

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, September 20, 1966.

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

QUESTIONS

HOUSING.

Mr. **HALL**: Allegations have been made to me that purchasers of houses from the Housing Trust are receiving higher priorities for house-building loans from the State Bank and the Savings Bank than are purchasers of houses from private developers. Can the Premier comment on (and, I hope, deny) that allegation? If he cannot comment now, will he obtain a report on this important question of loan priorities?

The Hon. **FRANK WALSH**: I would certainly dispute the fact that preference was being extended in this matter. However, rather than suggest something without proving the case I think it would be preferable to call for a complete report for the Leader, and I will do this.

Mr. **HALL**: In view of the financial stringency which the Premier claims is preventing the Government from taking further action to alleviate the unemployment position in South Australia, can he say whether the Government intends to alter its present policy of providing finance for existing houses, and to allocate the \$200,000 (at present being spent in this unproductive way) for the purposes of constructional work, thereby providing further employment in South Australia?

The Hon. **FRANK WALSH**: No. The Government has already received a report from the board of the Savings Bank, indicating specifically that the present system is of great benefit to people who wish to borrow for this purpose. As I intend to reply to the member for Unley (Mr. Langley) on a similar matter this afternoon, it may suffice to answer the two questions at once. At present there is an average of three houses a month approved (which is not confined only to the metropolitan area). The board has also informed me that, although applications are being received, many have to be refused, not because of the quality of the houses but because of the inadequate sum made available under this system. Many disappointments are therefore experienced because people have entered into an agreement to purchase without having regis-

tered with the bank. Unless the bank itself has had the opportunity, first, to register applicants and, secondly, to make investigations, it is unable to satisfy applicants. Routine safeguards apply in this matter, and loans are not used to pay off existing mortgages. I believe the Government's decision last year was a wise one and, indeed, its policy in this regard has been confirmed.

Mr. **LANGLEY**: Has the Premier further information in answer to the question I asked last week about the number of people selling old houses and moving into smaller and newer houses?

The Hon. **FRANK WALSH**: I do not know what numbers are involved, but from reports I have received I understand that some people in inner suburban areas have sold large houses and have moved to smaller houses; in some cases the smaller houses are new ones.

GOVERNMENT GRANTS.

Mr. **FERGUSON**: I read with great interest the following statement by the Attorney-General on grants made by the Commonwealth Government:

The only proper thing for the Commonwealth to do is to make these grants outright without any conditions.

Can the Premier say whether the Attorney was declaring the policy of his Government, and whether future grants to district councils and municipalities in this State will be made without strings and conditions being attached?

The Hon. **FRANK WALSH**: The honourable member is introducing complications, because undoubtedly the Attorney-General would have been concerned particularly with the suggested grants to the universities in this State, which have the condition attached that we have to match the grant. These grants have always been announced publicly before any State Government has had an opportunity to know whether it can provide the matching grant. I think this Government is doing fairly well regarding matching grants in the case of hospitals and various homes. Under certain powers associated with the Loan Council, certain limitations are placed on amounts that any Government may borrow for semi-governmental purposes. At this stage, the Government does not intend to offer any guarantee about matters to which the honourable member referred in the latter part of his question.

UNEMPLOYMENT.

Mr. CUMBE: Has the Premier seen the figures published today of the unemployment position in Australia, indicating that this State has the highest *pro rata* figure of any State in the Commonwealth? If he has seen them, can he say what action the Government is considering taking to alleviate the position?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Whilst the Government recognizes that, according to the published figures, there has been a further deterioration in the unemployment position, mainly as a result of adverse conditions in the motor body building and allied industries, it must be realized that there has been an improvement as regards the number of positions vacant. Also according to newspaper reports there has been an improvement in the sale of motor cars in the last week or two, and generally, there is a brighter outlook in the employment position in this State. For instance, I have been informed by the Minister of Agriculture, who represents the District of Murray, that labour (not necessarily skilled labour) is required for a meat works in that area, and that there are vacancies for female labour in Murray Bridge—to what extent I am not informed. Unless further money is made available by the Commonwealth Government, the Government cannot go beyond what it has provided for works in the Loan Estimates. Already there has been a condemnation and a damnation (if I may use that expression) by certain people associated with the building industry. The Government is substantially responsible for activities undertaken by the Housing Trust, whose programme this financial year will at least equal that of last year. The trust will build houses in the country as well as in the metropolitan area. If others in the building industry were prepared to keep pace with the

trust, I am sure the position would improve. The allocations to the co-operative building societies (both at Adelaide and Hindmarsh) are an improvement on those available last year, as a result of conferences between the Commonwealth Minister for Housing and representatives in this State. Generally, however, the Government is not able to exceed the amount already provided in the Loan Estimates that have been approved by both Houses.

SHEEP EXPORTS.

Mr. CASEY: As people engaged in the fat lamb industry in this State have expressed considerable anxiety about the low numbers of fat lambs consigned to the United Kingdom recently, can the Minister of Agriculture say how many fat lambs have been sent to the United Kingdom this season? Further, can he say what price was paid in Smithfield (England) for those lambs, and give the House any available figures regarding the slaughtering of lambs at the Gepps Cross abattoirs this season, compared with the figures for the corresponding period last year?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: As the honourable member was good enough to indicate that he would ask this question, I have obtained the following information:

Only one shipment of fat lambs has been shipped to the United Kingdom from Gepps Cross this season. About 120 tons was shipped last week on the s.s. *Perim*. The first shipment from Port Lincoln will leave on about October 9 next. No definite information is available as to prices. However, the General Manager of the Government Produce Department says he has heard that some forward sales have been made at 21d. sterling a pound, and that Smithfield market quotations for the past few weeks have remained fairly steady at this rate. The latest figures available from the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board cover the period ended August 26, 1966, and are as follows: (Slaughtering for the five weeks ended August 27, 1965, are also shown.)

	Local (Sheep and lambs.)	Export Sheep.	Export Lambs.	Total.
1966	157,365	—	3,655	161,020
1965	159,244	—	2,165	161,409
Total, July 1 to August 26, 1966	263,694	443	3,655	267,792
Total, July 1 to August 27, 1965	268,898	—	2,165	271,063

AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week about making agricultural land available for the study of animal husbandry at high schools?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Naracoorte High School site comprises 27½ acres, including 4½ acres acquired in 1965. It is not practicable to enlarge the site, which is larger than the 20 acres provided for large metropolitan high schools, which do not teach

agriculture. In any case, the total project area for agriculture considered by the Education Department to be required either for the present project or any further developments would be about five acres, and it is considered that the present school site is sufficiently large to meet all the requirements of these projects. With regard to the Lucindale Area School, I am advised that 10 acres are used for a sheep project. No request has been received for additional land but if, under changing conditions, a small additional area is requested, the Education Department will be pleased to consider it.

ELIZABETH TRADE SCHOOL.

Mr. CLARK: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of last week seeking information about the possible establishment of a trade school in the Elizabeth area?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: A site of about 5½ acres is provided in the Elizabeth town plan for technical school facilities, and on it the Education Department hopes eventually to provide facilities both at the trade and other levels of technical education. Although the desire of students from Elizabeth to attend local schools is appreciated, the last survey conducted by the Education Department showed that the numbers do not warrant the providing of such a school before very urgently needed schools in other areas. I am not in a position at present to say when these technical school facilities at Elizabeth will be provided.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

Mrs. STEELE: The results of the survey of justices of the peace in South Australia were communicated to members in June, together with a list showing the number of justices residing in each member's district, the proposed quotas for the various areas, and the number of vacancies (if any) in these areas. Whilst the survey was in progress, members forwarded nominations in the usual manner, and everyone knows from his or her personal experience that there must be a great build-up of nominations in the hands of the Attorney-General. Regarding my district, I understand that many quotas are filled but that in some areas there are vacancies which current applications could fill. To my knowledge (and I think this probably applies in the case of other honourable members) the only appointments made have been those requested by banks and official Government sources. As many applicants have approached me about their

nominations, some of which have been outstanding for 18 months or longer, will the Attorney-General make a statement on this matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Within the next few days honourable members will receive a request that they make an appointment with me to go through outstanding applications in respect of their districts. I should be grateful for the assistance and advice of honourable members in clearing up the outstanding applications in relation to their districts. Rather than do what has been done previously (that is, that the Attorney-General has simply gone through the applications, made his decision, and indicated the result in a somewhat terse, brief manner to honourable members without giving any reason for his decision), since honourable members are necessarily involved in the recommendations they make in respect of their districts and know the position in their areas better than anybody else could, I should be grateful for their advice on the matter of filling quotas. Therefore, all members will receive letters asking them to arrange a specific time with me to go through the vacancies in their districts so that the quotas can be filled and the appointments made.

HIGHBURY LAND.

Mrs. BYRNE: An article appearing in today's *Advertiser* states that a resident of Highbury has had to give up a 14-acre property which he has been developing for lemon growing, because of an acquisition move by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, portion of the land being acquired to guard against the pollution of water carried across the top of this property in an open channel to Hope Valley reservoir. The article also refers to the compensation to be received. Will the Minister of Works report on this matter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Anticipating a question on this matter, I called for a report from the Chief Valuer of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, who states:

Cabinet approval to acquire land on either side of the Hope Valley Aqueduct to protect the water from pollution was given on January 24, 1966, vide E.W.S. 5004/65. During March, 1966, the Property Officer and myself interviewed some of the owners who had received letters seeking permission for surveyors of the department to survey the areas to be acquired. Mr. Koperlos (the person concerned in the article), was one of those interviewed. Due to the very steep nature of the land and because of the difficulty of access to the river flats which would result from the acquisition of the 200 feet wide strip required from Mr. Koperlos,

it was felt that the whole of the land including the river flats should be acquired. However, following on representations made by Mr. Koperlos it was decided to ascertain if adjustments to the boundary of the required land could be made to enable Mr. Koperlos to retain the river flats and provide for a building site and access.

On April 18, 1966, Mr. Koperlos stated in a letter to the department that if the whole of the land was required the price would be \$14,190. With the Engineer for Water and Sewage Treatment and the Assistant Engineer for Water and Sewage Treatment, the Property Officer and myself inspected the area on August 31, 1966, and interviewed Mr. Koperlos. It was decided that, to satisfactorily protect the aqueduct now and in the future, against pollution, the whole of Mr. Koperlos' property should be purchased and he was so informed. He reiterated that he would want \$14,190 for its purchase which was the land tax value. On September 1, 1966, Mr. Koperlos again wrote to the department detailing his expenditure in connection with the property and increased his price to \$16,000 inclusive of a motor vehicle, plant and equipment. On September 19, 1966, the Property Officer discussed aspects of this acquisition with Mr. Koperlos and his solicitor (Mr. Lynch of Roder, Dunstan, Lee and Taylor) and he undertook to submit a departmental valuation within the next three weeks.

This action has been taken under the most reasonable form of negotiation, and the land is required to protect the reservoir from pollution.

ABORIGINES.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Some weeks ago I asked the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs a question regarding Aborigines at Koonibba, and I understand he now has a reply.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member asked me two questions concerning the situation at Koonibba. In one question, relating to the residences on the reserve, he said:

Can the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs say why some Aboriginal families living on the Koonibba Reserve still occupy the old, dilapidated shacks that have been there for many years when there are still available to them eight or 10 more modern residences? The old shacks have no bathing facilities of any kind, whereas the new houses have such facilities.

Mr. Speaker, all the newer type residences are fully occupied at Koonibba. The six more modern residences referred to by the honourable member are those buildings transported from Port Augusta and in the process of being renovated. An all-trades foreman was employed on August 2, 1966, whose sole job is to supervise the bringing of these cottages up to standard as soon as possible. This includes complete electrical wiring, plumbing,

and the provision of bathing and laundry facilities. Since commencing, the all-trades foreman has already completed one house with the exception of power and water. Although it is true that the old "shacks" have no bathing facilities, all houses here have had water reticulated to them. Indeed, I have had a request from the residents that they would be glad to see the honourable member at Koonibba and to demonstrate to him the improvements that have been made on the reserve. In fact, I am rather proud of what has been undertaken at Koonibba; the programme was commenced under the previous Minister, and it has been carried out since this Government took office. Koonibba today has macadamized roads, an underground electricity supply, and a reserve of which I think we can be justly proud.

The honourable member also asked me a question concerning children who travelled from Koonibba to Ceduna having to leave home in the morning without breakfast because the parents had spent the night on the drink. The honourable member went on to say:

If that is a fact, those children may have not taken any lunch with them. They have to leave home at 7.50 a.m., and probably they arrive back at Koonibba at 6 p.m.

There is only one incident to which this could possibly refer, and that concerns a child whose name I can give to the honourable member. This lad stayed away from school because he had no breakfast (so he did not actually go to school without lunch): his father had failed to provide for the family, having spent his money on drink. The mother had previously been supporting the family during the father's absence in gaol, and was in the process of taking a maintenance order out against him for failing to return after his release. However, he returned home, but he worked for only four days and he got drunk. On the day in question, it was brought to the notice of the Superintendent by the Welfare Officer that the boy was not at school and, after inquiries, the Superintendent was prepared to assist the mother. The mother refused straightout assistance during the interview, requesting that she be allowed to work. This was arranged, and an advance on wages was made immediately to tide her over the present situation so that she could provide for the children and the family. She is a responsible mother. It is unfortunate that her husband does not always measure up to his family responsibilities, but that (as Minister of Social Welfare, I assure the honourable

member) happens with people in the general community as well. Generally speaking, the situation in relation to drink at Koonibba is not nearly as it has been represented publicly: it is satisfactory.

Mr. HUGHES: Prior to the Show adjournment, the member for Mitcham asked the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs to comment on figures given in an article on Aboriginal gaol sentences by Mr. Stewart Cockburn. Can the Minister comment further?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am grateful to the honourable member for raising this matter. The total number of Aborigines admitted to gaol during the period June, 1965, to June, 1966, was 1,638, comprising 1,364 males and 274 females. The total number of persons admitted during this period was 8,353, comprising 7,871 males and 482 females. Aborigines represented 19.6 per cent of total admissions. The percentage of Aboriginal males admitted was 17.3 per cent of the total number of males, whilst the percentage for Aboriginal females was 56.8 per cent of the total number of females. By way of comparison, the total number of admissions for the period June, 1964, to June, 1965, was 7,060, comprising 6,735 males and 325 females. The number of Aborigines admitted totalled 1,043 (14.7 per cent) consisting of 941 males (14 per cent) and 102 females (31.3 per cent). This means there has been an increase of 57 per cent on the previous year's figures. However, the figures given thus are, on the face of it, quite misleading. It must be noted that in compiling figures this way no account is made of the number of individual Aborigines imprisoned or the number of people imprisoned more than once. An analysis of the admissions to Adelaide Gaol reveals that a substantial number were admitted more than once and some several times. For the year June, 1965, to June, 1966, 182 Aborigines were admitted 502 times, so that this means that of the 502 individual admissions only 182 Aborigines were individually responsible. It is apparent (and I have a complete run-down on the total number involved in cases) that a number were for other than drinking offences. Of the total number of offences, 214 were to do with matters of drink, but it is quite clear that in the past two months there has been a considerable falling off in offences by Aborigines throughout the State. I have discussed this with police officers in several country centres and they see a substantial alteration in the behaviour and no reason why that alteration should not continue. Consequently, I do not

expect that the increase shown last year will occur during the current year.

METROPOLITAN DRAINAGE.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Local Government, an answer to a question I asked some time ago regarding the introduction of a Bill dealing with metropolitan drainage?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Local Government states that he met representatives of councils last month and discussed draft proposals on metropolitan drainage. At this meeting, councils resolved that steps be taken to survey the drainage requirements of the area as an interim step. Arrangements for this survey are in hand, following which another meeting will be called to discuss further procedure.

PEAKE WATER SCHEME.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Works ascertain from his department whether it is intended to proceed with the township water supply for Peake? No line was shown on the Estimates for this. Therefore, if the Government intends to proceed with this supply, is it provided for under "Miscellaneous" expenditure?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be happy to obtain a report for the honourable member.

THE CHIEF JUSTICE.

Mr. LAWN: Last year, when Justice Mayo announced his resignation to take effect in June of this year, I understood that it was intended that Chief Justice Napier would resign at the end of this year. Has the Attorney-General further information on this matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not think I can give information on this score at present. Two judges, the Chief Justice and Sir Herbert Mayo, were appointed for life and they chose to retain their life appointments. Justice Reed, who was also appointed for life, chose to become a contributor under the pensions scheme and to retire at the pensionable age of 70 years. Subsequently, the House will remember that at the instance of the then Government, provision was made so that non-contributory retirement allowances the same as the allowances payable to those who had contributed would be payable to Sir Herbert Mayo and the Chief Justice. The Chief Justice is aware that it is not the policy of the Government that

a person should remain in public office substantially beyond the normal retirement age, and there have been discussions on this score. Last year at the annual dinner, the Chief Justice announced to the profession that he would be retiring in due course, but naturally this is a matter for him to intimate. At this stage, I have no further information I can give.

TREASURY FIGURES.

Mr. McANANEY: As the August statement of Treasury figures is usually available ere this, can the Treasurer say when it will be available as it may be of some value in the Budget debate?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I was under the impression that I had made this statement available and that a copy had been forwarded to the Leader of the Opposition before it was released. Unless there has been some misunderstanding between me and someone else, I think the Leader would have it by now. Although I will ensure that he has one immediately, I point out that the statement came to my notice only last Thursday or Friday.

GAS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not know whether the Premier has seen in the press a statement by Sir Colin Syme (Chairman of Directors of Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited) that in Victoria the Government has been negotiating with the company regarding the price of gas to be supplied to metropolitan Melbourne, and that substantial agreement has been reached that there will be a large reduction in the price of gas delivered to metropolitan Melbourne under the agreement—25 per cent immediately and probably another 25 per cent within a limited time. Can the Premier say whether discussions have taken place with the Delhi-Santos group concerning a possible price for gas supplied in South Australia?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Discussions have taken place, and they will continue until we have arrived at a satisfactory solution.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Premier say whether the Government has yet made a submission to the Commonwealth Government for assistance regarding the gas pipeline, or whether this approach is being delayed until agreement regarding the price of gas is arrived at with the companies?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The answer to the first question is "No". Regarding the

latter part of the question, the Government is still greatly interested in the matter but as yet its case is not finalized. However, I hope that it will not be long before the position is finalized, and I intend to inform the House as soon as it is.

