan Farm—Alterations and Additions, \$23,000". I know that the Superintendent has been anxious for some time to have a new shed erected at Struan. It would be necessary for such a shed to have doors and be capable of being locked. Can the Treasurer say whether this amount is for a new shed or for alterations to existing buildings?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Public Buildings Department is investigating the question of the type of structure needed, as it appeared that the estimate presented was a little out of proportion to what normally would be required for a place to house implements. The Minister of Works tells me that only this week we approved of a contract for a scullery and a toilet block. The other question is being further investigated.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The \$10,640,000 allocated for school buildings indicates the harsh cut in the amount of money proposed to be spent on education facilities during the coming 12 months, and this gives the lie to the lip service we often hear that this Government is interested in education. Because there is this very substantial cut in the amount allocated for the erection of school buildings, I guess that the Government is in some difficulty regarding priorities for school buildings. As I understand it, there always has been great pressure for the building of schools. In fact, the pressure has always been for the building of a greater number of schools than it has been possible for any Government in the past to cope with. Obviously, the Government this

year will be in extreme difficulty because of its inability to provide money even to match the programme in the last 12 months: in fact, there is over \$1,000,000 less. How will the Minister of Education settle priorities for schools? Will he concentrate on secondary, primary or area schools? What principle will he adopt to eke out the meagre amount of money allotted him by the Treasurer?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): It so happens that I have in my bag some of the principles upon which the question of priority of schools is determined. It is determined on an examination of the precise position by my officers, who take into account whether a school is desirable and essential in accordance with a set of criteria. These are: the need for a new school in a new locality; the inability of a site to permit of further essential expansion without consolidation of buildings; the need to replace a set of buildings markedly inadequate or unsatisfactory; the avoidance of the need (taking account of the date) to erect additional wooden rooms where the proportion of wooden rooms is already high; and the general desirability of replacing wooden by solid construction rooms. Of course, in new areas where there is a population explosion a new school has to be provided for children who are bound to go to school at a particular time.

This can be easily ascertained by watching the expansion of a district. My officers have been particularly active in this, with very few errors in their estimates. There have been one or two occasions in Elizabeth when we have had to take children from a school by bus to another school because the number attending exceeded those anticipated. However, generally speaking, our officers have made very accurate estimates of the situation, and all these things are taken into account in deciding priorities. The officers report to me, as Minister, in regard to their consideration of where the priorities lie.

Mr. FERGUSON: The only reason I can think of why the line on the Estimates for the new Maitland Area School is listed as major improvements instead of new work is that the original building is being retained as part of the new area school. I understand it is intended to retain the old building for Grades I and II and that the rest of the school will be shifted to the new site. Obviously, it will be unsatisfactory for one part of a school to be situated on the southern boundary of a town while the other (and major) part of it is situated half a mile away, on the northern

boundary of the town, because this means that two playing areas and two canteens will have to be maintained. It would be difficult for the headmaster of that school to maintain adequate control over two buildings half a mile apart. Can this situation be remedied as soon as possible by erecting on the new site a building suitable for accommodating Grades I and II also?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Public Works Committee investigates these matters. I understand that 10 acres is still the minimum requirement for a primary school and twice that amount for a high school. In this case the Public Works Committee's recommendation has been accepted, so we shall see what can be done about the matter when the next opportunity occurs.

Mr. McANANEY: Does the big reduction of over \$1,000,000 for school buildings mean that there will be more congestion in the schools or is it expected that there will be a reduction in the numbers of schoolchildren next year because of the decline in the rate of our population increase and in the net total of migrants gained by South Australia?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: It is anticipated that there will be 8,000 new enrolments in the schools next year. It was generally conceded that the amount of money spent on buildings last year (I stand to be corrected on this, because I have not the figures with me) was slightly in excess of that spent in previous years. Although there is some reduction this year, I do not admit it is excessive. We could spend more money, but I remind the honourable member that at present we are getting tenders for school buildings showing a saving on what was anticipated. I imagine that the amount of Loan money spent this year on schools will go further in terms of actual school space provided than would be the case otherwise. This is borne out by the Chairman of the Public Works Committee.

Mr. CURREN: I see that under "Other Government Buildings" an amount of \$70,000 is set aside for "Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science—Laboratory, Berri Hospital". Some time ago it was announced that this building would be included in this programme. It was also suggested that a radiology block be established at the same time in the one building contract. Can the Treasurer say whether this will happen?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: No; we have not the detail on that other than what is provided here but, if other buildings or equipment are to be installed, we shall find out

what the position is and let the honourable member know.

Mr. CUMBE: Under "School Buildings" I notice a credit of \$800,000 provided by special Commonwealth grant towards science laboratories and technical training. This is the money provided by Commonwealth subsidies towards expenditure made by this State under this item. When the Treasurer was giving his explanation in his main document, he said that last year, 1965-66, for the same item the amount of money provided from special Commonwealth grant towards science laboratories and technical training was \$1,156,000, whereas this year it is \$800,000. Can the Treasurer explain the reduction in this grant and say whether this sum is all that we are able to match?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Perhaps our estimates are not always exactly correct but in most cases the position resolves itself. There is nothing to be alarmed about in this, because we have been able to match what we have been promised.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In the list of major works for which planning and design is proposed during 1966-67, no reference is made to a school at Musgrave Park. I know there are problems of attendance and teachers' accommodation at this school, and there has been a public controversy about its necessity, but can the Minister of Education say what the programme is for the erection of this school?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Provision is not made under that line as it is regarded as a minor work, not a major work. At present, the Public Buildings Department is trying to find the most suitable type of building to be erected at Musgrave Park. The matter is being proceeded with now, and we hope to have the school operative by the middle of 1967 or early in 1968. I believe that the building will be a prefabricated type not made by the department, and the Minister of Works informs me that an attempt is being made to call for tenders within a month. The matter is being proceeded with as quickly as possible.

Mr. HALL: Under the line "Other Government Buildings", \$200,000 is provided for additions to Roseworthy Agricultural College. It has been difficult to obtain a direct answer from the Treasurer whether this money must come from the Commonwealth Government or not. As I see no other possibility than that this money must be a full reimbursement from

the Commonwealth Government for the additions at the college, can the Treasurer say whether this is a fact?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: This amount has to be shown on the Loan Estimates for the work to be done. When the work is completed, the Commonwealth Government's reimbursement will be paid into revenue, as I told the member for Onkaparinga an hour ago.

Mr. HALL: In apologizing to the Treasurer, I am thankful that he has at last said the sum will come from the Commonwealth Government. However, I should have thought the sum had to be reimbursed within this financial year. If that is not so, why is provision made in these Estimates? In his explanation, the Treasurer said that the Commonwealth Government was prepared to make grants to the State that "may" be used towards this project. Why was not the word "will" used? Why do we have this reluctance to give credit to the Commonwealth Government? The sum of \$163,000 is allocated this year for the Government Motor Garage, \$64,000 having been approved under this line last year. As we were told that the final cost was to be \$174,000, could the Treasurer explain this discrepancy?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Although I do not have the precise information, I point out that provision was previously made for land acquisition and work involved in levelling the land. I believe about \$160,000 was estimated for the actual construction work. Some alterations were made to the plan, effecting a reduction in the covered-in area. Although I am not sure of the actual sum, I know that the cost of the project was previously estimated not to exceed \$200,000.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Although I presume that work to be undertaken at the Cadell Training Centre is included in the line "Minor Alterations and Additions", can the Treasurer ascertain precisely what work at the centre will be undertaken this year?

Mr. COUMBE: This year, \$500,000 is allocated for the Bedford Park Teachers College (\$300,000 having been allocated last year), out of a total estimated cost on completion of \$3,000,000. The Education Department witnesses, when giving evidence to the Public Works Committee, emphasized that, in order to overcome crowding in the other existing teachers colleges and to work in with the facilities to be provided by the new Flinders university, it was desired that the first students at the new Bedford Park Teachers College would be enrolled in January, 1967. Can the Minister of Education give an assur-

ance that the first students will, in fact, be enrolled then?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: It is doubtful whether the first students will be enrolled in January, 1967. I think the honourable member knows that there are 133 teachers college students at the Flinders university, and we expect that, by the time the university requires that accommodation, there will not be sufficient accommodation for them in the Bedford Park Teachers College. We shall therefore have to find temporary accommodation for those students until the Bedford Park Teachers College is ready.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Minister of Works say whether the office accommodation in Victoria Square (for which \$1,000,000 is allocated) will be ready for occupation before the present Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. Dridan) retires? I am delighted that Mr. Dridan has been appointed Chairman of the Housing Trust. Having played a most important part in the State's development as head of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, Mr. Dridan will, I am sure, give excellent service to the Housing Trust. I am delighted to know that his services to the State will continue to be available.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: No provision is made in the Estimates for additions to the Karoonda Area School, which was investigated by the Public Works Committee. The recommendation was:

The committee is satisfied that the accommodation at present provided at the Karoonda Area School is unsatisfactory and inadequate and it adopts the department's proposals. During informal discussions on the site it was emphasized by members of the school committee that some of the temporary classrooms could be used to great advantage on the existing site. It is realized that the department already has this matter under consideration and the committee is of the opinion that after the new building is erected the desirability of retaining some of the existing classrooms for beneficial use could be further examined.

The committee recommended the construction of a new secondary school building at an estimated cost of \$330,000. The witnesses examined by the committee were Mr. N. L. Haines (Assistant Superintendent of Rural Schools, Education Department) and Mr. R. W. Johns (Senior Design Architect, Public Building Department). I and the people in the district are extremely disappointed that this school is not provided for on the Estimates, because this was one of the first area schools approved by the department. Wood and iron buildings were brought from schools in surrounding areas

to the present site many years ago and the committee was told at that time that these buildings would be only temporary. However, the population is increasing rapidly and the accommodation is totally inadequate. I hope that the Government will do something later to overcome the problem. Apparently, many other schools have received priority on these Estimates, although additions have already been made at those schools.

Mr. HALL: Last year \$64,000 was provided to commence the construction of buildings in Gilles Street for a new Government Motor Garage. I understand that the land the Treasurer mentioned in his explanation was purchased by the previous Government and, therefore, the cost of that land would not be included in the amount provided last year or this year. An amount of \$163,000 is provided for the garage this year. So, the total provided last year and this year is \$227,000. However, the Treasurer has said that the estimated cost is \$174,000. Can the Treasurer give the reason for the discrepancy and say why the money was not spent last year, when building was coming to a slack period and there seemed to be no reason in the trade for not expending the money? I do not think any back door way of increasing expenditure is involved, but the Treasurer should be able to obtain information so that the Committee would know the reason for the difference between the amount provided and the estimated cost.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have made a note and I shall obtain the information. I shall inform the Leader as soon as I get it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I refer to items in the first appendix on school buildings. The estimated cost of additions at the Upper Sturt Primary School is \$63,000. I have made representations to both this Government and the previous Government over a number of years on this matter, and it is now on the list of major works projected. Can the Treasurer or the Minister of Education say when it is likely that this new school will be ready for occupation?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: If I had a crystal ball, I might be able to answer now. However, I shall obtain the information.