OODNADATTA ROAD.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question about the road from Marree to Oodnadatta and Alice Springs, as the result of a conversation I had with a representative of the Ansett-Pioneer organization, which intends to organize a tour through that area next year?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have conferred with the Director and Engineer-in-Chief, who has forwarded me the following report from the Northern Districts Regional Engineer:

With the continued increase of tourist activities in the Far Northern area, there is a desire by some bus operators to travel one way to Alice Springs *via* the Flinders Ranges, Marree and Oodnadatta. However, before this road could be used frequently at all times by large tourist buses, many sections would require considerable up-grading and numerous creek crossings improved. With our present commitments this would be a major task and, in view of the proposal for the transfer of the responsibility for the construction and maintenance of northern roads to the Highways Department, no decision can be taken at this stage. I have arranged, however, for our roadworks personnel to improve the creek crossings specifically mentioned by Mr. Casey at an early date. Further, the road from Marree to William Creek has recently been graded and is now in reasonable order. Work on the section from William Creek to Oodnadatta has been delayed following the breakdown of the grader in that area. This section will, however, be graded as soon as possible.

The Regional Engineer has added that the road from Marree to Oodnadatta follows fairly closely to the railway line and that station people therefore have an adequate outlet for the transport of cattle and heavy goods. For this reason, the Marree-Oodnadatta Road has not been given a high priority and, with the limited resources of plant and finance available, work has tended to be concentrated on other roads, particularly the main North-South Road from the Northern Territory border to Kingoonya. However, the Marree-Oodnadatta Road has been graded as frequently as possible and, generally, this met the requirements of the local station people.

COLLIERS.

Mrs. BYRNE: The Attorney-General may be aware that the selling of encyclopaedias by Colliers Incorporated in this State has previously been raised in the House, particularly the question of whether contracts with that organization are enforceable and comply with

the provisions of the Book Purchasers Protection Act. As I have been informed of two instances in which this organization is pressing clients for outstanding payments, can the Attorney-General say whether there have been fresh developments in this matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Colliers informed me in December last that it intended to withdraw its sales organization from this State, because of the Government's attitude. (It was clearly expressed to that organization that we intended to enforce the provisions of the Book Purchasers Protection Act.) The contracts previously entered into in South Australia by various purchasers with Colliers which I have so far sighted were all in my view unenforceable, in view of the provisions of the Book Purchasers Protection Act. They did not contain the clauses specifically required by the Book Purchasers Protection Act to be included in a contract in order for the contract to be enforceable. In consequence, further pressure by Colliers in relation to these unenforceable contracts is, in my view, something these people would be wise to resist. It has been my practice to advise all those persons having contracts with Colliers to which they took objection to seek the advice of a solicitor as soon as possible to deal with any demands made upon them by Colliers.

EYRE PENINSULA RAILWAY.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My question concerns the availability of rolling stock to transport the forthcoming grain harvest on Eyre Peninsula. From year to year it has been necessary for the Railways Department to transport substantial tonnages of grain to relieve the pressure on country silos. I think that in all years that I can remember there have been occasions when the country bins have been filled and there has been a delay in deliveries from farms because the Railways Department has not always been able to keep up with the removal of the grain to make room at country silos for incoming wheat, and sometimes barley. Therefore, will the Premier ask the Minister of Transport for a return showing the number of diesel locomotives (as they are the only ones that really matter) available for service on the Eyre Peninsula Division at June 30, 1965, and at June 30, 1966, or for the forthcoming harvest (whichever is more suitable to the Railways Commissioner), and for a similar return regarding bulk grain trucks available on the

Eyre Peninsula Division? As the grain production on Eyre Peninsula is increasing rapidly, I desire to know whether the Commissioner is able to add to the fleet of rolling stock on that division to the extent necessary to cope with the increased production.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will take up the matter with my colleague and bring down a report as soon as possible.

DUTTON WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: On February 21 of this year I lodged a petition with the Minister of Works from a group of farmers in the hundred of Dutton who applied for a reticulated water service. Will the Minister ascertain what stage the processing of this petition has reached?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I well remember the petition, which I sent on to the department. However, the honourable member will appreciate that, as I was indisposed last week, the docket could have been returned to my office without my knowledge. I will comply with the honourable member's request and give a reply as soon as I can.

GOATS' MILK.

Mrs. BYRNE: On June 21 this year, in reply to a question I asked about imported dehydrated goats' milk obtainable under the Commonwealth Government health scheme causing clients to cancel orders for fresh goats' milk to the detriment of the industry generally, the Minister of Agriculture said that the matter would be placed before Cabinet with a view to an approach being made to the appropriate Commonwealth Minister. Can the Minister indicate the result of these representations?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: As promised, I took the matter to Cabinet, where it was agreed that the Premier should ask the Commonwealth Government whether something could be decided. The Premier has now forwarded to me the following letter he has received from the Hon. J. McEwen, who was the Acting Prime Minister in the absence of the Prime Minister overseas:

You wrote to the Prime Minister under your reference M.A. 26/66 and suggested that consideration be given to the provision of fresh goats' milk, as a pharmaceutical benefit, in preference to imported dehydrated goats' milk. I am informed that dehydrated goats' milk is available as a pharmaceutical benefit only for cows' milk allergy in children under the age of four years and only in cases where the written authority of the Commonwealth Director of Health in the State concerned is first obtained by the doctor writing the prescription. This would limit the amount of

dehydrated goats' milk which could be supplied as a pharmaceutical benefit. Careful consideration has been given to the question of making fresh goats' milk available as a pharmaceutical benefit. However, any item listed as a pharmaceutical benefit must be available throughout Australia, as any chemist could be called upon to provide it. It cannot be listed as a benefit if available only in certain areas.

In considering fresh goats' milk as a pharmaceutical benefit, a number of administrative problems would also be raised, such as continuity of supply in all seasons to widely separated areas, maintenance of quality and freshness, transportation and container costs and the fixing of a uniform all-seasons price applicable throughout Australia. Another point to consider is the 50c fee chargeable on each supply of a pharmaceutical benefit. As, in the case of fresh goats' milk, each supply would, in general, be the daily supply, the situation could arise where, as a pharmaceutical benefit, it would cost the recipient 50c each day, whereas four 1 lb. tins of dehydrated goats' milk, sufficient for approximately one month, can now be obtained as one prescription on payment of the one 50c fee. In view of these considerations you will appreciate that the listing of fresh goats' milk as a pharmaceutical benefit is most unlikely.

MUSGRAVE PARK.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Has the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs a reply to my recent question about staff at Musgrave Park?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The staff of the North-West Reserve is as follows:

Superintendent (Mr. Gratton).
Welfare Officer (Miss Atkins).
Nursing Sister (Sister Baker).
Daily Paid Building Overseer (Mr. Hewitt).
Patrolling Welfare Officer (Miss Forbes).

The honourable member will know that Miss Forbes is not always at Musgrave Park: she travels between Musgrave Park and Oodnadatta, and through the pastoral leases in the North. The Stock Overseer's position is vacant because of a resignation; applicants to fill the position have been interviewed; and an appointment will be made shortly. Application has been made to the Public Service Commissioner for the creation of a position of Mechanical Overseer and, when accommodation is provided, there will be an application for Storeman-Bookkeeper. In fact, one of the troubles we have had on the North-West Reserve is that we have not had a Mechanical Overseer, and because of the rugged nature of the terrain in the area the time of other staff has been taken up inordinately with the repair of vehicles when members of that staff could better have been engaged on the work for which they were properly appointed. We have been

told that we may well be able to get a qualified Aboriginal as Mechanical Overseer, and we hope to make such an appointment soon. In fact, we have already appointed a well qualified one on a daily-paid basis at Koonibba, and there is also a man with considerable experience who has applied for this position on the North-West Reserve. That person would be known to the honourable member for Flinders. Stock on the North-West Reserve at July 31, 1966, comprised 293 head of cattle, and possibly 44 additional head will be sent from Point Pearce, half of which will be young breeders. An additional bore will be sunk this year in the Cave Hill area to better use this paddock, and 20 miles of additional fencing on the station will be completed in the current financial year. Further progress with a rock-fill dam will be made during the year. The present height is 6ft. of a recommended height of 17ft. 6in. Mr. Speaker, we flew over the dam the week before last. It is holding pretty well; in fact, there is a good stretch of water there at the moment. The height of the dam will be increased, and surveys have been made of other possible dam sites there—both in the Tomkinson and Mann Ranges—to increase the possibility of providing water both for the residents of the reserve and natural game.

SCHOOLTEACHERS' DUTIES.

Mrs. STEELE: There is evidence of increasing concern amongst members of the teaching staffs of departmental schools that they are having additional duties imposed upon them to the detriment of their real function, namely, teaching. These duties, listed in some detail in a letter written to the *South Australian Teachers Journal* and signed by more than 100 teachers, are those of library duty; handling school bank deposits; work in connection with book lists; team coaching of the schools' various sporting activities; collection of moneys for a variety of purposes; compilation of lists of pupils for scholarships; handling bus passes for both Municipal Tramways Trust and private bus firms; and duplication of notes. I know, of course, that in high schools, technical high schools, and area schools with enrolments over a certain number clerical assistants are employed. However, in addition to all those duties teachers will now be expected to handle the free book scheme, and the clerical work consequently involved, as from the beginning of next year. In view of the fact that quite obviously the main function of teachers (after some years of training, at great expense

to the State) is to teach, can the Minister of Education say whether the Government can justify employing trained people for a multitude of minor clerical duties?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I suppose the Government could justify that to the same extent as did the previous Government, for I do not think there is much difference in the duties now from the duties that were carried out before this Government took office. Regarding the question of those duties generally, may I say that when more finance is available for education one of the first things that I should like to see is the provision of secretarial assistance for schools, and assistance of a nature that would relieve the teachers of these particular duties. As Minister of Education, I am certainly not in accord with teachers being asked to do any more than is necessary in this direction, and I should like to use their trained experience to the utmost. In my opinion, the provision of free books to primary schools in the manner indicated will not put so many duties upon the teachers as have been performed previously in collecting money for books. I know very well the sort of duties teachers had to carry out in collecting money at the beginning of each term, usually extending over a period of at least two or three weeks. Those teachers had the problem of keeping account of the various moneys that were outstanding, and it was often difficult to collect. From the very close examination we made of this problem before embarking on the method which we have embarked upon for the supply of free books in primary schools, I am quite sure that there will in fact be no more work for the teachers by this method than by the previous methods involved with books in primary schools. Therefore, I do not think it can be maintained that this is an additional duty.

BARLEY.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: A few days ago the Chairman of the Australian Barley Board (Mr. Strickland) announced that in this coming harvest barley would be received into silos with a maximum moisture content of 13 per cent. I suppose every barleygrower is rather anxious that the 13 per cent limit should be raised. The problem involved in harvesting barley is such that it is very difficult for a farmer to cart directly from the header into the silo and to get the moisture content as low as 13 per cent. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the Australian Barley Board or his department is still experimenting with

bulk barley to ascertain whether it will be possible in future to receive bulk barley with a greater moisture content than 13 per cent?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I have no doubt that my department and the Barley Board are anxious to do all that can be done, and I shall obtain a full report from the Chairman of the Barley Board, who is also the Director of Agriculture.

SCHOOL WINDOWS.

Mr. HALL: During the weekend I, with representatives of several school committees, attended a school function at which the cleaning of school windows was discussed. Generally, it was regretted that in future they were not to be cleaned departmentally. Although several people said that if economies were to be made this was one place where economies should be first considered, it was the unanimous opinion that windows had to be cleaned at some time. Those people present agreed that the figure by which the contracts had been reduced in respect of non-cleaning of windows was substantial and about the same as that given by the member for Mitcham in a question last week. As large reductions have been made, it was suggested that the department arrange a single contract for windows to be cleaned once a year. Some schools are two-storey and it would not be easy for untrained staff or staff without equipment to clean these windows. Will the Minister of Education re-consider or modify his decision to have school windows not cleaned, and arrange to have them cleaned once a year by using a single contract?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I do not intend to alter the present decision for the time being, but intend to watch the situation to see what happens. Windows in two or three-storey buildings can only be cleaned by people with proper equipment, and people should not be asked to do it without the necessary equipment, but I believe that in New South Wales many windows are satisfactorily cleaned by hosing. Regarding the suggestion that amounts have been deducted in proportion to the wages or contract price for cleaning windows, I point out that payment for cleaning windows has been on the basis of the area cleaned, and the amount deducted has been in relation to the amount for the area cleaned. There seems to be nothing wrong, if windows are not cleaned, in deducting from the total figure the amount relating to those windows, as that is a perfectly just procedure. If, as was said in the House last week when a member asked a question,

the cleaning of windows occupied 40 hours in one year it would seem that something less than \$300 was being paid for 40 hours' work.

THE BUDGET.

The Estimates—Grand total, \$258,018,000.

(Continued from September 15. Page 1651.)

In Committee of Supply.

THE LEGISLATURE.

Legislative Council, \$37,030.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): In supporting the first line, I speak much the same as I have spoken on other similar occasions. I cannot take pleasure in saying my forecasts over the years have proved accurate. This Government has become a luminary in the constellation of bodies that today do not balance their budgets. I have much sympathy with the Government because for many years by studying the position year by year I have known that the present position is inevitable. To state the position simply, no State Government today can balance its Budget unless it receives sufficient money from its internal taxation and other sources, and if it does receive it, the taxation must be heavy indeed. The stage will be reached where such taxation will be completely unwarranted, and a change is needed. Sir Henry Bolte (Premier of Victoria) is reported in the *Australian* as saying that the tax setup is crazy. He is not the first one to say that, but in order to obtain the money he considers necessary to balance his Budget (and he does not claim that it will) he will raise \$6,000,000 by levying a tax on gas and electricity. He does not want to do it, but in his Budget he has included a 3 per cent levy on the gross revenue of the State Electricity Commission and of the Victorian Gas and Fuel Corporation in order to raise \$6,000,000 a year. Observers believe that power charges to consumers will rise later. Compulsory third party motor insurance charges will rise by \$1.22 from January 1, bringing the cost for a private motorist in Victoria to \$28.52 a year. A stamp duty of 1.5 per cent will be imposed on all forms of credit agreement. The Victorian Premier is reported in the *Australian* as saying:

The whole system of Commonwealth-State tax reimbursement was so patently crazy and loaded against the States that it was beyond comprehension how anyone could be found to defend it.

I will certainly not endeavour to defend it, because I have opposed it for years. The *Australian* continues:

Making his Budget Speech in Parliament, the Victorian Premier added: "Yet defenders there are and when I, or any other State Premier, attempts to tell the people about it, the cry goes up that we are playing politics . . . politics indeed! This is a matter beyond politics, and I say to every member of the House that the hour is one minute before midnight, and there is barely time to save the situation for the States." Sir Henry said the Commonwealth was loading the burden of interest and debt charges almost exclusively on States.

That statement is indeed correct. The article continues:

The public debt of the States continued to soar while that of the Commonwealth declined. Over the past 20 years Victoria's public debt had grown from \$399,000,000 to \$2,174,000,000, including Commonwealth housing agreement advances. The combined debt of all States had increased from \$2,019,000,000 to \$8,767,000,000—a fourfold increase. But the Commonwealth Government's debt had been cut by half—from \$3,656,000,000 to \$1,872,000,000. Much of the increase in the debt of States—\$1,600,000,000 for all States and \$400,000,000 for Victoria—was money provided by the people by taxation to the Commonwealth Government and lent back to the States at market rates of interest. "Every dollar of this must be repaid to the Commonwealth, and, with interest added, we repay from State taxation about \$2.50 for every \$1 lent," he said.

How could there be any position more crazy than that? The article continues to quote Sir Henry Bolte:

May I say with force and feeling that Victoria seeks no weapons, nor do the other States. All we desire and need is the ability to finance services to the people.

I think that is all that any Government wants, but this Government does not have the capacity to do that; neither will it have that capacity. There are two features here; one, of course, relates to the Government's Loan funds; and the other is its Consolidated Revenue. We had a gross deficit this year of \$9,000,000, and our State debt rose by \$72,000,000. Where are we going with that? For the first time I have read where another Treasurer (our own Treasurer) has made an approach. The Treasurer said that the Government had to find additional revenue to avoid increasing the deficit beyond the estimated \$8,000,000. He said that the paying out of almost \$38,000,000 to meet the interest burden of the State made it more difficult to provide a balanced Budget.

Yes, it makes it \$38,000,000 more difficult! Over the last 25 years South Australia's burden

of debt, like that of Victoria, has risen by \$1,000,000,000, which is represented in the enormous Loan Fund works that are absolutely vital to South Australia. There is no other way of financing those works, except by borrowing money. When that money is borrowed, if Sir Henry Bolte is correct, every time \$1 is borrowed the borrower is forced in the long run to pay back \$2.50. When capital works begin to be productive of income, that income is never sufficient (or seldom sufficient) to meet the tremendous charges, in interest alone, on those works. The instance is, of course, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, which loses 62 per cent of its revenue in interest charges. Consequently, if further expansion and more services to people are to be financed, then, in order to obtain some money towards paying that 62 per cent, taxes have to be increased. Water supply charges are being increased; the price of almost every single item in South Australia has been increased. One or two things may have been overlooked, but I am sure they will not be overlooked for long.

It is born of the necessity to balance the Budget. I claim that the balancing of Budgets, as much as it is lauded by people, can be achieved only in one of two ways: either by sitting back and doing nothing, so that expenditure is not increased; or by loading the charges on to the people. Those charges are reaching breaking point. I am not speaking in any way politically. I hope the Government will appreciate that. I am meeting the position as I observe it.

Mr. McKee: It applies to other Governments, too.

Mr. QUIRKE: No Government is exempt from this position. All Governments are included, and the Commonwealth Government itself is budgeting for a deficit of \$200,000,000, which can only harm every State. The Financial Agreement and the Loan Council agreements are clearly designed to load the debt on to the States, and it is time (and I agree with the member for Glenelg and the Minister of Education in this regard) that we recast that legislation if we are going to get anywhere.

Nothing has been done about it since 1944. Now is the appointed hour to do something about it, using the united efforts of the State and Commonwealth Treasurers. They may have been parties to the agreement in 1927, but the agreement is now outmoded and unworkable. No Government, whether it be Liberal or Labor, can function under the present agreement.

This situation affects not only the finances of South Australia and every other State of the Commonwealth: it is having an effect on Australia's whole social structure. No longer, as I think I have said before, do the young people have the vision to which Banjo Paterson referred when he said:

And he sees the vision splendid of the sunlit
plains extended,
And at night the wondrous glory of the
everlasting stars.

How many of these scruffy kids think that way now—and it is not their fault that they do not! Young people in this country must be imbued with a desire to advance Australia, which now has the finest living conditions in the world. Young people, however, do not appreciate this, so they cannot be expected to see the position as we see it. The only answer to our problems is to re-cast the whole idea of how State finances can be budgeted. I have before me a document published by the Reserve Bank. I shall not weary members by reading all of it but I shall read a few extracts. The report states:

Despite the better than expected loan-raising experience, total borrowings available for the financing of States' works and housing programmes were still well short of the amount required. The original programme approved by the Loan Council in June, 1965, provided for a total of \$590,000,000, an increase of \$10,000,000 on the previous year.

I draw the attention of honourable members to the fact that, on Loan figures, the States are expected by the Commonwealth Government to keep advancement going on what they received last year, plus \$10,000,000. That sum would not pay for one decent capital work for one State. The report continues:

This was lifted a further \$15,000,000 in March, 1966, when a supplementary allocation was made to the States for housing.

Therefore, it was necessary for the Commonwealth to provide another \$15,000,000 for housing, but the original intention was to increase the allocation by only \$10,000,000, and what earthly use would that sum have been if there were going to be continual progress in Australia through the agency of all States? The report continues:

States' domestic loan raisings provided \$6,000,000 towards the total programme. After charging to Loan Fund \$90,000,000 for defence and \$132,000,000 for debt redemption—

thus, that is where \$132,000,000 of the total \$599,000,000 went—

the amount available in the Loan Fund was \$169,000,000 short of the \$599,000,000 required to meet the States' programmes and a special

loan was subscribed by the Commonwealth to bridge this gap. In 1964-65 a similar special loan of \$134,000,000 had been required.

Let us consider how much below what was required was the original estimate when these additional allocations were necessary. Who was the person responsible for drawing up the first estimates of the States' Loan requirements? That figure was obviously short by a colossal amount. The following interesting statement is included in the report:

Within the private sector, experience over the year as a whole varied a good deal between various groups. With severe drought in New South Wales and Queensland, farm incomes fell by about \$300,000,000 and, although investment outlays were reduced, the available evidence suggests that rural sector indebtedness increased significantly over the year.

Rural income was down significantly in other States as well and no money took the place of this income except in the form of debt. When a primary producer is afflicted by drought over two years and his income is down because of the drought, not only does the State's income go down, but his debts must be increased, and they take years to overcome. Imagine the restocking of places over a period of years that has to be done by people with no money with which to do it!

I could say many things on these matters, but I point out that I do not blame any Government in Australia, Liberal or Labor, which today faces a heavy deficit in its Budgets, for the good and sufficient reason that to avoid a deficit a Government would have to deprive people of something of which they cannot be deprived. In order to meet the requirements of the State, a Government should not be sorry to go into deficit. That is a plain fact. When Governments go into deficit in this way, in the following years Loan Estimates are reduced accordingly and where do States go from there? Is the deficit added to their allocation in order to make it up? The allocation is made up first, allowing for the deficit, and that is one of the first charges against the Loan allocation. I do not see any hope at all of Governments balancing their Revenue Budgets without heavy increases in taxation which are completely unwarranted and burdensome and which cause tribulation among the people.

There must be a more generous allocation of money from the source, and it is no use expecting allocations to come from any source other than the Commonwealth Government. Governments cannot look to the vast organization of private banks, which contribute nothing,

but benefit to an extraordinary extent through the spending of money because this money is channelled back to them. In spite of the publicity put out in the press and over radio and television by the banks, today they are just secondhand dealers. They are wonderfully effective in keeping accounts of people and not the slightest reproach can be levelled at them for their work in this connection. However, they do not contribute to the public works of a State but benefit to an amazing extent from those works.

This argument was the basis of the scheme I put forward as a means of financing the gas pipeline. Banks will contribute nothing towards this but will benefit mightily from it. Therefore, the Commonwealth Government is the only source from which a State can obtain funds at present, and we can obtain funds according to the ability of the people to lend money for them. The public works programme of Australia is in the main financed through the loans raised from the people of Australia. When they fall down on lending the money, when we cannot get it, and when it has to be supplemented by the Commonwealth Government, it is supplemented in as small a way as possible, and today the States are carrying practically the whole burden of Australian improvement. All the public works now proposed for Australia are expected to be financed mainly from public borrowings. Consequently, there is not a State in Australia that does not have a backlog of things that are needed but cannot be financed.

Mr. HUDSON: The Commonwealth even makes the States pay interest on the Loan money it makes available.

Mr. QUIRKE: The thing that must be thoroughly understood is that there is no free money. All money comes into existence as debt, and there is no other system that can be used at present. Even a Treasury bill that is current for about six months carries interest, and I maintain that it never should (certainly not to the extent that it does) unless it is funded only to the amount that is necessary to operate it; if it is not, then it means that other money can be found in the same way to finance the needed public works of Australia without putting this colossal debt on to the people of this country.

The other feature is this foolish sinking fund whereby we are expected to extinguish our debts over 53 to 58 years. On those works that were there before 1927 we pay at the rate of 50c to 75c in \$200, and on those that were put there after 1927 we pay \$1 per \$200. I

think we paid about \$8,000,000 in this way this year, and the debt of the State went up by \$72,000,000, so it means that a colossal amount will have to be found at some time in the future. England once had this system, but it became so impossible and so unwieldy that it was thrown out. We still have it, and we are burdened with debts that were incurred, for instance, on the manufacture of rolling stock which has long ago gone to Brown's scrap yard.

I could delay the Committee by saying what should be done. However, no suggestion will be any good because the collective effort of all Parliaments of Australia is needed to answer this question. As Sir Henry Bolte says, it is now a minute before midnight. We will go further and further down the drain as the years go by. I do not think any member can deny that. To deny that, a person would have to produce something that has not yet been produced anywhere to say how we could balance our Budgets without stopping our public spending on works to advance the interests of the State or without putting a tremendously heavy incubus of taxation on the people. Now is the time for the Treasurer of this State to use his influence and to call together the people of the Commonwealth on this matter. The employment situation is getting worse in all the principal States. I do not think it is possible to have a 100 per cent work force engaged. We have seasonal workers who travel all around the Commonwealth, and when their seasonal work ceases they register as unemployed. Therefore, they are not unemployed for the whole of the year. I maintain, however, that to the extent that it is possible no man should be unemployed.

We have these recessions that come along in the various industries. The motor body building, the refrigeration, and the washing machine industries today mainly depend on time-payment buying. This method has so got itself wrapped into the scheme of things in Australia today it is the only way whereby the output of industry can be absorbed. When things go bad and that avenue closes down, it makes things tighter for people and, when someone does not buy a motor car or a refrigerator, someone goes on to the unemployment list. We must work things better than that, and we must do it not in the interests of any one State nor in the interests of politics. Incidentally, the latter is a contributing factor to this business in many ways. This strife that goes on between the conflicting ideologies of Liberal and Labor in Australia is one of the things that is worked upon

openly, and we must get beyond that, for we are here to do the best we can for South Australia and for Australia generally. My attitude is "To hell with all the politics that prevent something better from being done."

A little effort on the part of some people is all that would be needed, and I suggest that this Government take a lead if necessary and get in with men like Sir Henry Bolte and others to see whether, with the collective effort of all the States of the Commonwealth, irrespective of their politics, we cannot change these things. At present not being able to balance a Budget is a slur on a Government, but it can be the exact reverse. In fact, it could be that a Government would fail if it balanced its Budget. Although I do so without much pleasure, I support the Budget in the hope that from this day onwards some attempts will be made by the Government of South Australia to alleviate a position which every member in this Chamber knows needs alleviating.

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): I support the first line. I consider that some Opposition speakers have been grossly unfair to this Government.

Mr. Hudson: Not the member for Burra.

Mr. HURST: No, I completely exonerate the honourable member, who said much of what I intended to say and therefore cut down my speech considerably, for which I know my leader will be grateful. The Government should be complimented on producing a good Budget. It had planned a small deficit of about \$2,000,000 this year, and this, related to a total Budget of \$255,000,000, works out at less than 1 per cent tolerance. This is a reasonable approach to the problem. Last year, there was a deficit of about \$8,000,000 but the Government should be complimented on running at that deficit, because without it, there would have been greater unemployment in this State. The Labor Party has been criticized by Opposition members who have requested that certain things be done.

Apparently, they are never satisfied, but this Government, on taking office, continued existing projects. Last year's deficit was caused, in part, because of the previous Government's commitments, and the Opposition should accept its share of the responsibility for this deficit. Opposition criticism is designed to lower the morale of the people of this State. Several reasons are apparent for the deficit: first, the drought could not be foreseen, and secondly, the action of members in another place with

respect to money measures that this Government wished to have implemented, also had its effect. Measures were rejected which, if approved, would have made the position better today. It is clear from the Auditor-General's Report what he considers to be some reasons for the deficit, but he points out that there was an increased number of State employees. This illustrates that the Government was honest and sincere in its efforts to keep employment figures at the highest level.

The Commonwealth Government is spending a meagre sum on projects in this State. Many Commonwealth establishments urgently need expanding: the Repatriation General Hospital at Daw Park is having \$2,000,000 spent on it, but that is not much. The Adelaide Airport lacks adequate facilities, but the Commonwealth Government will not spend money to improve them. This affects the employment in building trades which, until recently, have been the worst affected. Interest on bonds and debentures is considerably increasing the public debt in this State. Many people complain of the housing shortage, but houses should be built at a price the worker can afford so that he can give his family a decent living standard.

Houses built by private enterprise are vacant. They cannot be sold because of the large interest required on loans and on second and third mortgages, and the price of these houses is beyond the means of the ordinary person. This situation clearly demonstrates that the system and manner under which finance is handled, and in which large interest rates are required, are, to some extent, curbing progress and activity in this State.

The production of consumer goods is being curtailed, because of hire-purchase agreements and exorbitant interest charges, as people have to pay out more than they can afford to pay, and this affects industry. The Auditor-General has stated in his report:

Each year I have reported that very few of the capital works approved in recent years returned sufficient revenue to meet working expenses and debt charges. This has been evidenced by the increases in some public utility charges in recent years, a trend which must continue under present conditions. I again quote South Australian waterworks where debt charges were \$8,376,000 but surplus earnings over working expenses to meet this were only \$3,548,000. The policy of requiring private subdividers to meet a greater part of the capital cost of water services could assist in providing a better return as more housing schemes are serviced in this way.

I agree entirely with those remarks. It is far too much to expect people, particularly the

wage-earner, to pay for a block of land and a house, and then to find an extra sum to install essential services to keep health and hygiene at the required standard. If such charges could be spread over a period of, say, 30 years (not at today's rate of interest but at a rate comparable with a person's means), people would be much better able to balance their budgets. After all, if the ordinary man cannot budget, it must inevitably have some effect on industry and employment. The changeover to decimal currency must also be considered in this debate. Whilst the Auditor-General does not refer specifically to the ramifications of the changeover, he states that the changeover in State Government departments and other public authorities was "effected with a minimum of difficulty". The price of an item that might previously have increased by ½d. must now be increased by 1c which, when multiplied by the wide range of items purchased by people today, affects the lower wage-earner and his standard of living. In addition, whilst work was entailed in regard to the conversion of machines to decimal currency, the manpower and time available for other works and facilities were lessened.

The Minister of Education adequately dealt with the references to education that have been made in this debate, and clearly dispelled any suggestion that his department had been responsible for unnecessary spending. It is pleasing to note that reductions in Electricity Trust tariffs were effected during 1965-66. I commend the trust on not having to increase its charges, one of the reasons for which is that it has been using some of its small surpluses on capital works, thereby obviating the necessity to borrow money and to pay interest. Indeed, an examination of the trust's records reveals that interest payments represent much of its budget. The more interest that can be eliminated, the more efficient the undertaking can become, and the sooner the public can receive the benefits of reduced prices, and the enjoyment of advanced techniques. When speaking at the annual convention of the Liberal Party, the New South Wales Premier (Mr. Askin) said that he would have to make the Budget balance, and that his Government was firmly convinced that there was a need to overhaul the tax reimbursement formula. That, of course, was in accordance with what the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) said. The State Government had to meet the increase in the basic wage from current revenue, and it will be about 12 months before that can be

recouped. Although the Commonwealth Government has to meet that increase in so far as its employees are concerned, it will receive far more by way of income tax than it will have paid to its own employees. The Minister of Education said that Western Australia's deficit this year was to be \$7,000,000, but if we examine the allocations to the various States (and I am again referring to what the New South Wales Premier said), whereas Western Australia received \$125 a head, South Australia received only \$84, a difference of about \$40.

Mr. Nankivell: It was \$86 for South Australia.

Mr. HURST: It is quoted as \$84.

Mr. Nankivell: My figure was obtained in reply to a question asked on notice.

Mr. HURST: In any case, the difference between South Australia's and Western Australia's allocation is about \$40. It is a tribute to the Treasurer that the planning and progress of undertakings in this State have been effected in accordance with the Budget. It has been clearly illustrated that the Treasurer is a better manager than are the Liberal Treasurers in other States. Indeed, if South Australia received another \$40 a head, even more progress would be made. It gives me great pleasure to support the first line.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I should like to refer to some comments of Government members, and also to comment on my observations of the position in which the Government finds itself. One feature of the Treasurer's statement was that the Government was carrying into effect electoral promises. He said that a mandate had been given to the Government by the electors at the last election. I would not care to analyse the reason for the present Government's being in office, but it would be interesting to know whether it was, in fact, entirely owing to the bait dangled by the Treasurer in his election speech and whether the people voted for the Government as a result of those promises made to them. If they did, then some of them have reconsidered their thoughts on some of the things that could be claimed to be a mandate for the Government. Also, certain matters are before Royal Commissions, as a result of the attitude of electors towards them, that were a part of the policy speech and were claimed by the Treasurer to be matters he had a mandate to implement.

The Treasurer made a couple of interesting comments in his policy speech. First, he

went to great lengths to point out that no major works came before Parliament without their being considered by Cabinet, without their being recommended by the Minister, and without their being investigated by the Public Works Committee. He then said proudly that the Labor Party had three members on that committee. I can interpret that to mean only that no major works could have been undertaken by the previous Government without the knowledge of members of the Public Works Committee. Therefore, the programme of works (which, admittedly, was large because the Auditor-General has said that it was worth \$180,000,000, which is the equivalent of three years' expenditure at the present Loan allocation figure) must have been known, because it was recommended by the Public Works Committee and must have been on file. No works have been commenced since then without this Government's approval. Therefore, to say that a reason for the present situation is that the Government was committed to a volume of expenditure and to a programme about which it had no knowledge seems a rather specious argument.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: How many minority reports were made by the Public Works Committee before this Government took office?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I have never heard of a minority report by the Public Works Committee.

Mr. Coumbe: They are all unanimous.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes; the honourable member is a member of the committee and should know. This means that the works programme that embarrassed the Government during the past financial year was not something of which it had no knowledge. The Treasurer in his policy speech went on to say that any Government was questioned about where it was going to get money. He said:

Additional funds will also be available on account of the normal growth in Government revenue and Loan funds. The current trend of growth in Government expenditure and receipts is 7 per cent per annum and there is no indication that this trend is likely to alter. Last year Government expenditure exceeded \$140,000,000 and therefore we can anticipate cumulative increases of about \$10,000,000 each year for the next three years making a \$60,000,000 increase in all.

This was the money that the Treasurer said was going to provide for his promises. He said it would provide for new hospitals. Fortunately in one sense (and unfortunately in another) the land at Bedford Park has not proved to be a suitable building site. The

member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) will know there were great difficulties in obtaining a suitable area for the hospital at Tea Tree Gully which was so much featured in the Treasurer's speech. We wonder when we will see these things because we have heard the argument presented that the Government cannot find the money as it is committed already, as the Auditor-General said, in advance for three years.

Mr. McAnaney: Where did it build that hospital, by the way?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I think it is still in Annie's room. Nearly all these things are essential ultimately to State development, but one problem with which we are faced, as has been pointed out by many speakers, is that State Governments must function on a cash basis. I do not think we can get away from the fact that a State Government's finances are much the same as those of any individual: when it runs into strife it must go to its bank account and, if there is no money in that, it can only borrow. However, when it has no security it cannot borrow further.

Comments have been made about the finances of the Commonwealth Government. It has been said that the Commonwealth Government was in a similar position to that facing this Government as it had a \$252,000,000 deficit. However, as the member for Glenelg pointed out, that is different from a State deficit because the Commonwealth Government controls banking and, if it has a deficit, it is purely and simply a matter of transferring money from one Government department to another at some nominal interest rate. I do not believe there was anything wrong in the Commonwealth Government's budgeting for a deficit this year; it had a substantially increased Budget for defence. Of course, it was said that defence was taking priority over development and, as a consequence of this defence policy, development in this and other States would be hampered. However, I point out that income tax has increased by about 10.7 per cent over the last three years, and this reduces the spending power of people. That is elementary.

People can spend only their surplus income, their savings or what they can borrow, and they will not borrow if they do not have confidence. There is no confidence in the economy at present. Figures for retail trade show the reflection of that lack of confidence in the present economic situation. One of the things this Government can be held responsible for is the reduced confidence that is evident as a result of some of its policies. People are not

certain where they are going, because they have lost confidence. The lack of new industries in the State and the lack of outside capital are the result of the lack of confidence.

At present we are hearing about unemployment, which is principally in the motor body building industry. One of the tragedies of South Australia is that so much of its industrial economy is built up on motor cars. An interesting article in the *Financial Review* (I think the one released today) points out that the motor industry can be geared to defence purposes, and that General-Motors in America has major defence projects. If there is an increase in expenditure for defence, one thing this Government should be doing is attempting to persuade the people who make the decisions on where this expenditure will be made and what form it will take to see whether or not we in South Australia cannot diversify our industrial production in this State by taking up some of the slack.

Incidentally, much of this slack appears to be so unnecessarily useless slack in motor cars. We cannot keep on selling people new cars and we cannot build an industry on a depreciating asset, which is what most people are being asked to do; they buy something and by the time they pay for it it is worth very little and then it has to be taken off the road as scrap. We cannot build an industry on this sort of revolving finance. We must diversify our industry, and if we must have defence and our motor industry can take up the slack, this is a practical approach the Government of this State can take in attempting to remedy the unemployment situation in this industry.

Mr. Clark: The Commonwealth Government would have a say in that.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes, a tremendous say, because it controls the contracts. However, at least we have grounds for making representations to it. As we know, we have a big industry in this State, but it is all tied up in motor cars or components for motor cars, and if people stop buying that product there is immediately unemployment not only in that industry but in many ancillary industries. One reason given by the Government for the present financial position is that it is not receiving sufficient money from the Commonwealth Government. The States Grants (Income Tax Reimbursement) Act of 1942 came into operation when the income tax suspension legislation of 1942 was passed. In other words, the States gave up their income-taxing powers, and the Commonwealth Government

introduced an Act to reimburse them. Ever since then there has been a return to the States of taxation reimbursements on a per capita basis, worked out on an agreed formula related to population, average wages, and a 1.2 per cent additional loading. In this respect South Australia does reasonably well, I think better than it could possibly do under its own taxing arrangements.