Mr. HUGHES: I convey the appreciation of the people in my district of the liberal way in which they have been treated in the last two years regarding school buildings. An amount of \$68,000 has been made available for the completion of a new girls' craft centre at the Kadina Memorial High School. The building is pre-cast concrete. The girls are

taught cooking with gas and electricity, and provision has been made for the teaching of other domestic work—even washing, for which washing machines will be available.

This building enhances the beauty of the school and, although an inspector who visited the school about three or four years ago did not accept my suggestion that she recommend the construction of a building of the type that has now been erected, other inspectors who were more sympathetic also visited the school and this new building has been built in alignment with the old solid construction building. I have inspected the school on many occasions, as have many members of the public, and last Sunday week I was proud to accompany my wife as the Chairman of the High School Council there. I convey to the Treasurer, and to the Minister of Education and his colleagues, their appreciation for the provision of this building.

Provision is made for \$81,000 for a new Sameon school at Wallaroo Mines. I remember attending a meeting with the then Assistant Superintendent of Primary Schools (Mr. Dodd) in connection with a request for extensive repairs to be carried out at the old Wallaroo Mines school. It could be seen then that it would be useless to spend huge sums of money on the old school because it was affected by skimps from the nearby dumps. It was suggested that consideration be given to the erection of a new school on a site removed from the effects of the skimps. Mr. Dodd brought the recommendation back to Adelaide.

I had many discussions with the late Jack Whitburn on problems of constructing the new school. I pay a compliment to Mr. Whitburn for the co-operation I received from him in ironing out the problems, and it was upon his recommendation that it was decided to erect a new school. The previous Government promised to erect the school but this Government made available the money for its erection. I express the thanks of the Wallaroo Mines people for this fine new school building of which they are proud and in which they are taking a great interest. They have planted trees and roses around the building and have prepared the ground for lawn. Therefore, although various Opposition members have said that their districts have not been treated well enough in the Estimates, I acknowledge that I appreciate what has been done in the Wallaroo District in the way of schools.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I regret that the Treasurer was not able to give me the information I sought on the Upper Sturt Primary

School. A sum of \$52,000 is provided for Unley High—Girls' Craft (precast concrete). I welcome this but should be glad if the Treasurer could give any further details about this school. A sum of \$66,000 is provided for a workshop at Urrbrae Agricultural High School. I do not blame this Government alone for what has not been done in the provision of a new school at Urrbrae, because nothing was done when the previous Government was in office. Over the years the council of the school, the old scholars and all associated with Urrbrae have been most anxious that substantial additions to the present premises be built.

However, they never have been although they have been promised from time to time. Now they seem to be as far away as ever, with only the promise in these Estimates of a workshop. Of course, the workshop is most necessary but it is only a small part of what is required at Urrbrae and of what has been asked for ever since I have been a member. I ask the Minister of Education when it is likely that the Government will be able to consider the new school for Urrbrae. I know the great difficulty the Government has about money, which compounds the difficulties that the previous Government had.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I am very conscious of the needs of the Urrbrae Agricultural High School, as I am conscious of the needs of many other schools that need replacement. May I say that as Minister I am refraining from making any promises about the replacement of existing schools, because it is most unfair, in my opinion, in present circumstances to make those promises for the very good reason that the building of new schools in areas where there is a population explosion is absorbing all our Loan funds. Recently on my way to Whyalla I called at a school the replacement of which had been promised by the previous Government since 1938. I think the previous Government had its difficulties in this direction, too. I merely point out that many schools badly need replacing. We are trying to meet the needs of a large migrant population. We have accepted, I think, 15 per cent of the migrants who have come to Australia, which is a very high proportion considering our proportion of 9 per cent or 10 per cent of the total Australian population, and that has contributed greatly to our difficulties in replacing the older schools. I think I pointed out earlier that our officers look at this question of priority most scrupulously and carefully. They

can assess these priorities only on the situation as it exists, and, if a school is functioning reasonably well, there is no question of its replacement in present circumstances.

Mr. Millhouse: And that applies to Urrbrae? The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Treasurer give me the information I requested about the Unley Girls High School?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The total estimated expenditure is \$52,000, and \$22,000 has been allocated for work this year. The workshop block at the Urrbrae Agricultural High School is estimated to cost \$66,000, and \$36,000 is to be spent on it this year.

Line passed.

Other Capital Grants and Advances, \$13,130,000.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This is a new heading in these Estimates. I refer to the line "Electricity Trust of South Australia—Loan to, \$6,700,000". When explaining the Estimates the Treasurer detailed the \$35,000,000 expansion programme of the trust during the coming 12 months. As we know, a good proportion of this is for work at the Torrens Island power station. One of the most important problems we as a State are facing is the question of the building of a gas pipeline and the use of natural gas. One of the greatest (if not the greatest) users of natural gas will be the Electricity Trust. I understand that the Torrens Island power station is being constructed in such a way that it will be capable of adaptation for the use of natural gas rather than fuel oil, which I think is the fuel now contemplated to be used. Can the Treasurer tell me whether that is so and, if it is, how long it will take to make the required alterations at Torrens Island to burn natural gas once we know that the supply is assured and when it will be assured? It is a matter of the greatest importance to us all that it be possible to use this fuel.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I believe it is estimated that it will be possible to use it in 1968. However, I understand that residual fuel will be used during the running-in period.

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Treasurer give me any information about the conversion of the new Torrens Island power station to the use of natural gas?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: No; I have not been able to get the information the honourable member is seeking. I have already said that a report is being prepared on the projected

gas pipeline and everything associated with it, and that includes the use of natural gas by the Electricity Trust. I cannot at present give any information about the report and, until I get it, I cannot give a proper answer. Everything that can be done by the Government to get this report prepared and finalized is being done.

Mr. COUMBE: I refer to flat-building. In answer to my question today on notice the Treasurer indicated that last year no flat-building was commenced and that in this financial year it is not planned to commence the erection of any standard flats. I do not refer to the cottage flats being built by the Housing Trust, which have my full support. The latest publication of the Housing Trust indicates that this type of flat-building, of two or three storeys, was commenced in 1956-57 and that so far 1,367 flats of this type have been built in South Australia, of which 220 were completed at Elizabeth. These were built for a specific purpose and a particular need; they proved popular. In my district there is not one Housing Trust house but in the last two years two groups of Housing Trust flats have been built—one at Mellor Court, Walkerville, and another opposite the Walkerville town hall. They fulfil a desirable need and attract a good type of tenant.

For some reason, however, the Government has suddenly stopped building this type of flat in the metropolitan area and elsewhere in the State. It is expected that none will be built in 1966-67. Apparently, it is the deliberate policy of the Government to stop this type of building, which has been a marked success, as indicated by the fact that the Housing Trust has a waiting list of prospective tenants. For many years I have advocated higher density living in Adelaide. This type of building fits in with the Attorney-General's idea of an inner suburban development scheme, so it would meet with his approval. Can the Treasurer tell the Committee why this type of building has suddenly stopped?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Government has not instructed the Housing Trust to curtail its activities in flat-building. The only time the Government intervened was in respect of the proposed multi-storey flats in East Terrace. It has never told the trust not to proceed with the building of other types of flat. Perhaps there is some doubt whether or not these flats should go beyond three storeys. Another point is whether they can still be erected without incurring the need for excessive rental charges. I do not know what prices

are being paid for land in the honourable member's district but I know the Housing Trust has tended to build the \$100 deposit houses, which have been well received by the people. Also, some semi-detached units are to be erected this year. I can say nothing beyond that at the moment.

Mr. McANANEY: About 60 per cent of the total programme is to come from internal and other funds. Can the Treasurer tell us what those funds are?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall be presenting the Budget shortly. Great assistance has been offered by the Savings Bank of South Australia and, according to what I read hurriedly in the press this morning, some money is to come from the Commonwealth Bank, too.

Mr. HEASLIP: The heart of the city of Adelaide has been dying for some time. In the East Terrace project land was purchased to erect multi-storey flats. We read in today's paper that Perth is building flats 25 storeys high, which will bring about a closer density living. Apparently Western Australia is ahead of South Australia because we are losing people to that State. We used to bring people from there to here, but now the position is reversed, especially as that State has full employment. Adelaide is sprawling too much, and land values in the centre of the city have dropped. A virile and active centre of the city is necessary, and we must have closer density living to do that. If Adelaide is to progress, multi-storey buildings should be erected in the city to house people and to overcome transport problems.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I recollect that one of my colleagues in another place introduced legislation giving the city council every opportunity to erect flats, provided it retained the ownership. Surely the Government is not expected to buy land on park land frontages or where houses already exist. Many places have been demolished in Adelaide but nothing has been built on the sites. Occasionally, the trust has tried to buy cottages in suburban areas at a reasonable cost, especially those that are substandard, so that it could erect flats or widen a street. The trust will probably build no higher than three-storey units: if built higher than that lifts must be provided, which increases costs. If the trust can purchase suitable land in Adelaide for the erection of flats, it will do so, but it is time that free enterprise organizations helped by building flats in the city of Adelaide.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: For the first time two new major items are being charged against Loan Account rather than against revenue—University and Advanced Education Buildings, \$3,800,000 and Non-Government Hospital Buildings, \$2,600,000. In explaining these items, the Treasurer said:

For many years it has been the practice in this State to charge against Revenue Account those grants to institutions for tertiary education and to non-Government hospitals which are for buildings. Comparable expenditures for buildings for departmental schools, for Government hospitals, and for other departmental purposes, however, have regularly been charged to Loan Account.

The obvious reasons are that they are assets that are acquired by the Government in exchange for the investment of Loan moneys. The Treasurer continued:

The other Australian States adopt the general practice of charging such appropriations for building against Loan Account, whether they be by way of grants to institutions for tertiary education or non-Government hospitals, or direct expenditures for Government buildings. There can be no dispute that, if it can be afforded, the practice of charging building grants against Revenue Account rather than Loan Account is desirable. However, it would be foolhardy to continue this practice whilst the effect of charging them against Revenue Account is to put that account into further deficit, and then to require a funding of the resulting deficit out of a Loan surplus, with the penal consequences flowing from the provisions of sections 3 (10) and 12 (10) of the Financial Agreement.