I was challenged by the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) about my attitude to uniform taxation. I agree with the principle of uniform taxation. However, one thing that concerns me is that those people who want to spend the money do not always want to accept the responsibility for collecting the taxes, and that it is only when we have State taxation increases such as we have now that the Government in question is directly responsible to the people for those increases. It is easy to say that the Commonwealth Government can give us more money, but this Government and everybody else knows how unpopular is a move to increase taxes. It is not bad to increase them when it is possible to make a few hand-outs and gain a little support as a consequence. However, when a Government is giving the extra money to someone else and it has no say over how it is spent, it takes a pretty convincing argument to get any reaction.

The member for Semaphore (Mr. Hurst) commented on reimbursements. On August 2, in reply to a question on notice by the Leader of the Opposition, the Treasurer set out figures that are rather interesting. The tax reimbursement for 1966-67 (and this would be under the present formula) is as follows: New South Wales, \$63.7 a head; Victoria, \$62.6 a head; Queensland, \$75.4 a head; South Australia, \$86 a head; Western Australia (not \$125 as I think the member for Semaphore claimed) \$101.4 a head; and Tasmania, \$91.4 a head. Of course, we must remember that the last two States still get special grants in addition to this tax reimbursement.

When it comes to Loan allocations, as was pointed out during the debate on the Loan Estimates, South Australia, with 9 per cent of the population, receives 13.7 per cent of the allocation. Therefore, in actual fact, the South Australian taxpayer is being subsidized by taxpayers in other States such as Victoria and New South Wales, which get less per capita return. In addition, South Australia receives the benefit of Loan moneys that are raised in other States, and we get a bigger percentage than we could normally expect to raise in this

State. Therefore, I do not know how one could say from those figures that we could do any better under the present system than we are doing. The problem we are faced with, therefore, is one in which we undoubtedly have to cut our suit to match our cloth.

When the Minister of Education was defending the Government's policy he referred to the points that had been made as to the reasons for over-expenditure in the Government's Budget, and he raised this question of free school books. He said that nobody would say that they were not justified. Mr. Acting Chairman, I am going to say that although I do not disapprove of the principle I am concerned that we may not be able to match our part of the Commonwealth grants for tertiary education, and to me this is a very important matter. If we cannot match these grants we should not be giving out any charity unnecessarily anywhere else along the line in education. We must consider our resources in relation to education as a whole. I am extremely concerned about the possibility of cuts in the grants to the Flinders university, the University of Adelaide, and the Institute of Technology.

Some publicity has been given in the newspapers recently to a new Government plan for accepting migrant doctors as a means of overcoming a shortage. We should be doing everything we can to train our own doctors. We are turning our own people away from universities when we need more doctors. I spoke about this matter in the Loan Estimates debate. We need a new training hospital and a new School of Medicine at Flinders university, for we do not have the facilities even to train those we need to meet our present demands.

Because it is Government policy, free books are to be granted in primary schools, but this is of no benefit if we should lose money for tertiary education because we cannot match Commonwealth Government grants. Money should not be handed out without conditions attached to it; that has been the policy of both this and the previous Government. We have a responsibility to match grants and to provide the services we need. We cannot spend more money than we have, and we should not give away money that we cannot afford. Good government should not be ruined to pay for election promises.

We have an important object to provide necessary services for growth and development in this State. This is a balanced Budget, but it has been manipulated. We hear much about the National Debt and the increased payment

of sinking fund interest, but this Government, which opposed that procedure when in Opposition, is now transferring from Revenue to Loan Account accounts that were previously paid for in cash. Some election promises, such as school books and purchase of old homes, are good in principle, but can we afford them? We should be concerned with practical things as they will ultimately resolve the issues. We seem to have lost most of the sugar coating from the election pill, most of the icing has gone from the gingerbread, and people are wondering where they are going under this Administration. The Electricity Trust is a most efficient organization and has done a tremendous job, but it has not done it completely from its own resources. Much of what it has done has been done by special grant. The erection of a major power-line to the South-East was the result of a grant from surplus revenue, an advantage of being able to more than balance the Budget as shown by the previous Government, which did not fail to provide adequate services and consequently to expand industry in the South-East.

In the sparsely settled district of Albert, there will be few houses in the next three years that will not be able to connect to Electricity Trust power. I understand that some change has occurred in financing the trust's capital works, and projects that were promised for a certain time have now been postponed. There is nothing new in their being deferred, but this is the first time that projects promised in a financial year will not be started in that year. I hope this situation will not continue. Probably, the problem has arisen because the trust is being asked to find a greater proportion of the capital required to build the new Torrens Island power station than it reasonably expected. The transfer of money from the Highways Fund is legitimate, but with the highways in our State needing more money spent on them, it is wrong to use this principle.

Apparently, the Government considers that it does not require more money in the fund than is necessary to match grants from the Commonwealth Government for developing roads, so it has transferred \$1,000,000 from this fund to General Revenue. Consequently, our roads will deteriorate and the so-called freeways will develop more slowly. The free-way extension at Crafers seems to be at a standstill compared with what one would expect if the full resources of the Highways Fund were available for highway purposes. I support the first line with reservations.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): In supporting the first line I wish to refer to the remarks of the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke), concerning the responsibility for the State's present financial situation. His views are directly opposed to those that have been expressed by other Opposition speakers. The honourable member at least implies that much of the present situation is beyond the Government's control. I congratulate the Treasurer on his masterly effort in preparing and presenting the Estimates. The member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell), who has just resumed his seat, referred to the hospitals promised by the Treasurer in his policy speech, but I recall a number (I think it was 100) of major projects that were promised by the previous Treasurer during election campaigns, only nine of which I think ever saw the light of day. A deep sea port was shifted from the South-East to the North-East and other places for various purposes, and an atomic power station was promised. But the prime effort concerned the building of a canal to bring water to South Australia from the Medindee Lakes in New South Wales—

Mr. Nankivell: Through a tunnel at Murray Bridge!

Mr. CURREN: —with a fall of 1in. to the mile. That was never a feasible proposition; it was merely election bait, but it did not win any votes.

Mr. Freebairn: Are you sure about those details?

Mr. CURREN: The engineers were never consulted; it was a Playford pipe dream that never eventuated.

Mr. Rodda: Are you sure about that?

Mr. CURREN: I am reasonably certain, from discussions that I have since had with engineers. Many problems now confronting the present Government have been caused by circumstances beyond its control. I refer here to the basic wage increase, which—

Mr. Coumbe: Didn't you support that?

Mr. CURREN: I had no say in the matter. It was determined by the Arbitration Commission.

Mr. Hurst: A policy in which the Opposition believes!

Mr. CURREN: Under the Financial Agreement between the States and the Commonwealth, the States can receive no recompense for the costs involved in the basic wage increase until the ensuing financial year. Therefore, the Government is faced with all the expenses occasioned by that increase, but it is at present receiving no recompense to meet the situation. Other State Governments are facing problems

similar to those of South Australia. I think they are all confronted with large deficits, some larger than others. South Australia's problem is therefore common to all States. The Opposition would have us believe that our present situation had been caused by the Government's mismanagement, so that, if that were so, it must surely apply to Liberal Party Governments in power in other States. An article recently appearing in the *Advertiser*, headed "Politics of the Grape", and written by Mr. Stewart Cockburn, one of the newspaper's officials, was undoubtedly inspired by a question asked in Parliament by the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) who (either deliberately or unwittingly) loaded the explanation to his question. Other people as well as me, on reading the explanation to the question, inferred that the large winemaking firm to which the honourable member referred was leaving this State because of a so-called excess of \$6 a ton over the price ruling in New South Wales. That price, however, was not in accordance with fact, as was pointed out by the Secretary of the Grapegrowers Council of South Australia.

Mr. McAnaney: Did I mention a price?

Mr. CURREN: The honourable member mentioned a \$6 a ton difference between South Australia and New South Wales.

Mr. McAnaney: I didn't refer to a price; I referred to an investigation.

Mr. CURREN: If the honourable member examines *Hansard*, he may recall what he said. The one-sided view expressed in the article to which I have referred was ably answered by Mr. Alex Boxall of Loxton, a responsible grower who takes a great interest and plays an active part in the industry's affairs. I commend to honourable members the views he expressed in a letter to the Editor on September 14.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I am concerned at the changing emphasis from the development of this State to social services. As I have said previously, no member wants to see other than the best social services available to the people of the State. However, it has also been said previously that we must watch the level of our social service payments in relation to the general level of payments in other States, because if we relax our development we might find that we cannot sustain our payments. Therefore, we should be careful lest we impair the rate of the State's development, and I refer not to either secondary or primary development but to all aspects of development. I have made a few comparisons

of the figures in this year's Budget and those in the last Budget prepared by the Playford Government in 1964-65; I have gone back two years instead of one year.

As is well known and acknowledged, the Playford Government had, as its strongest purpose, the development of the State. In the two years since the last Budget of the Playford Government there has been a change in emphasis in the spending of different departments, and some remarkable changes are apparent in a comparison of expenditures. My figures are fairly rough and I could not guarantee the actual decimal point. Taking the figure actually spent in 1964-65 and the supposed figure voted for 1966-67, the general overall increase has been 14.77 per cent in those two years. The following departments have had their expenditure increased by more than 14.77 per cent in the two years: Attorney-General, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, and Minister of Social Welfare, 25.9 per cent; Minister of Works, 23.7 per cent (this expenditure is to be expected but unfortunately it is largely taken up with salary and wage increases and the real progress is smaller than the figure would indicate); Chief Secretary, 19.1 per cent; Minister of Education, 17.8 per cent; and Minister of Labour and Industry 16.6 per cent. The following departments have had their expenditure increased by less than the 14.77 per cent: Premier, 11.9 per cent (this shows that at least the Treasurer has been careful to practise his budgeting as abstemiously as possible); Minister of Agriculture, 9.2 per cent; and Minister of Lands and Irrigation, 4.9 per cent. Those figures illustrate the tremendous change in emphasis from development to social services.

Although we want to see social services provided for as adequately as possible, we want to see them in relation to the general progress made in the State. If they get ahead of that progress we might be heading for trouble later, if we are not already in trouble. I urge that whatever else the Government does it does not slow down its developmental expenditure, because in the long run such expenditure is vital to the prosperity and personal welfare of all people in the State.

First line (Legislative Council, \$37,030)—passed.

House of Assembly, \$59,304.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Premier give some explanation of the provision of \$2,000 for "Portrait of former Speaker"?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The sum has been provided for the painting of a portrait

of the Hon. Sir Robert Nicholls. Mr. Ivor Hele will be responsible for the painting.

Line passed.

Parliamentary Library, \$27,137; Joint House Committee, \$32,751—passed.

Electoral Department, \$184,369.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): This provision includes two controversial allocations. I could find no reference in the Treasurer's speech to expenditures for "Enrolling qualified electors for Legislative Council" for which \$14,000 is provided as salaries and wages, and \$70,000 as contingencies. This makes an increase over last year's vote of \$84,000. I should have thought that this new expenditure called for some explanation by the Treasurer. This is a matter of great concern to me. Member after member on the Government side has risen in this place and disclaimed (as individuals or as a Government) any responsibility for the present deficit of this State, yet here we see \$84,000 to be spent because this is Labor Party policy. It cannot be denied that this money is being spent to directly benefit the Labor Party in this State electorally.

Mr. Langley: Who was responsible for the gerrymander?

Mr. HALL: I should have thought that the member for Unley could give a better answer than that. He is a member of a Government that brought to this place last year a completely spurious Bill to re-allocate the boundaries of the State's electoral divisions. He knows that that Bill was ridiculous in many of its basic provisions, so it is useless for him to say that there is a gerrymander for which we are responsible. What we are considering here is expenditure of public money to benefit the Labor Party.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Nonsense!

Mr. HALL: No matter what the Attorney says, it is not nonsense. In fact, I believe it was the Attorney's idea.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I don't dispute that.

Mr. HALL: Of course he does not dispute it.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I will admit the soft impeachment.

Mr. HALL: Although he is putting it into operation, I believe he is being prompted and pushed in the general aspect of Labor Party policy of abolishing the Legislative Council by order of the Trades Hall, which is the machine of the Labor Party in this State.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There are too many interjections. I ask honourable members to refrain from interjecting.

Mr. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I repeat that at a time when we are going heavily into debt, budgeting for a deficit of \$2,500,000 this year, we are going to spend \$84,000 to achieve Labor Party policy. Let members of the Government go to the university and say, "Here is \$160,000 you will not get because we want to spend half of that amount which could have gone towards the matching grants for higher education in this State."

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Are you prepared to go along there with me?

Mr. HALL: We are talking here in the House of Assembly, the most responsible part of the Government of South Australia. The Attorney-General cannot rabble-rouse down at the university or anywhere else and explain away the frivolous expenditure of \$84,000 of the State's money. In fact, we do not know from which trust fund this \$84,000 comes. Certainly it will increase the expenditures that are incurred on the trust fund. We know that the Government has a policy of abolition of the Legislative Council. How are we to know that this enrolment will work? What areas will it work in? Will it work all over the State?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Yes.

Mr. HALL: How do we know? I have already been approached by a citizen who has complained to me that the Government is using, for its own electoral purposes, the computer that is within its control. I discounted this and said that I did not think that was so, but he insisted that it was so. We are paying for the services of a computer, and again I believe that public suspicion of what is going on will be very great. We do not know whether the Government will impartially administer this, even though it says it will. It is very wrong indeed that certain areas of this State could receive priority (under the direction of the Attorney-General, for that matter, if he is claiming credit for this) in the attention given in this enrolment situation. We need a far better explanation of how, when this State is in debt, we can frivolously spend \$84,000.

Mr. McKee: You are afraid of the result, are you?

Mr. HALL: The Government defeated a move by the present Opposition when it was in Government to widen the vote for the Legislative Council to include spouses of those already qualified to vote. It did not support

that move, and it did not try to amend the Bill to take out the clauses it considered obnoxious. Therefore, it deliberately rejected a move to widen the franchise of the Legislative Council very substantially, yet for its own purposes it introduces into these Budget Estimates this frivolous expenditure. It is easy going through this Budget, and through deliberate moves of the Government, to come up with some substantial sums which need not have been expended and which could have been available this year to match important grants from the Commonwealth Government. The Attorney-General himself is reported in the press in the last day or so as saying that this State Government is seriously embarrassed in matching the grants put forward by the Commonwealth Government. Why could we not have used this \$84,000? Why do we need to go out of our way deliberately to use this sum to achieve his Party's policy in this State? I believe that first his Party should have shown its good faith by allowing the widening of the franchise to the spouse, for if it had done that we could perhaps have listened to its ideas at this time. This is a very serious matter to me. Therefore, I move:

To strike out the line "Enrolling qualified electors for Legislative Council, \$70,000."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): We have just heard the most extraordinary speech from the Leader of the Opposition, who obviously does not believe in democracy or anything approaching it. I will tell this Chamber the history of this business. The policy of the Labor Party is that every citizen should have the opportunity to vote on those matters that affect his future. It has been the policy of the Labor Party that the first measure for the reform of the Legislative Council should be not partial franchise, not the enrolling of spouses of existing voters, but that every citizen of this State should have his right to vote. The Labor Party, time and again before the Leader was ever in this place and since he has been here, has put up measures to this place to demand adult franchise for the Upper House, and members opposite have opposed it. Therefore, when they come in here and say that we are opposed to widening the franchise for the Upper House they are talking sheer nonsense, and they know it.

What was the policy of the previous Government in the administration of this department? Every month the officers of the Electoral Department would go to the Lands Titles Office (and this still applies) and obtain a list of those

people who had registered transfers of freehold title. Those officers then filled out Legislative Council enrolment forms for those people. They put in all the details and sent them out saying, "You apparently have property qualification No. 1; kindly sign this form and return it to this office." The other property qualification holders were never invited by the Electoral Department to enrol, and nothing was sent to them. It was a sheer and utter discrimination in favour of property owners, and that is why the Legislative Council we have today is completely apart from the basis on which the Legislative Council enrolment existed in the Constitution of the State.

No applications were sent out by the Electoral Department to holders of property qualifications Nos. 2, 3 and 4. The Leader and Opposition members know what are the political convictions of most of these people; yet for the last 30 years the partial enrolment for the Legislative Council, by invitation at Government expense, has been sent out. The Government's proposal is that everyone it can find who is entitled to enrol shall be asked to do so. We are not going to use the computer to find holders of property qualification No. 4. We will invite the Returned Servicemen's League to provide us with a list of people who have the returned servicemen's qualification, and these people will be invited to enrol. Everyone who is entitled under the Constitution to vote will get the same privilege that for the last 30 years was extended by the previous Government to one qualification only. Yet the Leader says this is frivolous. It is something to which they are entitled, but is something that has been given only to holders of property qualification No. 1. People have gone to the local post office, and if the local postmaster is able to cull from all his forms the one required—

Mr. Heaslip: What about addressing the Chair?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am sorry if the member for Rocky River objects to my turning to my colleagues. Members on that side have never done the same thing!

The CHAIRMAN: I think the honourable member can wait until the Chairman draws his attention to these matters.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I thought you were with me. These people go to the post office and, if the postmaster finds the enrolment form, they have to work out what it means. Those with property qualification No. 1 were not faced with this difficulty because the gobbledegook and the form could be worked out by the Electoral

Department, which filled in all details. People from the university approached my wife and asked her how these forms should be filled in. They were not students but members of a staff whom the Leader of the Opposition has now invited me to address on this score. I am perfectly willing to take up his challenge, and invite him to come with me any time he likes. The fact is that neither the form nor the method of enrolment was properly adapted to enable simple and easy enrolment by people qualified to vote for the Legislative Council. The Government intends to give to those people, who have not been given the privilege of an invitation filled out by the Electoral Department to enrol as was done with property qualification No. 1, the same privilege, so that those qualified to vote for the Legislative Council will have the opportunity to enrol and may have their say in things that affect them in future. If any member believes in democracy, he must believe in giving a chance to the voter to express his view, and that is what this Government intends to do.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Attorney-General's outburst astonishes me. He said that it was the previous Government's policy to dispatch officers of the Electoral Department to the Lands Titles Office to record land transactions, and subsequently fill out a form that was sent to the new owner of land or the transferee of land, on which it was stated that apparently the person had certain property qualifications and was entitled to vote. I was a member of Cabinet from 1956, and say categorically that I have never heard of this procedure.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It took place.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Mr. Chairman, you made a biased remark, if I may say so, but I forgive you.