He went on to say that he proposed to do this "so long as it is necessary". This is a barefaced attempt to circumvent the provisions of the Financial Agreement. It may succeed politically, but it would never be tolerated in arrangements between private citizens. We are attempting to escape the provisions of the agreement when a deficit is funded, so we are simply saying, "In future, to avoid funding a deficit, we will charge certain items against the Loan Account direct, and not against Revenue Account. That will relieve the Revenue Account, and will allow it nominally to remain in balance." That is absolutely wrong, in my view, because of the purposes for which the moneys allocated for the items of "Universities and advanced education buildings" and "Non-Government hospital buildings" are being used. Obviously, the moneys for those purposes should come from revenue. Not even a child could be taken in by such a device; it is a mere juggling of the books of account of this State, and I have no doubt at all that if this had to be construed in a court of law (as, indeed, it may have to be construed) it would certainly

be regarded as an obvious trick to avoid our obligations under the Financial Agreement.

In justification of what he has done, the Treasurer says that other States do it. I should like to know a little more about that, but this is the first time South Australia has had to do it. It is humiliating that we should have to resort to doing something that would be regarded as between citizens as a dishonest device. Of course, from a mere bookkeeping angle, it is entirely unsatisfactory to do this, because we are using Loan moneys (moneys for capital investment) that should be used to acquire assets for the Government for non-capital works. We are giving this money away; it is money on which the Government has to pay interest, and the Government itself obtains no return at all.

Mr. Coumbe: We do not even own the buildings.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course; that is the whole point. The Treasurer may chuckle; he may think it is funny. I do not know whether that is because he does not understand what he is doing, or whether there is some other reason for it. I believe every member of the Committee should view this matter seriously. Let me remind the Treasurer (although, heaven knows, he was a grown and mature man when it happened) that the States and the Commonwealth entered into the Financial Agreement for two reasons: first, so that the Commonwealth could take over the then existing State public debts; and, secondly, so that the Loan Council could be set up to regulate and restrict future public borrowings, both by the Commonwealth and the States. In 1928 the Commonwealth Constitution was amended to validate the agreement into which the States and the Commonwealth had entered, and a new section (105a) was written into the Constitution. What are the obligations under the Financial Agreement, which South Australia is now trying to avoid? The first obligation to which I refer is contained in clause 5 of Part I of the Financial Agreement, the relevant paragraph of which states (the clause having earlier referred to the powers of the States to borrow moneys):

The Commonwealth shall not be under any obligation to make sinking fund contributions in respect of moneys borrowed or used pursuant to this clause to meet a revenue deficit of a State but the provisions of clause 4 (d) of Part II and of clause 3 (j) of Part III of this agreement shall apply respectively to all moneys borrowed or used for that purpose.

Clause 4 (d) of Part II states:

In respect of any loan raised after June 30, 1927, by a State or by the Commonwealth for and on behalf of a State to meet a revenue deficit accruing after that date no sinking fund contribution shall be payable by the Commonwealth, but that State shall pay from revenue a sinking fund contribution at a rate of not less than 4 per centum per annum on the amount of that loan.

Finally, clause 3 (j) states:

In respect of any loan raised after June 30, 1927, by a State or by the Commonwealth for and on behalf of a State to meet a revenue deficit accruing after that date no sinking fund contribution shall be payable by the Commonwealth, but that State shall for a period sufficient to provide for the exemption of that loan pay from revenue in each year during such period a sinking fund contribution at a rate of not less than four per centum per annum of the amount of that loan . . .

We are, in fact, funding our deficit in this way just as surely as though the Revenue Accounts were to be allowed to get into deficit. There is no doubt at all that if the Commonwealth wanted to make us honour our obligations (that is, to pay 4 per cent on the moneys we are using in this way), it could do so. Section 105a (3), which was written into the Commonwealth Constitution in 1928, states:

Parliament may make loans for the carrying out by the parties thereto of any such agreement.

The "parties" are the parties to the Financial Agreement, 1927, and the Commonwealth is given power to make loans for the carrying out of obligations under it. Subsection (5) states:

Every such agreement and any such variation thereof shall be binding upon the Commonwealth and the States parties thereto notwithstanding anything contained in this Constitution or the Constitution of the several States or in any law of the Parliament of the Commonwealth or of any State.

Therefore, there is an absolute obligation on us to honour the provisions of the Financial Agreement.

Mr. Hall: This money represents dead weight.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Indeed, it does, so far as the State's funds are concerned.

Mr. Hall: There's no return on interest.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No. Let me remind the Treasurer, who is apparently studying something else at present, that something similar has happened before in the history of this country, namely, in the case of Mr. Jack Lang, who was a Labor Premier of New South Wales in the early 1930's. His Government attempted to default and not to fulfil its obligations under the Financial Agreement.

The point I refer to is that the Government of New South Wales, a Labor Government led by Mr. Jack Lang, attempted to avoid its obligations under the Financial Agreement and the Commonwealth Government passed two Acts that, in effect that, garnisheed the revenues of the State of New South Wales to satisfy the obligation of that State to the Commonwealth. These were the Financial Agreement (Commonwealth Liability) Act of 1932 and the Financial Agreement Enforcement Act of the same year.

The State of New South Wales attempted to justify its position by having those two Acts declared invalid by the High Court. I see the Attorney-General is becoming impatient. I do not know whether he disagrees with what I am saying: I do not know whether he advised his Treasurer on the legality of the course he has adopted, or whether he and the other Ministers of this Government do not care whether what they are doing is legal or illegal, honourable or dishonourable. By the look on the Attorney's face, I think the position is that he does not care. This matter is of the utmost gravity to the people of this State, and it ill-behoves the Attorney-General, as law officer of the Crown, to try to laugh it off.

Mr. McKee: He is laughing you off.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He who laughs last shall laugh the loudest. The Attorney-General knows that what I am saying is correct and that what we, as a State, are doing is a disgrace. What, in the course of their judgment, did Mr. Justice Rich and Mr. Justice Owen Dixon, as he then was, say? It is perhaps noteworthy (and the Attorney-General may take some comfort from this fact) that the then Mr. Justice Evatt dissented. Nevertheless, the majority of the High Court held that those two Commonwealth Acts were valid. This is what they said in their judgment:

In our opinion the effect of this provision is to make any agreement of the required description obligatory upon the Commonwealth and the States, to place its operation and efficacy beyond the control of any law of any of the seven Parliaments and to prevent any constitutional principle or provision operating to defeat or diminish or condition the obligatory force of the Agreement.

Yet we, by a bare-faced trick, are trying to get around the agreement itself. The Commonwealth could do, in law, the same to us as it did to the former unlamented Government of New South Wales, the Lang Labor Government. It is disgraceful and humiliating that, after 17 months of Labor Government in South Australia, we are reduced to this situation, and

one can only imagine the feelings of the Treasury officers who have had to advise the Treasurer to use such a ruse as this to try to get out of the financial mess into which the Government has led us. This is apart altogether from the "temporary" use of trust funds, and the severe cuts in Loan works that this Government has been forced to make. I hope that this will have some effect. I rise to make my emphatic protest against such unsound and dishonest budgeting.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have listened to the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) with much interest. In considering this matter, we should remember that the Financial Agreement is a part of the Commonwealth Constitution. It is one of the few referenda that have been carried. It came into effect as a result of an agreement entered into between the States and the Commonwealth in 1927, and was one of the few matters that have been included in the Constitution since the original Constitution was drawn up.

In 1927 the States did not enter into the Financial Agreement with much delight. Up to that time, the Commonwealth had made per capita payments to the States out of the revenues from import duties and excise, and this took away from the States the per capita grants they received, but in place of it the Commonwealth at that time took over the whole of the States' debts. The States agreed that they would pay into a Sinking Fund Account as far as the future debts incurred were concerned, and they also agreed to pay into that account as far as their deficits were concerned, which would have to be funded out of Loan Funds to provide the necessary cash.

So the Treasurer, by transferring some amounts that were normally and properly charged to Revenue and placing them in the Loan Budget, is putting an obligation on the Commonwealth Treasury to pay its share of the Sinking Fund and is reducing the proper payments that would be made in connection with this matter from 4 per cent to $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. I consider that, if the matter comes before the National Debt Sinking Fund Commissioners, an order will be made against South Australia. I say that because I know that on a previous occasion some Governments in Australia were threatened with an order. If the Attorney is sufficiently interested and open-minded to listen, I point out that the circumstances at that time were closely analogous to the circumstances here. They were sufficiently similar to bear some relation to this problem.

In the years from 1930 to 1933 the Commonwealth had not yet assumed responsibility for the unemployed relief payments and the States, with their inadequate finance, were called upon, for the sake of humanity, to provide something to keep together the bodies and souls of the unfortunates who could not get work. The circumstances of the grants were such that no one could possibly support them.

The type of assistance given was miserable and inadequate, but it was as much as the States could afford at that time. Indeed, it was beyond their financial resources. As a consequence, the Commonwealth said, "We will grant you the right to take up Treasury bills for the amount that you have to meet in unemployment relief." The States were charged only 1 per cent. These Treasury bills were used exclusively for unemployment relief. I think they were on a three-month basis, but the States had the right to renew them at the end of the three months. A large sum was made available to the States by this type of finance and the bills continued to be renewed every three months until in 1939, 1940 or 1941 the Chief Justice of the High Court, who was the Chairman of the National Debt Sinking Fund, served an order on the Commonwealth and the States. This order stated that, as the Financial Agreement was not being properly complied with, arrangements would have to be made forthwith to comply with it or he would take suitable action.

The States and the Commonwealth considered the matter and as a result immediately made arrangements for a funding of these amounts and for the sinking fund payments to be made. Therefore, the Treasury bill finance was wiped out. The States at that time had a legal device that was not completely prescribed by the Financial Agreement, although the agreement does not specifically state that the States and the Commonwealth cannot have Treasury finance. However, the Chief Justice decided that this was an arrangement to circumvent the agreement and that the sinking fund payments should be made. He was trustee for the bondholders.

I have no doubt that this is a device for avoiding the payment of some sinking funds although it does not avoid paying all. The argument of the member for Mitcham perhaps falls down in that there will be some sinking fund payments, as one-half per cent will be paid by the State and one-quarter per

cent by the Commonwealth, which means that the debt will be liquidated. Under the agreement the period is 53 years, but the provisions regarding a deficit are different. There is no Commonwealth contribution to a deficit: the State has to pay 4 per cent forthwith and liquidate the debt in, I think, 20 years.

The honourable member's objection is a proper one, as the Treasurer has made clear that his purpose is to avoid having a deficit. The honourable member objects to the fact that we are spending money on assets that do not belong to the State, and in that respect I doubt whether this is a good device. I know from experience that, in relation to Treasury bills for unemployment relief, the States had to provide proper sinking fund payments, as the Chief Justice had decided that a device had been used to circumvent the agreement. I do not think the case quoted by the member for Mitcham is completely analogous, and the case I have quoted is certainly not. However, the Treasurer has said that this is a device. He has said that it is no good charging this to revenue as a deficit, as we will ultimately have to take it into the Loan Fund and pay interest at a higher rate.

This matter needs investigation, quite apart from the fact that it is completely unsound to spend money upon which we have to pay interest for a long period. This debt will not be repaid for 53 years. We should keep our accounts straight, because once the accounting system is twisted to meet circumstances it is not satisfactory. Only last week the Attorney-General publicly made a special plea for honesty in accounting, and I hope he gives this advice to the Treasurer in relation to Loan accounts. As the Attorney-General said, if you do not keep your accounts straight you do not fool anyone but yourself. If something is charged to one account this year and to another the next year purely to prevent the sinking fund provisions of the agreement from operating, it will not be long before we are pulled up with a sudden jerk.

Mr. SHANNON: On the face of it, there appears to be no attempt here to comply with the spirit of the 1927 agreement between the Commonwealth and the States. The first thing the State expects to get for its Loan Fund expenditure is an asset, if possible a revenue-producing asset that will help to pay for the debt incurred. This is not the intention of the provision in this case.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: How much revenue do we get from schools?

Mr. SHANNON: In that case the Government renders a service to the people. The Police Department is another service from which there is no direct return, but there is an indirect return from both expenditures.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: So there is from this.

Mr. SHANNON: It would appear that future generations of taxpayers in the State will carry some of this burden. To overcome its difficulties, the Government is now trying to rearrange the Financial Agreement. If a deficit is accounted for in this way—by a bookkeeping entry—will some future Government finish up having to pay 4 per cent interest for this money? As no-one would have had more experience in accounts than the member for Gumeracha, I am prepared to accept what he has said and, as I do not believe there would be any statutory limitation involved in this case, if a future Commonwealth Government decided to look into this matter if could be that a future Government could be saddled with an additional charge.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The Financial Agreement is binding on all States and your colleagues in other States are doing what we are doing.

Mr. SHANNON: If there is an attempt by various States to avoid their just obligations—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: There is no avoidance.

Mr. SHANNON: As I understand it, a revenue deficit falls into a separate category under the provisions of the Commonwealth law with regard to the Financial Agreement. If that is true and if a correct assessment of the Loan and Revenue Accounts is ever taken in any of the States doing what the Attorney-General says they are doing, then there will be an accounting for everybody at some stage. I want to know what would happen if a future Commonwealth Government decided that this State was funding its deficits by using Loan funds and decided to get back the money. I believe that this could be done legally. If ever that point were raised of the States using this method of balancing their internal revenue accounts by using Loan moneys, then they might have a rude awakening.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I agree with what my colleagues have said. Apparently the Attorney-General did not grasp the point made by the member for Onkaparinga. As he tried to show, it is the function of money spent through the Loan programme to try to create an asset for the State. In this case we are passing our money over to hospital institutions

and I have no quarrel about the work they do, with their worthiness or with the necessity for them to be heavily supported by the public purse in their capital works. We are handing over borrowed money, which should be used to create an asset for the State, to private organizations not directly accountable to the State for the funds so expended. In other words, we are giving away to private institutions money that we have borrowed for the purpose of creating developmental assets. I believe this is wrong; I cannot discuss the legalities of it because I am not sufficiently familiar with the terms of the Financial Agreement to go into those matters in detail.

Another point is that the transfer of \$2,600,000 from the Budget Account to the Loan Account for the purpose of financing capital works on other than Government hospitals is another way of misleading the public as to the true deficit position. It reduces the deficit in the Budget Account by that amount and transfers it to the Loan Account. I think it would have been preferable and more straightforward had the Government faced up to the Budget situation and made a proper presentation of it to the people, rather than using this means of reducing it and therefore painting a rather better picture of the budgetary situation than exists.

As a matter of comparison, we refer the deficit in one year's Budget to the deficit in the previous year's Budget. By that means the public is inclined to gauge the activities of a Government and the success or failure of its finances from year to year. This method destroys that comparison. It puts it in an unrealistic light, and it tends to cause the taxpayer to believe that in fact the Government is doing better than it really is. In my opinion, this is not straightforward accounting.

Today I read a letter from the Minister of Local Government to the chairman of a local government body in this State dealing with certain alleged irregularities in the accounting of that body. Indeed, there were two letters, both saying the same thing in equally trenchant terms. Those letters pointed out that the local government body in question must present its accounts in the proper form and in accordance with the Local Government Act. I have no quarrel with that. However, it is rather strange, in the light of that, to find that this Government itself is not carrying out the terms of the law regarding its Loan Account, and I think there will be some wry smiles in local government areas in this State when local gov-

ernment authorities realize exactly what the Government is doing in this respect.

The further point I wish to make is that by utilizing these funds for the purposes for which it intends to utilize them the Government is directly depriving the Minister of Works of \$2,600,000 in the carrying out of his programme of works, and it is quite idle for the Minister to say (as I suppose he has been compelled to say in public statements that appeared in the press and in reply to inquiries on what is happening about other developmental works) that because of the shortage of money he cannot do this or that. Here is \$2,600,000 that the Minister of Works could very well have devoted to the Kimba pipeline or to the Tailem Bend to Keith scheme or to doing some of the other very many urgent works that are of importance to the developmental activities of this State.

As I have travelled through the honourable member for Eyre's district and my own during this past couple of weekends I have been astounded to see being brought into production the vast areas of land which hitherto were thought to be perhaps unproductive or incapable of economic development. I would think that within the last two years and in this coming year at least 1,000,000 acres of agricultural land in that area alone will have come into production. This country has no natural water, and as soon as it is capable of carrying stock it will have to depend on pipeline water from some source or another to provide the means for sustenance for stock. How are we going to do these things when the Minister of Works is prevented from having his proper allocation of funds by the transfer of these not inconsiderable amounts of money to other purposes for which they should not be so employed?

Mr. HUGHES: I notice in the line "South Australian Housing Trust—Loan to," that many houses are to be built under the various schemes of the trust in country areas. The appendix to the Treasurer's explanation shows that at Kadina there was one house under construction at June 30 and that a further four are to be commenced in 1966-67. Can the Treasurer say whether any or all of those houses are to be built for the Education Department and, if they are, who are to occupy them?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am amazed that neither the Attorney-General nor the Treasurer, apparently, intends to get up to answer the points that have been made by members on this side of the Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN: No honourable member is under any obligation to speak in this debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That may be so, Mr. Chairman, but when matters of such importance are raised, surely it is incumbent upon the Government either to acknowledge that the statements made are correct or to show where they are incorrect. So far we have had only sneers and jeers from the Attorney-General and dumb silence from the Treasurer. All I can say is that if we do not get an explanation either from those two gentlemen or from any other Minister on the front bench we must assume (as I in fact do now) that what we have said is correct and that the Government has no answer to these things, that in fact what it has done is a mere device to get around its obligations. If the Government can do this with these items, then apparently it can do it with any items and it is quite useless and a waste of time having the two sets of Estimates. If the Government can change items from one to the other, why not put them together and have just one set of Estimates? That in itself shows that what we are doing here is wrong. Are we to get no explanation at all on this point?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The member for Glenelg might help us out.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know whether the honourable member is going to do that. This is a departure from what has always been done in this State before, and the Treasurer himself said when he introduced these Estimates that there can be no dispute that, if it can be afforded, the practice of charging building grants against Revenue Account rather than Loan Account is desirable. Yet he intends now to give no explanation and no answer at all to the points we have made. All one can conclude is that the Treasurer knows (or, if he did not know, he has been told by his advisers, which I think is the more accurate way of putting it) that what he is doing is undesirable, and he has no answer at all to the arguments that we have put up.

Mr. McANANEY: I strongly support the line taken by the member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson). We are spending money from Loan funds on works that will not return any immediate gain, whereas if we spent the money on developmental work there would be some return to the State. It has been said that we get no return from school buildings, but surely if we are educating the children we are getting a return. The Government's action here is sharp financial practice in that it is designed to show that it does not have

such a big deficit. We have been hearing learned remarks from honourable members opposite about budgeting for deficits to assist the economy. Well, for the first 10 months of this financial year the Government was working with a credit balance: it had no deficit at all until about the end of April. It was during that time that it got into trouble, when all the unemployment started and the lack of confidence became evident. That was when the Government was taking more money out of the economy than it was putting back.

On the budgeting for a deficit theory, now that things are really bad the Government should not want to juggle its accounts so that it can avoid a deficit in this coming year: if its argument on this subject is correct, it should budget for a deficit to boost the economy, because the economy now is really in trouble and needs some help. The Government has got our finances into such a bad state that it has no room in which to manoeuvre. It must try to get back on to a sound financial basis and use common sense to extricate itself from its present difficulties. By adopting its present methods, the Government is pursuing the policy that when things are bad it must withdraw some money from circulation rather than adhere to its arguments. All in all, we as a Parliament should set an example to the companies that the Attorney-General is always criticizing as being bad. I strongly object to this money being used in this manner when it should be used on developmental works for the benefit of the State.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Is the Treasurer still not going to make any explanation of this matter?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It has already been explained to you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Where is the explanation?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Not so much against this, although this is a disgrace, I have a good mind to move that this line be reduced by \$200, as a protest against the discourtesy of the Treasurer and the Attorney-General in not replying to this matter. I emphatically repeat that some member of the Government front bench owes us and the people of this State an explanation of this move that the Government has made.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: The members opposite preserve an abject silence.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. I ask the Treasurer again to give some explanation or say something in answer to the point raised on this side.

Mr. HALL: The main results of this switch have been outlined by the members of our Party. What the Government has not realized is that this cannot be repeated year after year. We have used a device that works for only one year. We have used trust funds that cannot be re-used for this purpose. The Budget and, in particular, the Loan Estimates that we are considering are being propped up by a temporary device that cannot be repeated and will have grave consequences, as the State's Revenue Account for the first months of the year was running at a very high deficit. This presents a great problem for the Government. If it has not come to grips with the run-down in the State's finances, what does it intend to use next year in lieu of these financial gymnastics? I ask the Treasurer a simple question: does he intend to reverse this procedure at the first opportunity?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask the Treasurer a specific question and hope that he will give a direct reply to it: is it his intention, as the Treasurer of this State, that the practice he has adopted this year of charging these items against the Loan Account will be the practice to be adopted in future years in budgeting in this State?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I consider that the Opposition is not being accorded the slightest respect in this matter. The Leader of the Opposition has asked a simple question of the Treasurer: does he intend to reverse this practice—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I refer to members on both sides of the Committee. The honourable member for Alexandra.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: A few minutes ago the Leader of the Opposition asked a direct question of the Treasurer: does he intend to reverse this practice as soon as possible? No simpler question could be asked. Any Treasurer should be able and prepared to answer it. If the Treasurer is not prepared to make any statement on this, I shall be prepared to support any move made on this side of the Committee to reduce the Loan Estimates.