The CHAIRMAN: I accept your forgiveness.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Perhaps you spoke without thinking, and I forgive you for that comment. I say categorically that I have never heard of this procedure. Furthermore, I have been a member of Parliament for 15 years since 1951, and I took an active part in building up the organization that I represent for at least 12 years before then, but never once did I hear a member of the public or an elector say he had received such a notice.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I could give you the details.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I cannot help what the Attorney-General says. At no time since I sat in Cabinet did I hear this matter discussed or was I aware of any authorization or instruction given to the Electoral Department to do what the Attorney-General alleges it does.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I can tell you that it went on.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I reject the Attorney-General's accusation that the previous Government used this instrument as a matter of policy, because that is completely wrong and the allegation is untrue.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Your Minister must have known what happened, because he was in charge of that department.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I know of no discussion or decision by Cabinet.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You had Ministerial responsibility.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not know of the Electoral Department doing any such thing.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: Did you ever try to find out?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Attorney-General makes accusations that reflect on the previous Administration, and I say categorically that I know nothing of it. I know of no instruction about it, and I have never met any person who received such a notice. It is strange that in 15 years of wandering around my district and 12 years' active participation in politics before then, a total of 27 years' experience, I have never seen the form spoken of by the Attorney-General and I have never seen or met a person who received such a notice.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: I have received one.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I felt obligated to say what I have said. I do not think I have established a reputation for telling deliberate untruths, and what I say is said with absolute definiteness. The basis of enrolment for the Legislative Council since the Constitution was set up has been on the basis of a voluntary enrolment. It is an enrolment for which the applicant must make a claim and on him or her rests the sole responsibility; it has always rested on him or her to apply and to be enrolled accordingly. The Leader's point is well taken. The Attorney-General has just handed me a form, but—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It is the ordinary Legislative Council enrolment form.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: —I don't know who made it out.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The electoral officer, of course!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It is a type-written statement; that does not prove who made it out.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It was sent out.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Attorney-General said that, accompanying this form, was another form pointing out to the transferee of the property how he was entitled to vote.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I shall get you a printed notice, if you wish.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I should like to see it. I have seen many of these enrolment forms in the past. When the Government was crying poverty and saying that it could not meet many of its commitments without pinching \$1,000,000 from the Highways Fund and a few other sources, it was strange that we should find it necessary to pass without objection an expenditure of \$84,000. There is nothing of a Party nature about the old method of enrolling for the Legislative Council. The Labor Party had its organizers in the field—

Mr. McKee: Well, why such a system?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: —and the Liberal Party had its organizers in the field, and everybody was at liberty to go to work in an electoral district and endeavour to enrol people for the Legislative Council. We were all on an equal footing in that respect. The facts are, however, that the Labor Party has at long last realized its opportunities in this field, and we have seen steep increases in enrolments in industrial areas, particularly in certain Legislative Council districts.

Mr. Burdon: Do you object to that?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Legislative Council District of Northern is considered possibly to be the best opportunity for the Labor Party to win some seats. It has organized itself assiduously in the industrial centres in the northern parts of the State, enrolling many qualified electors in those areas. Nobody can blame the Party for that, but I point out that this facility has been available in equal measure to both sides. We have had that advantage to enrol people, and we have done so. No reason exists why this campaign could not and should not even be intensified.

Mr. Clark: That is what this is doing.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It is doing it in a peculiar way.

Mr. Clark: It is giving people a right.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: They have the right, and they know that. The Attorney-General has now handed me another form that I have never seen before in my life.

Mr. Ryan: You didn't know what was going on.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It is a printed form, signed by the Assistant Returning Officer for South Australia.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It was sent out under your Government for 30 years.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have never seen it in operation, and I repeat that I have never known any authority for it to be issued.

Mr. Burdon: This could have been done before you went into Cabinet, and there was no reason for changing policy in the meantime.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Other members on this side went into Cabinet before I did. They may refer to this matter if they wish, and I am sure they will. Is the Attorney-General suggesting that this notice was sent out under instructions from the previous Government? Indeed, he categorically stated that that was done. Therefore, is he accusing a public officer of political bias in this matter? He is saying that Mr. Batchelor issued these invitations to selected people to be enrolled.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I am suggesting that you didn't provide the money to do it for everybody.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Attorney-General says we did these things: in other words, we did them with intent; we instructed (and a public officer of the State accepted the instruction) the issue of these notices in a particular way for a particular purpose. It involves the previous Government in a plot not only to do certain things: the Attorney-General also involves responsible officers of his own department, in order to justify the use of a machine bought by the previous Government to serve the departmental needs of the State. In order to justify the computer's use for this purpose, the Attorney-General claims (and this is the only justification with which I am dealing at the moment) that we did it ourselves in another way. We did not!

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It was done under your Government.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Attorney-General says that if we do not agree with this, we do not believe in democracy, but that is sheer nonsense. The Attorney-General has employed his best histrionic art in order to impress us in this matter, but he does not impress me. After all, I do not think he is the

only democrat in this world. In fact, in many of the Labor Party's activities the evidence of democracy is noticeable by its absence. I could refer to many matters in which the Labor Party, because of its policy, has exercised its powers in a way that is nothing short of sheer duress on many citizens in this State, in order to conform to the rules and regulations of the Party. If the people concerned do not conform they are out. If this is an example of democracy, can the Attorney-General call himself such a great democrat?

When charges of lack of democracy are being hurled around the place, if the Attorney-General wishes to buy into that fight I am prepared to be in it with him. Why is the system of giving equal rights to both Parties to enrol people to the Legislative Council to be discarded at a cost of \$84,000? As the Leader properly pointed out, money is urgently needed for essential purposes. Why are we expected to devote this sum for this particular purpose at this time? I support the Leader's remarks.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I support the Leader, who is perfectly correct in regard to this completely unnecessary expenditure of money at a time when the Budget is in such an appalling condition. The previous Opposition used to complain about the former Premier's television—

Mr. McKee: Gerrymander!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: —interviews. The former Premier's weekly telecasts were not in any way propaganda. They were news items.

Mr. Ryan: The joke of the week!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I did not expect the remark to go unchallenged. Most people would agree that it was a news item, and the loudest complainant in those days about the weekly television statement by the Treasurer was the member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan). It was not a political statement and was of a type given by other leaders in the past. The late Right Hon. J. B. Chifley made radio broadcasts to the nation. The present Treasurer has caused television interviews to degenerate to an appalling degree. While he speaks, much background activity is depicted. The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) complained about one television interview.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the honorable member can link his remarks with the item before the Committee.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am going to link them with the matter quickly. The Government has asked why we are suspicious

of this. The Treasurer, in his financial statement, did not mention this matter. He announced it on television and it was not referred to by the Government in this Chamber.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: Or by the Opposition.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This was simply put in the Estimates and the Treasurer did not comment on it until he made his public announcement while the Budget debate was proceeding. If that is not contempt of this Committee, I do not know what is. We know that it is Labor Party policy to abolish the Legislative Council.

Mr. Ryan: Hear, hear! The sooner the better.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: We also know that it is the policy of a large section of that Party to abolish State Parliaments as policy-making instruments. That is not often said at election time, but the Attorney-General has said it. I support my Leader in protesting at the method by which this expenditure was announced and at the waste of money.

Mrs. STEELE: From the moment the Leader mentioned these two items, it was interesting to watch the reaction of members opposite. If ever members were touchy on a subject, Government members, particularly the Attorney-General, were touchy on this matter. Neither of these two items was mentioned by the Treasurer when he introduced the Budget, yet they were entirely new items and involved an expenditure of \$84,000. I agree with what my Leader and the member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) have said, that the House has been treated with contempt.

We know this item is consistent with the Government's policy of abolishing the Legislative Council. No-one has been debarred from enrolling on the Legislative Council roll. In fact, many people have been encouraged by members on both sides of the House to do that. The inference that people have been discouraged actively from enrolling on the Legislative Council roll is incorrect. The Attorney-General said he would be perfectly willing to debate this matter with the Leader at the university.

The Leader did not mean that he wanted to indulge in rabble rousing among the students, which might be what the Attorney-General had in mind. He wanted the Government to explain why it could find \$84,000 to take this step at a time when it had had to cut down allocations to our tertiary educational establishments. As I am a member of the councils of

Flinders University and the Institute of Technology, I know that people responsible for securing facilities and lecturing staff are concerned about the trend that will require us to cut our cloth to a much smaller pattern than we expected. I support my Leader. The public would be interested to hear the Government's reasons for taking the action covered by these two lines.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I listened to the Attorney-General's statement with much interest, but it did not make me attracted in any way to this proposition. Evidently, he has some problem about the trouble to which the Electoral Department goes in telling people who have purchased properties that they are eligible for enrolment on the Legislative Council roll. He has produced some documents which my colleague has seen and which tend to show that that is correct. I was associated with Cabinet for a long time, but I never heard this matter discussed. It is possibly something a previous Labor Government introduced. I do not know its origin but, strangely enough, I do not see very much wrong with it.

This is in the hands of the Electoral Department, in which I have confidence. I am certain that the officers do not advise property owners in one district but exclude those in other districts. Whatever those officers do is fair and proper. However, this proposal is entirely different. This takes the authority from the Electoral Department, because the computer is under the control of another Minister. The Attorney-General can shake his head, but he knows that the computer is controlled by someone outside the Electoral Department, and it could be controlled in a most improper manner. I make no apology for having said that. For instance, it could be concentrated upon getting a roll up to full strength in one particular area. If the Treasurer was reported correctly, he said it would take some considerable time before the rolls were completely adjusted. I think that is correct, but he did not say whether Whyalla would get preference over a farming area like Eyre in getting its names on the roll. Honourable members opposite who are so tickled with this idea know that it can be used for Party political purposes. That is what it is for. Why does the Treasurer go on the air and make his statement with so much satisfaction?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If honourable members wish to address themselves to the question, they must adopt the usual procedure of rising in their places and being called.

Otherwise, will they please extend courtesy to the honourable member who is on his feet?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Members opposite feel so much satisfaction about this because they know they can use this machine for political purposes. I am not an expert on the use of computers, but certainly the Electoral Department has no expert who can use them. These notices will be under the control not of the Electoral Department but of a body outside that department. The Attorney-General shakes his head but he knows it is a fact.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I do not know it is a fact: it is untrue.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The electoral officers are not technical officers; nor could they be trained for that purpose. I know what the computer was purchased for, because I was associated with it. The notices will go out as a result of directions given to the computer. I have given this point much thought, but I do not know how we shall overcome this problem. Placing the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly electors upon a uniform roll only duplicates the expense of the system without getting any very valuable addition to our legislation. If we are to bring the Legislative Council electors on to a common roll, the purposes of the Legislative Council will be largely finished. After all, we do not elect people to the Senate under the same system as we elect people to the House of Representatives. Frequently, the Government majority in the House of Representatives does not apply in the Senate. To bring the Legislative Council electors on to the House of Assembly roll would, to a large extent, affect the usefulness of the Council. The roll has been widened and includes all servicemen. That is a permanent qualification, involving no problem as regards enrolment. The roll includes all householders—but here we have a totally different position, because that is not a permanent qualification. I do not know how the computer will compute that. A person can be a householder in a rented house today but, by the time the computer has processed the information, he may not be a qualified voter at all. That is interesting, because the qualification depends upon his being the occupier of a house.

Mr. Shannon: In a certain locality.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A person may get a notice that he is the occupier of a house and therefore is qualified to enrol on the Legislative Council roll. He may take that card to the Electoral Department and

become duly enrolled, but in the meantime he may have ceased to be the occupier of a house.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Then it would be wrong for him to make his application.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As a matter of fact, what is the information upon which the computer will work? It is altering every day.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is so with everything.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This will alter every day. The Government has had to use trust funds in order to carry on, so there is no ground for this expenditure, which is designed, at least partly, for political purposes. It has the fundamental weakness that it takes away the control of the rolls from the Electoral Department and puts it under another Minister, who is not in charge of that department. The Minister would not be doing too much in connection with the rolls, because the electoral officers are the persons to maintain them in a proper manner. I have the greatest confidence in the integrity of our electoral officers. Over many years I have learnt to accept their work with confidence.

The member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) mentioned the tremendous satisfaction of the Treasurer in his telecast. I was not privileged to see it so I do not know whether that is correct. I looked at one or two of his telecasts but gave them away a long time ago. This procedure mentioned by the Attorney-General has a distinct political flavour, and this is something we do not want. We should have the Electoral Department doing its job efficiently, not directed by the Minister and, particularly, not directed by a machine over which it has no control.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The member for Gumeracha has displayed an ebullient ignorance of the workings of the computer that needs immediate correction. We were told the honourable member knew all about the computer because he bought it, or something, but obviously he did not know anything about it. This process was adopted on the advice of Professor Ovenstone, and the university computer was used to run test programmes and prepare a full computer programme at no cost to the Electoral Department. We are always happy to obtain the assistance of the university authorities, who seem to be far more enthusiastic about this programme than the member for Burnside would have us believe.

Mr. Heaslip: How can you get something for nothing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There was no cost to the Government. A certain sum is provided annually for the university's computing centre, and that money was used for this and other programmes, about which advice was given to the public generally. The university was happy, as part of its research work, to prepare this programme without cost to the Government. I believe that was proper, and I hope members opposite will not think it was anything else. The initial work to be done here is the punching of cards for both the House of Assembly and Legislative Council rolls, and those cards will be the basic material held in the Electoral Department. As alterations to the roll occur, new cards will be punched and inserted. Indeed, the new system will mean that either roll can be printed off at five hours' notice by computer. We will not have the expense in future of the enormous amount of lead carried in the Government Printing Office for printing the Commonwealth and State electoral rolls. We will get from the Commonwealth a substantial sum for the rolls we print for it at short notice, and it will not be necessary to print supplementary rolls.

Mr. Ryan: A big saving.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Indeed. The whole system of computerizing the rolls was recommended to all Governments by the Commonwealth computing centre at Canberra, and all Governments in Australia are interested in the work being done in South Australia which, under this Government, will once again be leading the Commonwealth. The basic material for the roll will be kept at the Electoral Department, and the roll will be kept up to date by that department. The only work to be done by the computer is the comparison of the two rolls and the printing of the material from the computer programme, which will show the apparent inhabitant occupiers or other qualified voters for the Legislative Council. The computer simply compares the two rolls, throws out a list of apparently qualified persons (and Professor Ovenstone has worked out a computer programme under which, by comparison of the two rolls, this can be done), and then prints off all the material to be affixed to the form. Therefore, there is simply a series of little adhesive taped-back butts of paper that go back to the Electoral Department to be put on to cards to be sent out by the Electoral Department, and not by anyone else. So, that computer will be doing what the Government Printer did previously.

Mr. Nankivell: More unemployment!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government Printing Office is so heavily committed at the moment that it will be grateful to be relieved of this job. This matter will be under the control of the Electoral Department, as it is now. No other Minister or head of department will take over the responsibility now assumed by the Electoral Department.

The statements of the member for Gumeracha were completely without basis and were uttered in complete and utter ignorance of the process of the computer. The responsibility of the proper electoral officers for this work will continue but now, instead of the policy from which members opposite are keen to dissociate themselves (but for which they were, as Ministers, responsible for 30 years) of partial invitations to one section of Legislative Council voters continuing, the Electoral Department will be glad indeed to be able to give the same facilities to all qualified voters—and what is wrong with that?

Mr. Clark: And what is political about it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is nothing political about it, unless members opposite think that it is politics that all qualified voters should be asked to enrol.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: They don't want them to.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I know that. Let them tell the people that only one section of the public should be invited to enrol because it is in the Opposition's political interests if that happens.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Which district are you going to deal with first?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The lot.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You can't.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We can deal with the lot, because all districts will have been covered, I assure the honourable member, by the end of next year. We will proceed to prepare the punch cards for all districts. The computer programme will then compare the punch card systems for the two rolls, the things will be printed off, and the large number of cards for all districts will go out at once. Therefore, there is no question whatever of any district getting preference in this matter. Every qualified elector in the State who can be reached by the Electoral Department will be reached, and that is how it should be in a democracy. It is the policy of the Government in this matter to give justice to qualified voters of the Legislative Council for the first time in 35 years.

Mr. SHANNON: I have heard some impassioned speeches on behalf of the Government but what I have just listened to is perhaps a gem. However, it smacked of protesting too much, and I think the Attorney-General is guilty of that. It is obvious to members on this side that the Government believes it is a shame we saw this item. I do not think we were intended to take particular note of it, because the Treasurer avoided any reference to it in his speech. The Attorney-General said it was something new: therefore, I should have thought it would be a feature of the speech.

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

Mr. SHANNON: I now wish to say something about the Attorney-General's attempt to cover up for the Government and of his imputing a certain type of tactic to the former Government. I would not have expected this from the Attorney. Obviously, he sought certain evidence, and I think his colleague, the member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne), provided him with some evidence which his legal training should have taught him to test before he started using it in this Chamber as something to embarrass the Opposition. The evidence the Attorney gave to the member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson) is quite innocent, and when the member for Flinders denied that he had ever seen such notification from the Electoral Department I was not surprised, for I would not have expected him to see such notification.

I think it comes to the knowledge of most members of Parliament that the Electoral Department, as a result of information gained from the General Post Office from time to time, issues notices to electors of changes of address. The department is informed that a person is no longer at an address to which correspondence has been addressed, and it then takes steps to give the opportunity to the person so involved—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is not what I said.

Mr. SHANNON: Then perhaps that is just as well. I think if the Attorney had adopted that policy earlier he would have been very wise. I point out that what the Electoral Department did in this field is not unusual, and in that respect it has no ulterior motive, no matter what Government happens to be in office. I think I might quote for the benefit of the Attorney a very appropriate quotation: Evil be to him who evil thinks. There is no doubt that as soon as the Attorney saw the

evidence produced by his colleague he jumped to the conclusion that this was a conspiracy on the part of the former Government to seek enrolments of a special category, namely, those people who own land.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I have full information from the Electoral Department as to what its procedures were.

Mr. SHANNON: Has the Attorney anything from the department that implicates the former Government in what he intended to imply by his first statement on this matter? If he has not, then I think he was unwise to stick his neck out, which he undoubtedly did. The Attorney explained at some length how this computer was going to operate. Although I do not know very much about it, I know a little of the work done by various commercial undertakings in the use of computers. I point out that computers cannot initiate information, because one thing that we do not yet have is a computer that can start by telling one something on some particular topic that one does not know. Computers will give many answers, but someone has to ask the questions. The Attorney made it clear that we would use punch cards. This is the usual method of handling or preparing information to be fed by punch cards, but I should like to know who prepares the material for feeding into the computer, for that is the vital factor in this matter.

I believe that ethics come into this, for somebody will be charged with the responsibility of seeking information. The Attorney himself intimated that the Returned Servicemen's League might be asked for certain information with a view to making sure that all of its members enrol for the Legislative Council, as they are eligible to do. He pointed out that that was one field which could be advantageously surveyed. Possibly that also applies to other organizations. In saying that, I am merely drawing attention to the *modus operandi* that obviously is to be pursued. Without any doubt at all, when the information is supplied to the Government these punch cards will be prepared. What my colleague, the honourable member for Gumeracha, had to say about this matter is all too true. We have in every branch of commerce a certain percentage of nomadic employees, people who work for a few months or possibly a year or more in one place and are entitled to enrol because they rent a house. Sometimes those people, without telling anybody, vacate those premises and move to another State.