Mr. HEASLIP: I support the member for Alexandra and all honourable members who have spoken regarding the discourtesy of the Government. At least we are the Queen's Opposition and, as such, should be treated with some respect. We are being totally ignored by the Government in a straight-out question that

could so easily be answered if somebody on the Government benches knew the answer. I do not know whether or not any member opposite does know the answer but, if he does, he should be able to give it. So far, we have been absolutely ignored, with either complete silence or sneers from Cabinet members of the Queen's Government. I do not think that is the way that we, as the Queen's Opposition, should be treated when asking for an answer to a simple question. If the answer is not known, let the Government say so but, if the Government has an answer, let it give it. If it does not, I, like the member for Alexandra, shall be prepared to support a move for a reduction of the Loan Estimates.

Mr. QUIRKE: I know the difficulties confronting the Government, but certain plain questions have been asked and they should be answered. If we do not get an answer, we can only conclude that members of the Government do not know the answer.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Nonsense!

Mr. QUIRKE: I have never listened during a debate on the Loan Estimates to more nonsense than has emanated from the Government benches on this occasion. I walked out of this place in shame tonight because of the replies given by the Treasurer to questions from this side. Now there is a direct refusal to answer a simple question: is this going to be the practice in future? If it is not to be the practice in future, why is it here now? Surely the Treasury benches can answer that? What is more, they should answer it. If they do not, they are defaulting in their duty not only to the Opposition—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Why don't you read the Treasurer's statement instead of going on like that?

Mr. QUIRKE: It is no use getting angry about it. It does not matter what is in the Treasurer's statement. If a question is directed from this side, in the ordinary respect of Parliamentary procedure the Leader of the Opposition is entitled to an answer. I assume that what is printed in the document is unknown to the Treasurer, because he does not answer the questions.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It is there for you to read: he has already told you.

Mr. QUIRKE: If the Treasurer cannot answer, will the Attorney-General do so? Apparently, he doesn't know either. There is not a Government member that can now tell us what is in the report. If he can, let him stand up and say so. I am not called on to read it. I could ask the member for Port Pirie but that

would be useless, because he would not know either. If the Leader asks the Treasurer a question he is entitled to the courtesy of a reply. I am ashamed of what has happened today because of the replies that have been given by the Government to the Opposition. Surely someone on the Government benches knows the meaning of what is contained in these printed Loan Estimates. If the Government members want to redeem themselves they should answer the Leader's questions. I can sympathize with the Government if the answers are not given because the Government is in financial difficulties. I have no challenge with that. I am challenging that if the Government is in difficulties, and is asked questions, at least it should give answers. That is the right of all members of this House: each member has an individual responsibility to many people.

Mr. McKee: I don't know what you expect.

Mr. QUIRKE: I expect an answer to the Leader's simple questions. If the Treasurer cannot give it, some other Government member can do it.

Mr. McKee: Information has been given to the House.

Mr. QUIRKE: It has not.

Mr. McKee: The Treasurer made a statement, and that has been printed.

Mr. QUIRKE: Rubbish, and absolute nonsense; the honourable member does not know what he is talking about. What he is saying is that something has been printed and put on the table, and we are told to take it or leave it; he is saying that the Government is not obliged to explain it or tell the Opposition anything; he is saying that we do not represent anyone but are just the Opposition, while he is the Government, which can do as it pleases and ignore the Opposition.

Mr. McKee: That is how it used to be.

Mr. QUIRKE: It has never been that way. The honourable member knows that if he asked any question while in Opposition he always received a courteous and full reply.

Mr. McKee: Don't kid yourself.

Members interjecting:

Mr. QUIRKE: The honourable member knows that when he was in Opposition he was never refused a reply on the Loan Estimates.

Mr. McKee: Not much!

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We were just ignored.

Mr. QUIRKE: The member for Millicent was never refused an answer.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Yes I was: if the member for Burra reads *Hansard* he will see where I was refused.

Mr. QUIRKE: The former Premier, the member for Gumeracha, is smiling, not because of this debate but because he recognizes the ineptitude of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order! Will the honourable member for Burra take his seat. I have been pretty lenient with members of the Committee tonight and they have taken advantage of that fact. I draw the attention of honourable members to Standing Orders and ask them to remain silent and give the honourable member addressing the Committee a fair go. The honourable member for Burra.

Mr. QUIRKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do not find it necessary to get your protection, but even if I do not need it I am always glad of it. If the honourable member for Gumeracha is smiling he has reason to do so. Obviously people outside this House have also realized the ineptitude of the Government.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: You're telling me!

Mr. QUIRKE: This is the Parliament of the State, in which Government and Opposition members represent people, and the same respect is due to members of the Opposition as is due to Government members. People outside this House expect that they will receive the same consideration. Today, a member representing those people has been refused answers to simple questions, and it cannot be said that the answers are contained, and a full explanation of everything has been given, in the printed document that is in front of members.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: This debate has resolved itself into a series of quotations from what I said when presenting the document to this House. I fully explained everything and my explanation has been quoted many times. I particularly requested that full information be given to the House about the Loan Estimates, and I believe that departmental officers have done more than ever before as a result of my request. I did that because of the circumstances we find ourselves in. I remind the Committee that the first page of my explanation answers many queries that have been raised about Loan and Revenue matters. Later, I stated:

The Government has decided, therefore, that as an alternative to budgeting for a surplus on Loan Account in order to contribute towards a deficit on Revenue Account it will, so long as it is necessary, charge to Loan Account such proportion of building grants for tertiary education purposes and for hospitals as will absorb any potential surplus which otherwise would be available for offsetting deficits on Revenue Account.

The Government has never advocated continuing this policy, as long as it can avoid it. On this occasion the Government was at least prepared to tell the Committee where it stood; it cannot retract statements that it has already published. Nobody was more concerned about the presentation of these Estimates than I was, acting on the Government's behalf. We have been accused of interfering with trust moneys, but this is not the first time they have been used, and it certainly will not be the last. It previously occurred in 1958 and 1959, and has probably occurred on other occasions. We have been accused of denying people the right to exist, but I repeat that nobody was more concerned about those Loan Estimates than I was.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, \$1,024,000—passed.

Grand total, \$77,459,000, passed and Committee's resolution adopted by the House.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to authorize the Treasurer to borrow and expend moneys for public works and purposes and to enact other provisions incidental thereto.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It appropriates the moneys required for the purposes detailed in the Loan Estimates which the House has considered. Clause 3 defines the Loan Fund, and clause 4 provides for borrowing by the Treasurer of \$67,680,000. This is the amount of South Australia's allocation for works and purposes arranged at the June, 1966, meeting of Loan Council. Clause 5 provides for the expenditure of \$77,459,000 on the undertakings set out in the First Schedule to the Bill. Clause 6 authorizes certain advances during 1965-66 for the undertakings set out in the Second Schedule. As no authority, or insufficient authority, was included in the Public Purposes Loan Act of 1965, appropriation was given by warrant by His Excellency the Governor under powers conferred on him by the Public Finance Act.

Clause 7 makes provision for borrowing and payment of an amount to cover any discounts,

charges and expenses incurred in connection with borrowing for the purposes of this Bill; clause 8 makes provision for temporary finance if the moneys in the Loan Fund are insufficient for the purposes of this Bill. Clause 9 authorizes the borrowing and the issue of \$30,000,000 for the purpose of financing Loan undertakings in the early part of next financial year until the Public Purposes Loan Bill for 1967 becomes effective.

Clause 10 gives the Treasurer power to borrow against the issue of Treasury bills or by Bank overdraft. The Treasurer possesses and may exercise this authority under other legislation, but it is desirable to make the authority specific year by year in the Public Purposes Loan Bill as is done with other borrowing authority. Clause 11 deals with the duration of certain clauses of the Bill. Clause 12 directs that all moneys received by the State under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act shall be credited to a special account to be paid out as required for the purposes of the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act. Clause 13 provides for this Bill to operate as from July 1, 1966.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

That the debate be now adjourned.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Mr. Speaker,—

The SPEAKER: There will be no debate. The question before the Chair is that the debate be now adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (16).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall (teller), Heaslip, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Stott.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. McAnaney and Teusner. Noes—Messrs. Bywaters and Jennings.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. HALL: The motion to adjourn the debate was a protest by the Opposition in answer to the contempt with which this Parliament has been treated today by the Treasurer and his Government and I hope that he realizes that this Parliament is an institution of the people of this State and that, in treating the Parliament with contempt, he is also treating the people of South Australia with contempt.

He has given indeterminate answers and has also refused to give answers. I took the trouble to jot down what he said in regard to a question I put to him a short time before the debate on the lines closed, and he said these words—

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the Leader of the Opposition that we are discussing the Bill, not re-debating the Estimates.

Mr. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do understand that we are discussing this Bill, which implements the programme we have discussed line by line, and I may say that we consider we are voting on a Bill of which we have not received sufficient details regarding implementation of the expenditure. Statements such as, "as long as it can avoid it" will continue, but they are utterly meaningless in regard to the questions we have put to the Treasurer. It is entirely wrong that this Committee, which is the main Committee to examine expenditure of \$77,000,000, has been refused answers to vital questions.

The SPEAKER: I point out to the Leader that we cannot go over the debate that has taken place in Committee. The question before the Chair relates to this Bill and the provisions in it.

Mr. HALL: I apologize if I have transgressed. The reason is that we have not had time to look at it, and—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable the Leader.

Mr. HALL: I do not oppose this Bill, although it implements a programme that lacks lustre. However, the reason for attempting to adjourn the debate is simply that we do not come here to Parliament to form a club: we come to administer the affairs of the State, and we do not believe that the institution of Parliament should be treated with the contempt with which it has been treated.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): I support the Leader in his protest about this Bill. Apparently, much happened today that gave point to what he said, but I do not want to develop that thought. All I want to say is that this evening I have seen what has been going on this year: the information we desired to assist us in our consideration of this Bill was not forthcoming all afternoon. Neither the ignorance of the Treasurer nor the arrogance of the Attorney-General is acceptable.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think that on reflection the honourable member will see that this is a personal reflection. I ask him to withdraw it.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: If you instruct me to withdraw it, Mr. Speaker, I have no option, but I ask for your ruling on whether I am entitled to say "apparent ignorance".

The SPEAKER: I asked the member for Flinders to withdraw what I considered to be a personal reflection on the Treasurer. I ask him again to withdraw.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am quite happy to withdraw, but I did not think what I was saying was a contravention of Standing Orders. However, I withdraw the statement. It is regrettable that the Treasurer should not have seen fit to give more information, and I think that on reflection he also will regret that he has not taken members more into his confidence. This Bill is for a substantial sum, and the Opposition is entitled to a full and frank discussion on the matter. For as long as I can remember it has been the peculiar duty of the Treasurer to supply information on this matter. I would have forgiven the Treasurer last year, after recently assuming office, for not giving all the information we desired, but at this stage he cannot claim a privilege by saying that he is new to the job and therefore unable to supply information. I am sure that on reflection the Treasurer will regret this, because no doubt he will introduce a similar Bill next year, and naturally he has put the Opposition in the mood—indeed, under the requirement—to be most critically analytical of any such proposal now or in future.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I find myself under more than my usual disability in debating this Bill, as I have not had the opportunity to study the second reading explanation given by the Treasurer a few minutes ago. Apart from this, I was not able to take in all he said because of the manner in which it was read to this House. I do not think any member could possibly have been able to understand what he was saying in explaining this measure. I cannot understand the Government's refusal to allow Opposition members time to study this measure before speaking on it. Why on earth this could not be done, I do not know. This was requested in the proper way by the Leader but was cavalierly refused. The Opposition did not deny the Government a suspension of Standing Orders to introduce the Bill and give the second reading explanation forthwith. We extended this courtesy to the Government, but the Government will not extend any courtesy to us tonight, nor did it do so this afternoon during the Committee stage.

The SPEAKER: Order! This debate will not get out of hand.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It certainly will not get out of hand so far as I am concerned.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know whether the Government is capable of doing anything tonight but jeer, but that is all we have heard from the Government benches and, as always, from the Attorney-General.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member not to reflect on other members of the House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not reflecting on him at all.

The SPEAKER: Well, do not.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me conclude my remarks on this aspect by protesting at the treatment this House has received at the hands of the Government. I will deal now with the Bill, which I will try to debate in the light of the added disability I have in not being given an explanation of the various clauses. I wish to refer to two clauses, the first being clause 8. I think I am right in saying (the Treasurer may have said this in his second reading explanation, although I did not pick it up) that this clause is in its normal and usual form. It may be, but it gives the Treasurer the authority to use moneys in his hands for purposes of the Loan Fund. It provides:

If the money in the Loan Fund is at any time insufficient for the purpose of carrying out the works and purposes mentioned in the First Schedule the Treasurer may use other money in his hands for those purposes, but any money so used shall be repaid from the Loan Fund as soon as there is sufficient money in that fund to make the repayment.

Mr. Nankivell: Where would they get the money from?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: From the trust fund, as this clause authorizes the Treasurer to use it. This may be in the usual form, but it was not used by the previous Government in this way.

Mr. Nankivell: Are there any trust funds left?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, the Government got through only one-third of the funds last year, I believe. I do not think the Government should be given the authority to dip into these funds indefinitely, and I believe this clause should be amended so as to deprive the Treasurer of the right to do so. In due course I shall move in this direction.

Mr. Rodda: Are you trying to save the Treasurer from his folly?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am trying to save the State from his folly: I am not concerned about the Treasurer. In view of the demonstration we have had from the Treasurer since he

has been Treasurer, I do not think he should have this power. I refer now to clause 12, which provides:

All moneys received by the State from the Commonwealth by way of grants under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act, 1964, or any amendment thereof, or any Act substituted therefor, shall be paid to a special account in the books of the Treasurer, and the Treasurer shall on request of the Minister of Roads issue and pay out of the money so credited such sums as are required for purposes specified in the said Act.

Unless I am mistaken, this is the authority to spend moneys on the road programme without bringing the matter before this House. This is something about which members opposite complained bitterly when in Opposition.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: On one of these Bills?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Generally. I am not responsible for when members complained about it or for whether they were asleep when such a Bill went through. I am sure the member for Gawler and I know that the Treasurer and Attorney-General, when in Opposition, complained bitterly about the expenditure of moneys on the roads programme without the details of the expenditure being debated in the House. This has been done time and time again and, unless I am wrong (and I may be wrong because I have not been given much opportunity to study this)—

Mr. Clark: And it takes a long time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Standing Orders provide that only one stage of a Bill shall be dealt with each day. The Opposition extended the Government the courtesy of allowing it to introduce and explain this Bill but we have not been given time to study the legislation. It is hypocritical in the extreme for members opposite to include this provision, of which they have complained, in the Bill.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: This Bill is in the same form as you used in the last 12 years you were in Government.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Oh, do be quiet! The Attorney-General is a close and old friend of mine but tonight he has really excelled himself: he has not been able to contain himself at all. This may be the normal clause but it provides for something about which members of the present Government complained bitterly when they were in Opposition and about which I complained when I was a member of the Government and about which I have continued to complain since I have been a member of the Opposition. I direct the attention of honourable members to this matter

and I intend to ask the Treasurer, when we get to the relevant clause, whether his Government intends to do anything to alter the situation so that the roads programme can be debated in this House in future.

Those are the only remarks I have to make on the Bill except to echo what was said by the Leader and by the member for Flinders: that we have been sadly disappointed with the little information that was given us, particularly by the Treasurer, in answer to our questions on the lines. I think I am entitled to refer to this because the lines are set out in the First Schedule of the Bill. It has been almost literally impossible to get an intelligent answer to any question. I refer not only to the occasion tonight when the Treasurer gave a blank refusal to answer, but even when he got up to reply he was monumentally lacking in information for the Committee. Of course, I do not oppose the passage of the Bill but I oppose most strongly the tactics by which the Government is overriding the Opposition and forcing a Bill through without giving us adequate time to consider its implications.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): Probably no member has been reflected upon as much as I have been today. I understand all members have a copy of the Bill. The only difference between this Bill and previous Bills for this purpose (if there is a difference) is that it makes provision for temporary finance if the moneys in the Loan Fund are insufficient for the purposes of the Bill. However, this Bill is no different from Bills that have been introduced since I have been in the House. By tradition, Standing Orders have always been waived and the Bill has been allowed to proceed through its various stages. Honourable members have already had an opportunity to debate the various subjects dealt with in the Bill during the previous debate. In this case, I have done only what tradition has established. The first words the Leader of the Opposition used in this debate were a protest that I had not given certain information. I am a little surprised at that because during the previous debate I quoted and requoted what was contained in my explanation; not once did I deny anything I previously said. I had thought that the member for Flinders was more reasonable than to say what he said tonight, but I do not desire to go into that. Regarding what the member for Mitcham said about having a debate on the roads programme, so long as I am Treasurer the answer is "No".

Mr. Millhouse: You've changed your tune.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: No. The honourable member has indicated that he wants a debate on where moneys provided for the roads programme are to be expended, and I have now told him that I will not introduce any means by which a debate can be held on this matter as long as I am here. I ask members to pass this Bill so that it can be presented to another place and so that the Government of the State can really commence to provide means by which we shall keep the people of this State in employment as far as possible. That is what I am concerned about in these matters.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Temporary finance for Loan works."

Mr. QUIRKE: I draw attention to the concluding words of clause 8 because I wish to refer to another clause, concerned with these words, at a later stage.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

After "hands" to insert "(not being any money representing a trust fund held by the Treasurer)".

The clause would then read:

If the money in the loan fund is at any time insufficient for the purpose of carrying out the works and purposes mentioned in the first schedule the Treasurer may use other money in his hands (not being any money representing a trust fund held by the Treasurer) for those purposes, but any money so used shall be repaid from the loan fund as soon as there is sufficient money in that fund to make the repayment.

Mr. Nankivell: When is that likely to be?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is the 64-dollar question, and the question that the Treasurer and the Attorney-General refused to answer when asked to do so. Earlier I drew attention to the fact that this is the clause that apparently authorizes the Treasurer to use trust funds in his hands for the purposes of financing Loan works. I respectfully remind you, Mr. Acting Chairman (Mr. Ryan), that the Treasurer himself explained to the Committee that he had used about one-third of the accumulated trust funds in his first full 12 months in office, because this is what he said:

Of an aggregate of \$27,322,000 of trust and deposit accounts held by the Treasury at June 30, 1966—

these are the accounts, not the money—
\$18,000,000 was held in fixed deposit at the Reserve and State Banks, and the remainder was used either to finance temporarily the deficits I have mentioned or held in current form at bank and in minor cash balances:

We can assume that about one-third of the accumulated funds of this nature had been used by the Treasurer for other purposes, and it is not hard for any member (even the dullest of us) to make the calculation that if this continued again in the next year it would take only another two years for the funds to be exhausted altogether. This is a very bad thing, and it is something that should not be allowed. Also, it is something the Treasurer should not have to do. I point out that it was not necessary for the previous Treasurer to make a practice of dipping into the trust funds of the State. I have not had a very good opportunity to study this, because we have not been given time to do so.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We gave you more time than your Government ever gave us.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As I understand the situation, the last time the trust funds of this State were significantly depleted was in the time of the Hill Labor Government in the early 1930's. If members of the front bench opposite do not think that one-third in 17 months is a significant depletion, I do not know what is. This should not be, and I do not believe that this Parliament should give the present Government or the present Treasurer the power to do this in future. If the Treasurer needs to do it, he had better come back to Parliament and explain why and get another Bill through. That can be done if it is absolutely necessary. However, he has shown such irresponsibility with the finances of this State that he should not be trusted with this blanket power because, as I believe, he has already shown that he is prepared to abuse it.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I have no hesitation in asking the Committee to reject the amendment. I do not wish to reflect on the Commonwealth Government in any way, but I say to the Committee that if we found that the Commonwealth Government was not able in certain circumstances to find the necessary Loan moneys that we were to receive we would find ourselves under an even worse disability than the one we are now under. The Committee has already accepted that there would be a deficit in the Loan funds. In 1958 and 1959 there were significant deficits, but these were held over for a time pending examination and subsequently a recommendation in respect of them was made by the Commonwealth Grants Commission. I have here statements relating to the temporary financing of

deficits as at June 30, 1958, at June 30, 1959, and at June 30 of this year. The two statements I have mentioned for 1958 and 1959 have been extracted from data in the Auditor-General's Reports issued in those years.

This Government in its wisdom used its constitutional rights in respect of trust funds. We have used those funds for a purpose which I have already indicated, and I do not intend to go over that again. I point out to the Committee that I have the best advice that could possibly be available to the Treasurer of this State or of any other State, for I consider that there is no better Under Treasurer in any State than the one we have in South Australia. I have been advised by this very competent officer about what should be done in the emergency that arose through our being forced into something that was not of our making. The year 1964-65 opened with accumulated surpluses totalling \$8,000,000—

Mr. Millhouse: Who was the Treasurer then?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: —including \$1,360,000 from the Radium Hill project. We did not have that money.

Mr. Millhouse: Who built it up?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: About \$7,500,000 of the \$8,600,000 was absorbed in the consequent rate of expenditure, and the revenues currently available for 1964-65 created the difficulties that we took over.

Mrs. Steele: Really!