Mr. Clark: That happens now.

Mr. SHANNON: I know it does. I am pointing out that the Electoral Department handles that problem through its own machinery. If this computer is to be used for some specific purpose, I want to know what that purpose is, because the department already deals with those people I have mentioned. It appears to me that we are spending State money on something which could have the same implications as those with which the Attorney charged the former Government. If there is no intention to use this for Party purposes, then it seems to me that the department itself could handle everything that is required. If the department in its wisdom desires to use a computer for the compilation of a roll, there is no need for this suggested procedure to enter into it. The department itself can prepare a punch card system of enrolment and use the computer for the composition of the roll, for there would be no difficulty in that.

I quite admit that the Government Printer, with whom I have some association, is overloaded and that there are times when the Government Printing Office is embarrassed with work. Most of this work comes from the Government, and that is as it should be because, after all, the Government has first call on its services, and I do not complain about that. I know that the printing of the reports of the committee of which I am the Chairman comes second in this matter. I advise when the committee has reached a decision regarding a project and when the report on the project is printed it can be tabled. It gives the Minister and Government the opportunity to proceed with an urgent project. I am not arguing that the use of a computer has advantages, but I stress what seems to be an unnecessary exercise. Both Parties have been active in pursuing the opportunity to enrol people who are entitled to be enrolled on the Legislative Council roll. No system, nor what I understand is intended by the Government, is perfectly correct, and I doubt whether it is possible to secure the necessary information for everyone entitled to vote, whatever method is used.

I doubt whether it is ethical for the Government to seek such information from electors, as the obvious inference is that it is seeking this information for its own good; if not, there is no need to spend money on a project with a limited value. The computer can produce all types of collating material for which it can and should be used, and I do not object to the Electoral Department's using a card system to produce information in proper form more

quickly than by manual operation. This system should be used if there is a saving to the Government, but I do not agree that it is proper or in good taste. The Attorney-General may draw a long face, but I charge him with being out of step with good taste when he suggests approaching certain organizations about their membership.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Only if they wanted to supply the information.

Mr. SHANNON: That is available now, and the fact that a man who served overseas is entitled to vote is well known.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Many people don't know about it.

Mr. SHANNON: If you draw the attention of the leaders of any such organization to those who are entitled to vote there is nothing wrong, but I understood from what the Attorney-General said that the Government will seek information from these sources in order that certain information may be carded—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is correct.

Mr. SHANNON: —for use by the Electoral Department in using the computer to prepare a roll.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We would not need to use a computer for that.

Mr. SHANNON: The computer is not a fossicker for evidence but is an analyser. I oppose the expenditure of Government money in seeking information about people who may or may not have sought their rights to enrolment on the Legislative Council roll: the Government may obtain much valueless information, as many will have already enrolled. Would the R.S.L. know which of its members had taken the necessary steps to enrol? No such record would be kept, as it would have no value to that organization.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We have it in the Electoral Department.

Mr. SHANNON: Of course, and that is the right place for such information to be gleaned.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It will be gleaned by the Electoral Department.

Mr. SHANNON: The Minister gave a different story before. He suggested that a list of people entitled to be enrolled would be compiled, and from that list punch cards would be made.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No.

Mr. SHANNON: I am glad to know that the Attorney-General is coming back a bit. Perhaps he was a bit distraught and, perhaps he did not realize that we as a phleg-

matic Committee are accustomed to analysing a man's word more carefully than a street corner meeting would be. If he wishes to revise what he has said and the inference he conveyed when he first spoke on this matter, he has the opportunity to do so. This is a question of expenditure of public money that we can ill afford, for a purpose that I do not think will be worth while. I have no objection to using a computer for the preparation of rolls.

Mr. Curren: As long as it is not the Legislative Council roll.

Mr. SHANNON: Any roll. I do not object to using computers for the purpose for which they are designed.

Mr. COUMBE: I listened with interest to the Attorney-General's comments and his explanation of the expenditure and what the computer may do, and I appreciate the saving of cost of printing, but exception has been taken to the application of this work. However, printing will still have to be done. On examining the line, we find that the sum allocated for the joint roll with the Commonwealth is to be increased this year from about \$27,000 to about \$55,000 which, obviously, is for printing. We also see that the line for the Legislative Council roll is not increased, the same sum being provided this year as that for last year. We find, then, a decrease for periodical and general elections, etc. I realize that a Commonwealth election is to take place soon, which may or may not have some bearing on the increase of about \$27,000 this year for printing.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We have an agreement with the Commonwealth in that regard.

Mr. COUMBE: I understand that.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We cannot print the rolls according to the computer until the whole thing has been done, and that means not until the end of next year.

Mr. COUMBE: I appreciate what has been said by the Attorney-General and, I believe, by the Treasurer during a telecast last week. What the Attorney-General has said about savings being made by the use of a computer is acceptable, but I repeat that considerable printing work will still have to be undertaken.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The extra printing, in fact, will be less costly. The initial expense lies in the punching of the cards. Once that has been done, the ultimate cost to the State will be very much less than the present cost.

Mr. COURCEL: I appreciate what the Minister is trying to say, and the point about the saving on the supplementary rolls.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It is not only on the supplementary rolls: the actual cost of printing the whole roll will be very much less under the computer system than under the present system.

Mr. COURCEL: We accept that statement in regard to the printing and preparing the standard rolls, because it will save this State some money, but it is the application of these lines to which members are taking exception. I am the first to admit that the computer involves specialized studies; not even the Attorney-General would be brave enough to say here that he knew how a computer worked. I know that the working of a computer requires two main ingredients: the first one is the preparation of the data to be used. That must be extremely carefully prepared because, in a commercial or industrial undertaking, for example, it would be easy to slant the material to be used by the computer.

Mr. Shannon: Any human error in the question asked results in an error in the computer.

Mr. COURCEL: It is magnified. Interpreting the computer's results is extremely complicated, also. I have seen a number of computer results—a series of complicated hieroglyphics. The punch cards have to be prepared by specially trained staff. The sum of \$14,000 is allocated for enrolling qualified electors for the Legislative Council, and \$70,000 is to be spent for that exercise. Right throughout this debate we have heard the Treasurer and Government members saying to the Opposition, when it has made certain suggestions, that costs have to be pruned; expenditure cannot be increased on certain vital items, including education. However, this project involves an increase on the lines of \$84,000 for work that can hardly be regarded as vital and in the best interests of the State's affairs.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The total estimate for the Electoral Office this year is very little more than it was last year.

Mr. COURCEL: The whole of the Government's tone has been to cut each Minister's allocations; there is nothing to spare. But what will this proposition achieve? The Attorney-General has explained that the sum will be used for enrolling qualified electors on the Legislative Council roll. Anybody who is qualified, or who can qualify, is free today to enrol, if he so desires. The categories of

those who can be qualified are wider in their application than they may seem at first blush. I should say that many people at present occupying rental houses were entitled to enrol but have not bothered about it.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No. You don't know that they are entitled to enrol.

Mr. COURCEL: Many of these people are entitled, but have not bothered to enrol.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They have never been entitled, as properly qualified people (No. 1) have been.

Mr. COURCEL: I am not talking about that qualification. Qualification No. 1 deals with the person who usually owns property; I am talking about the rental house occupier in qualification No. 4. This condition has existed for many years; any person is perfectly entitled, as he has been in the past, to enrol on the Legislative Council roll, provided he qualifies.

Mr. Clark: But he hasn't been entitled to be encouraged to do it!

Mr. COURCEL: Why the sudden urge to question people that they enrol?

Mr. Clark: There is nothing very sudden about it.

Mr. COURCEL: As soon as I mention this, we hear a guffaw from the other side. Both political Parties seem to have as many people enrolled on the Legislative Council roll as they can. It is up to the person entitled to enrol; if he so desires, he can complete the form and send it to the Electoral Office. If he complies with the necessary requirements his name will be added to the roll. Any person who comes within Nos. 1, 2, 3, or 4 categories is entitled to enrol on the Legislative Council roll but the Government now intends to put everybody on the Assembly roll on to a card; to run the cards through the machine; to cipher or make a hole in the card; and, if the card shows that the person concerned is eligible to be on the Legislative Council roll, he will be sent a note to that effect and encouraged to enrol. At present everyone qualified to enrol has complete freedom. The House of Assembly enrolment card does not show whether a person is qualified for enrolment on the Legislative Council roll and we have not been told how the persons qualified will be recorded by the computer. There must be some other means by which the entitlement of people will be ascertained. The R.S.L. list would not contain the names of all people who saw active service. We agree about the saving of printing costs but we object to expenditure of \$84,000 to

enrol people by passing names through a computer when the Budget has been cut to the bone and when money cannot be made available for deserving causes.

Mr. HEASLIP: This is another instance of waste of money, collected by increased taxes and fares, on unwise and unproductive expenditure.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: This may come out of trust funds.

Mr. HEASLIP: The extra money being raised will not be sufficient and trust funds will be raided. No-one has asked the Government to do this.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I have had dozens of complaints from your members that the Legislative Council roll was obviously out of order.

Mr. HEASLIP: The Government is causing much hardship to taxpayers by increasing charges and is wasting the money. It admits that it is not able to match Commonwealth grants to our universities.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We had not said that.

Mr. HEASLIP: If the Government used \$84,000 to match Commonwealth grants to universities, education would benefit by \$168,000. The Legislative Council rolls have been satisfactory for many years and qualified electors may enrol if they so desire. Taxpayers' money should not be spent to remind those who do not value their vote sufficiently to inquire about entitlement.

Mr. McKee: What about one roll for both Houses?

Mr. HEASLIP: It would be cheaper. Members opposite are either democrats or dictators and, if they believe in compelling people, they are dictators.

Mr. Curren: Do you believe in compulsory national service for overseas?

Mr. HEASLIP: That has nothing to do with this matter. I should have thought that the Treasurer or the Minister of Education would deal with this subject, but it seems it is to be dealt with by the Attorney-General, who has some, if not all, of the answers.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: After all, it is my department.

Mr. HEASLIP: Very well: it is the Attorney-General who is responsible for it. He is trying to give us the answer, but there is much he has not given us, although he has given us all he can. When speaking to the first line, I said that if we did not use our money wisely we would go into liquidation.

Now the Attorney-General states that for this exercise the university computer was used at no cost. He is a financial wizard if he can use any machine or manpower at no cost. It is impossible.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I meant that it did not cost the Government anything.

Mr. HEASLIP: What is the Government? It is only the taxpayers of South Australia. It collects our taxes and is supposed to spend the money wisely. If the Attorney-General says the Government is not the people of South Australia, who represents them?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We do.

Mr. HEASLIP: The Attorney-General has now admitted that he represents the people of South Australia. Will he also admit that he collects taxes from them? We have the whole answer now. Where is the sense in saying that it costs the Government nothing to use this computer? It is a foolish statement. I refer to a statement by the Attorney-General that South Australia was going to show all the other States how the computer worked in this respect. Is a State that ran into a deficit of \$8,000,000 in 12 months in a position to experiment and go out and show other States whether it works or how it works?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I thank the Attorney-General for explaining how this new system would work. I am not familiar with computers but, as I understand it, he said that the computer would analyse the House of Assembly roll and the Legislative Council roll; it would pick out those names on the House of Assembly roll that were not on but should be on the Legislative Council roll, and then the persons concerned would be advised of their right to vote.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: By the Electoral Department.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. I have analysed the procedure in connection with the electoral roll of my own district, where I know the circumstances of the electors. When a person enrolls, he does not supply in the enrolment for the House of Assembly roll (which is the Commonwealth roll) the information that would enable the computer to give the necessary answers. He does not say whether he is a returned soldier, whether he owns any property, or whether he is a householder. That information is not supplied to the Electoral Department. So, when the Attorney-General says that the computer will compare information contained in the House of Assembly roll with the names of people on the Legislative Council roll, there is still a missing link. For

the House of Assembly roll, an elector is given a number; then the card shows his or her surname, Christian names, postal address and occupation which, in the case of females, is mainly home duties. The point is that the computer could not tell from the House of Assembly roll whether these people are qualified to go on to the Legislative Council roll because insufficient information is included in the House of Assembly roll.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The computer is not a clairvoyant. ◦

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It can give the answer only if sufficient information is fed into it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government did not embark on this proposal without careful analysis and without the best possible advice. In fact, it examined various ways of seeing to it that the same facilities were offered to the various qualifications for the Legislative Council roll (other than property qualification No. 1) that had, under the previous Government, been persistently applied to people possessing property qualification No. 1. Whether the previous Government instructed the Electoral Department on this score I do not know: I can point out merely that it was only under property qualification No. 1 that electors were, under the previous Government, given notification; the Ministers of that Government should accept the responsibility for what was done by the Electoral Department under my predecessor.

I raised with Mr. Douglass and Professor Ovenstone exactly the queries raised by the member for Gumeracha and said, "How can a computer effectively compare the two rolls?" Professor Ovenstone, after analysing the information contained in the two rolls, said we could effectively get to a situation where all people entitled to property qualification No. 4 were listed. There may be a few cases (but there will not be many) where two or more persons may be thrown out by the computer for the same address. In that case, they will have to be told that they must choose between them which of them is entitled to vote.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: How is this information obtained?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The information is gathered by taking the names on the Legislative Council roll and comparing the names with the names on the House of Assembly roll. The computer throws out a list of those who are not on the Legislative Council roll and then analyses them according to addresses or places of living.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Not post office addresses?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. Upon analysis of the places of living, it can, by a series of eliminations, get to the apparent inhabitant-occupier. Professor Ovenstone was able to demonstrate this in a series of tests on the Liberal subdivision of Fullarton. He was able to run off from the computer the results of the tests, which were then carefully checked by the Electoral Department. We are perfectly prepared to re-run the tests for Opposition members, if they wish, so that they can look at the results. We were perfectly satisfied by the results that what Professor Ovenstone had put to the Electoral Department was correct. Before we finally proposed to go ahead with this scheme, we had the situation examined in the United States of America by advisers in that country with the latest computer systems, and we were satisfied that the programme could be run effectively, satisfactorily, and cheaply.

Mr. Coumbe: How accurate would this be?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Extremely accurate.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: In the case of a woman who gives her occupation for the House of Assembly roll as home duties, how do you discover whether she is a joint property owner?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We do not, because that is property qualification No. 1, not No. 4.

Mr. Coumbe: You are running it on No. 4.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. Heaslip: What about Nos. 2 and 3?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They would be provided not by computer analysis but by analysis of the files at the Lands Titles Office. In reply to the matter raised by the member for Onkaparinga, the lists to be supplied by ex-servicemen's organizations need not be computerized either, because it was found from those lists that those people, who have apparent qualification to vote, are not on the electoral roll. Therefore, we need simply send cards to them and do not need to analyse the information by computer. That applies to property qualifications Nos. 2 and 3 as well as to property qualification No. 1, which was the only qualification acted on by the previous Government. The only qualification that needs to be computerized is property qualification No. 4, and that is where the major expenditure is involved in the initial punching of the cards which will give not only the basis of analysis of the two rolls but also the means thereafter of keeping

those rolls up to date in a fashion which, in the long run, will prove extremely inexpensive to the State.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: If a woman lists her occupation as "home duties", how does anyone determine whether she is the inhabitant-occupier or the spouse of the inhabitant occupier?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A series of analyses is made of all people listed for the same address, and from that we can, by a series of eliminations, determine whether there is an apparent inhabitant-occupier.

Mr. Heaslip: And whether she is a returned servicewoman?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, because that does not appear on the electoral roll. The only way we can get at that is to request ex-service organizations to assist the department.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It would be very incomplete.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It would be far more complete than is the present system. If the honourable member could suggest to me any way in which we could add to the information to be given to the department, I would be grateful, because the basic policy of this Government is to enrol everybody qualified to enrol. The previous Government saw to it that the only people who were encouraged to enrol were people who had, to its knowledge, property qualification No. 1, and the procedures thereafter adopted for all other property qualifications were that people were not told; in fact, by the way in which the regulations were prescribed by the previous Government, those people were discouraged from enrolling.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Mr. Chairman, it is obvious now that the information given by the Attorney before the dinner adjournment was not in accordance with fact. He told us that the computer was going to compare the two rolls and from that it was going to pick out the people who were justified in applying and gaining enrolment for the Legislative Council. However, the computer cannot do that. All the computer can do is try to select those with property qualification No. 4. The computer will know nothing at all about the qualification of a returned serviceman or servicewoman.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I told you about that before dinner.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The computer does not know anything at all about that, because it is not on the roll.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What did you ever do about enrolling those people?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It is obvious that the information given by the Attorney is not correct. The information given to us was that the computer would try to guess, by some system of elimination, who was the occupier. I know a number of people in my district who are occupiers of property, but the fact that they are occupiers does not appear on the electoral roll, and the computer will never be able to find that out.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Did you invite those people to enrol?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I said I would give the Attorney-General a list of names and that he or the computer would not be able to tell me which of those people were occupiers and qualified to vote.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Unless the computer was supernatural.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The computer can provide only the information fed into it. The Attorney said that the previous Government had been very careful to check regarding property qualification No. 1. Has any instruction been given to the Electoral Department to stop giving that information to the people concerned?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I assure him that my Party's position regarding this matter is precisely the same as his Party's position, for it is a system that has been inherited. Incidentally, the system was never objected to by this Government when it was in Opposition.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We raised the matter time and time again in this place.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This system has been carried on by the present Government. This suggested procedure is a complete and utter waste of money. The computer cannot give information that is not available to it, and all that we are going to do is notify many people that they are entitled to vote when they will not be entitled to vote and will not be able to substantiate any such entitlement. When this word goes out, is that to be the final say, or do those people still have to fill in their claim forms?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They will have to sign them and send them back.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Will this be the final say, or will the Electoral Department still have to check whether these people are eligible? I think the Attorney may have to consult his American friends again

and come back with something a little more sensible.

Mr. QUIRKE: I do not care whether we use computers. I do not understand the workings of computers, but I know they are not omnipotent. I am amazed at the explanation of the Attorney about how this procedure is going to work and how these things are going to be analysed. I maintain that the computer will not do what he says it will do, and I have a tenner to back my opinion. What concerns me is the number of people who are eligible for enrolment on the Legislative Council roll but who for reasons best known to themselves do not take the trouble to enrol. I would not wish those people to be forced to enrol if they did not wish to do so.

In a country town the clerk presiding at the polling booth knows everybody in the town. That clerk first hands a voter the House of Assembly paper. He will then say, "Oh, Bill, here's your Legislative Council voting paper." At the last election I saw two people in those circumstances say, "That is not compulsory, so I am not going to vote." I remonstrated afterwards with those voters. However, they just did not want to vote. Those people have a perfect freedom to refuse to vote, and I would not wish to see that freedom denied them. People should be given the opportunity to be enrolled. At the last election I set out with several cards to tell people they were entitled to vote in the Legislative Council. These people would have had one of the entitlements, but I did not get half a dozen of those cards returned, because the people did not worry about it. If cards were sent out telling people they were entitled to vote, not 25 per cent would be returned.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: There would be far more than were returned with qualification No. 1.

Mr. QUIRKE: I did not blame the Government for not having enough money to carry out its functions, but under present conditions this is an absolute waste of \$84,000. I can tell Ministers where some of this should be spent. I would not object if we had this money to spend, but it should not be spent in this way now. What is the sudden concern of the Labor Party for the Legislative Council? The Legislative Council enrolment is pure democracy: people either enrol or stay off, and they are entitled to do that. Compulsion is not democracy.

Mr. McKee: What about those without qualifications?

Mr. QUIRKE: Provided you leave compulsion out, I do not care who is on the Legislative Council roll, but the Government wants to get the absolute maximum number on it and then compel these people to vote.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Who said that?

Mr. QUIRKE: It is Labor Party policy to have a compulsory vote, and when this is obtained it hopes to abolish the Legislative Council. However, if there were a Labor Party majority in the Upper House, it would not be abolished. This democratic desire to give a vote for the Legislative Council to the poor unfortunate people entitled to vote is not in accordance with Labor policy. According to that policy they would not have a vote anyway, as that Party would abolish the Legislative Council.

Mr. COUMBE: From what the Attorney-General has said about the Fullarton subdivision of the Unley District, apparently there will be a sampling of various districts, the results being based on the occupation and living conditions of the people, but these results would be only approximate. In densely populated areas it might be fairly accurate, but in other districts it would be futile. What about people living in flats? Those living in home units will come under property qualification No. 1 and flat dwellers would be under qualification No. 4. Under the sampling system it would be most difficult to assess country areas. Perhaps Whyalla would cause no difficulty, but Mount Barker and Norton Summit would pose a problem. If this information is required it would be better for the Attorney-General to send a letter to each elector in the State, as this would cost less than \$84,000 and no-one would be missed.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is quite untrue: we have examined that, amongst other things.

Mr. COUMBE: I should like the Attorney-General to give me that figure. Having seen the faces of honourable members opposite while the Attorney-General was speaking, I believe they are not altogether happy about the expenditure of this sum at a time when many projects in their districts have been cut back. This sudden encouragement for electors to go on to the Legislative Council roll is strange, when one of the main planks of Labor's platform seeks to abolish the Upper House. I should like the Attorney-General to comment on my suggestion about sampling and on how much it would cost to write to everybody in this State.

Mr. SHANNON: I thank the Attorney-General for confirming the charge against the

former Government that he made earlier. I suggest that the Attorney-General telephone the Chief Electoral Officer and inquire whether it has been the Electoral Department's practice over many years to take this matter up with the Land Titles Office. Obviously the Attorney-General has not sought information on this question. He glibly charges the former Government with attempting to keep the roll as heavily weighted as possible in favour of property owners, but that charge has no justification.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It is what you did.

Mr. Hudson: Sending cards to those with property qualification No. 1 is the justification for the charge.

Mr. SHANNON: The member for Glenelg speaks with the abysmal ignorance one would expect from a man who has attended the university—a person whose understanding has been warped. The Attorney-General makes a serious charge against a Party that it sought to build up its Legislative Council roll with a certain category of electors. That has never been done. Let the member for Glenelg know that if he changes his address and it is reported to the Electoral Office that his mail is returned unclaimed, the department endeavours to ascertain the new address. If the computer exercise shows that certain people are entitled to be enrolled but are not at present enrolled, will the Electoral Department receive an instruction that when the cards are returned such people are to be enrolled without investigation? If that is not the case (and the Attorney-General is shaking his head) the exercise is a complete waste of time.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Nonsense!

Mr. SHANNON: The computer's results may be inaccurate because of incorrect material used. The Attorney-General said it would be "something of that order".

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I did not say that.

Mr. SHANNON: I think the Attorney-General said it would "approximate the people entitled to be enrolled". Obviously we can go no further than that; indeed, if the Attorney-General went any further, he would obviously be asking for trouble. It is a physical impossibility for the computer to detail every entitled person, and I am therefore anxious to know whether the Electoral Office is to be instructed on whether the information gleaned by the exercise is to be final and whether a person who receives a card to be completed for enrolment is to be immediately enrolled when the card is

returned. If that is to take place, I can see the scope of all sorts of doubtful practices, to put it politely.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Section 20 (1) of the Constitution Act states:

Subject to the next three succeeding sections the following persons, and no other, shall be entitled to vote at the elections of the Legislative Council namely:

. . . IV. any person who is an inhabitant occupier, as owner or tenant, of any dwelling-house . . .

I am indebted to the Attorney-General for his explanation of the way in which the computer may be used to determine which electors (already on the House of Assembly roll) are to be eligible to enrol for the Legislative Council, under category IV. I believe that if I heard the Minister correctly, the computer will automatically sort out cases where more than two people at any one address are enrolled. It occurs to me that the computer system, in that case, will surely work satisfactorily (if it works satisfactorily at all) only in regard to the metropolitan area or any large country town. The Minister of Agriculture, I think, lives in Sunset Drive, Murray Bridge, a street in which I do not think the houses are numbered. The computer may indicate that only one person in that street is entitled to vote, as it will find only one person living at Sunset Drive. In country towns, many people have the same surname.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Rarely do they all live in the one street.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I hope that Attorney-General explains the points that I have raised.

Mr. McANANEY: At last the Labor Party has come alive. Government members were rather crestfallen when they were dealing with the lack of money but, when they are spending money on unproductive matters, they become alive and begin to enjoy themselves. I consider that the expenditure involved in this line is a waste of money. The Attorney-General has said we are not spending much more on the Electoral Department this year than was spent last year. However, last year about \$100,000 was spent on a lotteries referendum merely because the establishment of lotteries had been on the A.L.P. platform for many years. The Government is introducing T.A.B. and is spending about \$100,000 on a Royal Commission to obtain evidence of what we either all know is taking place or could have got from Victoria.

This line is designed to acquaint people with their entitlement to vote, whereas a

democracy requires that the people have sufficient responsibility, initiative and drive to look after their own interests. Why should a person have a vote if he is not sufficiently interested to enrol? It was found that American prisoners of war in the last Korean war made no effort to escape because a commander had told them they would be provided with food and would not have to work or do anything else. As a result, they merely sat around and deteriorated, which was degrading for humanity.

The Attorney-General has said there is inefficiency somewhere and that enrolment cards are not readily available at post offices. I do not know why that is so or why people who obtain cards do not send them to the Electoral Department. I do not know anything about computers, but I cannot understand how the result of this work will be accurate. In my own case, I own no land and my wife is the only occupier of the house for five nights each week. The computer may prove that I have no right to vote at Legislative Council elections. Accuracy would be achieved if checks were made of leases, and so on, but I oppose this waste of money when funds are not available.

Mr. HALL: The member for Stirling has brought this debate back to where it should have been for a long time. He has brought it back to a consideration of the money to be expended by the Government. The Treasurer has said that he has reduced expenditures in all cases where that was possible consistent with efficiency and proper service. It does not behove this Committee to look into the final details of how the computer will work or to evaluate the Attorney's brief statement on the matter. It would take a longer time to convince the Committee about efficiency. We are considering whether the result will be worth while.

The Attorney has said that his Party believes in democracy, which gives everyone the right to vote, but these fine words are not supported by his Party in the management of its own affairs. The Attorney is well known as one of the six delegates from this State to the Federal Conference of the Australian Labor Party. The decisions reached by the six delegates from each State become policy that binds any Labor Government elected in the House of Representatives. That policy is based on anything but the democratic principles that the Attorney talks about. It is also evident from statements by a rather famous South Australian Senator

that this fate is not likely to befall the Australian community.

The Estimates do not indicate that the saving the Attorney talks about will be achieved. There is a reduction in expenditure on fees for elections and referenda of about \$75,000 and a reduction in the expenditure for the purchase of office machines and equipment. Despite these reductions, the overall expenditure is an increase of about \$15,000 over last year's expenditure. There is no indication that our system of operating the Electoral Department is becoming more efficient. The predictions in the Budget last year were not fulfilled in regard to the deficit at the end of the year. I am not willing to accept the Attorney-General's assurance that by spending \$84,000 we shall eventually be saving the Electoral Department money. Because of our present financial position, we should not spend \$84,000 on an experiment conducted to further Labor Party policy in regard to the Legislative Council.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall (teller), Heaslip, McAnaney, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

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

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Millhouse. No—Mr. Jennings.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Line passed.

Government Reporting Department, \$179,528; Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, \$8,949; Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement, \$4,190—passed.

Miscellaneous, \$137,400.

Mr. HALL: I see that \$10,000 was voted last year for fares, rail and tram passes of members and ex-members of the Legislature, of which \$9,855 was actually spent. This year, \$9,500 is proposed. This seems a large amount. Divided by 60, it works out at \$158 for each member. I did not think that extensive travelling was done by train, by members. Obviously, some members make no use of their rail privileges, so we can easily double that figure, making it over \$300 for each member. I understand that the Government pays into a pool to cover travel to other States. Does this sum cover only the fares incurred by members

travelling within South Australia or does it cover fares incurred when members travel to other States?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: This payment is made to the Railways Department for gold passes for members of Parliament, to the Tramways Trust for tram passes, and for travel by members of Parliament on Commonwealth railway lines. Steamer and air fares across Bass Strait are paid for as the actual costs are incurred. On the Commonwealth railway line from Port Pirie to Western Australia we would have to pay the Commonwealth direct. That applies to steamer and air fares, too. There is a payment into a pool by each State to cover the normal expenses incurred on the State railways systems.

Line passed.

CHIEF SECRETARY AND MINISTER OF HEALTH.

State Governor's Establishment, \$22,646—passed.

Chief Secretary's Department, \$51,289.

Mr. McANANEY: Regarding "Under Secretary, Secretary to Minister of Health and Clerk to Executive Council", expenditure last year was \$2,167 less than the sum voted, whereas the sum allocated this year is \$3,164 more than that spent last year. Has the Treasurer an explanation?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Under Secretary for 1965-66, Mr. King, is to receive \$8,692. Mr. King was Director of the Royal Visit from February 13, 1965, to April 1, 1966, and his salary for that period was debited direct to this line.

Line passed.

Statistical Department, \$80,200.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Treasurer say why the expenditure for the Public Actuary last year was \$1,181 whereas this year \$6,250 is proposed?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Provision has been made in anticipation of the appointment of a Public Actuary to replace Mr. A. W. Bowden. The Government has been concerned about this matter and we expect to be able to engage the services of a Public Actuary.

Line passed.

Audit Department, \$265,638—passed.

Printing and Stationery Department, \$957,196.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The total provision last year for "Office expenses, motor vehicle expenses, advertising, printing and binding material, water rates, fuel and light, litho-printing, insurance, public stores charges, minor equipment and sundries" was \$105,678 whereas the actual payments were

\$128,010, which is about 25 per cent extra expenditure. This year the sum allocated is \$134,651, an increase on what was proposed last year of about 33 per cent. Can the Treasurer say why expenditure on this line last year exceeded the estimate and why a further increase is proposed this year?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The expenditure was \$22,332 over the sum voted last year, mainly because of the increased use of the Government photo-lithographic plant and outside printing establishments (\$11,000), payment of meal allowances (\$5,000), and heavier freight commitments and miscellaneous expenses (\$3,500).

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Treasurer details of the expenditure and of the policy behind it?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have already referred to the expenditure at the Government photo-lithographic plant and to the use of outside printing establishments. The Government has no alternative but to use outside organizations. When I was in Opposition, I condemned the last Government because of its inactivity regarding improvements to the Government Printing Office. As insufficient facilities are available there, we have had no alternative but to use outside printing establishments.

Further, it is not my responsibility to say when and for how long Parliament shall sit. I do not want to be accused of short-circuiting the right of freedom of speech in this place. If, as a result of the sittings here, the Government Printer and his staff work overtime, and if the *Hansard* staff in the gallery above us has to work overtime, then we must expect to pay for it. If members want to reduce the time of sittings, they should bring the matter forward and perhaps some of this expenditure could be saved. The proposed increase of \$6,641 relates chiefly to the added cost of meal allowances for a full year. Should we deny people working overtime at night the privileges provided for them? These payments are made as the result of industrial awards.

Line passed.

Police Department, \$8,216,459.

Mr. McANANEY: I note that there is a substantial increase (about 25 per cent) on the line "Probationary Constables in training (each with quarters or allowance in lieu thereof and reimbursement for uniform \$120 p.a.), Cadets (each with reimbursement for uniform \$90 p.a.)". Can the Treasurer say whether there are more cadets in training?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: A large number of senior officers resigned and were replaced as regards numbers by cadets. Provision was made for the appointment of cadets to replace known and expected retirements and resignations. That is offset to some extent by the fact that there were only 14 enlistments under the augmentation scheme and not 155 enlistments as originally planned. Provision is also made for replacement for 125 cadets to duty rates, together with the basic wage increase from July 11 of this year.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I think everyone is conscious of the fact that our Police Force today is, and has been for some years, seriously under-staffed. Can the Treasurer say what increase in the number of police officers will be possible as a result of this increased allocation?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I cannot give that information at this stage, but I shall try to get it for the honourable member as soon as possible.

Mr. McANANEY: According to the Auditor-General's Report, there has been a substantial change in the personnel of the Police Force since 1962. In that year there were 1,099 constables, whereas now there are 1,053, yet the number of non-commissioned officers has increased from 342 to 522. Therefore, instead of the ratio of non-commissioned officers to constables being about one to three it is now about one to two. Can the Treasurer explain this?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I do not have that information offhand.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I refer to the line "Purchase of motor vehicles—Additions to fleet". The amount on that line this year is \$8,899 less than the sum spent last year. For a long time it has been the policy of the Police Department and other Government departments to change their vehicles at regular mileage intervals. This policy was analysed carefully by departmental accountants, and it proved to be advantageous to the Government. Can the Treasurer say whether this reduction in the amount to be spent on replacement in this department indicates a change of policy whereby it is intended to operate these vehicles over a longer mileage period, or whether it just happens to be one of those years when it is not necessary to make so many new purchases? I cannot believe that it is the latter, because the Police Department operates many vehicles, and I think the Commissioner has arranged his programme so as to have a fairly consistent requirement year after

year of new motor vehicles in terms of replacement policy.

If these vehicles are to be operated over a longer period, does it mean that the Commissioner and the Treasury are satisfied that this would be economic? I know that the replacement factor encompasses such matters as the resale value of vehicles that are traded in on new ones, and it may be that with the tendency to lower values for trade-in vehicles the accountants have decided that it is uneconomical to trade vehicles in on such low mileages. This matter has an important bearing on Budget finances right through every Government department, for the number of vehicles operated is very substantial indeed. I suggest that the Treasurer take a long, hard look at any change of policy in this matter, and that he make sure that the findings that determined this policy over a long period of years are not lightly disregarded and that the policy is not lightly changed.

One of my former duties as Minister was to examine this matter, and with the material assistance of Treasury officers and the accountants of various departments I assembled much data on the question. Although I was inclined to disagree with the policy as then suggested for early replacement of vehicles, I was finally convinced that I was wrong and that the departmental officers were right. If this line reflects a change of policy, can the Treasurer say whether he and his officers have scrutinized the matter to see whether the change is wise? On the other hand, is it merely a cut in expenditure in a year when the Government finds it necessary to cut expenditure at every possible point?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: As Premier and Treasurer, I am responsible for the motor vehicles in the Government Motor Garage. I have been consistent in my belief that the economic mileage at which to change a Holden sedan is between 25,000 and 27,000 miles. I believe this coincides with the practice normally adopted in the past, and there will be no alteration to this policy in respect of the Police Department. The Land Rover purchased for Andamooka was additional to the original programme. Provision is made for the purchase of five Valiant station sedans, six Holden utilities, three Land Rover utilities, one Bedford 3-ton truck and one Land Rover utility fire unit. The Supply and Tender Board has not disposed of three vehicles put up for sale in March 1966. No tender was received in one instance and quotes in the other two cases were considered to be too low. Provision is

made for the replacement of seven Holden sedans, 15 Holden utilities, one heavy utility, one Commer passenger bus, 66 Valiant sedans, 13 Valiant station sedans, six Land Rover utilities, and 45 solo motor cycles with similar vehicles; also, the replacement of 26 motor cycle outfits with 26 Holden utilities. This is a large programme for this or any other department; there is no reduction in this important item. The service being rendered to the public as a result of the operation of the motor fleet is to be commended, and I think the Police Commissioner is doing a splendid job in the interests of the people. The Government appreciates this service, and is not trying to curtail necessary equipment for an efficient police service. It desires more officers in the force, but the equipment programme envisaged this year is equal to anything that has been in existence before.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I accept the Treasurer's assurance that the replacement policy is being maintained, and I agree that the Police Department needs good motor vehicles in good order at all times. The replacement programme outlined has alleviated any fear I had that the policy was being changed.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Am I correct in assuming that the reimbursement of medical expenses, etc., incurred by ex-Constable R. L. Minear of \$1,125 is for medical expenses incurred as a result of injuries received or of illness arising out of and in the course of his employment and duty as a police officer? Are members of the Police Force insured against injuries arising during the course of their duty and employment? Is the Government carrying this insurance or does it insure with an outside insurance company?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: My information indicates that it was to meet medical expenses incurred, the actual cost of which was advised. I understand that, in a recent case considered by Cabinet, a police officer was entitled to compensation for some injury, but any cost above the benefits he received as a consequence would be met by the Government. I do not know whether police officers are insured under a Government scheme or some other scheme, but I understand that the Government, in many cases, carries its own insurance. Other matters may be associated more with workmen's compensation, but I think police duties normally come within that category. There are special provisions of which I do not have full details that I can give tonight, but I shall inquire from the Chief Secretary to

satisfy these questions, particularly in relation to insurance coverage.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Treasurer say what extension of civil defence services is to be carried out?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The following information should satisfy the honourable member: two days' bonus was paid to police officers and salaries were increased on July 5, 1965, and February 28, 1966; provision was made for 27 pay periods together with 12 months' payment of increase from February 28, 1966; an additional constable was appointed as instructor from September 1, 1966; also, there was the basic wage increase from July 11, 1966. Referring to the line for contingencies for civil defence, additional instructors requested were not approved and travelling and other expenses consequently were reduced; insurance of civil defence personnel was arranged by a Government insurance officer; and provision was made for administration and travelling expenses together with stores handling, replacements, printing, etc.

Line passed.