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: This position arises from the advice I accepted from one of the most competent members of the Public Service—the Under Treasurer. He suggested that I should do something, which I have done on behalf of the Government. Are members opposite trying to accuse me of something, or is it a reflection on the Public Service of this State? Of course, it is a reflection on the Public Service of the State.

Mr. Quirke: Nonsense! You are using the Under Treasurer as an excuse.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I accepted the advice of the Under Treasurer, who is an officer responsible to this Government, as he was to other Governments. As far as the Under Treasurer's advice is concerned, I discussed all the facets of this matter before this Bill was introduced. My advice was exactly what is contained in this Bill.

Mr. Nankivell: Why didn't you get his advice sooner?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I ask the Committee, irrespective of whether it will

accept my adviser's information on this matter, to reject this amendment.

Mr. HALL: Members have heard enough of Ministers sheltering behind public servants. It has gone on throughout this session in respect of important decisions on important occasions. Ministers have refused to take the responsibility for their decisions. I never thought I would see the Treasurer of the State blaming the situation facing us at this time on the Under Treasurer and accusing us as an Opposition, who have directly laid our criticism (and, if it has not struck home, the Treasurer must be deaf) where it belongs—on the Treasurer. In the last few minutes we have heard him trying to shrug this off on to a public servant. This is a mean trick, if the officers of the Public Service cannot serve the Government without fear of being blamed by the Government. We have heard enough, too, about the surplus accumulated by the Playford Government as being a main reason why this Government has got into trouble. Have we ever heard such nonsense? Let us look at the date. The Treasurer blames the surplus existing at the beginning of the financial year 1964-65, yet at this time of the year in 1964 members opposite were sitting on this side considering financial documents similar to those we are considering tonight. They saw the exact effect of those surpluses on the Budget of that year. They went to the people in February and March of the following year and made certain promises, in the full knowledge of what surpluses meant to the Budget of this State. They come here and complain that this is the reason. Their attitude is mean in the extreme.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Treasurer would have been well advised not to bring two matters into this debate. The clause that the honourable member seeks to amend has been in the Public Purposes Loan Bill in its present form for probably 20 years. The circumstances in which the clause was previously used were totally different from those in which it is proposed to use it this year. That is why the member for Mitcham moved this amendment. Let me deal with two matters raised by the Treasurer. The first is the expenditure of Loan moneys by the previous Government. Every honourable member with any experience of Loan Council procedure knows that we get our Loan money for a year. The procedure is quite clear. The various State Governments bring forward their programmes and the Loan Council considers them and decides how much money can be borrowed

at reasonable rates of interest. It then allocates the money to be made available to the State Governments for expenditure on Loan works for that particular year. Occasionally, for some reason or another, a State is not able to spend its Loan allocation for a particular year—perhaps because its contractors are slow or because it cannot get sufficient labour to undertake Loan works.

If there is a carry-over, it has to be reported to the Loan Council, which then considers it; so there is no suggestion that we carry over sums of Loan money from one year to another; nor is it provided for in the Financial Agreement. The Treasurer's saying that he would be better off if we had not spent our Loan money in 1964 is not correct, because the Loan Council itself would have adjusted the position. If we had not spent that money in 1964, the Loan Council would have taken it into account. In fact, it would have come directly into our account, according to the formula. Therefore, the Treasurer should not have referred to that matter, as it has no bearing on what we are considering. Radium Hill funds were not trust funds: they were profits that the Government earned from a contract with the American Atomic Energy Commission, and were kept for public purposes. In that year not one member of the present Government objected to the procedures. The previous Government did not undertake obligations that it could not carry out, but the present Government assumed many more obligations. I have worked with Mr. Seaman, the Under-Treasurer, for many years, and I believe that he is an officer of the highest calibre and one who is responsible, loyal to the Government, and extremely capable. He is probably one of two of the foremost Under-Treasurers in the Commonwealth today, but he should not have been brought into this debate.

Some time ago the Attorney-General said that members should not quote the opinion of the Parliamentary Draftsman as he was not Parliament's legal adviser. We now have a statement of what Mr. Seaman may or may not have said, but the circumstances under which he may have said it are unknown to us. It is improper for the Government to shelter behind one of its officers, and if the Government wants to quote an officer's report it should be the written report that is quoted. I believe the Under-Treasurer would like to keep his accounts in an impeccable condition, and he never encouraged me to use trust funds. Apart from other issues, the use of trust funds will not solve the present Government's problems. It is

a temporary expedient that leaves the Government in a worse position as the use of these funds in this way is fundamentally unsound, and does not solve any problems. The Treasurer's argument, that the trouble arose because of what had been done by the previous Government, is not valid.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (16).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Pearson, and Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, Shannon, and Mrs. Steele.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Teusner and Stott.

Noes—Messrs. Bywaters and Jennings.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause passed.

Clause 9 passed.

Clause 10—'Power to borrow against Treasury Bills or by overdraft.'

Mr. QUIRKE: This clause contains the root of much of the trouble that faces the Government of today. Borrowing against Commonwealth Treasury bills clearly illustrates that a State has insufficient money in the first place. That money has to be repaid, and is lost forever. With such a provision in the Financial Agreement, no State can progress, short of having access to a terrific income for its revenue. Treasury bills are a means only of temporary finance, the financial benefit from which has no real foundation. Any moneys obtained must be paid out to cancel them. A revision of the Financial Agreement is urgent, in Australia's interests.

Mr. Clark: What is your hope of getting it?

Mr. QUIRKE: All Governments should combine, in order to obtain a revision of what are now completely outdated provisions.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (11 to 13) passed.

First and Second Schedules passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (T.A.B.).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 10. Page 998.)

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): I took no part in the debate last session on the motion so ably moved by the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) that sought to introduce a Bill for a totalizator agency board system, similar to Victoria's system. After listening to the different opinions expressed by members on both sides, I was not sure whether T.A.B. would be a good thing. However, what was most important was that the House had the opportunity to debate the motion. It was carried and a Bill is now before Parliament.

Members opposite often claim that Government members are bound on various matters, but one thing that irks the Opposition is that we are given ample opportunity to express our opinions on social questions. We are not hamstrung on this matter; we are free to vote as we please. When the present Opposition was the Government, it did not show any enthusiasm for social legislation and the people were starved of social reform. However, the people of South Australia are no different from the people of any other State, and the present Government has introduced social reform.

Only tonight in another debate we heard criticism of a change in procedure. It is said that such changes should not be made, but I consider that this Bill should have been brought in long ago. People who travel see forms of legalized betting operating in the other States. In Western Australia and Tasmania we see systems of betting not very different from the betting shops that operated here, and in Queensland, which we visited recently with some Opposition members on a sporting trip, we saw a form of legalized betting that was better than the systems operating in the two States I have mentioned. The Victorian scheme is a sound one and, as South Australia is the last State to introduce T.A.B., we will be able to bring forward the best scheme, after examining the faults in other systems.

I condemn the system of betting shops that operated in this State. Although I was not old enough to go into them, I recall that members of sporting teams were picked up in different suburbs by charabanc in the days when motor cars were a luxury. I recall that we were able to pick up from the betting shops in the Colonel Light Gardens area those members of the team who were losing with their betting, but we could not get those who

were winning to come with the rest of the team. We will not experience what happened in those days, but people will be able to bet legally and go off to sport or to whatever they choose to do on Saturday afternoons.

It is interesting to note that new arrivals in England are immediately offered credit by book-makers. No money has to be paid. The person is given an immediate credit and receives an account. England today is a bookmaking country and people specialize in that business. I am not sure that it is good business. In South Australia, money will be lodged beforehand, and that is more desirable. Our system of betting will be of much value to people in the country and also to people who desire to attend sporting fixtures.

I am not in favour of one part of the Bill, which deals with the composition of the board. It appears that the board will be dominated by racing men and I cannot understand why five members should be from the racing fraternity. There are many trotting clubs in South Australia, yet the racing clubs have five representatives and the trotting clubs have only two. I should like to see three members representing trotting clubs, three representing racing clubs and one member from the racing interests. I think a person not connected with the racing or trotting committees would be a valuable member.

Sometimes a preponderance of members of a controlling body results in matters being pushed through. Such a preponderance of members sometimes looks after certain interests. However, the Bill is a good one, and there may be an opportunity of remedying this particular provision in future. Most members have had representations about the winning bets tax that was introduced many years ago. The Bill provides that, after a certain time, portion of the amount paid to the punter will not be taxed. I am sure the Government will need to get as much money as possible to institute this system, and it will get it from this source.

Last Saturday I went to the races, although I was not as successful as was the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse). However, I had an afternoon out. People who back horses at 12/1 think they have beaten the books if the price drops to 8/1, and they enjoy having a flutter. However, I think many members in their heyday would have been able to race some of the horses I backed last Saturday. While at the races I noticed that the totalizator was not operating on the Melbourne races, but a totalizator for interstate races should be oper-

ated when T.A.B. is introduced. The racing clubs will need to spend money to make these facilities available. As they will get a fair percentage from totalizator investments on the course, I am sure they will do this.

Off-course betting has been going on illegally for many years, and only the illegal operators have benefited. A section of the community will always enjoy having a wager, and when T.A.B. is introduced the money will be channelled to the right places. Many people who do not bet will benefit. If the matter were explained to many of the people who do not know what is going on at the moment, they would find things were not as bad as they had been told. I am sure the legislation will be of benefit to the community, and it will give people the opportunity to have freedom in this sphere. They will no longer have to bet behind closed doors. In the circumstances, I have pleasure in supporting the measure.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): As I supported a motion on this subject last year, I suppose it is incumbent on me to support this measure, although it cannot be said that it is strictly similar to the motion, which provided for a scheme similar to that in Victoria. This scheme differs from the Victorian scheme in several ways. However, I think it should be supported.

I am not a keen racegoer: I do not think I have ever attended the Adelaide races, although I go to the races when in other States and in the country. I have no vested interest in the racing game, and I think it is wrong for people to bet with S.P. operators, whom the police do not attempt to apprehend, because they do not get any co-operation from the public. I think it is bad for the morale of the State if people think it is right to bet illegally, as they thereby evade taxation.

When I have asked people what they think, many have said that although they do not bet those who wish to bet should be able to do so. In Victoria it is the middle-age group, not the young people, who bet with T.A.B. and invest in the lottery. The young people have so many other interests that they do not participate, but the middle-age group have a bet to have some excitement in a mundane life. Because of this, I do not think T.A.B. will bring any harm to the community. People who are opposed to betting should set an example for others to follow rather than dictate to others what they should do.

I oppose having agents on commission, as in Victoria. If there are agents, they will have an incentive to build up their businesses,

and I do not think this should happen. It is illegal under the Act for people to solicit bets, so I do not know what is the idea of having agents on commission. I had intended to move an amendment in relation to this, but I have decided not to do so because it is illegal to solicit for bets. Also, an agent may be inclined to inform on an S.P. bookmaker if there is one in the town where he lives.