Prisons Department, \$1,481,056.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I find the greatest difficulty in following figures submitted on this line and getting a clarification from the Auditor-General's Report on those figures. According to the Estimates, about \$150,000 was spent at the Cadell Training Centre last year, whereas the Auditor-General reports that about \$201,000 was spent. Will the Treasurer therefore endeavour to ascertain the reason for that discrepancy? When the centre was first proposed, it was considered that its earnings would provide considerable revenue towards maintenance costs. Although the net cost for each inmate at Cadell was \$1,661 this year, which was a substantial improvement on the figure for the previous year, the figure is still higher than that for the Adelaide Gaol or the Yatala Labour Prison. Can the Treasurer explain the reason for this?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The average net cost for each person at the Cadell Training Centre in 1964-65 was \$1,834, compared with \$1,661 in 1965-66. In 1965-66, there were 102 prisoners at Cadell, compared with 87 in the previous year, and yet the costs for the previous year were greater than those for 1965-66.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: That would be a natural result.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: One line refers to office expenses, provisions, and

expenses incurred in the normal operation and maintenance of the centre. Allowance has also been made for further development of the farm, dairy, and orchard areas, as well as for increased rate of earnings approved by Cabinet (although I cannot now recall the details of the latter). Further allowance is made for the replacement of unserviceable hoses and equipment, the purchase of two boars for breeding purposes and 600 chickens. Provision is also made for two farm orchards, garden irrigation, garage equipment and such other matters as were arranged. The Committee must also bear in mind the basic wage increase and other increments that involve additional expenditure.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Port Lincoln Gaol is almost complete structurally and will soon be ready for the reception of prisoners. As far as I know, the security block has been completed. This gaol is not specifically mentioned in the reference to country gaols and I should like the Treasurer to say when it is likely to be occupied. The erection of the gaol is justified for the number of prisoners for whom accommodation is required and I should think it would be the desire of prison officers to have it operative as soon as possible in order to avoid the cost of transporting prisoners from the limited accommodation in the Port Lincoln cells to the Adelaide Gaol or other places. No provision is made for salaries, wages or contingencies at Port Lincoln specifically, although the expenditure may be included in the general provision.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall obtain the necessary information.

Mrs. STEELE: Can the Treasurer say whether the increase provided as payments to prisoners at the Adelaide Gaol and other institutions is the result of an increased rate that will be paid to them or has there been an extension of facilities for prisoners to do work for which they will be paid?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: As I have said, I know approval has been given for an increase but I cannot recall the reason for that increase. I shall obtain further information.

Mr. McANANEY: There is a reduction of \$3,871 in the amount provided for materials for manufacture of cement bricks at the labour prison. Can the Treasurer say whether there has been a change of policy regarding employment of prisoners on this work? If not, what is the reason for the reduction?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The only information I have is that the present output

should be maintained. There is a falling off in the usage of bricks in building generally at present and I can only make a stab in the dark that the decrease is probably because of that position.

Mr. RODDA: In each instance there is an increase in the amount provided for payments to prisoners. Is that because of an increase in the rate of payment or because of an increase in the number of people in the institutions?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have already told the Committee that I will obtain information on these matters as soon as possible. I know Cabinet has approved increases, but I have not the details.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Apparently I did not make myself clear when I sought information regarding the Cadell Training Centre. The total amount provided for the centre is \$154,968, which is made up of salaries and wages of \$79,133 and contingencies of \$75,835. Last year the provision for contingencies was \$80,000 and that for wages was \$69,000, making a total provision of \$149,000, or about \$5,000 less than is provided this year.

The Auditor-General, in referring to the Cadell Training Centre on page 165 of his report, says that payments last year were \$201,000. There is therefore a discrepancy of \$50,000 between the figures in the Estimates and in the Auditor-General's Report and I seek a clarification of the reason for the difference.

If we take out the net figures, they show a discrepancy of \$20,000. I do not expect the Treasurer to explain this tonight but will he undertake to explain what appears to be a totally different system of accounting? The amounts provided on the Estimates are supposed to be gross figures. The Revenue Estimates show the income to be taken off but, even if we take it as not a gross but a net amount, there is still a deficiency of some \$20,000. Will the Treasurer get a reconciliation of those figures for me?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes, I will try to get that information by tomorrow evening. There is much to be said for what the Auditor-General says on page 166 of his report about the Cadell Training Centre.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The administrators of the Cadell Training Centre are doing an excellent job, the farm part of the establishment being rapidly developed. So far, however, nothing has been done about the disposal of seepage water. Some provision should be made for deep drainage, at least over a part of the

training centre. At the southern end seepage water is encroaching, causing embarrassment to the permanent settlers in that area. Has the Cadell Training Centre taken any steps to have a proper seepage survey made? Will the Treasurer be good enough to find out from the departments concerned just what work has been done in this direction?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have no record of it with me tonight but I will endeavour to get the information for the honourable member.

Line passed.

Hospitals Department, \$19,854,082.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Page 123 of the Auditor-General's Report deals with hospital patients' fees and outstanding fees. It states:

As from April 1, 1966, charges to public and intermediate ward patients were increased by \$1 per day and to private room patients by \$1.50 per day. . . . Debits raised against patients for the year amounted to \$3,959,000. . . . Cash received for patients' fees and Commonwealth hospital benefits for 1965-66 was \$4,368,000. . . .

The next paragraph deals with outstanding fees (excluding vehicular accident accounts). I can well understand the problem of accident cases being treated in public hospitals, because, until these cases are decided in court, it is impossible to collect outstanding fees due from patients. However, it is a matter of concern that amounts outstanding at June 30 last were higher than for many years. The previous highest figure was \$618,000 in 1962. The collection of hospital fees always involves hospital authorities in some difficulty. From June, 1965, to June, 1966, fees outstanding rose from \$493,000 to \$603,000 in respect of Government maintained hospitals. When we relate that to the debits raised against patients for the year, totalling \$3,959,000, an amount of \$603,000 outstanding is rather a large percentage of fees not collected.

Will the Treasurer tell me what steps are being taken towards recovering this amount of money and, what is more important, can he say how accounts for Government hospitals are rendered to patients? It seems that the hospitals that render an account to the patient before he leaves hospital are the most successful in collecting their fees. That is a practice that, if not already adopted, should be adopted. Can the Treasurer explain the reason for the increasing amounts of outstanding fees? The \$603,000 outstanding would be largely in his hands, but he is deprived of it while these accounts are outstanding.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will inquire further into the matter and see whether the necessary information can be made available by tomorrow evening.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Some time ago in this place I referred to charges at the Royal Adelaide Hospital in the case of a patient who had had a number of tests made. A number of these tests were probably made to give students an opportunity to study the making of the tests. Under the previous Government, when such tests were administered a charge was remitted. It seems rather unfair for a test to be made, perhaps for the benefit of students or of the hospital, that is ultimately charged to the patient whether or not it was actually necessary. Has the Treasurer any information on this matter?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Government has been most sympathetic in cases of hardship and I believe the matter referred to by the honourable member would come within that category. Although I am sure no alteration in policy has been made in this connection, I will obtain further information for the honourable member.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The sum of \$13,120,279 is provided for total salaries and wages for the Hospitals Department, an increase of \$1,112,878 over last year's expenditure. During the last 12 months much discussion took place on the qualifications of nurses, nurses' registration and other matters. Has the Treasurer information about the staff position in Government hospitals generally in this State? Are there sufficient personnel both in the administrative and supervisory capacity, and are there sufficient trainees for running the hospitals in the State?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have no relevant information on the matter, but I will obtain it.

Mr. McANANEY: The increase in the allocation provided for the Matron and Superintendent of nurses, matrons, sisters and nursing staff at the Royal Adelaide Hospital is only 5.7 per cent, and the same applies in respect of other hospitals. Does this indicate a shortage of nurses and, if there is a shortage, can some of the efforts of such personnel be supplemented by engaging additional clerical staff?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The increase in the line referred to by the honourable member is in respect of basic wage increases. The increased allocation for Secretary, and for the administrative, accounting, supply and

clerical staffs of the Royal Adelaide Hospital provides for a basic wage increase, for an additional pay period, and for salaries of 25 ledger staff transferred from the head office. In all cases of Government expenditure on wages and salaries, provision must be made for an extra pay period this financial year.

Mr. McANANEY: As the expenditure allocated to the group laundry service is offset by a contra, can the Treasurer say whether the group laundry is operating at a profit within the department?

Mr. SHANNON: On the inspection the Public Works Committee made of the group laundry. I was most impressed with what I saw. We were told by the Superintendent of the laundry division that, although the laundry was not yet working at full capacity (nor will it for some time), the cost per pound of materials handled was about 12c, which is very good indeed. I know that some of the main hospitals, including the Royal Adelaide and the Queen Elizabeth Hospitals and all of the ancillaries, as well as the mental institutions, are contributing to the group laundry, and that in all almost \$900,000 is being contributed to the Central Linen and Laundry Service.

I compliment the staff there and the organization of the group laundry on the way it is handling dry cleaning and the special articles of clothing of various types, including uniforms and so on, for various small departments of the State, such as the Department of Social Welfare. Even the work shirts of the small boys are being handled. The organizing of this appears to be running very smoothly indeed, and I could not fault it in any way. I consider that there is nothing about which the group laundry can be criticized at this stage. Not only is the work being handled efficiently, but it is being handled at a cost that is more than competitive with the cost of anything being done anywhere else.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: When we were debating this matter last year a discussion took place on the method of accounting of this organization. The question then arose as to what the group laundry was actually costing, and what the success or otherwise of the service would be. The Estimates this year show more detail than was given last year. For instance, this year we can see what is charged to the various hospitals in respect of the group laundry. We see some startling differences from the proposed Estimates for last year. For instance, we see that although the amount proposed to be paid by the Hill-

crest Hospital to the group laundry was \$75,000, actually nothing was paid. This year it is proposed to pay \$100,000, and this, of course, is shown as a \$100,000 increase. That sort of thing shows in a number of items throughout the Estimates. I cannot see any line for contingencies. Can the Treasurer say where the contingencies are shown?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The honourable member singled out particular hospitals. How could we spend the \$75,000 provided in respect of Hillcrest Hospital? Provision is made for group laundry under each hospital. The payments to be made by the Hillcrest Hospital to the Group Laundry and Central Linen Service will operate as from November 1 this year.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Frankly, I am a little bemused about the way the group laundry is being run at present. As a result of the Public Works Committee's report on this considerable activity, I assumed that the group laundry would have the necessary stock and that it would charge each hospital so much a pound for that hospital's use of the linen or sheeting being supplied. That would mean that the hospital concerned would pay the group laundry for the service it was providing and that it would then return the linen. I understood that there was to be a depreciation account in respect of the linen, that there would be a balance sheet for the group laundry, and that we would be able to gauge the efficiency or otherwise of the activity. However, although, as far as I can see, the items are being charged to the various hospitals using the group service, we do not appear to have any information about the basis for the charge, about what the service is costing the taxpayer, or about whether or not the group laundry is making a profit.

I understand that a similar institution in another State made it clear that the group laundry would have the stock of linen and sheeting and that it would charge each institution so much a pound for the use of that linen. The proposal was that after the linen had been returned to the group laundry for cleaning, it would be re-issued. The laundry should be run as a business, and it is clear that certain amounts are charged to various departments for using the linen, but whether the laundry is profitable, how much it charges departments, and what depreciation is provided is obscured by the way the Estimates are shown. One item for \$487,100 is shown but there is

nothing about the purchasing of linen or contingencies. The laundry must use detergents, but I do not know how or whence they are purchased. No provision is made on a separate line for the laundry. This is an institution that has a wages expenditure of nearly \$500,000 but the Committee cannot see how it is being provided for.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Hospitals are jointly paying the laundry for services rendered.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. In his report the Auditor-General states:

Existing linen stocks have been taken over from various government hospitals and institutions at no actual cost to the group laundry but for costing purposes have been brought into account at valuation. One exception to this arrangement was the Lyell McEwin Hospital where an actual cash payment was made as it was not receiving a maintenance grant from the Government. Since commencing operations in November, the laundry has progressively taken over the servicing of various hospitals and institutions as plant capacity and linen stocks made this possible.

The Auditor-General has made a segregation, but there is no segregation in the Estimates. No doubt the Auditor-General has some information that we have not been able to locate in the Estimates.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: This is not the fault of the group laundry or of the Government, but if the laundry had been operating for longer than 12 months no doubt these difficulties would not exist. On the line relating to the Parkside Mental Hospital, a separate line is shown of the payment to the group laundry and central linen service from January 1, 1967. The payment for the Enfield Receiving Home is for a full year, but payments for other institutions using the group laundry services are shown over varying periods. The laundry has only just got off the ground since January 1, 1967. The member for Onkaparinga, as Chairman of the Public Works Committee, would not give information to this Committee if he had not examined this matter, and I commend him for the forthright way he has commended the management of this laundry. When all hospitals are working under the present scheme, the laundry will render a satisfactory service to everyone, and because of the volume of work it will cost the hospitals less than before. This laundry does not deserve to be kicked to death.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: We are not kicking it to death.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It should be given the opportunity to have a full year's

operation before being criticized. This laundry will prove its value to hospitals using its facilities, and will save the Government considerable money.

Mr. McANANEY: We are not trying to kick the group laundry, as it will probably work at a profit. We are apparently now confronted with a new set of circumstances. Are we to change our whole system of voting line by line for the Government's expenditure, or are we to deal with these contra entries? If we are to have three or four different systems in considering the one account, it can lead only to more confusion. I ask the Treasurer to obtain an explanation from his expert on this matter.

Mr. SHANNON: I think the Hospitals Department may be forgiven at this stage for not being able to give itemized accounts for a full year's operations. The Superintendent of Laundries explained to me this morning the present method of charging the various institutions using the laundry's services. Although, for example, the Group Laundry does not supply materials for the Children's Welfare Department (uniforms and working shirts, etc., are the property of that particular client), the major hospitals all take their linen from the central linen service on the basis of about 12c a pound of dry weight. I calculate that about \$1,000,000 will be paid by the various institutions for this laundry service, excluding revenue obtained from extraneous clients. Mr. Spencer also informed me that wages represented 42 per cent of the laundry's overall expenses.

I pay a tribute to this officer; he is a good businessman, as well as a first-class laundryman. Having been around the world, he is well versed in laundry work. The Public Works Committee has taken evidence on laundry work in most parts of Australia, and I can say that the Royal Melbourne Hospital laundry cannot compare with ours. I am also informed that the Group Laundry is at present using a new type of linen containing 200 threads compared with the 130-thread article previously used, and that the new material is lighter and stronger, with much better lasting qualities than those of the previous article. The hospitals using the new material are satisfied with it, and no extra cost is involved. I was told that the laundry carried an additional week's supply of linen in order to meet contingencies.

No problem exists in ascertaining the cost of laundering the various uniforms (doctors' smocks and gowns, and nurses' caps, etc.), as the dry weight basis of payment simplifies bookkeeping. I hope the laundry is not a

money-spinner but that it will be purely a service department. After all, nearly 100 per cent of its clients are Government institutions, so that money is going merely from one pocket into another. The committee was impressed by what it saw at the Group Laundry this morning.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Treasurer and the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) have been talking about the desirability of having the group laundry, but I am concerned about the hopeless muddle that the accounts of the laundry are in. I could not find anything about the group laundry in the provision for the Hospitals Department. It is not a part of that department at all. The Auditor-General makes it clear that the Group Laundry and Central Linen Service is a separate department and he has provided a balance sheet unlike anything submitted to Parliament. Naturally, the Auditor-General's balance-sheet includes the cost of certain materials purchased.

It is a fundamental principle that, if the Government is spending money, the Estimates of that expenditure should be presented to Parliament. I ask the Treasurer where he shows the loss of \$66,000 made by the laundry last year. I am not complaining about the loss, but Estimates should be presented for this department as they are presented for other departments. All that is included in the Hospitals Department Estimates is the expenditure for salaries for the laundry. The provision for long service leave is not voted by Parliament and the \$66,000 has not been appropriated by Parliament. The Auditor-General stated that the cost a pound of linen supplied to institutions was 11.7c and that the amount charged to the hospitals was 10c, so there was not a full recouping of the charges.

I am not complaining about the loss of \$66,000. My Government submitted the proposal for a group laundry to the Public Works Committee, made the land available and made the first payments towards its establishment. When I raised this matter last year, I was told that the position would be rectified. However, the Estimates for the laundry are not before Parliament, except the provision for salaries, which is included in the Hospitals Department. We are told that the laundry is conducted by four senior members of the Hospitals Department and is the responsibility of the Director General of Medical Services, but it is not a part of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. It is located at Dudley

Park and serves such institutions as the Home for Incurables, which is not a Government institution. The laundry provides a service that is paid for by the people who use it. Will the Treasurer ensure that the Estimates for this department are properly presented in future?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: There has been much fuss about the group laundry. No provision is made for the purchase by the laundry of any linen or other material.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: That's what we are complaining about.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Of course, honourable members are complaining about it. We do not know the complete cost of laundering work for the Royal Adelaide Hospital, yet the honourable member wants details before the system is in full operation. The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) gave interesting information on the laundry and I agree with his statement that it has been set up to render a service to the various departments as cheaply as possible. I am sure we would have more laundry work from the Parkside Mental Hospital than from the Royal Adelaide Hospital or some other general hospital. Some of the laundry work from the mental institutions would have to be done in a more particular way.

Mr. Shannon: If you saw how they handled foul linen you would be amazed.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes, but I point out that considerable cost is involved in the laundering. If the items for this laundry are to appear under one department, I will make the necessary allocation of Loan money in next year's Loan Estimates and provide for the cost of administration, including wages and salaries.

Mr. McANANEY: I am still not satisfied. We have a certain method of presenting the Budget in various departments. Now we have entered a new type of bookkeeping. We have \$487,100 proposed for wages and salaries, with a contra of \$487,100 in revenue. We are recovering \$140,000 in interest on this group laundry, and there is a recovery of debt charges of \$110,000, making \$250,000. We add that on to the \$487,100 and we get \$737,100. Then we are asked to approve lines to the extent of nearly \$900,000 to the various departments. It is the difference between those two amounts that is spent on detergents and various other items. In all other departments, they appear as a contingency line, which has been eliminated altogether here. The Treasurer says that he

will see to it next year, but we already have a method of doing this. Stick to it now! Why present something different to us? The Treasurer has said that we do not know what we are talking about. All we know about it is that there is a missing link. That information has not been given to us.

I note that \$20,000 was voted last year for the payment of bursaries to potential nurses, of which \$9,400 was actually used. This year \$6,800 is proposed, a decrease of \$2,600. We understand that this money was provided with the object of securing more nurses. We are short of nurses in the various hospitals, so can the Treasurer explain why this amount is being reduced each year?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The information I have is that bursaries will not be granted for the year 1967. Alternative schemes are under consideration and the provision is for the final instalment of bursaries granted for the year 1966.

Line passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ENFIELD GENERAL CEMETERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 11.15 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 21, at 2 p.m.