Another way in which this system will be different from the Victorian system is that the winning bets tax will be retained. I cannot see any rhyme or reason why there should be a winning bets tax rather than a turnover tax. In 1950, when the winning bets tax was first introduced on the course (it had been used in betting shops before that), the then member for Edwardstown opposed it and said a turnover tax was much better. The reason for introducing the winning bets tax in 1950 was that other States had it and it cost South Australia \$200,000 in regard to grants money because other States had a form of taxation that we did not have.

The totalizator on the course pays a turnover tax and the same tax will apply to T.A.B. However, money invested with bookmakers has applied to it the winning bets tax, and I cannot see the reason for this. Last year, when speaking on the motion regarding T.A.B., I said that a complete totalizator scheme would be better and that bookmakers should be eliminated, as had been done in France and New Zealand where racing is successful in every aspect. Such a system has many benefits. However, if we are to have bookmakers then they should operate under the same form of taxation as applies to the totalizator.

At the end of three years, of the money invested on the course totalizator the Government will collect 4.8 per cent tax out of the 14 per cent tax collected. This varies from 1½ per cent to 5½ per cent but the average over the last three years shows that 4.8 per cent is collected. An additional 1½ per cent will be paid into the hospital fund so actually the Government will collect just over 6 per cent on the turnover of money invested on the course totalizator. The Government will receive 5½ per cent from T.A.B. as well at the end of three years, and I cannot follow why the Government should lose on that turnover compared with the course totalizator turnover. I think that whatever form of betting is followed the Government should receive the same proportion of tax.

The bookmakers are at a tremendous advantage because the Government collects only 2 per cent on local racing and 3 per cent on races in other States from them. Why is this difference necessary and why should bookmakers have this advantage with the Government getting less from their turnover? I have arrived at the figure of 3 per cent because the Government gets 1½ per cent on the turnover from betting in other States and then there is the winning bets tax of 2.4 per cent on the average for the past three years. That adds up to 3.65 per cent if the stake is eliminated as it is suggested it will be at the end of the year.

The member for Glenelg maintained that this would mean a reduction of 30 per cent and he said that the Treasury and racing clubs had agreed on that figure. However, I do not know how they arrived at that figure because over the last 20 metropolitan meetings of 159 races the average price a horse has been 6.2 to 1, and last Saturday it was 7.2 to 1. This would provide a reduction of only about 15 per cent. The member for Glenelg argued that many people made place bets which pay a bigger percentage of tax on the stake. At country race meetings I have attended I have found it difficult to make a place bet and perhaps only 10 per cent of bookmakers will accept one. I have been told that in Adelaide a lot more accept place bets.

Mr. Freebairn: Only on horses at a long price.

Mr. Rodda: On horses at 4 to 1 or more.

Mr. McANANEY: Occasionally there is a race where the favourite starts at odds on and there is no place betting; nor is there place betting when only six horses start in a race, although this does not happen very often. Therefore, I think the figure of 30 per cent is high.

The average price of placed horses (excluding those starting at under 4 to 1 on which there was not much place betting) at the last eight meetings for 101 bets was 21.7 to 1. Therefore I cannot understand from where the honourable member for Glenelg gets his figure. On these figures the Government will get about 3 per cent tax on bookmakers' turnover from a race in another State. At local meetings, when the club gets a bigger proportion of the turnover and the Government receives a quarter, the Government will receive only 2 per cent on bookmakers' turnover on local races. That is why there was about \$61,000,000 invested with bookmakers in 1964-65 and only about

\$5,000,000 with the totalizator, because naturally bookmakers must be able to compete more than favourably with the totalizator under those conditions. When one works out just what happened at the races last Saturday, it is no wonder that the member for Unley lost his money.

Mr. Langley: You don't know what you are getting from the tote, but you do know the odds when you bet with a bookmaker.

Mr. McANANEY: With the modern totalizators a person can see the figures flashing all the time. However, I know that one can get caught. I went to the Caulfield races and saw that Citius was about 1 to 3 with the bookmakers whereas the price on the totalizator about 10 minutes before the race was even money. Doing the smart thing, I invested my money on that horse but so did everybody else and within a few minutes the price was much shorter. With these things we have a fair idea of what we are going to get. The bookmakers tell me that because of their bad debts they must have a slightly bigger margin. One of the advantages we claim for T.A.B. is that it eliminates credit betting, and if the bookmakers indulge in credit betting they should be prepared to stand any loss they incur.

Naturally, the bookmakers have to meet certain expenses, including their licence fees. However, I find their claim that their margin over the past three or four years has been only about 4 per cent very hard to believe. If we divide their alleged total profits over that period by the number of bookmakers, the figure that we get would indicate that they should be driving around in Mini Minors rather than in big Chevrolet cars. Therefore, it is hard to credit that that is the only margin of profit that they make. The member for Glenelg tried to tell us that this Bill was good for the racing clubs, the bookmakers, the hospitals and everyone else. He even got down to claiming that it was good for the punters, although how it could be good for them I cannot imagine.

He then said that at a small country meeting where the totalizator pool is very small a bet of \$20 would seriously reduce the dividend paid, but with additional money invested from T.A.B. a bet of this size would not decrease the totalizator odds and therefore more people would bet with the totalizator. However, if we are going to give the bookmakers the advantage of paying substantially less tax (and their expenses would be less, I imagine), the bulk of the bets on the racecourse would still be with the bookmakers and the Government would not collect the money it collected before,

because I cannot see the totalizator improving its figures if 14 per cent comes out of the pool and the bookmakers pay only 2 per cent or 3 per cent.

Mr. Casey: Have you ever compared the dividends paid by the totalizator on Saturday racing with the prices paid by the bookmakers?

Mr. McANANEY: Yes, frequently. At the meeting on Saturday last the average price of the winners was 7 to 1. If a person had \$1 on each winner he would get back \$57, whereas if he did the same thing on the totalizator his investment would return him \$69. I do not say that is always the position: I think it usually comes out at somewhere about the same. The totalizator is paying 12½ per cent and the bookmaker is paying only 3 per cent, so according to the published figures one should get a better return from the bookmaker. I maintain that there must be fair competition. I am strongly opposed to this winning bets tax, for it is neither logical nor fair.

Why the bookmakers should have an advantage over the totalizator, I do not know. As I said before, I would eliminate them altogether, for there would then be cleaner and better racing. However, seeing that they are there they should at least be on the same footing and pay the same taxation to the Government. I am not saying what the increase in turnover tax should be to enable the Government to eliminate this tax, for it is up to the Government to work out what is fair and reasonable. The same turnover tax should be paid, irrespective of whether the money goes through the totalizator or the bookmakers. I strongly oppose the part of the Bill in which it is proposed to tax a person who bets on the totalizator on the course at a different rate from that which applies with the T.A.B. and with a much higher rate of tax paid by people who bet with bookmakers, and I will be amazed if the Government can prove that this provision is fair and equitable.

Mr. Lawn: What tax does the Government get out of the totalizator and what tax does it get from bookmakers?

Mr. McANANEY: Under this proposed scheme the Government will get over 6 per cent from the totalizator on the course and 5½ per cent from T.A.B. after three years. If the Government lifts the winning bets tax from the stake it will get 3 per cent from the bookmaker on the course on races in other States and 2 per cent from races in this State. If members opposite can prove that I am wrong (or that that is fair and just), I will be amazed.

Mr. Lawn: And you want to lift that tax on the bookmakers?

Mr. McANANEY: I am saying that the same level of taxation should apply, whether the betting is through the totalizator on the course, through T.A.B., or through the bookmakers. I cannot see any logical reason for the winning bets tax at all.

Mr. Hudson: You want to take off the winning bets tax and increase the tax on turnover that goes through the bookmakers to 5½ per cent?

Mr. McANANEY: I am not stating any definite figure; I will leave it to the Government. The point I am making is that it should be even. There should be a fair and logical adjustment and everybody should be on the same basis, irrespective of the method of betting adopted, and it is up to the Government to determine the rates. The Government can make it 4 per cent right through if that is how much the Government wants. I do not have much sympathy for the member for Glenelg on his point that the money would get into the Hospitals Fund and would rob the general revenue. As long as I have money it does not matter what pocket I have it in, because it will go to a good cause. I think the member for Glenelg was making a political point when he tackled our Leader on that aspect. Whether we have the money in the Hospitals Fund or in General Revenue, it will be of the same benefit to the State, according to what the Treasurer of the day decides.

Mr. Hudson: It cannot be exactly the same benefit.

Mr. McANANEY: Of course if anybody disagrees with the member for Glenelg he is stupid, but I have just disagreed with him.

Mr. Hudson: You have all the qualifications!

Mr. McANANEY: One honourable member referred to being "fair and equitable". We must get on to the Port Pirie betting shops. I do not see how they can possibly remain in existence after the introduction of T.A.B. The member for Port Pirie sometimes demonstrates that he has a fair sense of justice, but I do not think he could maintain that those shops should be spared.

Mr. Casey: How long have those shops been in Port Pirie?

Mr. McANANEY: Too long.

Mr. Casey: They should have been got rid of years ago.

Mr. Lawn: The bookmakers at Port Pirie are not mentioned in the Bill, are they?

Mr. McANANEY: They are mentioned in the second reading explanation given by the Treasurer, and we have plenty of experience of things being mentioned in a second reading explanation without being mentioned in the Bill. Realizing that at times the Treasurer is reasonable, we gather from that that the Port Pirie betting shops may be closed.

Mr. Lawn: You are giving a contingent notice of motion?

Mr. McANANEY: For the benefit of the member for Adelaide, I do not think I should reiterate what we are doing. However, I support the Bill. We must produce the fair basis of having one turnover tax. I cannot see why we should have agents on commission, other than that there may be some reason for trying to suppress the S.P. bookmaker. If we try to suppress him, we charge only the bookmaker; yet I understand from the Lottery and Gaming Act that the man putting on the bet is liable to just as big a penalty as is the bookmaker.

Mr. Ryan: He cannot afford to pay the fine.

Mr. McANANEY: Then he cannot afford to bet, anyway. If he is on this credit basis, in the future he may have enough money to pay a fine. After all, in these days 99 per cent of the people of Australia are workers. Realizing what their incomes are, we can appreciate that their standard of living is much the same everywhere. In these days the incomes of workers in various occupations are more or less equal, differing only very slightly, so I think the old cry "The worker cannot afford to pay" is out of date. When income tax and other adjustments are considered, it can be seen that we are more or less enjoying similar standards of living. I support this Bill, but let Parliament introduce a tax fair to everybody.

Mr. FREEBAIRN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 11.4 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 24, at 2 p.m.